

Panel Data: The Effects of Some World Development Indicator (WDI) on GDP Per Capita of Selected African Union (AU) Countries (1981-2011)

M. I Ekum¹, D. A Farinde², F. J Ayoola³

^{1,2}Department of Mathematics & Statistics, Lagos State Polytechnic, Lagos State, Nigeria

³Department of Statistics, University of Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we employ Fixed Effect of Panel Data Model to formulate a Panel Data Linear Regression model of Gross Domestic Product Per Capita of 20 African Union (AU) Countries using five World Development Indicators (WDI) as explanatory variables. Data were collected from 1981 to 2011. The five WDI are OER-Official Exchange Rate (LCU Per US\$, Period Average), BM-Broad Money (% of GDP), INF-Inflation, GDP deflator (Annual %), TNR-Total Natural Resources Rents (% of GDP) and FDI-Foreign Direct Investment, Net Inflows (% of GDP). At the end of the analysis it was discovered that the OER, BM, INF, TNR and FDI all have significant relationship with GDP per Capita (RGDP). The estimated GDP per capita of the selected AU countries when the effect of OER, BM, INF, TNR and FDI are zero is \$193.29. 1.00 unit increase in OER-Official Exchange Rate (LCU Per US\$, Period Average) will lead to a significant reduction in GDP per capita by \$0.23 (0.23USD); if BM-Broad Money (% of GDP) increases by 1.00% then GDP per capita will increase by \$24.50; if INF-Inflation, GDP deflator (Annual %) increases by 1.00% then GDP per capita will decrease by \$1.11; if TNR-Total Natural Resources Rents (% of GDP) increases by 1.00% then GDP per capita will increase by \$3.65 and if FDI-Foreign Direct Investment, Net Inflows (% of GDP) increases by 1.00% then GDP per capita will increase by \$57.05. It is seen that 97.2% of the total variation in GDP per capita of the selected AU countries can be explained by the variations in these five WDI used in this paper while the remaining 2.8% could be explained by other variables other than the five WDI used in this model. The result also shows significant cross-sectional effects i.e countries effects. We therefore recommend that for African countries to be among the best economies in the world, they have to increase their gross domestic product per capital (RGDP) by increasing their foreign direct investment (FDI), total natural resources (TNR) and broad money (BM) while on the other hand, they have to reduce their official exchange rate (local currency to US dollar) and inflation rate (INF).

Keywords: *Econometrics, Cross section, Time series, Panel data, fixed effect, random effect.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Econometrics is a rapidly developing branch of economics which, broadly speaking, aims to give empirical content to economic relations (Frisch, 1936 [8]). Econometrics can be defined generally as the application of mathematics and statistical methods to the analysis of economic data. (Samuelson, Koopmans and Stone, 1954 [13])

Panel data are data where the same observation is followed over time (like in time series) and where there are many observations (like in cross-sectional data). In this sense, panel data combine the features of both time-series and cross-sectional data and methods. (Michele Pellizzari, 2012 [11])

2. PANEL DATA MODEL

Different types of data are generally available for empirical analysis, namely, time series, cross section, and panel. A data set containing observations on a single phenomenon observed over multiple time periods is called time series (e.g GDP per capita of a country for several years). In time series data, both the values and the ordering of the data points have meaning. In

cross-sectional data, values of one or more variables are collected for several sample units or entities, at the same point in time (e.g., GDP per capita of several countries for a given year). (Woolridge, J, 2002 [14]).

Panel data sets refer to sets that consist of both time series and cross section data. This has the effect of expanding the number of observations available, for instance if we have 31 years of data across 20 countries, we have 620 observations. So although there would not be enough to estimate the model as a time series or a cross section, there would be enough to estimate it as a panel. (Robert A. Yaffee (2003) [12]).

