GLOBALIZATION, FEDERAL DIRECT INVESTMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITYOF GREENFIELD INVESTMENT PROJECTS IN NIGERIA

Haveez Omotayo Ahmadu[1]
Department of Marketing, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Oyo State
Ahmaduhaveez@gmail.com

Adedayo Oluwafemi Samuel[2]
Department of Business Administration and Management
Osun State Polytechnic, Iree, Osun State
femiadedayo6077@gmail.com

Kolade Gloria Modupe[3]
Department of Business Administration and Management
Osun State Polytechnic, Iree, Osun State
samchrist2222@gmail.com

Ogundipe Oluwabukola Titilayo[4]
Department of Marketing
Federal Polytechnic, Ede, Osun State
olubukola.dipe@gmail.com

Jimoh Korede Musiliu[5]
Department of Business Administration and Management
Osun State Polytechnic, Iree, Osun State
korede@gmail.com

Abstract
Globalization and foreign direct investment are now key forces shaping sustainable development in emerging economies. This study examined how both factors influence sustainable development outcomes using a quantitative design with regression analysis. The results show that globalization (B = .168) and FDI (B = .628) positively predict sustainable development, with FDI exerting a stronger effect. These findings support Narula and Pineli's (2020) argument that FDI drives economic transformation and align with Adegbite and Ayadi's (2022) view that globalization strengthens innovation and institutional capacity in African economies. The analysis suggests that globalization facilitates cross-border integration and knowledge flows, while FDI provides the capital and technological spillovers that more directly enhance development indicators. The study reinforces the relevance of the resource-based view and modernization theory. In practical terms, policymakers need to attract high-quality FDI and manage globalization in

ways that promote inclusive and sustainable growth. The results stress the value of maintaining openness while applying strategic regulation to secure long-term development gains. The study therefore recommends that policymakers prioritize the attraction of environmentally responsible FDI, strengthen regulatory enforcement, and align investment policies with sustainability goals to ensure that economic growth does not compromise environmental integrity.

Keywords: Globalization, Foreign Direct Investment, Sustainable Development, Emerging Economies, Policy

1.1 Introduction

As societies struggle with resource depletion, ecological degradation, and climate change, environmental sustainability has emerged as one of the most important global issues of the twenty-first century. The quest for industrial and economic growth frequently comes at the expense of environmental health in developing nations like Nigeria. Finding a balance between economic growth and environmental preservation has become more urgent due to rising carbon emissions, deforestation, pollution, and biodiversity loss (Ghosh, 2021). According to academics, sustainability needs to become an actionable framework integrated into national development strategies rather than just a rhetorical commitment (Adeleye et al., 2023). Therefore, figuring out how external factors like globalization and foreign direct investment (FDI) affect host nations' environmental results is essential for identifying sustainabledevelopment.

Globalization is often described as a double-edged sword in the sustainability debate. On one hand, it fosters access to advanced technologies, cleaner energy, and international environmental standards; on the other, it accelerates unsustainable industrialization and resource exploitation in developing regions (Stiglitz, 2020; Zhou, 2021). In Africa, globalization has reshaped economic structures, but its ecological consequences remain contested. While proponents argue that global integration promotes efficiency and green innovation, critics maintain that globalization exposes weaker economies to a “race to the bottom” in environmental standards (Aluko, 2022). This tension makes it important to empirically investigate the ways globalization influences environmental sustainability in Nigeria, particularly in the context of rapid industrial expansion and foreign investment.

Foreign direct investment (FDI) has become a central feature of globalization, shaping the economic and environmental landscape of host economies. Greenfield investment, in particular, represents a direct establishment of new facilities and infrastructures by foreign firms, often linked to industrial growth, job creation, and technology transfer. However, the environmental outcomes of such investments are not straightforward. While some studies suggest that FDI can bring cleaner technologies and stricter management practices, others indicate that in countries

with weak environmental institutions, FDI inflows may increase pollution and resource depletion (Demena & Afesorgbor, 2020; Khan et al., 2024). Nigeria's growing reliance on FDI, especially in energy and manufacturing, therefore raises critical questions about whether such inflows align with sustainable development goals or worsen environmental vulnerabilities.

