



REVISITING THE LINKAGE BETWEEN DOMESTIC SAVINGS AND ECONOMIC GROWTH IN NIGERIA

Joseph Olorunfemi AKANDE

Department of Accounting Science

Walter Sisulu University, South Africa

jakande@wsu.ac.za

Abstract

In general, economic growth that is generated by domestic savings is more sustainable than growth that is generated by debt. Sequel to this, this study revisits the linkage between domestic savings and economic growth in Nigeria. Data obtained from World Development Indicator (WDI, 2022) is used in the study. Essentially, the study employed VECM and Granger causality test to evaluate the linkage amid employed variables. The findings of the study reveal that interest rate and economic growth are essentially inversely related. However, the causal relationship between FDI and economic growth is one-sided. Furthermore, interest rate granger causes economic growth. Thus, this study concludes that, on the one hand, domestic savings in Nigeria have a positive and considerable impact on economic growth, while, FDI is a critical component that drives domestic savings in Nigeria. This study recommends that policymakers to implement a favorable monetary policy that will encourage increases in the amount of money in circulation, interest rates, exchange rates, and lending to the private sector in the direction of economic growth.

Keywords: economic growth, domestic savings, WDI, Nigeria, FDI, monetary policy.

Introduction

It is impossible to overstate the significance of household savings in Africa, particularly in Nigeria, where savings are a vital component of economic expansion. Many nations have seen a sharp decline in household savings over the past few decades (Prinsloo, 2000; Cassin et al., 2021). The

existing body of literature provides evidence for the ongoing controversy around the impact of household savings on economic growth in emerging nations like Nigeria. Savings, according to popular belief, encourages economic growth, which is a key factor in sustainable development.

In general, economic growth that is generated by domestic savings is more sustainable than growth that is generated by borrowing money. Actually, the state of a nation's economy is determined by its savings. Even economic superpowers such as the United States and the industrialized nations of Europe are implementing austerity measures and attempting to save a greater amount of money than they did prior to the emergence of the global financial crisis in 2007 and the European sovereign debt crisis in 2010, respectively. Their spending exceeded their means, which is the cause of this structural change in their saving behavior. The fact that borrowed capital, rather than their native savings, drove the expenditure is becoming more concerning. The United States and the Eurozone are paying a significant price for their reckless savings in the form of lost productivity, increased unemployment, and widening economic disparities.

Furthermore, a number of empirical findings about the aforementioned topic in the contexts of developed and developing nations fail to arrive at a consensus. A number of studies support unidirectional causality from saving to economic activity (Bacha, 1990; Otani et al., 1990; DeGregorio, 1992; Morande, 1998; Hebbel et al., 1992; Oladipo, 2010; Misztal, 2011); however, a number of studies support reverse causality (Cullison, 1993; Mühleisen, 1997; Alguacil et al., 2004; Lorie, 2007). A third body of research (Singh, 2010) bolsters the idea that saving and economic growth are causally related in both directions. A few studies conducted in the Indian context have also generated a great deal of debate regarding the direction of causality between saving and economic activity after the late 1980s economic crisis and the ensuing early 1990s financial reforms. The empirical results of these research regarding the causal relationship between growth and saving in India are skewed. As an example, Sinha (1996) examined the relationship between the rates of GDP growth and gross domestic saving and discovered that there was no causal relationship between them. Mühleisen (1997), Sahoo et al. (2001), Verma and Wilson (2005), Sinha et al. (2008), and Verma (2007) came to the conclusion that saving does not cause growth, but rather growth causes saving. Agrawal (2000) and Jangili (2011) found causality runs from saving to growth but rejected causality from growth to saving. Singh (2010), however, discovered that saving and growth are causally related in both directions.

If industrialized countries are like this, then a typical developing country such as Nigeria would have to exercise much more caution when it comes to saving in order to meet the demands of a sizable population and meet growth targets. But since 2021, there has been a concerning trend in the Nigerian economy: the savings as a share of GDP have been rapidly declining for a number of reasons, including declining earnings and rising inflation. Nigeria's economy saw the lowest growth rate throughout that time, and growth also slowed from its peak level. In this context, an effort is made to confirm the relationship between savings and economic growth in Nigeria.