Looking at the model below:

$$\begin{aligned}
 y_{it} &= \beta_0 + \sum_{w=1}^k \beta_w X_{wit} + U_{it}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2.1}$$

In matrix form

$$\begin{aligned}
 y_{it} &= \beta_0 + X'_{it}\beta \\
 &+ U_{it}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2.2}$$

In *time series* data, $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ and $n = 1$; while in *cross-sectional* data, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $T = 1$. However, in *panel data*, $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ and $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

2.1 Types of Panel Data

Generally speaking, there exist two types of panel datasets. *Macro panels* are characterized by having a relatively large T and a relatively small n . A typical example is a panel of countries where the variables are macro data like the one we are working on i.e GDP per capita. *Micropanels*, instead, usually cover a large set of units “ n ” for a relatively short number of periods T .

Another important classification is between *balanced* and *unbalanced* panels. A *balanced dataset* is one in which all the n observations are followed for the same number of periods T . In an *unbalanced dataset* each observation might be available for a different number of periods so that the time dimension is potentially different for different observations. (Afees A. S, 2011 [1])

2.2 Uses of Panel Data

Panel data possess some advantages over cross-sectional or time series data.

Panel data can address issues that cannot be addressed by cross-sectional or time-series data alone. Baltagi (2008 [5]) highlighted the following advantages of panel data over cross sectional or time-series data:

- (i) Panel data control for heterogeneity, they give more informative data, more variability, less collinearity among the variables, more degrees of freedom and more efficiency
- (ii) They study better, the dynamics of adjustment.
- (iii) They are able to identify and measure effects that are simply not detectable in pure cross-sectional or pure time series data.
- (iv) Panel data models allow us to construct and test more complicated behavioural models than purely cross-sectional or time-series data.

2.3 ESTIMATION OF PANEL DATA MODELS

As earlier discussed, panel data has two dimensions viz: the individual dimension and time dimension. A panel data model differs from a cross-section or time series in that it has double subscript on its variables. That is, it's of the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
 y_{it} &= \beta_0 + \sum_{w=1}^k \beta_w X_{wit} + U_{it} \\
 &= \beta_0 + X'_{it}\beta + U_{it}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2.3}$$

$i = 1, 2 \dots n; \quad t = 1, 2 \dots T$

i could denote individuals, households, firms, countries etc. for the purpose of this paper, i denotes countries while t denotes time, y_{it} hence denotes the value of the dependent variable y for country i at time t . β_0 is a scalar, β is $k \times 1$ matrix (a column vector) and X_{it} is the i th observation on the k explanatory variables. Although (2.3) postulates common intercept (β_0) for all i and t and common vector of slope coefficients for all i and t , variants of the model exist.

The variants include:

$$\begin{aligned}
 y_{it} &= \beta_{0i} + \sum_{w=1}^k \beta_w X_{wit} + U_{it} \\
 &= \beta_{0i} + X'_{it}\beta \\
 &+ U_{it}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2.4}$$

(2.4) postulates constant slope coefficients and intercept that varies over countries.

$$\begin{aligned}
 y_{it} &= \beta_{0it} + \sum_{w=1}^k \beta_w X_{wit} + U_{it} \\
 &= \beta_{0it} + X'_{it}\beta \\
 &+ U_{it}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2.5}$$

(2.5) postulates constant slope coefficients and intercept that varies over countries and time.

$$\begin{aligned}
 y_{it} &= \beta_{0i} + \sum_{w=1}^k \beta_{wi} X_{wit} + U_{it} \\
 &= \beta_{0i} + X'_{it}\beta_i \\
 &+ U_{it}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2.6}$$

(2.6) postulates intercept and slopes that vary over countries.

$$\begin{aligned}
 y_{it} &= \beta_{0it} + \sum_{w=1}^k \beta_{wit} X_{wit} + U_{it} \\
 &= \beta_{0it} + X'_{it}\beta_{it} \\
 &+ U_{it}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2.7}$$

(2.7) postulates intercept and slopes that vary over time and countries.

