

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Babatunde, Solomon, Awodele, Oluwaseyi and Adeniyi, Onaopepo (2018) Opportunities and challenges of foreign direct investment utilisation and its impact on construction sector in developing countries. *Journal of Financial Management of Property and Construction*, 23 (2). pp. 239-256. ISSN 1366-4387

Published by: Emerald

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFMPC-07-2017-0025> <<https://doi.org/10.1108/JFMPC-07-2017-0025>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/32608/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)



UniversityLibrary



Northumbria
University
NEWCASTLE



Emerald

Journal of
Financial Management of
Property and Construction

Opportunities and challenges of foreign direct investment utilisation and its impact on construction sector in developing countries

Journal:	<i>Journal of Financial Management of Property and Construction</i>
Manuscript ID	JFMPC-07-2017-0025.R3
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Foreign direct investment, construction sector, Developing countries, gross domestic product, Nigeria

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Opportunities and challenges of foreign direct investment utilisation and its impact on construction sector in developing countries

Abstract

Purpose – Foreign direct investment (FDI) inflows to both developed and developing countries have increased over the past three decades. However, investigation of opportunities and challenges associated with FDI on the host economy and its impact especially on the construction sector through empirical assessment, have received scant attention. The purpose of this study is to address this gap in knowledge with in the Nigerian context; and examine the trend of FDI inflows to the construction sector for the period 2000-2013 inclusive. Relationships between contributions of the construction sector to Nigeria's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) are also studied.

Design/methodology/approach– The study ~~adopted~~ used a literature review, a questionnaire survey, and archival data culminated in data analysis. The survey targeted financial experts in Nigerian financial institutions/local banks. Archival data included the annualised data extracted from the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) statistical bulletins. The period examined witnessed stable economic conditions. Data collected were analysed using mean score, factor analysis, and correlation.

Findings – Eight identified opportunities of utilising FDI were grouped into three principal factors: knowledge spillovers; capital for new investment; and resilience during financial crises. The 10 identified FDI challenges were grouped into three major factors: loss of ownership advantage and additional costs; crowding-out of national firms; and administrative bottlenecks and overdependence. Based on the hypotheses tested, the study found a significant relationship between the contributions of FDI inflows in the construction sector and the total GDP of the host country.

Practical implications – This study provides greater insight on the effects of FDI on a host economy in developing countries, which would help policymakers to examine existing policies, and look for new ways of increasing foreign investment flow; ~~e~~ E specially in the area of Construction Facility Investment (CFI).

Originality/value – This study is important because it ~~would enable~~ informs policymakers in developing countries at large, to promote FDI with special considerations for the construction sector of the economy.

Keywords Foreign direct investment, construction sector, developing countries, gross domestic product, Nigeria

Paper type Research paper

1. Introduction

Over the last three decades, foreign direct investment (FDI) has significantly expanded across many countries. For instance, the developed ~~economies~~, developing, and transition economies have attracted high volumes of inward FDI. ~~The~~ FDI flows across the globe ~~has~~ have risen sharply, from an annual average of US\$142 billion during the period ~~of~~ 1985-1990, to over US\$385 billion in ~~the year~~ 1996, ~~and then it~~ made a record by reaching US\$1.9 trillion in ~~the year~~ 2007 [United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), 2009a]. Developing countries are not an exception to this ~~development trend~~; ~~These countries they~~ increased d their annual share ~~out of total~~ world FDI from 15 per cent in 1990 to 30 per cent in

2006; and then to 37 per cent in ~~the year~~ 2008 (UNCTAD, 2009a). In 2014, ~~the~~ global FDI inflows fell by 16 per cent to US\$1.23 trillion, mostly because of the fragility of the global economy, policy uncertainty for investors and elevated geopolitical risks (UNCTAD, 2015). In Africa, the largest recipients of FDI in 2015 included: Egypt (US\$ 10.2 billion); Mozambique (US\$ 4.7 billion); Morocco (US\$ 4.2 billion); South Africa (US\$ 3.6 billion); Ghana (US\$ 2.5 billion); the Democratic Republic of the Congo (US\$ 2.5 billion); Zambia (US\$ 2.4 billion); Tanzania (US\$ 2.3 billion); Ethiopia (US\$ 2.1 billion); Guinea (US\$ 1.9 billion); and Kenya (US\$ 1.9 billion) respectively [African Development Bank (AfDB), 2016].

The significance of foreign infrastructure development capital for ~~the provision of infrastructure development for~~ both macroeconomic and microeconomic activities of a country cannot be overemphasised. In developing countries, a key factor influencing ~~the~~ economic growth is the amount and quality of infrastructure provided for transport, water, energy, waste disposal, education, and health. ~~Thus, the~~ This provision is costly and normally requires expertise and resources that are not often ~~not~~ available locally (Howes and Robinson, 2005). Developing countries have huge requirements for infrastructure development in order to support growth, reduce poverty, and improve living standards. As FDI is part of the economic system that stimulates economic growth, there is a need for governments in developing countries to attract investment capital ~~from developed countries~~ to bridge their 'infrastructure gap', hence enhancing their economic growth. The importance of FDI in the growth dynamics of countries has created much interest amongst scholars (see De Mello, 1997; Borenstein *et al.*, 1998; Dees, 1998 among others) ~~among others~~. Despite these previous studies, empirical evidence on whether FDI promotes growth in Africa remains inconclusive (Edwards, 2001).