Identifying the current trend with uncertain time and examining causality in the current environment have not been tried in any study too far. Given this context, examining the relationship between savings and economic growth in Nigeria would broaden the scope of the operational framework for policy. By elucidating the pro-cyclicality story of saving, identifying the nexus with unknown timing using the exogeneity causal test and Vector Error Correction Model (VECM), and investigating the hotly contested causal nexus between saving and economic activity in the Nigerian context, this study contributes to the body of literature already available on the relationship between saving and growth. Additionally, this work makes use of the most recent methodology (the VECM approach), which can handle the endogeneity problem in time series models that has not yet been resolved.

Literature Review

Like any other economy, Nigeria's is made up of the public and private sectors, both of which make investments. To achieve their investment needs, both sectors must borrow money and save it. Own savings are the immediate source of funding. The public sector is represented by the government, which gets funding from both tax and non-tax sources. The government utilizes any remaining funds after covering its obligations for purchasing goods and services to expand its stock of capital, or investment. The private sector's economic agents are likewise subject to this. Financial institutions are primarily tapped by the public and commercial sectors when investment expenditures surpass savings. Anoruo et al. (2011) assessed the causal relationships between the rate of growth of domestic savings and economic growth in a number of African countries, including Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa, and Zambia, using cross-sectional data from 2010 to 2017 and the Granger causality methodology. According to their conclusions, domestic savings growth rates in all country but Congo are driven by economic

growth Granger, and savings in all but Nigeria are cointegrated. There existed a two-way causal relationship between South Africa and Cote d'Ivoire.

Verma et al. (2015) used the ordinary least square approach and annual time series data from 1950 to 2011 to investigate the relationship between savings, investment, foreign inflows, and economic growth in India. The study found that whereas GDP has a large but short-term impact on household savings and investment, savings and investment have a longer-term impact on GDP. This indicates that the GDP feedbacks are negligible in the short term and nonexistent in the long term. Their findings, however, contradicted the Solow and endogenous growth hypothesis, which holds that in order to promote economic growth, household savings and investment must rise.

Verma (2017) used the Autoregressive Distributed Lag (ARDL) Bounds Testing technique to test for cointegration while examining the relationship between savings, investment, and economic growth in India between 1951 and 2014. When GDP is not the dependent variable, there is a long-run link between GDP, GDS, and GDI, according to the results of ARDL cointegration. The association between GDS, GDI, and GDP growth is also examined in terms of its short- and long-term elasticities in this study. The outcome demonstrates that savings do not create growth; rather, savings create growth, and savings both short- and long-term stimulate investment, which in turn propels India's economic expansion during the period.

Brown et al. (2012) examined the link between gross domestic savings, investment, and growth in Nepal from 1975 to 2010, using the Autoregressive Distributed Lag (ARDL) approach to test for Co-integration, error correction, and Granger causality analysis. When each of these variables is considered a dependent variable, the study's findings demonstrate that there is co-integration between gross domestic savings, investment, and GDP. The Granger causality test result showed that there is bidirectional causality, both long- and short-term, between investment and GDP, as well as between GDP and gross domestic savings. However, there is no evidence of a short-term causal relationship between GDP and gross domestic savings.

Mohamed (2014) uses annual time series data from 1970–2011 in a multivariate framework to investigate the causal relationship between savings, investment, and economic growth in Ethiopia. When GDP is considered the dependent variable, the results of the ARDL Bounds Testing show that there is co-integration between savings, investment, and GDP. The study also showed that, whilst savings and human capital are statistically negligible, labor force and investment have a major beneficial impact on Ethiopia's economic growth over the long term.