However, (2.3) suffices for most applications involving static (non dynamic) panel data models and shall hence form the basis of our further discussions on panel data. (Ayoola F. J, 2013 [2])

3. METHODOLOGY

Basically, the static panel data models can be estimated using:

1. Ordinary Least Square (OLS)

2. Fixed Effects (FE) and
3. Random Effects (RE)
4. Seemily Unrelated (SUR). (See Baltagi, B.H., 1980 [4])

Each of these methods has its underlying assumptions which must necessary be satisfied to obtain unbiased and efficient estimates. We consider only the Fixed Effects model.

3.1 One-Way Error Component Regression Model

Recall (2.3)

$$y_{it} = \beta_0 + \sum_{w=1}^k \beta_w X_{wit} + U_{it} = \beta_0 + X'_{it}\beta + U_{it}$$

$$i = 1, 2 \dots n; \quad t = 1, 2 \dots T$$

Where U_{it} denotes the effect of all omitted variables. If U_{it} is decomposed as

$$U_{it} = \mu_i + v_{it} \tag{3.1}$$

We have

$$y_{it} = \beta_0 + X'_{it}\beta + \mu_i + v_{it} \tag{3.2}$$

(3.2) is called the one-way error component model where μ_i denotes the unobservable country specific (time invariant) effect and v_{it} (which varies with individual and time), the remainder disturbance in regression. (Baltagi, B.H. and Q. Li, 1992 [4])

3.2 THE FIXED EFFECTS MODEL

As earlier emphasized, one of the approaches used to capture specific effects in a panel data model is the fixed effects (FE) regression. The FE approach is based on the assumption that the effects are fixed parameters that can be estimated. (Ayoola F. J, 2013)

In this case, the omitted country specific term μ_i are assumed to be fixed parameters to be estimated and v_{it} normal, independent and identically distributed i.e $NIID(0, \sigma_v^2)$. The X_{it} are assumed to be independent of v_{it} for all i and t . The fixed effects model is appropriate if inference is to be drawn on the countries that constitute the sample only and not for generalization for the entire population. (Hsiao, C. 2003 [9]).

In vector form (3.2) can be written as:

$$y = \beta_0 J_{nT} + X\beta + U = Z\delta + U \tag{3.3}$$

where

y is $nT \times 1$; X is $nT \times k$; $Z = (J_{nT}, X)$; $\delta' = (\beta_0', \beta')$
 J_{nT} is a vector of ones of dimension nT .
 Note that (3.1) can be written as

$$U = Z_\mu \mu + v \tag{3.4}$$

Where

$$U' = (U_{11}, U_{12} \dots U_{1T}, U_{21}, U_{22} \dots U_{2T} \dots \dots \dots U_{n1}, U_{n2} \dots U_{nT})$$

$$Z_\mu = I_n \otimes J_T$$

Where I_n is an identity matrix of dimension n , J_T is a vector of ones of dimension T and \otimes denote skronecker product;

$$\mu' = (\mu_1, \mu_2 \dots \mu_n); v' = (v_{11}, v_{12} \dots v_{1T}, v_{21}, v_{22} \dots v_{2T} \dots \dots \dots v_{n1}, v_{n2} \dots v_{nT})$$

Z_μ is a matrix of ones and zeroes, that is, a matrix of individual dummies that are included in the regression to estimate μ_i which are assumed fixed.

At this juncture, we should note the following:

$$* Z_\mu Z_\mu' = I_n \otimes J_T \text{ (where } J_T \text{ is a square matrix of } 1 \text{ 's of dimension } T \text{)}$$

$$** P = Z_\mu (Z_\mu' Z_\mu)^{-1} Z_\mu'$$

$$= I_n \otimes J_T \left(J_T = \frac{J_T}{T} \right)$$

{ P is a projection matrix on Z_μ . P averages the observations across time for each country.}

$$*** Q = I_{nT} - P$$

{ Q is a matrix which obtains deviations from individual mean.}
 **** P and Q are symmetric idempotent matrices ($P' = P$ and $P^2 = P$)

P and Q are orthogonal i.e $PQ = 0$

$$P + Q = I_{nT}$$

Model Estimation

If we substitute (3.4) into (3.3), we shall have:

$$y = \alpha J_{nT} + X\beta + Z_\mu \mu + v = Z\delta + Z_\mu \mu + v \tag{3.5}$$

Where Z is $nT \times (K+1)$ and Z_μ , the matrix of country dummies is $nT \times n$, if n is large, (3.5) will include too many dummies and the matrix to be inverted will be dimension $(N+K)!$. Apart from the herculean task of having to invert such a large matrix, the matrix will also fall into dummy variable trap.