The significance of this study lies in its potential to provide clarity in a highly contested area of research. By focusing on Nigeria, a country characterized by abundant natural resources and high dependence on foreign investment, the study addresses an important policy concern. It speaks to the broader debates on how Africa can pursue sustainable growth while engaging with global capital flows. Previous works have emphasized the need to reassess traditional models of development that prioritize short-term economic gains over long-term ecological balance (Adegbite & Ayadi, 2020; Liu et al., 2023). By interrogating the interplay of globalization, FDI, and environmental sustainability, this research contributes both to academic literature and to policy formulation aimed at building resilient and green economies in Africa.

The problem addressed by this study stems from the limited empirical evidence on how globalization and specifically greenfield investment projects influence environmental sustainability in Nigeria. While previous studies have examined globalization's general effects on the environment and the broader role of FDI in emerging markets, few have isolated the impact of Greenfield investment in the Nigerian context (Okafor & Egbetokun, 2021; Park & Lee, 2025). This gap has created uncertainty for policymakers and development planners seeking to balance the benefits of foreign investment with the costs of ecological degradation. To bridge this gap, the objectives of this study are twofold: first, to examine the impact of globalization on environmental sustainability in Nigeria; and second, to evaluate the influence of FDI, particularly greenfield projects, on environmental outcomes.In view of this, the study aims to provide policy strategies that can ensure that globalization and FDI support Nigeria's sustainability agenda rather than undermines it.

2.1 Literature Review

2.2.1 Globalization

Globalization's environmental effects vary. They depend on the type of globalization you measure and the context of the country. Recent evidence from multiple countries shows that economic globalization often raises emissions. In contrast, social and political globalization can reduce some of that pressure through the spread of norms and governance effects, especially in South Asia from 1996 to 2019. This highlights that globalization is complex, not just one force, according to Nature Portfolio in 2024. Stronger research designs also indicate that structural breaks and scale effects are important. When growth, trade intensity, and

technology evolve together, the relationship between globalization and the environment changes over time and across different systems. This helps explain why many earlier linear estimates were unreliable, as noted in Nature Portfolio in 2023. For Nigeria, this research suggests you cannot assume a uniform effect from globalization. You need to identify which channels are active locally and when, as stated by Akor et al. in 2024 and Liu et al. in 2023.

2.1.2 Foreign Direct Investment (FDI)

For foreign direct investment (FDI), recent studies fall into three categories. First, meta-analytic and global panels find that FDI tends to worsen pollution on average, especially in low- and middle-income countries. This aligns with the concept of a pollution-haven effect (global evidence 2025; meta-analysis 2021). Second, models that account for institutional factors show that where the rule of law and environmental enforcement are strong, FDI often does not reduce emissions intensity as claimed. Weak institutions diminish the benefits of mitigation, meaning that "good FDI" does not work effectively without proper governance (Journal of Environmental Management, 2024). Third, a newer set of studies identifies "green FDI" and reports that it reduces emissions in less-developed countries. This suggests that the type of investment matters and that policy can steer investment toward cleaner projects (Heliyon, 2024). Together, these findings highlight differences based on income level, regulatory quality, and the environmental goals of investments, rather than suggesting a single effect of FDI. (Park & Lee, 2025; Dechezleprêtre& Sato, 2021; Khan et al., 2024; Sulemana et al., 2024).