~~In Nigeria,~~ The empirical linkage between FDI and economic growth in Nigeria is yet unclear (Ayanwale, 2007). Previous studies ~~have that~~ examined ~~this the impact of FDI on Nigeria's economic growth~~ with varying outcomes (see Akinlo, 2004). Also, few studies have focussed on the impediments of ~~attracting~~ significant FDI inflows to Nigeria (Dupasquier and Osakwe, 2006). Other studies have focussed that focus on determinants of FDI in Nigeria (see Asideu, 2006; Anyanwu, 2011). However, there is a dearth of effort at investigating through empirical assessment, the opportunities and challenges associated with FDI on ~~the a~~ host economy in developing countries. Also, the impact of FDI, especially ~~on at~~ the construction sector level, has received equally scant attention. ~~It is against this backdrop that this study aims to fill the identified gaps. Therefore,~~ this study therefore was guided by the following derived objectives:

- Identify and assess ~~the~~ opportunities and challenges associated with FDI on the Nigerian economy
- Examine the trend of FDI inflows to the Nigerian construction sector ~~in Nigeria~~ between the years 2000 and 2013
- Establish the relationships between the contributions of construction sector FDI inflows ~~in the construction sector~~ and Nigerian's gross domestic product (GDP).

This study ~~would~~ provides greater insight on the effects of FDI on a host economy, which would help policymakers to examine existing ~~laws~~ legislation, and look for new ways of increasing foreign investment flows, especially in the area of Construction Facility Investment (CFI).

2. Literature review

2.1 Theoretical framework of the study

It is generally agreed that FDI plays a vital role in the developmental process of a country but the question of ~~if-whether~~ its effect is positive or negative, is highly controversial. There are ~~some relevant~~ economic theories underpinning the role of FDI in the country both from the positive and negative points of view. This study, ~~therefore,~~ considered and reviewed endogenous growth model theory and dependency theory as theoretical underpinnings of the opportunities and challenges associated with FDI on ~~the-a~~ host economy, ~~which is the focus of this study~~ focus are as follows:

2.1.1 Endogenous growth model theory

The new growth model endogenised the technological progress in the older Neoclassical Solow-type model (Romer, 1986). It provided a theoretical justification for FDI as a catalyst for economic growth and development. Theoretically, FDI increases the rate of technical progress in the host country through a "contagion" effect from the more advanced technology and management practices used by multinational corporations (MNCs), which may lead to improvements in productivity and efficiency in local firms and hence economic growth (Zhang 2001; Durham, 2004). For instance, Eaton and Kortum (1996) found out that domestic productivity growth is mainly related to foreign innovation, rather than domestic innovation. The evidence of positive spillover effects tend to be more favourable in developed countries. For example, Haskel *et al.* (2007) found out positive spillovers from foreign to local firms in a panel dataset of firms in the UK. Görg and Strobl (2003) concluded that foreign presence reduces exit and encourages entry by domestically owned firms in Ireland's high-tech sector. It is evident that FDI fosters international technology spillovers. It can be deduced from endogenous growth model theory that there is a positive relationship between FDI and economy growth of a host country.

2.1.2 Dependency theory

During the 1960s and 1970s, FDI was highly criticised as being responsible for inequalities between the developed and developing countries. Much of this view was wrapped up in dependency theory (Lund, 2010). Dependency theorists argued that FDI holds negative political, social and economic costs. For instance, Alfaro (2014) asserted that the impact of FDI on the host economies is difficult to assess. For example, the empirical evidence for FDI generating the expected positive effects is ambiguous at both the micro and macro levels (Alfaro, 2014). Görg and Greenaway (2004) concluded that the micro-level analysis of spillovers from foreign-owned to domestically owned firms indicate the effects are mostly negative. Blomström and Kokko (2003) concluded that the spillovers are not automatic, since local conditions have an important influence on firms' adoption of foreign technologies and skills. Alfaro *et al.* (2010) confirmed that not all countries satisfy the preconditions for taking advantage of FDI's potential benefits. Bruno and Campos (2013) concluded that the effects of FDI are mostly negative or that the evidence for its benefits is weak at best, particularly for developing countries. The mixed findings reached by studies under endogenous growth model theory and dependency theory on the effect of FDI and host countries suggest that these relationships should be examined closely.