Rather than attempt OLS on (3.5), we can obtain Least Squares Dummy Variables (LSDV) Estimators of α and β by pre multiplying (3.5) by Q and performing OLS on the transformed model:

$$Qy = QX\beta + Qv = Z\delta + Z_\mu \mu + v \tag{3.6}$$

Since $QZ_\mu = QJ_{nT} = 0$

$$QZ_\mu = [I_{nT} - Z_\mu (Z_\mu' Z_\mu)^{-1} Z_\mu'] Z_\mu = Z_\mu - Z_\mu (Z_\mu' Z_\mu)^{-1} Z_\mu' Z_\mu = Z_\mu - Z_\mu = 0$$

As follows:

$$Qy = QX\beta + Qv$$

$$Qv = Qy - QX\beta$$

$$S = (Qv)'(Qv) = (Qy - QX\beta)'(Qy - QX\beta)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 S &= y'Q'Qy - y'Q'X\beta - \beta'X'Q'Qy + \beta'X'Q'QX\beta \\
 S &= y'Q'y - y'Q'X\beta - \beta'X'Q'y + \beta'X'Q'X\beta \\
 S &= y'Qy - 2\beta'X'Qy + \beta'X'QX\beta \\
 \frac{dS}{d\beta} &= -2X'Qy + 2X'QX\beta \\
 0 &= -2X'Qy + 2X'QX\beta \\
 2X'QX\beta &= 2X'Qy \\
 \hat{\beta} &= (X'QX)^{-1}X'Qy
 \end{aligned}$$

$$V(\hat{\beta}) = \sigma_v^2 I_{nT} (X'QX)^{-1}$$

Note: The OLS $\hat{\beta} = \beta + (X'QX)^{-1}X'Qv$ is sometimes called the Least Square Dummy Variable (LSDV).

4. RESULT OF ANALYSIS

The proposed Econometric model is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 Y_{it} &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 OER_{it} + \beta_2 BM_{it} + \beta_3 INF_{it} + \beta_4 TNR_{it} \\
 &\quad + \beta_5 FDI_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}
 \end{aligned}$$

For $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ where $n = 20$; $T = 31$

Note: The independent variables are carefully selected so that they are correlated with the dependent variable but are not correlated with other independents variables. Hence, the independent variables are not correlated with one another (no multicollinearity).

In this section, we present the result of the model using the following specifications below.

Model Specification

Estimation of equation

Methods: Least Squares (LS)

Sample: 1981-2011

Panel Options

Effects specification: Cross Section is fixed, Period is none

Weights: GLS weight: Cross-section SUR

Coefficient covariance method: Ordinary

Mean of β

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\beta} &= (X'QX)^{-1}X'Qy \\
 \hat{\beta} &= (X'QX)^{-1}X'(QX\beta + Qv) \\
 \hat{\beta} &= (X'QX)^{-1}X'QX\beta + (X'QX)^{-1}X'Qv \\
 \hat{\beta} &= \beta + (X'QX)^{-1}X'Qv \\
 E(\hat{\beta}) &= \beta + (X'QX)^{-1}X'QE(v)
 \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$E(v) = 0$$

Then

$$E(\hat{\beta}) = \beta$$

Hence, $\hat{\beta}$ is an unbiased estimate of β .