The biggest changes since 2021 differentiate greenfield investments from mergers and acquisitions. Evidence from multiple countries shows that greenfield foreign direct investment (FDI) often has bigger immediate environmental impacts than M&A. This happens because greenfield investments create new capacity and plants instead of reorganizing existing ones (The World Economy, 2023). However, new plants can be used to increase renewable capacity when policies guide them that way, as demonstrated in 41 developing countries from 2003 to 2022 (Energy Economics, 2025). What Nigeria lacks is detailed, sector-specific evidence that identifies greenfield investments based on their environmental goals and technology age. It also needs to explore how state-level enforcement affects outcomes beyond CO_2, such as water quality, biodiversity, and flaring. This is the gap your study will fill. Your goals are to 1) examine globalization's effects on environmental sustainability in Nigeria by breaking down economic, social, and political factors, and 2) assess the role of FDI while clearly distinguishing between greenfield projects and their environmental performance (Abidoye & Yakubu, 2023; Ahsan et al., 2025).

2.2 Theoretical Review

A highly relevant theory for this study is the **Pollution Haven Hypothesis (PHH)**, which argues that multinational firms tend to relocate environmentally intensive industries to developing countries with weaker environmental regulations in order to reduce production costs (Cole et al., 2021). The theory provides a framework for understanding the interplay between globalization, FDI, and environmental sustainability in Nigeria. According to the PHH, as globalization deepens, trade liberalization and investment flows may encourage foreign firms to establish operations in countries like Nigeria, where environmental enforcement may be less stringent compared to advanced economies. This relocation process, often materialized through Greenfield investment projects, can lead to environmental degradation if appropriate safeguards are absent (Shahbaz et al., 2022).

In relation to the first research objective, which seeks to examine the impact of globalization on environmental sustainability, the PHH is directly applicable because it explains how global economic integration can influence the environmental trajectory of developing nations. Globalization facilitates the free movement of capital, technology, and industries, but when regulations are weak, the PHH predicts a "race to the bottom" effect where environmental standards are compromised to attract foreign investment. In Nigeria, this could manifest through liberalized trade and investment policies that prioritize economic growth over ecological safeguards, leading to pollution, deforestation, and resource depletion (Zhou & Wang, 2023).

For the second research objective, which evaluates the influence of FDI, the PHH sheds light on the environmental implications of Greenfield investment projects. While FDI has the potential to bring cleaner technologies and promote sustainable practices, the PHH warns that it could also exacerbate environmental damage if foreign investors exploit Nigeria's regulatory weaknesses (Sulemana et al., 2024). Thus, the PHH provides a theoretical anchor to investigate whether Nigeria is experiencing a pollution haven effect through Greenfield projects or whether globalization and FDI are being harnessed to improve environmental sustainability. This makes the PHH not only a diagnostic tool but also a guide for policy, as it highlights the need for strengthening environmental governance to ensure that globalization and FDI align with sustainable development goals.

2.3 Empirical Review

A study by Demena and Afesorgbor (2020) brought together 65 primary studies in a meta-analysis. They found that the relationship between FDI and the environment depends on context, measurement, and methods. Pollution-haven and pollution-halo effects appear under different conditions. In the work by Boateng, Annor, Amponsah, and Ayibor (2024), which estimated an IV -GMM panel model for 2000 to 2018 across income groups, institutional quality was a key factor. FDI is more

likely to reduce CO_2 intensity when host governance is strong. However, this positive effect weakens where regulatory capacity is limited. According to findings from Sultana, Hossain, Voumik, and Raihan (2023), using CCEMG and AMG estimators for the Next-11 economies from 1990 to 2018, broader globalization tends to increase per-capita emissions in the long run. This pattern points to scale and composition effects that can overshadow gains in techniques. In line with new gravity-model evidence published in Scientific Reports, Avazdahandeh (2024) re-examined the pollution-haven hypothesis by studying the impact of environmental law strictness on bilateral FDI between the EU and China from 2016 to 2020. Their findings showed that stricter rules in potential host countries divert investment away from pollution-heavy sectors, supporting the idea of a haven effect in less regulated areas. The IMF (2022) noted a significant gap in research. Many country studies fail to distinguish between production-based and consumption-based emissions when evaluating the environmental effects of FDI. Evidence from Gyamfi et al. (2024) on South Asia, using the KOF index and panel methods from 1996 to 2019, suggests that political globalization through treaties can slow emissions growth. This further highlights that globalization is complex and different aspects have varying environmental impacts.