3. FDI and the Nigerian economy

Recently, ~~the~~ FDI inflows into Nigeria ~~was-were~~ dominated by the oil industry. Although at independence, in 1960, there was a widespread FDI presence in the economy. Policy design thereafter narrowed the scope for FDI and decades of political instability, economic mismanagement and endemic corruption further reduced Nigeria's ability to attract and retain

FDI (UNCTAD, 2009b). This was compounded by a relentless deterioration of the country's social conditions and physical infrastructure, in spite of increased public revenues generated by the oil sector (UNCTAD, 2009b). Nigeria as a country, given her natural resource base and large market size, qualifies it to be a major recipient of FDI in Africa and indeed is one of the top three leading African countries that consistently received FDI in the ~~past decade preceding 2003~~ (Asiedu, 2003). This is corroborated by Ayanwale (2007) ~~that~~ Nigeria is one of the few countries that have consistently benefited from ~~the African FDI inflow to Africa~~. In 2006, FDI inflow to West Africa ~~was mainly benefited dominated by inflow to~~ Nigeria, who received 70 per cent of the sub-regional total (UNCTAD, 2006).

Since 2007, more than 50%~~per cent~~ of ~~the Nigerian FDI investment capital invested into Nigeria~~ has ~~targeted been into~~ the capital intensive resource sectors, particularly the oil sector. There has been strong growth in investment into telecommunications, with the sector attracting 23.9 per cent of FDI projects between 2007 and 2013 (Ernst and Young, 2014). Between 2007 and 2013, Nigeria ~~has~~ attracted FDI from industrialised countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and emerging economies such as China, India, and South Africa (African Development Bank (AfDB), 2016). In 2011, the country ranked 170 out of 213 countries with respect to the Gross National Income Per Capita which was put at US\$1,200 (World Bank, 2011b). Many analysts and experts have suggested the use of FDI as a veritable injection to kick-start the Nigerian economy. The Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) (2013) reported that FDI inflows constituted 18.0 per cent of total inflows and represented 2.1 per cent of GDP, signifying ~~the~~ continued confidence in the economy by foreign investors. However, the country has witnessed a sharp decrease in FDI from US\$ 8.1 billion in 2011 to US\$ 1.4 billion in 2015 (AfDB, 2016). This is not surprising because ~~the year during 2015 was~~ a general election in Nigeria ~~that~~ triggered political risk coupled with deteriorating security, corruption and poor infrastructure, which are threats to investment and business in Nigeria.

4. The Nigerian construction sector

The Nigerian construction sector primarily comprises ~~the organised a~~ formal sector and unorganised informal sector. The formal sector encompasses foreign/expatriate and indigenous firms that are classified into small, medium and large based on their number of employees, and annual turnover (Oladapo, 2007). The large firms are dominated by international construction firms, and they accounted for about 5 per cent of the total number of construction firms in the formal sector. ~~They and control~~ about 95 per cent of the construction market (Oladapo, 2007). For instance, Vetiva (2011) reported that 'Julius Berger Nigeria Plc.' remains the market leader, as it controls a large chunk of public sector construction, but with the ~~entrant entrance~~ of Chinese Construction giants (China Civil Engineering Construction Company) the dominance of Julius Berger faces a significant threat in the long term. Between the 1960s and 1980s, the construction sector was the major contributor to Nigeria's GDP, accounting for about 70 per cent of ~~the~~ GDP (Aibinu and Jagboro, 2002). This made the sector very strategic to the nation's development efforts. Regrettably, ~~the Nigerian construction sector~~ is bedevilled by low productivity and poor performance, since the decline of the national economy started at the end of the 1980s (Adeyemi *et al.*, 2005).

The ~~Nigerian construction~~ sector performed below expectations between 1981 and the late 1990's (Aibinu and Jagboro, 2002). The only period of the boom between 1980's and 1990's was in early 1980's when the sector accounted for 6 per cent of the Nation's GDP (Aina and Wahab, 2011). At the beginning of 2000, ~~the sector's~~ GDP contribution was around 1-2 per cent (Bamisile, 2004). Despite a 9 per cent growth ~~in the sector~~ as a result of on-going

5.1 Questionnaire survey

~~In order to capture broad perceptions of the respondents and to empirically assess the opportunities and challenges associated with the FDI in Nigeria; this study adopted a questionnaire survey.~~ The questionnaire survey was conducted with targeted financial experts in the Nigerian financial institutions/banks. ~~The Potential~~ respondents were purposively selected based on two major criteria as follows:

- Having reached the managerial level or departmental/unit head ~~of the unit~~
- Having in-depth knowledge of private/foreign capital investment

Given these criteria, it was believed that it afforded the respondents opportunities to give reliable and realistic information. Also, the respondents were selected from 20 commercial banks and 6 specialised banks, thus resulting in 26 banks in Nigeria. For objectivity, during the survey, 3 copies of the questionnaire were distributed to each bank at their head office. This approach was supported by previous studies (see Badu *et al.*, 2012; Famakin *et al.*, 2012; Babatunde and Perera, 2017). Overall, 78 copies of the questionnaire were purposively administered, out of which 63 copies of the questionnaire were completed and deemed suitable for the analysis.