Variance of β

$$\hat{\beta} - \beta = (X'QX)^{-1}X'Qv \tag{3.7}$$

$$V(\hat{\beta}) = E(\hat{\beta} - \beta)(\hat{\beta} - \beta) \tag{3.8}$$

On substituting (3.7) into (3.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 V(\hat{\beta}) &= E\left[[(X'QX)^{-1}X'Qv][[(X'QX)^{-1}X'Qv]']\right] \\
 V(\hat{\beta}) &= E[(X'QX)^{-1}X'Qvv'Q'X(X'QX)^{-1}]
 \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$QQ' = Q$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 V(\hat{\beta}) &= \left[(X'QX)^{-1}X'Q[E(vv')]Q'X(X'QX)^{-1} \right] \\
 E(vv') &= \sigma_v^2 I_{nT}
 \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$V(\hat{\beta}) = \sigma_v^2 I_{nT} [(X'QX)^{-1}X'QX(X'QX)^{-1}]$$

Table 1: Panel Data Format

CCode	Cnid	t	i	YEAR	RGDP	OER	BM	INF	TNR	FDI
NGA	1	1	1	1981	772.10	0.62	30.03	16.21	30.18	0.91
NGA	1	2	2	1982	624.98	0.67	32.13	2.61	29.19	0.87
NGA	1	3	3	1983	428.13	0.72	33.31	16.14	35.71	1.04
NGA	1	4	4	1984	336.74	0.77	33.40	16.95	47.46	0.67
NGA	1	5	5	1985	330.98	0.89	32.00	3.69	47.04	1.71
NGA	1	6	6	1986	229.52	1.75	32.31	-1.50	31.82	0.96
NGA	1	7	7	1987	259.41	4.02	26.54	50.08	33.39	2.60
NGA	1	8	8	1988	246.39	4.54	26.44	21.38	29.16	1.66

NGA	1	9	9	1989	250.63	7.36	19.29	44.38	40.54	7.90
NGA	1	10	10	1990	291.87	8.04	22.08	7.16	47.48	2.06
NGA	1	11	11	1991	273.17	9.91	24.10	20.17	42.22	2.61
NGA	1	12	12	1992	319.30	17.30	20.82	83.62	35.70	2.74
NGA	1	13	13	1993	203.49	22.07	20.52	52.64	48.51	6.30
NGA	1	14	14	1994	220.22	22.00	21.58	27.77	41.14	8.28
NGA	1	15	15	1995	255.50	21.90	16.12	55.97	38.01	3.84
NGA	1	16	16	1996	313.44	21.88	13.11	36.90	40.11	4.51
NGA	1	17	17	1997	314.30	21.89	14.62	1.36	39.38	4.25
NGA	1	18	18	1998	272.44	21.89	18.58	-5.55	25.98	3.27
NGA	1	19	19	1999	287.92	92.34	21.79	12.29	32.60	2.89
NGA	1	20	20	2000	371.77	101.70	22.16	38.17	46.91	2.48
NGA	1	21	1	2001	378.83	111.23	24.52	10.74	39.87	2.48
NGA	1	22	2	2002	455.33	120.58	21.83	31.47	27.98	3.17
NGA	1	23	3	2003	508.43	129.22	20.20	11.20	34.40	2.96
NGA	1	24	4	2004	644.03	132.89	18.26	20.73	37.36	2.13
NGA	1	25	5	2005	802.79	131.27	17.73	19.76	43.15	4.44
NGA	1	26	6	2006	1,014.58	128.65	19.04	19.56	38.12	3.34
NGA	1	27	7	2007	1,129.09	125.81	28.03	4.81	34.84	3.64
NGA	1	28	8	2008	1,374.67	118.55	36.35	10.98	37.00	3.96
NGA	1	29	9	2009	1,091.26	148.90	40.68	-4.41	25.46	5.07
NGA	1	30	10	2010	1,443.21	150.30	32.48	26.78	32.56	2.65
NGA	1	31	11	2011	1,501.72	154.74	33.58	2.34	42.00	3.62
CIV	2	1	12	1981	948.99	271.73	27.92	2.98	3.84	0.39
CIV	2	2	13	1982	815.28	328.61	26.56	8.30	4.64	0.63
CIV	2	3	14	1983	706.10	381.07	26.55	9.05	5.50	0.55
CIV	2	4	15	1984	678.06	436.96	27.63	17.91	5.05	0.32
CIV	2	5	16	1985	664.87	449.26	29.97	0.34	4.70	0.42
CIV	2	6	17	1986	840.50	346.31	30.42	-2.02	2.76	0.77

OUTPUT FROM EVIEWS 7

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Variables Used.