In the study by Sulemana, Appiah-Otoo, and colleagues (2024), researchers analyzed a panel of 71 less-developed countries from 2003 to 2021 using dynamic GMM to separate "green FDI" from total inflows. The authors found that green FDI significantly improves environmental quality, while non-specific FDI can either be neutral or harmful, depending on the sector. According to Borowiec, Papież, and Śmiech (2024), who examined production- and consumption-based accounts alongside Environmental Policy Stringency indicators, strict policies are linked to lower emissions. This supports the idea that regulatory quality helps make FDI cleaner. In line with trade-and-environment research, recent studies using global value-chain metrics show that deeper GVC participation can transfer carbon across borders. For example, research in European and emerging markets from 1995 to 2020 indicates that globalization increases ecological footprints unless it is paired with scaling up renewable energy and improving governance (Sultana et al., 2023; Gyamfi et al., 2024). The IMF framework (2022) suggests that future research should combine firm- or project-level FDI data with supply-chain embodied emissions. This step would help avoid misattributing the carbon of foreign-owned output to the wrong place, which remains a problem for many macro panels.

Based on the evidence above, several gaps remain that a Nigeria-focused study on greenfield projects can address. A study by Boateng et al. (2024) and the review by Demena and Afesorgbor (2020) both point out that most panels combine very different types of foreign direct investment (FDI). Few focus on greenfield manufacturing, energy, or extractives while explicitly considering host regulatory capacity, sector mix, and timeframes that align with policy cycles. Evidence from

Avazdahandeh (2024) is bilateral and based on short windows, while Sultana et al. (2023) use national averages that do not capture project-level differences or Nigeria's institutional dynamics. In the work of Sulemana et al. (2024), "green FDI" is inferred at the industry level instead of by verified project characteristics, and the analysis is focused on the country rather than individual projects. Overall, the gap is clear: we lack project-specific, Nigeria-focused evidence that distinguishes greenfield from mergers, connects projects to sector-specific environmental risks, and includes institutional quality and environmental policy strength as factors. This is where your study should contribute. It should use reliable greenfield project data, a panel or combined data from Nigerian states or sectors over a defined time, and approaches that directly address endogeneity and cross-sectional dependence.

3.1 Methodology

3.1.1 Research Design

The study adopted a quantitative research design with a cross-sectional survey approach. This design is appropriate because the research seeks to measure and statistically analyze the relationship between globalization, foreign direct investment (FDI), and environmental sustainability in Nigeria within a specified time frame. By collecting data at a single point in time, the study captures respondents' views on globalization processes, foreign investment activities (especially Greenfield projects), and their perceived impact on environmental outcomes. This approach is consistent with similar empirical studies in marketing, economics, and environmental management that rely on survey data to establish causal inferences through regression modeling (Demena&Afesorgbor, 2020; Sulemana et al., 2024).

3.1.2 Population of the Study

The target population consists of professionals, policymakers, investors, and academics in Nigeria who are knowledgeable about globalization, FDI, and environmental issues. Specifically, the population include staff members of selected federal and state ministries (Environment, Trade, and Industry), employees of multinational corporations engaged in Greenfield projects, and academics in the fields of economics, business, and environmental sciences. This population is chosen because of their exposure to policies, practices, and impacts that directly relate to globalization and sustainability in Nigeria.

3.1.3 Sampling Technique and Sample Size Determination

A probability sampling technique, specifically simple random sampling, was adopted to ensure that each individual in the population has an equal chance of

being selected. To determine the appropriate sample size, the study was used Cochran's formula for sample size calculation:

$$n_0 = \frac{Z^2 \cdot p \cdot q}{e^2}$$

Where:

- ξ n0 = the sample size,
- ξ Z = the Z-value (1.96 at 95% confidence level),
- ξ p = the estimated proportion of the population (0.5 will be used to maximize variability),
- ξ p=1- p, q = 1 - q
- ξ e = margin of error (0.05).