The questionnaire ~~designed for the study~~ was structured and multiple-choice type. ~~The questionnaire-It~~ was divided into two sections. Section 'A' comprised the background information of respondents; this includes their academic qualification, years of industrial/professional experience. Section 'B' was designed in relation to the purpose of the study. The questions were asked using an ordinal Likert type scale of 1 to 5 where: 5—very critical, 4—critical, 3—somehow critical, 2—less critical, and 1— not critical. ~~Further, a A~~ reliability test using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was conducted. The result indicated the reliability coefficient value of Cronbach's alpha 0.840 signifying that the questionnaire used was significantly reliable and indicates evidence of internal consistency (George and Mallery, 2003). ~~The Those~~ data obtained through questionnaires were analysed using ~~the~~ SPSS. The study employed both descriptive and inferential statistics for the analysis. ~~The d~~ Descriptive statistics ~~techniques used~~ included percentage, average and mean score. The inferential statistics employed was factor analysis. As a first step in conducting factor analysis, the suitability of ~~the~~ survey data collected was examined using Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test (Pallant, 2010). The KMO values indicated ~~the~~ sampling adequacy to be 0.707 and 0.805 respectively for the factors identified as opportunities for utilising FDI and identified factors as challenges associated with FDI. The KMO values exceeded the 0.6 value that Kaiser (1974) suggested as satisfactory for accurate completion of factor analysis. Therefore, the data obtained were confirmed satisfactory and appropriate for use in factor analysis.

5.2 Archival data

Annualised archival data from the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) Statistical Bulletin from the year 2000-2013 served as the data source. The period examined witnessed stable economic conditions. The details information relating to FDI inflows to Nigerian economy, FDI inflows to the construction sector, total GDP, and contributions of the construction sector to total GDP were extracted from archival data for the period 2000-2013. The statistical technique employed in analysing ~~the~~ secondary data was correlation (instead of regression because the purpose of the analysis was not a prediction but simply to show the relationships between ~~the~~ dependent and independent variables) (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1996). ~~In this regards, t~~ The following hypotheses were postulated:

- i. There is no significant relationship between FDI and total GDP in Nigeria.
- ii. There is no significant relationship between the contributions of the FDI inflows in the construction sector and the total GDP of the Nigerian economy.

increased FDI brings over-reliance which makes a country too dependent on it and it may turn into a risk; domestic firms may suffer if they are relatively uncompetitive; and sophisticated foreign investors can use their skills to strip the company of its value without adding any.

~~The study, through f~~Factor analysis, grouped the eight identified opportunities of utilising FDI into three principal factors. ~~The factors to~~ include: knowledge spillovers; capital for new investment; and resilience during financial crises. ~~In the same vein Similarly,~~ the study, ~~through factor analysis,~~ further grouped the 10 identified challenges associated with the utilisation of FDI into three major factors. ~~These to~~ include: loss of ownership advantage and additional costs; crowding-out of national firms; and administrative bottleneck and overdependence. ~~Based on the hypotheses tested in this study, the study found a~~ significant relationship between FDI and total GDP of the host country was found, and a significant relationship between the contributions of FDI inflows in the construction sector and the total GDP of a country's economy. ~~It is on t~~This premise, ~~that this the~~ study established that FDI inflows in the construction sector have a positive relationship with economic growth in developing countries.

The findings of this study ~~are very interesting and important,~~ providing greater insights and empirical evidence on the positive relationship between FDI inflows in the construction sector and the total GDP of the host country. These findings will be beneficial to policymakers, particularly in the developing countries to promote FDI with special considerations for the construction sector of the economy. ~~Also, the study f~~Findings will also enable policymakers to carefully review the sectoral basis on how to facilitate FDI promotion policies to be more productive and beneficial for the developing countries. This study is not without limitations. Although the use of questionnaire survey allows large sample to be captured, other methods such as interviews which can complement questionnaire survey in revealing the host country's specific opportunities and challenges associated with FDI were not used. Therefore, further studies should be conducted in other developing countries to derive specific opportunities and challenges associated with the utilisation of FDI on each host country.

References

- Adeyemi, A. Y., Oladapo, A. A. and Akindele, O. (2005), "Balancing globalisation, glocalisation and the sustainable development equation in the Nigerian construction industry", Paper presented at the 3rd Postgraduate Conference, 9-11 October, Johannesburg.
- Africa Development Bank (AfDB) (2016), African economic outlook: sustainable cities and structural transformation, available at: https://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Publications/AEO_2016_Report_Full_English.pdf (Accessed 15 September 2017).
- Aibinu, A. A. and Jagboro, G. O. (2002), "The effects of construction delay on project delivery in Nigerian construction industry", *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 20 No. 8, pp. 593-599.
- Akinlo, A. E. (2004), "Foreign direct investment and growth in Nigeria: an empirical investigation", *Journal of Policy Modelling*, Vol. 26 No.5, pp. 627-639.
- Alfaro, L., Chanda, A., Kalemli-Ozcan, S. and Sayek, S. (2010), "How does foreign direct investment promote economic growth? Exploring the effects of financial markets on linkages". *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 91 No. 2, pp. 242-256.