	RGDP	OER	BM	INF	TNR	FDI
Mean	1160.794	197.7944	37.83302	12.69653	7.640170	1.274752
Median	583.1229	8.803060	32.16974	7.774248	4.042073	0.373410
Maximum	8532.617	2522.746	151.5489	189.9751	48.50557	10.05164
Minimum	102.4829	0.000275	7.287787	-27.04865	0.145038	-2.069713
Std. Dev.	1325.736	357.1241	21.99282	21.04700	9.652967	1.892576
Skewness	2.254689	2.852006	1.194571	4.347025	2.344576	1.926401
Kurtosis	8.838048	13.04535	4.468418	27.94831	8.064135	7.063302
Jarque-Bera	1405.780	3447.326	203.1598	18031.79	1230.535	809.9913
Probability	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000

Sum	719692.1	122632.5	23456.47	7871.850	4736.905	790.3462
Sum Sq. Dev.	1.09E+09	78945766	299400.4	274202.3	57678.28	2217.162
Observations	620	620	620	620	620	620

Source: Eviews 7 Output

It can be seen from Table 2 that the average RGDP per capita is \$1,160.79, the average Official Exchange Rate (in local currency) is 197.79, the average board money is 37.83, the average inflation rate (GDP deflator) is 12.70, the total natural resources % of GDP is 7.64 and the foreign direct investment % of GDP is 1.27.

It is also evident that the GDP per capita minimum ever attained is \$102.48 and the maximum ever attained is \$8532.62. The standard deviation for the 620 dataset for RGDP is 1325.736 with skewness and kurtosis of 2.25 and 8.84 respectively.

4.1 Empirical Results

This section presents the empirical results of our model with the objective to assess the impact of some world development indicators (OER, BM, INF, TNR, FDI) on variables on gross domestic product per capita Africa Union countries. Estimates are made using the ordinary least squares static panel of cross sectional fixed effect. The choice of this model is justified by the fact that the dynamic panel data and random effect have not yielded robust estimators. Table 3 shows the results of estimating the Fixed Effect panel model in one stage on 20 African Union countries for the period 1981-2011. (See Breusch, T. and A. Pagan, 1980).

Table 3: Estimates of the Cross Section Fixed Effect panel model of one-error component on 20 African Union countries for the period 1981-2011

Dependent Variable: RGDP				
Method: Panel EGLS (Cross-section SUR)				
Sample: 1981 2011				
Periods included: 31				
Cross-sections included: 20				
Total panel (balanced) observations: 620				
Linear estimation after one-step weighting matrix				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	193.2930	19.02488	10.16001	0.0000
OER	-0.233136	0.011616	-20.06969	0.0000
BM	24.50454	0.444517	55.12621	0.0000
INF	-1.108138	0.136813	-8.099676	0.0000
TNR	3.649029	0.710298	5.137320	0.0000
FDI	57.04904	1.733163	32.91614	0.0000
Effects Specification				
Cross-section fixed (dummy variables)				
Weighted Statistics				
R-squared	0.971509	Mean dependent var	3.679436	
Adjusted R-squared	0.970360	S.D. dependent var	6.465174	
S.E. of regression	0.989187	Sum squared resid	582.2025	
F-statistic	845.3767	Durbin-Watson stat	1.569984	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			
Unweighted Statistics				
R-squared	0.747038	Mean dependent var	1160.794	
Sum squared resid	2.75E+08	Durbin-Watson stat	0.201782	

Interpretation of Regression Results

The model to be fitted is

$$RGDP_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 OER_{it} + \beta_2 BM_{it} + \beta_3 INF_{it} + \beta_4 TNR_{it} + \beta_5 FDI_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