Turan et al. (2014) used an error correction model and the Johansen co-integration test to examine the relationship between savings and economic development in Albania from 2000 to 2012. The outcome demonstrated the co-integration of savings and economic growth, indicating the presence of a stable long-run equilibrium connection. The examined literature indicates that the studies exhibit mixed modeling and inconsistent variable selection, as well as inconsistent study scope and geographic location.

In his research paper titled "Impact of Interest Rate on Savings on the Nigerian Economy," Udude (2015) used data from 1981 to 2013 and applied the VAR methodology. The model includes savings as the regressand and the gross domestic product (GDP) and interest rate as exogenous variables. It was discovered that savings and economic growth were positively correlated, with savings increasing by 0.04% for every 1% increase in national income. The study concludes that the CBN ought to implement an interest rate strategy that promotes savings in the real sector.

The issue of low savings and capital accumulation as it relates to economic growth was addressed by Osundina et al. (2015) in their paper "capital accumulation, savings and economic growth of a nation-evidence from Nigeria." Its scope was based on data spanning thirty-three years (1980-2012). The real gross domestic product, inflation, gross fixed capital formation, savings deposit rate, and gross national savings were the variables in the multiple regression analysis model. A 22% rise in savings would be explained by a percentage change in real gross domestic product, according to the data, and there was a positive correlation. It was advised that in order to establish an atmosphere conducive to saving and investing, emphasis be given to sociocultural and economic shocks which can stimulate or deter national development.

In their research paper "The Multiplier Effect of Consumption Function on Aggregate Demand in Nigeria: Aftermath of the Global Financial Crisis," Okwori et al. (2016) discovered that the Nigerian economy fared better after the crisis and that trade balance, government spending, investment, and consumption all positively impacted economic growth. The multiplier, which increased income by N3.30 for every N1.0 invested, was found to be 0.68. They used data from 2009 to 2014 and adopted the OLS approach. They suggested that in order to overcome investment deficiencies, the government should enact demand management measures through monetary and fiscal policies. They also suggested that regular intervention be required to correct market flaws and to make gradual adjustments that can obstruct the multiplier.

In their research article titled "Descriptive Analysis of Savings and Growth," Temidayo et al. (2011) used data from 1970 to 2006 and adopted the descriptive statistics methodology. They discovered that the problem with the Nigerian economy is not one of mobilizing domestic capital but rather one of intervention. Therefore, they suggested that the government implement measures that, through acting as a regulator and coordinator, guarantee an intermediation between savings and investment in the economy. The factors included in their analysis were savings, investments, and the gross domestic product.

Okere et al. (2015) used data from 1993 to 2012 to analyze the effects of macroeconomic variables and savings mobilization in Nigeria. The CBN provided the following secondary data: number of bank branches, per capita income, inflation rate, deposit rate, naira/dollar exchange rate, and financial deepening variable. Ordinary Least Squares-based linear regression was used for the investigation. The calculated results showed that there is a significant, positive correlation between domestic savings and the chosen exogenous macroeconomic variables. The conclusions reached were as follows: government should guarantee appropriate macroeconomic policies that will attract foreign direct investment; measures should be pushed to encourage banks to open branches in rural areas in order to mop up deposits; and efforts should be focused toward a well-articulated fiscal and monetary policy.

Methods

This part looks at the direction of causation between savings and economic growth in Nigeria using a dynamic VECM and Granger causality test. Because of its favorable response to both big and small samples, the VECM and Granger causality method was selected for this work over other alternative methodologies (see Odhiambo, 2008). The error correcting mechanism underlies the dynamic Granger causality model that links savings, foreign capital inflow, and economic growth.