- 1
2
3 Alfaro, L. (2014), "Foreign direct investment: effects, complementarities, and promotion",
4 Working Paper 15-006, National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER), Cambridge,
5 MA.
- 6 Amadeo, K. (2013) Foreign direct investment (FDI), available at:
7 [http://useconomy.about.com/od/tradeterms/g/Foreign-Direct-Investment-FDI-](http://useconomy.about.com/od/tradeterms/g/Foreign-Direct-Investment-FDI-Definition.htm)
8 [Definition.htm](http://useconomy.about.com/od/tradeterms/g/Foreign-Direct-Investment-FDI-Definition.htm) (Accessed 25 September 2017).
- 9
10 Anyanwu, J. C. (1993) *Monetary economics: theory policy and institution*, Hybrid Publishers
11 Ltd: Onitsha.
- 12 Anyanwu, J. C. (2011), Determinants of foreign direct investment inflow to Africa, 1980-
13 2007. Working Paper No 136, African Development Bank, Tunisia.
- 14 Asiedu, E. (2003), "Capital controls and foreign direct investment", *World Development*,
15 Vol. 32 No.3, pp. 479-490.
- 16 Asiedu, E. (2006), "Foreign direct investment in Africa: the role of natural resources, market,
17 size, government policy, institutions and political stability", *World Economy*, Vol. 29
18 No. 1, pp. 63-77.
- 19 Ayanwale A.B. (2007), "FDI and economic growth: evidence from Nigeria", Africa
20 Economic Research Consortium Paper 165, AERC, Nairobi.
- 21 Babatunde, S.O. and Perera, S. (2017), "Barriers to bond financing for public-private
22 partnership infrastructure projects in emerging markets: A case of Nigeria", *Journal*
23 *of Financial Management of Property and Construction*, Vol. 22 No.1, pp.2-19.
- 24 Badu, E., Edwards, D.J., Owusu-Manu, D. and Brown, D.M. (2012), "Barriers to the
25 implementation of innovative financing (IF) of infrastructure", *Journal of Financial*
26 *Management of Property and Construction*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 253-273.
- 27 Baldwin, R., Braconier, H. and Forslid, R. (2005), "Multinationals, endogenous growth, and
28 technological spillovers: theory and evidence", *Review of International Economics*,
29 Vol. 13 No.5, pp. 945-963.
- 30 Bamisile, A. (2004). *Building Production Management*. Lagos, Foresight Press Limited,
31 Nigeria.
- 32 Blomström, M. and Kokko, A. (2003), "The economics of foreign direct investment
33 incentives", NBER Working Paper 9489, National Bureau of Economic Research,
34 Cambridge, MA.
- 35 Borensztein, E., De Gregorio, J. and Lee, J. (1998), "How does foreign investment affect
36 economic growth? *Journal of International Economics*, Vol. 45 No.1, pp. 115-135.
- 37 Brown, J. D. (2009), "Choosing the right type of rotation in PCA and EFA", *JALT Testing*
38 *and Evaluation SIG newsletter*, Vol.13 No.3, pp. 20-25.
- 39 Bruno, R. L. and Campos, N. F. (2013), "Re-examining the conditional effect of foreign
40 direct investment", Discussion Papers 7458, Institute for the Study of Labour (IZA),
41 Germany.
- 42 Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) (2013), "Economic report for the first half of 2013", available
43 at: <http://www.cenbank.org/documents/annualreports.asp> (Accessed 20 July 2015).
- 44 Dainty, A. (2007) "A Call for Methodological Pluralism in Built Environment Research",
45 *Proceedings of the Third Scottish Conference for Postgraduate Researchers of the*
46 *Built and Natural Environment*, Glasgow Caledonian University, November 20-22,
47 pp. 1-10.
- 48 Dees, S. (1998), "Foreign direct investment in China: determinants and effects", *Economics*
49 *of Planning*, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 175-194.
- 50 De Mello, L. R. (1997), "Foreign direct investment in developing countries and growth: a
51 selective survey", *Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 34 No.1, pp.1-34.
- 52 De Silva, D. (2011), "Foreign direct investment (FDI) in the context of trade and economic
53 development", *Sri Lankan Journal of Management*, Vol.16 No1/2, pp.1-40.
- 54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Dunning, J. H. (1988), "The eclectic paradigm of international production: a restatement and
4 some possible extensions", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 19 No.1,
5 pp. 1-31.
- 6 Dupasquier, C. and Osakwe, P. N. (2006), "Foreign direct investment in Africa: performance,
7 challenges, and responsibilities", *Journal of Asian Economics*, Vol. 17 No.2, pp. 241–
8 260.
- 9 Durham, J. (2004), "Absorptive capacity and the effects of foreign direct investment and
10 equity foreign portfolio investment of economic growth" *European Economic Review*,
11 Vol. 48 No. 2, pp. 285-306.
- 12 Eaton, J. and Kortum, S. (1996), "Trade in ideas: productivity and patenting in the OECD"
13 *Journal of International Economics*, Vol. 40 No. 3/4, pp. 251–278.
- 14 Edwards, S. (2001), "Capital mobility and economic performance; are emerging market
15 economies different? Working Paper W8076, National Bureau of Economic Research,
16 Cambridge: MA.
- 17 Ernst and Young (2014), Africa by numbers a focus on Nigeria special report issued for:
18 World Economic Forum on Africa, available at:
19 [http://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/EY-Nigeria-Country-Report/\\$FILE/EY-](http://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/EY-Nigeria-Country-Report/$FILE/EY-Nigeria-Country-Report.pdf)
20 [Nigeria-Country-Report.pdf](http://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/EY-Nigeria-Country-Report/$FILE/EY-Nigeria-Country-Report.pdf) (Accessed 15 September 2017).