Substituting values:

$$n_0 = \frac{(1.96)^2(0.5)(0.5)}{(0.05)^2} = \frac{3.8416 \times 0.25}{0.0025} = \frac{0.9604}{0.0025} = 384.16$$

Thus, a minimum sample size of **384** respondents was calculated.

3.1.4 Research Instrument

The main instrument for data collection was a structured online questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into four sections: Section A captures demographic information; Section B measures constructs relating to globalization (economic, social, and political dimensions); Section C focuses on FDI and Greenfield investment projects; and Section D will assess environmental sustainability indicators (such as waste management, pollution levels, renewable energy adoption, and regulatory compliance). A five-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (5) was used to ensure consistency in responses.

3.1.5 Data Collection Procedure

Data was collected through Google Forms, which allows for efficient online administration and wider reach of the selected sample. The questionnaire link was distributed via official emails, institutional platforms, and professional social media groups (LinkedIn, WhatsApp groups of professionals, and academic networks). Online distribution is suitable given the educated nature of the respondents and ensures faster responses and minimal logistical costs. Respondents were assured of confidentiality, and participation was voluntary.

3.1.6 Method of Data Analysis

The collected data was coded and analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 23. Descriptive statistics (mean, frequency, and standard

deviation) was employed to summarize respondents' demographic characteristics and general trends. To test the research objectives, multiple regression analysis was applied to determine the impact of globalization on environmental sustainability and the influence of FDI (Greenfield projects) on environmental sustainability. The regression model help establish the strength and direction of the relationships between the independent variables (globalization and FDI) and the dependent variable (environmental sustainability). Hypotheses were tested at a 5% significance level.

4.1 Data Analysis

4.1.1 Demographic Variables

Table 1: Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	198	51.6	51.6	51.6
	Female	186	48.4	48.4	100.0
	Total	384	100.0	100.0	

SPSS Output, 2025

Based on the results presented in the frequency distribution of gender, the data indicate that out of the total 384 respondents, 198 were male, representing 51.6 percent of the sample, while 186 were female, accounting for 48.4 percent. It is evident that the gender distribution in this study is fairly balanced, with only a slight difference of 3.2 percent between male and female participants. The analysis reveals that male respondents constituted the majority, although by a narrow margin, suggesting that both genders were almost equally represented in the study population.The data show that this near-equitable representation enhances the reliability of the study findings, as it minimizes the risk of gender bias in responses. Since the cumulative percentage reached 100.0 percent for both groups combined, the analysis confirms that all respondents were valid and accounted for, ensuring completeness of the dataset. The gender distribution reflects a diverse and representative sample, which strengthens the credibility of the study outcomes. This balance also provides a sound basis for examining the relationship between globalization, foreign direct investment, and environmental sustainability across gender lines, as both male and female perspectives are adequately captured.

Table 2: Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18-24	225	58.6	58.6	58.6
	25-34	106	27.6	27.6	86.2
	35-44	33	8.6	8.6	94.8
	45-54	20	5.2	5.2	100.0
	Total	384	100.0	100.0	

SPSS Output, 2025

Based on the results in Table 2, the data indicate that the largest proportion of respondents fell within the age range of 18–24 years, accounting for 225 individuals, which represents 58.6 percent of the total sample. The analysis reveals that this group forms the majority, suggesting that younger participants were more actively represented in the study. The data show that the second largest group was respondents aged 25–34 years, with 106 individuals, representing 27.6 percent of the total. Together, these two categories (18–24 and 25–34) constituted 86.2 percent of all respondents, making it evident that the sample was dominated by young adults. Furthermore, the data indicate that respondents aged 35–44 years comprised 8.6 percent (33 individuals), while those in the 45–54 years category accounted for the smallest proportion, with 20 individuals, representing only 5.2 percent of the total. It is evident from the distribution that older age groups were less represented compared to younger ones. The cumulative percentages confirm that the dataset captured all age categories considered in the survey, with no missing values. Based on the results, the age distribution suggests that the study primarily reflects the perspectives of younger adults, particularly those in their early adulthood stages. This demographic trend may be linked to higher internet accessibility and digital literacy among younger respondents, as the data were collected using online questionnaires. Consequently, while the findings offer valuable insights into the views of younger participants, the limited representation of older age groups should be acknowledged when generalizing the results.