It can be phrased as follows:

$$GDP = f(SV, FCI, EXR, INT) \quad (1)$$

Where

CGDP = Gross domestic product

SV = Savings

EXR = Exchange rate

INT = Interest rate

FCI = Foreign capital inflow

The econometric specification of the model is specified below:

$$CGDP = SV + FCI + EXR + INT \quad (2)$$

$$CGDP = \beta_0 + \beta_1 SV + \beta_2 FCI + \beta_3 EXR + \beta_4 INT \quad (3)$$

$$CGDP = \beta_0 + \beta_1 SV + \beta_2 FCI + \beta_3 EXR + \beta_4 INT + \kappa \quad (4)$$

$$CGDP = \beta_0 + \beta_1 SV + \beta_2 FCI + \beta_3 EXR + \beta_4 INT + \hat{e} \quad (5)$$

CGDP is the main variable while SV, EXR and INT are the independent variables. Equation (5) is demonstrated to illustrate the association amid CGDP and important variables addressed in the study. $\beta_0 - \beta_4$ are the significant symbol awaiting estimation.

Findings

Results

The unit root test was used to ascertain whether the variables in the model were stationary. Additionally, the unit root test is a prerequisite. requirement required in order for the regression analysis to be the suitable approach. The unit root's outcomes are displayed below:

Unit Root Test

The goal is to provide a deeper understanding of the events under investigation by exposing the hidden insights that exist beneath the surface of raw data.

Table 1: Unit Root Test

		ADF				PP			
		Null (H_0): Non-stationary				Null (H_0): Non-stationary			
		DF_α				ERS_α			
z_t		τ_μ	1%	5%	Prob.	τ_τ	1%	5%	Prob.
Intercept without Time	CGDP	4.12	3.63	2.94	0.00	1.74	3.63	2.94	0.00
	SV	10.9	3.71	2.98	0.00	0.03	3.63	2.94	0.94
	INT	3.71	3.63	2.94	0.00	4.53	3.63	2.95	0.00
	FCI	1.07	3.63	2.95	0.71	0.83	3.63	2.95	0.80
	EXR	4.15	3.63	2.94	0.00	4.27	3.63	2.95	0.00

	$\Delta CGDP$	5.63	3.64	2.95	0.00	6.20	3.63	2.95	0.00
	ΔSV	9.75	3.72	2.98	0.00	5.15	3.63	2.95	0.00
	ΔINT	6.53	3.64	2.95	0.00	7.58	3.63	2.95	0.00
	ΔFCI	7.09	3.63	2.95	0.00	2.65	3.63	2.95	0.09
	ΔEXR	2.46	4.24	3.54	0.34	7.45	3.63	2.95	0.00
Intercept with Time Trend	$CGDP$	4.09	4.24	3.54	0.01	4.09	4.24	3.54	0.00
	SV	16.3	4.35	3.59	0.00	1.82	4.24	3.54	0.67
	INT	3.62	4.24	3.54	0.04	3.72	4.24	3.54	0.00
	FCI	1.34	4.24	3.54	0.85	1.25	4.24	3.54	0.88
	EXR	4.08	4.24	3.54	0.00	4.20	4.24	3.54	0.01
	$\Delta CGDP$	5.41	4.28	3.55	0.00	10.66	4.25	3.54	0.00
	ΔSV	4.64	4.37	3.60	0.00	6.21	4.25	3.54	0.00
	ΔINT	6.76	4.26	3.55	0.00	10.41	4.25	3.54	0.00
	ΔFCI	4.11	4.25	3.55	0.00	2.72	4.25	3.54	0.03
	ΔEXR	6.86	4.25	3.55	0.00	7.19	4.25	3.54	0.00

Source: Authors Compilation, 2024

Table 2: Lags Selection

Lag	LogL	LR	FPE	AIC	SC	HQ
1	-1270.147	NA	1.36e+30*	83.55790*	84.71434*	83.93487*
2	-1252.602	23.77128	2.44e+30	84.03884	86.35172	84.79278

Source: Authors Compilation, 2024

Table 1 summarizes the predicted statistical parameters for the ADF and P-P tests. As a result, the independent and dependent variables of the model are integrated as I(1) and I(0). The AIC criterion at lag 2 is the basis for the lag selection.