- 21
22 Famakin, I.O., Aje, I.O. and Ogunsemi, D.R. (2012), "Assessment of success factors for joint
23 venture construction projects in Nigeria", *Journal of Financial Management of*
24 *Property and Construction*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 153-165.
- 25
26 Fellows, R. R. and Liu, A. (2008) *Research Methods for Construction*, Wiley-Blackwell
27 Science, London.
- 28 George, D. and Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for windows step by step: a simple guide and*
29 *reference 11.0 update*, Allyn and Bacon, Boston.
- 30
31 Görg, H. E. and Strobl, E. (2003), "Footloose multinationals? *The Manchester School*, Vol.
32 71, pp. 1-19.
- 33 Görg, H., Hanley, A. and Strobl, E. (2011), "Creating backward linkages from multinationals:
34 is there a role for financial incentives?" *Review of International Economics*, Vol. 19
35 No. 2, pp. 245-259.
- 36 Haskel, J. E., Pereira, S. C. and Slaughter, M. J. (2007), "Does inward foreign direct
37 investment boost the productivity of local firms?" *Review of Economics and Statistics*,
38 Vol. 89 No. 3, pp. 482-496.
- 39 Holt, G. D. and Goulding, J. S. (2017), "The "ological-triad": considerations for construction
40 management research", *Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology*, Vol. 15
41 No.3, pp.286-304.
- 42
43 Howes, R. and Robinson, H. (2005), *Infrastructure for the built environment: global*
44 *procurement strategies*, Butterworth-Heinemann, UK.
- 45
46 Kaiser, H. (1974), "An index of factorial simplicity", *Psychometrika*, Vol. 39 No.1, pp. 31-
47 36.
- 48 K'Akumu, O. A., Jones, B. and Yang, J. (2013), "Factor analysis of the market environment
49 for artisanal dimension stone in Nairobi, Kenya", *Journal of Construction in*
50 *Developing Countries*, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 15-32.
- 51 Kline, P. (2002) *An Easy Guide to Factor Analysis*, Routledge: London.
- 52 Lipsey, R. E. (2002), "Home and host country effects of FDI", NBER Working Paper 9293,
53 National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA.
- 54 Loungani, P. and Razin, A. (2001), "How beneficial is a foreign direct investment for
55 developing countries?" available at:
56 <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2001/06/loungani.htm>
57 (Accessed 2 February 2016).
- 58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Love, P. D., Holt, G. D. and Li, H. (2002), "Triangulation in construction management
4 research", *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, Vol. 9 No. 4,
5 pp. 294-303.
- 6 Lund, M. T. (2010), Foreign direct investment: catalyst of economic growth? PhD Thesis, the
7 University of Utah, United States.
- 8 National Bureau of Statistic (NBS), (2016), Nigerian Gross Domestic Product Report: Quarter
9 one, Issue 9 No. 1, pp. 1-22.
- 10 OECD (2008), The social impact of foreign direct investment, available at
11 <https://www.oecd.org/els/emp/The-Social-Impact-of-foreign-direct-investment.pdf>
12 ((Accessed 15 September 2017).
- 13 Oladapo, A. A. (2007), "A quantitative assessment of the cost and time impact of variation
14 orders on construction projects", *Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology*,
15 Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 35-48.
- 16 Pallant, J. (2010) *SPSS survival manual: a step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for*
17 *windows*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- 18 Puapan, P. (2014), *Assessment of FDI impact on Thailand's production sectors: implications*
19 *for investment promotion activities*, Institute of Developing Countries (IDE), JETRO,
20 Japan.
- 21 Romer, P. (1986), "Increasing returns and long-run growth", *The Journal of Political*
22 *Economy*, Vol. 94, pp.1002-1037.
- 23 Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2012), *Research Methods for Business Students*,
24 Pearson, New York.
- 25 Sutrisna, M. (2009), Research methodology in doctoral research: understanding the meaning
26 of conducting qualitative research, Working Paper, In: Ross, A. (Ed.), proceedings of
27 the Association of Researchers in Construction Management (ARCOM) Doctoral
28 Workshop, Liverpool, UK, 12 May 2009, pp.48-57.
- 29 Tabachnick B. G and Fidell L. S. (1996) *Using multivariate statistics*, HarperCollins College
30 Publishers, New York.
- 31 Thadani, R. (2011), Advantages and disadvantages of FDI, available at:
32 <http://www.buzzle.com/articles/advantages-.pdf> (Accessed 25 September 2017).
- 33 UNCTAD (2006) *FDI from developing and transition economies: implications for*
34 *development*, UNCTAD, New York.
- 35 UNCTAD (2009a) *World investment directory*, UNCTAD, New York.
- 36 UNCTAD (2009b) *Investment policy review of Nigeria*, UNCTAD, New York.
- 37 UNCTAD (2015) *World investment report: reforming international investment governance*,
38 UNCTAD, New York.
- 39 Vetiva (2011), "Construction industry reports a haven of opportunities", available at:
40 <http://www.proshareng.com/admin/upload/reports/> (Accessed 25 October 2015).
- 41 Zhang, K. (2001), "Does foreign direct investment promote growth? Evidence from East Asia
42 and Latin America" *Contemporary Economic Policy*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp.175-185.
- 43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