Table 3: Occupation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Student	283	73.7	73.7	73.7
	Teacher	55	14.3	14.3	88.0
	Trader	28	7.3	7.3	95.3
	Administrator	18	4.7	4.7	100.0
	Total	384	100.0	100.0	

SPSS Output, 2025

Based on the results presented in Table 3, the data indicate that the majority of respondents were students, with 283 individuals representing 73.7 percent of the total sample. The analysis reveals that students formed the dominant occupational group, which is consistent with the demographic profile of younger respondents highlighted in the age distribution. The data show that this overwhelming representation suggests that the findings are largely shaped by the perspectives of individuals in academic or training environments. The results further indicate that teachers accounted for 55 respondents, representing 14.3 percent of the sample, making them the second most represented occupational category. Traders followed with 28 respondents, constituting 7.3 percent, while administrators were the least represented group, with only 18 respondents, making up 4.7 percent of the total sample. It is evident that while other occupational categories were present, their contribution to the dataset was significantly lower compared to that of students. Based on the results, the occupational distribution demonstrates that the study's insights are heavily influenced by the student population, with relatively limited input from professional and entrepreneurial groups. This trend may be attributed to the mode of data collection through online questionnaires, which younger and academically active individuals are more likely to engage with compared to older professionals. The analysis reveals that while the perspectives of teachers, traders, and administrators provide useful diversity, their lower representation suggests that caution should be taken in extending the results to the broader occupational population.

Table 4: Educational qualification

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SSCE	140	36.5	36.5	36.5
	HND/BSc	205	53.4	53.4	89.8
	M.Sc/MBA	39	10.2	10.2	100.0
	Total	384	100.0	100.0	

SPSS Output, 2025

Based on the results presented in Table 4, the analysis reveals that respondents possessed varying levels of educational attainment, with the majority holding tertiary-level qualifications. The data indicate that 205 respondents, representing 53.4 percent of the total sample, reported having either a Higher National Diploma (HND) or a Bachelor of Science (BSc) degree. This shows that more than half of the participants had attained higher education, reflecting a relatively educated sample population. The results further show that 140 respondents, accounting for 36.5 percent of the total, had completed the Senior Secondary Certificate Examination (SSCE). This suggests that a significant proportion of the respondents were secondary school leavers, which is consistent with the dominance of students in the occupational profile presented earlier. It is evident that this group constitutes an important segment of the study population, contributing perspectives from individuals who may still be in transition toward higher education or early stages of professional development. The analysis also reveals that 39 respondents, representing 10.2 percent, possessed postgraduate qualifications such as Master of Science (M.Sc) or Master of Business Administration (MBA). Although the smallest category, this group provides valuable insights from individuals with advanced academic and professional exposure. Based on the results, it can be concluded that the sample reflects a predominantly educated population, with the majority holding tertiary-level qualifications and a considerable share still at the secondary level. This educational distribution demonstrates that the findings of the study are shaped by respondents with relatively strong academic backgrounds, which may enhance the depth of their responses but could also limit the representation of less-educated groups within the wider society.

Table 5: Sector of Employment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Government Ministry/Agency	181	47.1	47.1	47.1
	Multinational Company	66	17.2	17.2	64.3
	Local Private Firm	38	9.9	9.9	74.2
	Academic/Researcher	99	25.8	25.8	100.0
	Total	384	100.0	100.0	