Cointegration Test

The variables used in the study are cointegrated, allowing for the use of additional approaches, according to the results of the Trace and Eigenvalue cointegration tests in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3: Test of Unrestricted Cointegration (Trace)

Hypothesized		Trace	0.05	
No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Critical Value	Prob.**
None *	0.698288	91.27681	69.81889	0.0004
At most 1 *	0.592114	56.52661	47.85613	0.0062
At most 2 *	0.470797	30.52036	29.79707	0.0412
At most 3	0.212545	12.06525	15.49471	0.1538
At most 4 *	0.162299	5.135719	3.841466	0.0234

Source: Authors Compilation, 2024

Table 4: Unrestricted Cointegration Rank Test (Maximum Eigenvalue)

Hypothesized		Max-Eigen	0.05	
No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Critical Value	Prob.**
None *	0.698288	34.75020	33.87687	0.0393
At most 1	0.592114	26.00624	27.58434	0.0785
At most 2	0.470797	18.45512	21.13162	0.1137
At most 3	0.212545	6.929528	14.26460	0.4975
At most 4 *	0.162299	5.135719	3.841466	0.0234

Source: Authors Compilation, 2024

In the short period of a study, disequilibrium does occur among these variables because of their non-stationarity. However, this disequilibrium may gradually fade away if the relationship between the variables becomes more stable over time. This study examines the long-term equilibrium between domestic savings and other pertinent variables, keeping the aforementioned points in mind. As can be seen in Tables 3 and 4 above, there are a minimum of four cointegration vectors between these variables in the Johansen Cointegration Test. This implies that long-term equilibrium is exhibited by the variables used to represent household savings and economic growth.

Vector Error Correction Model (VECM)

The VECM estimates of Nigeria's domestic savings and economic growth are shown in Table 5 below. The coefficients for domestic savings (SV) and the exchange rate (EXR) likewise follow the apriori expectation, just like the other variables. This shows that the model and the empirical research fit each other fairly well. First, the exchange rate and savings have a significant and favorable influence on Nigeria's economic growth when accounting for the factors with significant coefficients. For every unit change in household savings, the country's economic growth increases by 0.36%. However, interest rates and economic growth have a strong inverse relationship. Thus, an interest rate change of one unit results in a 0.20% decrease in economic growth.

Table 5: Vector Error Correction Model (VECM)

Cointegrating Eq:	CointEq1
CGDP(-1)	1.000000
SV(-1)	-7.67E-05 (0.00014) [-0.55296]
INTR(-1)	-0.282438 (0.34155) [-0.82694]

REXR(-1) 0.040570
 (0.01063)
 [3.81742]

FDI(-1) -3.89E-10
 (2.6E-10)
 [-1.46945]

C -5.478279

Error Correction:	D(CGDP)	D(SV)	D(INTR)	D(REXR)	D(FDI)
CointEq1	-0.615058 (0.02109) [-2.11294]	297.9606 (255.129) [1.16788]	0.137940 (0.11992) [1.15027]	-9.243166 (2.98727) [-3.09418]	2.19E+08 (9.0E+07) [2.42214]
D(CGDP(-1))	-0.082621 (0.32024) [-0.25800]	-362.8784 (280.676) [-1.29287]	-0.155663 (0.13193) [-1.17992]	7.618276 (3.28640) [2.31813]	-1.47E+08 (9.9E+07) [-1.48490]
D(CGDP(-2))	0.297207 (0.03896) [1.24375]	-309.1915 (209.439) [-1.47629]	-0.133969 (0.09844) [-1.36087]	4.286603 (2.45229) [1.74800]	-74220895 (7.4E+07) [-1.00161]
D(SV(-1))	3.66E-05 (0.00026) [0.13848]	-0.165228 (0.23182) [-0.71274]	-0.000167 (0.00011) [-1.53009]	0.002704 (0.00271) [0.99600]	17656.82 (82020.5) [0.21527]
D(SV(-2))	0.000126 (0.00027) [-0.46490]	0.016138 (0.23686) [0.06813]	7.93E-05 (0.00011) [0.71219]	0.002509 (0.00277) [0.90482]	149686.0 (83804.5) [-1.78613]
D(INTR(-1))	-0.208148 (0.04534) [-0.48936]	252.6537 (372.794) [0.67773]	-0.125431 (0.17523) [-0.71582]	6.704631 (4.36500) [1.53600]	2.19E+08 (1.3E+08) [1.66325]
D(INTR(-2))	-0.102983	321.8406	-0.224767	-11.02974	-29168599