List of Tables

Table I: Opportunities associated with the utilisation of FDI on the host country

Opportunities	Reference
1. FDI provides training for the employees, innovations in operational practices, and new financing tools	Zhang 2001; Durham, 2004 Haskel <i>et al.</i> , 2007; Thadani, 2011
2. FDI provides management, accounting, and legal guidance with the best practices	Görg and Strobl, 2003; OECD, 2008; Amadeo, 2013
3. FDI has proved to be resilient during financial crises	De Silva, 2011; Thadani, 2011
4. FDI allows quick implementation	Thadani, 2011; Amadeo, 2013
5. FDI contribute to corporate tax revenues in the host country	De Silva, 2011; Amadeo, 2013
6. FDI reduces the disparity that exists between costs and revenues, especially when they are calculated in different currencies	Loungani and Razin, 2001; Thadani, 2011
7. The risk involved is reduced	Ernst and Young, 2012; Amadeo, 2013
8. FDI allows diversification	Ernst and Young, 2012; Amadeo, 2013

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table II: Challenges associated with the utilisation of FDI on the host country

Challenges	Reference
1. Delays due to government bureaucracy and local political demands	Thadani, 2011; De Silva, 2011
2. Increased FDI brings over-reliance which makes a country too dependent on it and it may turn into a risk	Thadani, 2011; Amadeo, 2013
3. Domestic firms may suffer if they are relatively uncompetitive	Bruno and Campos, 2013; Amadeo, 2013
4. Sophisticated foreign investors can use their skills to strip the company of its value without adding any	Amadeo, 2013
5. High travel abroad and communications expenses	De Silva, 2011
6. FDI takes longer time to set up	Alfaro <i>et al.</i> , 2010
7. Extra expenses incurred for management talent to train staff and managers in host country	De Silva, 2011
8. Percentage restrictions on investments and ownership	OECD, 2008; De Silva, 2011
9. Loss of control by host country	Amadeo, 2013
10. Language and cultural barrier may pose problems between the investor and the host country	De Silva, 2011

Table III: Ranking of opportunities for utilising FDI on the host country

Opportunities	Frequency	Mean score	Std. dev.	Rank
1. FDI provides training for the employees, innovations in operational practices, and new financing tools	68	3.65	0.71	1
2. FDI provides management, accounting, and legal guidance with the best practices	68	3.54	0.78	2
3. FDI has proved to be resilient during financial crises	68	3.50	0.68	3
4. FDI allows quick implementation	68	3.50	0.76	4
5. FDI contribute to corporate tax revenues in the host country	68	3.38	0.77	5
6. FDI reduces the disparity that exists between costs and revenues, especially when they are calculated in different currencies	68	3.34	0.84	6
7. The risk involved is reduced	68	3.16	0.89	7
8. FDI allows diversification	68	2.97	0.79	8

Table IV: Ranking of challenges associated with utilisation of FDI on the host country

Challenges	Frequency	Mean score	Std. dev.	Rank
1. Delays due to government bureaucracy and local political demands	68	3.75	0.87	1
2. Increased FDI brings over-reliance which makes a country too dependent on it and it may turn into a risk	68	3.72	0.75	2
3. Domestic firms may suffer if they are relatively uncompetitive	68	3.35	0.93	3
4. Sophisticated foreign investors can use their skills to strip the company of its value without adding any	68	3.34	0.84	4
5. High travel abroad and communications expenses	68	3.32	0.82	5
6. FDI takes longer time to set up	68	3.32	1.01	6
7. Extra expenses incurred for management talent to train staff and managers in host country	68	3.26	0.92	7
8. Percentage restrictions on investments and ownership	68	3.18	0.98	8
9. Loss of control by host country	68	3.06	0.91	9
10. Language and cultural barrier may pose problems between the investor and the host country	68	3.03	0.91	10