The model fitted is

$$\widehat{RGDP}_{it} = 193.29 - 0.23OER_{it} + 24.50BM_{it} - 1.1175INF_{it} + 3.65TNR_{it} + 57.05FDI_{it}$$

Base on the probability values, OER, BM, INF, TNR and FDI are all statically significant. Note that all the regressions are not in the same unit. The average estimated GDP per capita of the selected AU countries when the effect of OER, BM, INF, TNR and FDI are zero is \$193.29. 1.00 unit increase in OER-Official Exchange Rate (LCU Per US\$, Period Average) will lead to a significant reduction in GDP per capita by \$0.23 (0.23USD); if BM-Broad Money (% of GDP) increases by 1.00% then GDP per capita will increase by \$24.50; if INF-Inflation, GDP deflator (Annual %) increases by 1.00% then GDP per capita will decrease by \$1.11; if TNR-Total Natural Resources Rents (% of GDP) increases by 1.00% then GDP per capita will increase by \$3.65 and if FDI-Foreign Direct Investment, Net Inflows (% of GDP) increases by 1.00% then GDP per capita will increase by \$57.05. (Note: All the estimated parameters are significant at 5% without exception)

Table 3 also shows that 97.2% of the total variation in GDP per capita of the selected AU countries can be explained by the variations in OER-Official Exchange Rate (LCU Per US\$, Period Average), BM-Broad Money (% of GDP), INF-Inflation, GDP deflator (Annual %), TNR-Total Natural Resources Rents (% of GDP) and FDI-Foreign Direct Investment, Net Inflows (% of GDP) while the remaining 2.8% could be explained by other variables other than the ones used in this model (Note: this is for the weighted statistics). While the unweighted statistics shows that 74.7% of the total variation in GDP per capita of the selected AU countries can be explained by the

3. The Panel data Fixed Effect Regression Econometric Model formulated is given below as:

$$\widehat{RGDP}_{it} = 193.29 - 0.23OER_{it} + 24.50BM_{it} - 1.1175INF_{it} + 3.65TNR_{it} + 57.05FDI_{it} + \mu_i$$

And $\mu_i =$

μ_1	μ_2	μ_3	μ_4	μ_5	μ_6	μ_7	μ_8	μ_9	μ_{10}
-539.2	0.919	-310.2	-961.2	-563.1	2176.581	-613.2	-922.6	1281.641	2540.773

μ_{11}	μ_{12}	μ_{13}	μ_{14}	μ_{15}	μ_{16}	μ_{17}	μ_{18}	μ_{19}	μ_{20}
853.9543	-1325	-475	700.3812	-194.2	-390.2	-258.7	-238.4	-639.2	-123.7

variations in OER-Official Exchange Rate (LCU Per US\$, Period Average), BM-Broad Money (% of GDP), INF-Inflation, GDP deflator (Annual %), TNR-Total Natural Resources Rents (% of GDP) and FDI-Foreign Direct Investment, Net Inflows (% of GDP) while the remaining 25.3% could be explained by other variables other than the ones used in this model.

5. CONCLUSION

The data collected from World Bank Development Indicator (WDI) for 20 African Union (AU) countries from 1981 to 2011, which were summarized and analyzed in order to achieve the objectives of this work are hereby conclude as follows:

1. The Gross Domestic Product Per Capita (RGDP) of African Union (AU) countries ranges from \$102.48 to \$8,532.62, which was for Uganda in 1981 and Botswana in 2011. The average RGDP for AU countries is \$1,160.79. The RGDP of AU countries is time dependent .i.e it has upward trend, it increases with time as shown by the line graph plot for each country except for Zimbabwe, which decreased steadily from \$1,058.10 in 1981 to \$354.63 in 2007 and started to recover in 2008 and rose to \$757.09 in 2011. The minimum RGDP of Nigeria ever was \$203.49 in 1993 and the maximum ever reached was \$1,501.72 in 2011. It has been on the increase \$272.44 in 1998 to \$1,501.72 in 2011 (Thanks to democracy).
2. The predictors included in Africa nation’s RGDP are Official Exchange Rate (X_1), Broad Money (X_2), Inflation, GDP deflator (X_3), Total Natural Resources Rents (X_4) and Foreign Direct Investment, Net Inflows (X_5). All these 5 WDI are significantly related with the Gross Domestic Product Per Capita (RGDP). Their Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) computed with the pooled regression and the fixed effects show that there is no sign of multicollinearity in the data. Set. The independent variables do not have strong correlation with one another.