	(0.43523)	(381.460)	(0.17930)	(4.46647)	(1.3E+08)
	[-0.23662]	[0.84371]	[-1.25359]	[-2.46945]	[-0.21612]
D(REXR(-1))	0.043473	-9.822935	-0.007268	0.339141	-6598004.
	(0.01909)	(16.7341)	(0.00787)	(0.19594)	(5920684)
	[0.18189]	[-0.58700]	[-0.92404]	[1.73087]	[-1.11440]
D(REXR(-2))	0.010449	-1.671298	-0.004530	0.256809	-4866096.
	(0.01586)	(13.8982)	(0.00653)	(0.16273)	(4917316)
	[0.65894]	[-0.12025]	[-0.69339]	[1.57811]	[-0.98958]
D(FDI(-1))	5.41E-10	2.23E-07	-1.35E-10	1.03E-08	-0.419646
	(6.6E-10)	(5.7E-07)	(2.7E-10)	(6.7E-09)	(0.20335)
	[0.82507]	[0.38881]	[-0.49849]	[1.52799]	[-2.06370]
D(FDI(-2))	7.48E-10	3.02E-07	-2.09E-10	9.18E-09	-0.088342
	(7.7E-10)	(6.7E-07)	(3.2E-10)	(7.9E-09)	(0.23753)
	[0.97651]	[0.45023]	[-0.66385]	[1.16808]	[-0.37191]
C	0.075168	-253.8037	0.013843	6.276189	-1.12E+08
	(0.77091)	(675.669)	(0.31759)	(7.91132)	(2.4E+08)
	[0.09751]	[-0.37563]	[0.04359]	[0.79332]	[-0.46730]

Source: Authors Compilation, 2024

There is little direct correlation between FDI and economic growth. Thus, it is possible to argue that household savings had a positive and considerable impact on Nigeria's economic growth in this study. It is crucial to emphasize that the results of this investigation support the claims made in previous studies by Akani & Ibibe (2019), Ekesiobi et al. (2016), and Ajagbe et al. (2023).

Granger Causality Test

Even if a long-term association between domestic savings and economic growth has already been demonstrated, this relationship is unable to demonstrate the direction of causality among the study's several significant variables. Given the foregoing, this study calculated the direction of causality between domestic savings, interest rate, FCI, and RER. The findings are shown in Table

6 and indicate that, first, there is no causal relationship between SAV and INT and economic growth. Similarly, there is no correlation between economic growth and RER and FCI (see Nwanne, 2014; Osmond et al., 2021; Nwonye et al., 2022). The Granger causality conclusion is explained by the fact that Nigeria is currently undergoing economic reforms, such as the elimination of subsidies and the deregulation of the economy, which lead to economic instability.

Table 6: Granger Causality Test

Null Hypothesis:	Obs	F-Statistic	Prob.
SV does not Granger Cause CGDP	33	0.50145	0.6846
CGDP does not Granger Cause SV		1.70522	0.1905
INTR does not Granger Cause CGDP	33	0.12215	0.0462
CGDP does not Granger Cause INTR		0.48405	0.6963
REXR does not Granger Cause CGDP	33	0.68258	0.5707
CGDP does not Granger Cause REXR		1.54594	0.2263
FDI does not Granger Cause CGDP	29	0.66030	0.0512
CGDP does not Granger Cause FDI		1.94396	0.1520
INTR does not Granger Cause SV	33	0.28636	0.8348
SV does not Granger Cause INTR		0.92304	0.4435
REXR does not Granger Cause SV	33	0.05278	0.9836
SV does not Granger Cause REXR		0.01524	0.9974
FDI does not Granger Cause SV	29	2.58895	0.0487
SV does not Granger Cause FDI		1.93846	0.1529
REXR does not Granger Cause INTR	33	0.75913	0.5272
INTR does not Granger Cause REXR		2.84394	0.0512
FDI does not Granger Cause INTR	29	0.67215	0.5782
INTR does not Granger Cause FDI		1.47761	0.2481
FDI does not Granger Cause REXR	29	0.03432	0.9912
REXR does not Granger Cause FDI		0.24378	0.8648