Table V: Total variance explained on the opportunities for utilising FDI on the host country

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative % of Variance Explained	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative % of Variance Explained	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative % of Variance Explained
1	3.301	41.267	41.267	3.301	41.267	41.267	2.279	28.486	28.486
2	1.301	16.260	57.526	1.301	16.260	57.526	2.137	26.714	55.200
3	1.036	12.950	70.476	1.036	12.950	70.476	1.222	15.276	70.476
4	0.674	8.423	78.899						
5	0.586	7.328	86.226						
6	0.510	6.371	92.597						
7	0.375	4.693	97.290						
8	0.217	2.710	100.000						

Table VI: Principal factor extraction and varimax rotated component matrix^a on the opportunities for utilising FDI on the host country

Component	Principal Factor		
	1	2	3
1. FDI provides training for the employees, innovations in operational practices, and new financing tools	0.822		
5. FDI contribute to corporate tax revenues in the host country	0.803		
2. FDI provides management, accounting, and legal guidance with the best practices	0.735		
7. The risk involved is reduced		0.872	
6. FDI reduces the disparity that exists between costs and revenues, especially when they are calculated in different currencies		0.642	
8. FDI allows diversification		0.638	
4. FDI allows quick implementation		0.581	
3. FDI has proved to be resilient during financial crises			0.924

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization^a^aRotation converged in 6 iterations

Table VII: Total variance explained on the challenges associated with utilisation of FDI on the host country

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative % of Variance Explained	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative % of Variance Explained	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative % of Variance Explained
1	4.526	45.260	45.260	4.526	45.260	45.260	2.992	29.923	29.923
2	1.357	13.567	58.826	1.357	13.567	58.826	2.175	21.747	51.669
3	1.115	11.148	69.975	1.115	11.148	69.975	1.831	18.305	69.975
4	0.685	6.846	76.820						
5	0.517	5.174	81.995						
6	0.497	4.974	86.969						
7	0.441	4.407	91.376						
8	0.395	3.946	95.322						
9	0.276	2.760	98.083						
10	0.192	1.917	100.000						

Table VIII: Principal factor extraction and varimax rotated component matrix^a on the challenges associated with utilisation of FDI on the host country

Component	Principal factor		
	1	2	3
8. Percentage restrictions on investments and ownership	0.812		
5. High travel abroad and communications expenses	0.801		
10. The language and cultural barrier may pose problems between the investor and the host country	0.732		
7. Extra expenses incurred for management talent to train staff and managers in host country	0.693		
3. Domestic firms may suffer if they are relatively uncompetitive	0.594		
4. Sophisticated foreign investors can use their skills to strip the company of its value without adding any		0.848	
6. FDI takes longer time to set up		0.743	
9. Loss of control by host country		0.723	
1. Delays due to government bureaucracy and local political demands			0.835
2. Increased FDI brings over-reliance which makes a country too dependent on it and it may turn into a risk			0.808

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization^a^aRotation converged in 7 iterations

Table IX: FDI inflows into construction sector and GDP of the Nigerian economy (-N-MILLIONS)

Year	FDI inflow to the Nigerian economy	FDI inflow to construction sector	% of FDI inflow to construction sector	Total GDP	Contribution of construction to total GDP
2000	157,508.60	3,995.90	2.50	329,178.70	6,433.80
2001	161,441.60	4,211.90	2.60	356,994.30	7,205.90
2002	166,631.60	4,293.90	2.60	433,203.50	7,518.90
2003	179,687.60	4,545.80	2.50	477,533.00	8,176.80
2004	249,639.30	5,194.10	2.10	527,576.00	7,622.50
2005	324,129.30	6,713.30	2.10	561,931.40	8,544.50
2006	482,447.80	10,461.10	2.20	595,821.60	9,654.80
2007	552,498.60	12,030.20	2.10	634,251.10	10,912.60
2008	586,309.70	12,702.50	2.20	674,889.00	12,337.50
2009	492,737.92	8,825.40	1.79	24,794,240	347,690
2010	108,737.92	6,414.31	5.90	54,612,300	1,570,970
2011	274,749.36	6,581.40	2.40	62,980,400	1,905,570
2012	401,100.00	9,969.28	2.49	71,713,900	2,188,720
2013	431,230.00	8,563.50	1.99	80,092,560	2,676,280

Source: (CBN annual report, 2013)

(Exchange Rate (official) in 2013: 1US\$= N155.70, 1UK£= N257.48)

Table X: Correlations with log

		LFDIE	LFDIC	LTotal	LConstruct
LFDIE	Pearson Correlation	1	.873**	.128	.099
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.663	.735
	N	14	14	14	14
LFDIC	Pearson Correlation	.873**	1	.329	.310
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.251	.281
	N	14	14	14	14
LTotal	Pearson Correlation	.128	.329	1	.997**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.663	.251		.000
	N	14	14	14	14
LConstruct	Pearson Correlation	.099	.310	.997**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.735	.281	.000	
	N	14	14	14	14

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)