4. The five (5) WDI all have significant impact on nations' RGDP. These WDI are Official Exchange Rate (X_1), Broad Money (X_2), Inflation, GDP deflator (X_3), Total Natural Resources Rents (X_4) and Foreign Direct Investment, Net Inflows (X_5).
5. The individual country effects are significant at 5% level. The countries in Africa do not have the same RGDP but the ones within the same region tend to have the same RGDP with little variations as compared to the ones in other regions. The explanatory variables in X are independent of the idiosyncratic error term (v_{it}). The idiosyncratic error term (v_{it}) are identically and independently distributed with mean 0 and variance 0.94 that is $v_{it} \sim iid(0, 0.94)$.
6. There is no significant autocorrelation (serial correlation) in the fixed effect regression model at 5% level of significance.

5.1 Recommendation

Gross Domestic Product per Capital (RGDP) is a measure of economic growth of a country. African Union (AU) countries should provide a means to increase this RGDP over time because this will go a long way to improve the well being of the citizens of such country and this can make such country be among the best economies in the world.

However, we therefore recommend that for African Union (AU) countries to be among the best economies in the world, they have to increase their gross domestic product per capital (RGDP) by increasing their foreign direct investment (FDI), total natural resources (TNR) and broad money (BM) while on the other hand, they have to reduce their official exchange rate (local currency to US dollar) and inflation rate (INF).

REFERENCES

- [1] Afees A. Salisu (2011): Introduction to Panel Data Analysis. Centre for Econometrics and Allied Research, Department of Economics, University of Ibadan, Nigeria. Pp 7-8.
- [2] Ayoola F. J. (2013): Lecture Note on Econometrics Methods. Statistics Department, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria; Pp 7-12.
- [3] Baltagi, B. H. (2008): Econometric Analysis of Panel Data. Fourth Edition. John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- [4] Baltagi, B.H. and Q. Li, (1992): Prediction in the one-way error component model with serial correlation, *Journal of Forecasting* 11, 561-567.
- [5] Baltagi, B.H., (1980): On seemingly unrelated regressions with error components, *Econometrica* 48, 1547-1551.
- [6] Breusch, T. and A. Pagan (1980): The LM Test and Its Applications to Model Specification in Econometrics. *Review of Economic Studies*, 47, 1980, Pp 239-254.
- [7] Frisch, R. (1934): Statistical Confluence Analysis by Means of Complete Regression Systems; Oslo: University Institute of Economics.
- [8] Frisch, R. (1936): Note on the term 'Econometrics'. *Econometrica* 4, 95.
- [9] Hsiao, C. (2003): Analysis of Panel Data. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [10] International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics and data files and OECD GDP estimates. Balance of Payments databases, World Bank, International Debt Statistics (2013).
- [11] Michele Pellizzari (2012): Notes on Panel Data and Fixed Effects models. IGER-Bocconi, IZA and FRDB
- [12] Robert A. Yaffee (2003): A primer for Panel Data Analysis.
- [13] Samuelson, P.A., Koopmans, T.C. and Stone, J.R.N. (1954): Report of the evaluative committee for Econometrica. *Econometrica* 22, 141-6.
- [14] Woolridge, J. (2002): Econometric Analysis of Cross-Section and Panel Data. MIT Press, Pp 130, 279, 420 – 449.
- [15] World Bank national accounts data, and OECD National Accounts data files. Catalog Sources World Development Indicators (2013).