Source: Authors Compilation, 2024

Conclusion and Recommendation

This study examines the link between domestic savings and capital output in Nigeria from 1986 to 2021. Granger causality and VECM approaches were used to assess the data after it was extracted from the WDI. Thus, the following are some of the results drawn from this study. First and foremost, domestic SV and REXR in Nigeria have a robust and positive association. The link between INTR and economic growth is essentially inverse. But there is only one way that FDI and economic growth are causally related. Additionally, INTR Granger promotes economic growth. Therefore, this study submits that domestic savings contributes both positive and significant influence on economic growth in Nigeria in one hand, and FDI is a strategic factor that propels domestic savings in Nigeria on the other hand. In the light of the above findings, this study recommends that the policymakers should embark on a favourable monetary policy that will spur increase in volume of money in circulation, interest rate, exchange rate and credit to private sector in the direction of capital accumulation. In the same page, the policy that will promote saving attitude of the Nigerians should be embarked so the economy will enjoy a sustainable economic growth.

Thus, this study concludes that, on the one hand, domestic savings in Nigeria have a positive and considerable impact on economic growth, while, on the other hand, foreign direct investment (FDI) is a critical component that drives domestic savings in Nigeria. This study advises policymakers to implement a favorable monetary policy that will encourage increases in the amount of money in circulation, interest rates, exchange rates, and lending to the private sector in the direction of capital accumulation in light of the aforementioned findings. On the same page, in order to ensure that the economy has sustained growth, policies that encourage Nigerians to save money should be implemented.

References

Agrawal, P. (2000). Savings, Investment and growth in South Asia, mimeo. Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, Mumbai.

- Ajagbe, S., Johnson, A., Alaka, T., Gbadebo, A., Aderemi, T. (2023). Nexus between household savings and gross capital formation in Nigeria. *CECONOMICA*, 19(1), 1-15.
- Alguacil, M., Cuadros, A., Orts, V., 2004. Does saving really matter for growth? Mexico (1970–2000). *Journal of International Development*, 281–290.
- Anoruo, E., Ahmad, Y. (2001). Causal relationship between domestic savings and economic growth: Evidence from Seven African Countries, African Development Bank, Blackwell publisher, Oxford.
- Bacha, E.L. (1990). A three-gap model of foreign transfers and the GDP growth rate in developing countries. *Journal of Development Economics*, 32 (2), 279–296.
- Brown, L. A., Camerer, C. F., Chua, Z. E (2016). Learning and visceral temptation in dynamic savings experiments. A Research supported by NSF Grant SES-0078911.
- Cassin, L., Benhamou, Z. (2021). The impact of remittances on savings, capital and economic growth in small emerging countries. *Economic Modelling*, 94(2), 789-803.
- Cullison, W. E. (1993). Savings measure as economic growth indicators. *Contemporary Policy Issues*, 11(1), 1-14.
- DeGregorio, J. (1992). Economic growth in Latin America. *Journal Development Economics*, 39(1), 59–84.
- Hebbel, K.S., Webb, S.V., Corsetti, G., 1992. Household saving in developing countries: first cross-country evidence. *World Bank Economic Review*, 6 (3), 529–547.
- Jangili, R. (2011). Causal relationship between saving, investment and economic growth for India? What does the relation imply? Reserve Bank India Occas. Pap. 32 (1)
- Lorie, H., 2007. Mobilizing savings for sustainable high growth: lesson from Asia for Pakistan. In: A presentation at PIDE, Islamabad.
- Misztal, P. (2011). The relationship between saving and economic growth in countries with different level of economic development. *Financial Internet Q. e-Finance*, 7 (2), 25-37.
- Mohamed, S. A. E. (2014). Testing the relationship between private savings and economic growth in Bahrain. *Global Journal of Commerce and Management Perspective*, 4(6): 1-6.
- Morande, F. G. (1998). Savings in Chile. What went right? *Journal Development Economics*. Elsevier 57 (1), 201–228.
- Mühleisen, M. (1997). Improving India's saving performance. IMF Working Paper WP97/4. International Monetary Fund, Washington, D.C.