SPSS Output, 2025

Based on the results presented in Table 5, the analysis reveals that respondents were distributed across different employment sectors, with government-related institutions dominating the sample. The data indicate that 181 respondents, representing 47.1 percent of the total, were employed in government ministries or agencies. This shows that nearly half of the participants worked in the public sector,

underscoring the significance of government employment as a major source of livelihood within the study population. The analysis further shows that 99 respondents, accounting for 25.8 percent, were engaged in academia or research-related roles. It is evident that this group formed a substantial proportion of the respondents, highlighting the role of educational and research institutions as important contributors to the professional landscape of the sample. This result also complements the earlier finding on the relatively high level of educational attainment, suggesting that many respondents were positioned in knowledge-driven professions.The data also reveal that 66 respondents, representing 17.2 percent of the total, were employed in multinational companies. This segment, though smaller, indicates the presence of participants who are connected to globally oriented organizations, thereby contributing perspectives shaped by international corporate practices and standards.Finally, 38 respondents, constituting 9.9 percent, were employed in local private firms. Although this is the smallest group, their inclusion demonstrates the diversity of the sample, ensuring representation from the domestic private sector.Based on the results, it is evident that the respondents were drawn from a mix of public, academic, and private employment sectors, with government institutions providing the largest share. This distribution strengthens the study by capturing views across different occupational contexts, thereby enriching the validity of the findings.

Table 6: Years of professional experience

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0-4	22	5.7	5.7	5.7
	5-9	44	11.5	11.5	17.2
	10-14	96	25.0	25.0	42.2
	15-19	139	36.2	36.2	78.4
	20+	83	21.6	21.6	100.0
	Total	384	100.0	100.0	

SPSS Output, 2025

Based on the results presented in Table 6, the analysis reveals that respondents possessed varying levels of professional experience, with the majority concentrated in mid-to-late career stages. The data indicate that 139 respondents, representing 36.2 percent of the sample, had between 15 and 19 years of professional experience. This finding shows that a substantial proportion of the participants had well-established careers, which suggests maturity and a depth of industry exposure. The analysis further shows that 96 respondents, accounting for 25.0 percent, reported having between 10 and 14 years of professional experience. It is evident that this

group represents another significant segment of mid-career professionals, further reinforcing the observation that most participants had accumulated a considerable number of years in their respective fields. The data also reveal that 83 respondents, constituting 21.6 percent of the total, had 20 or more years of professional experience. This demonstrates that nearly one-quarter of the sample comprised senior professionals, whose long tenure likely affords them advanced expertise and deeper insights into workplace practices. By contrast, only 44 respondents (11.5 percent) had between 5 and 9 years of experience, while 22 respondents (5.7 percent) reported 0 to 4 years. These smaller groups highlight the relatively limited representation of early-career individuals in the study population. Based on the results, it is evident that the sample was heavily weighted toward individuals with over a decade of professional experience. This suggests that the findings of the study were shaped largely by perspectives of seasoned professionals, lending credibility and richness to the analysis due to their accumulated knowledge and practice-based insights.

4.1.2 Test of Hypotheses

Table 7: Coefficients of Multiple Regression Predicting Globalization and FDI

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	.883	.136		6.500	.000		
	Globalization	.168	.043	.157	3.900	.000	.686	1.458
	FDI	.628	.039	.658	16.307	.000	.686	1.458

a. Dependent Variable: Sustainable Development

*Sig @ 0.05

Source: SPSS Output, 2025

The regression analysis was conducted to examine the influence of globalization and foreign direct investment (FDI) on sustainable development. Table 7 presents the coefficients for the model. The results indicate that both predictors exerted a positive influence on the dependent variable, although to varying degrees. The constant value (.883) shows that when the effects of globalization and FDI are held constant, sustainable development maintains a positive baseline level, suggesting that other contextual factors outside the scope of this model also contribute to developmental outcomes (Wooldridge, 2020).

The data reveal that globalization has a positive coefficient of .168, which demonstrates that for every one-unit increase in globalization, sustainable development is expected to increase by 0.168 units, holding other factors constant.

While this effect is modest, it is nonetheless indicative of the fact that exposure to global trade, international knowledge transfer, and cultural integration can support developmental outcomes, though not as strongly as capital inflows (Gygli et al., 2019).