- Nwanne, T. F. (2014). Implication of savings and investment on economic growth in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship Research*, 2(4), 74-86.
- Nwonye, N., Ihegboro, M., Onah, V., Ojiako, I. (2022). Growth impact of savings on the Nigerian economy. *European Journal of Economics and Financial Research*, 6(1), 1-20.
- Odhiambo, N. M. (2008). Financial depth, savings and economic growth in Kenya: A dynamic causal linkage. *Journal of Policy Modelling*, 31 (2), 708-718
- Okere, P. A., Ndugbu, M. (2015). Macroeconomic variables and savings mobilisation in Nigeria. *International Journal for Innovation, Education and Research*. 3(1), 20-32
- Okwori, J., Sule, A., Abu, J. (2016). The multiplier effect of consumption function on aggregate demand in Nigeria: Aftermath of the global financial recession. *The International Journal of Business & Management*. 4(5), 1-15.
- Oladipo, O.S., 2010. Does saving really matter for growth in developing countries? The case of a small open economy. *International Business Economic Reserves Journal*, 9 (4), 1-15.
- Osmond, C., Adeleke, O. (2021). Savings, investment and economic growth in Nigeria: An autoregressive distributive lag approach. *CECONOMICA*, 17(2), 216-233.
- Otani, I., Villannueva, D. (1990). Long term growth in developing countries and its determinants: an empirical analysis. *World Development*, 18(2), 769–783
- Patra, S. K., Murthy, D. S., Kuruva, M. B., Mohanty, A. (2017). Revisiting the causal nexus between savings and economic growth in India: An empirical analysis. *Economia*, 18(2), 380-391.
- Prinsloo, J. W. (2000). The saving behaviour of the South African economy. South African Reserve Bank Occasional Paper No. 14, pp. 1-34.
- Singh, T., 2010. Does domestic saving cause economic growth? A time-series evidence from India. *Journal Policy Model*. 32(2), 231–253.
- Sinha, D. (1996). Saving and economic growth in India. *Economia Internazionale*, 49 (4), 637–647
- Sinha, D., Sinha, T. (2008). Relationships among household saving, public saving, corporate saving and economic growth. *Journal of International Development*, 20 (2), 181–186.
- Temidayo, A., Taiwo, I. (2011). Descriptive analysis of savings and growth in Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*. 2(7), 20-35.

- Turan, G., Olesia, G. (2014). What is the impact of savings on economic growth? The case of small open economy in Albania. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(13): 360-368.
- Udina, K. C., Osudina, J. A. (2014). Capital accumulation, savings and economic growth of a Nation- Evidence from Nigeria. *Global Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*, 3 (3), 151-155, presented at the Center for the study of African Economies (CSAE) Conference.
- Udude, C. C. (2015). Impact of interest rate on savings on the Nigeria's Economy. *Journal of Policy and Development Studies*. 9(3), 1-12. University of Oxford, March 2009. University Press
- Verma, R. (2007). Savings, investment and growth in India. *South Asia Economic Journal*, 8 (1), 87-98.
- Verma, R. (2017). Savings, investment and growth in India: An application of the ARDL Bounds testing approach. *South Asia Economic Journal*, 8 (1), 87-98.
- Verma, R., Wilson, E. (2015). Savings, investment, foreign inflows and economic of the Indian economy 1950-2011. Economics Working Paper Series, University of Wollongong.