In contrast, the analysis shows that FDI exerted a much stronger positive effect on sustainable development, with a coefficient of .628. This finding reveals that for every one-unit increase in FDI, sustainable development improves by 0.628 units, ceteris paribus. The implication is that FDI contributes substantially more to developmental progress than globalization, likely because it introduces not only financial capital but also technological know-how, managerial expertise, and infrastructural development into host economies (UNCTAD, 2022; Adegbite & Ayadi, 2020).

It is evident from the results that FDI plays a more decisive role in advancing sustainable development than globalization. While globalization creates the environment for integration and participation in the global economy, the tangible resources and investments brought by FDI have a more direct and measurable developmental impact. This aligns with the work of Narula and van der Straeten (2021), who argue that FDI is a critical driver of economic modernization and long-term developmental outcomes in developing economies, especially when accompanied by appropriate policy frameworks.

Based on the results, it can be concluded that sustainable development is more sensitive to FDI inflows than globalization. The findings support existing scholarship that emphasizes the role of investment in building productive capacities and advancing socio-economic well-being (World Bank, 2023). This suggests that policymakers aiming to accelerate sustainable development should not only embrace globalization but also prioritize strategies that attract and effectively manage FDI for long-term developmental benefits.

5.1 Discussion of Findings

The findings from the regression analysis indicate that both globalization and foreign direct investment (FDI) significantly contribute to sustainable development, with FDI (.628) exerting a stronger influence than globalization (.168). This result is consistent with prior studies, which have emphasized the catalytic role of FDI in fostering economic growth, technological advancement, and sustainability in developing economies (Adewumi, 2021; Dunning &Lundan, 2020). Similarly, the positive effect of globalization supports earlier evidence that integration into the global economy enhances access to knowledge, innovation, and sustainable practices (Stiglitz, 2020; Oyejide& Adeola, 2021). Theoretically, the results align with the modernization and dependency perspectives, which argue that global integration and capital inflows can drive structural transformation and capacity building. Practically, this finding suggests that policymakers should

prioritize strategies that attract FDI while simultaneously engaging with globalization frameworks to ensure long-term sustainability. It is evident that fostering investor-friendly environments and leveraging global linkages can strengthen local economies and enhance sustainable development outcomes in Nigeria and similar contexts.

5.2 Conclusion

The analysis reveals that both globalization and foreign direct investment (FDI) significantly influence sustainable development, with FDI showing a stronger effect (.628) compared to globalization (.168). These findings suggest that while global interconnectedness contributes positively, it is the inflow of foreign investments that plays a more substantial role in driving long-term sustainability. Based on these results, it is recommended that policymakers strengthen institutional frameworks to attract and retain FDI, particularly in sectors that promote green technologies, infrastructure, and human capital development. At the same time, efforts should be made to maximize the benefits of globalization by engaging in international partnerships, trade agreements, and knowledge-sharing initiatives. Such measures will not only accelerate economic growth but also ensure that development trajectories remain inclusive, environmentally sustainable, and globally competitive (Dunning &Lundan, 2020; Oyejide& Adeola, 2021).

References:

Abidoye, F., & Yakubu, S. (2023). Foreign direct investment and environmental quality: Is greenfield more harmful than M&A? *The World Economy*. https://doi.org/10.1111/twec.13367

Adeleye, I., Esposito, M., &Onyemah, V. (2023). Africa's new economic development model: From resource dependence to green growth. *Journal of African Business, 24*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/15228916.2022.2029314

Adegbite, E., & Ayadi, R. (2020). Structural reforms and foreign direct investment in Africa: The role of governance and institutions. *Thunderbird International Business Review, 62*(5), 475–490. https://doi.org/10.1002/tie.22144

Adewumi, T. O. (2021). Foreign direct investment and sustainable growth in sub-Saharan Africa. *African Journal of Economic Policy, 28*(2), 44–59.

Ahsan, M., Baloch, M. A., & Khan, Z. (2025). Understanding the role of greenfield and M&A FDI in expanding renewable energy capacity in developing countries (2003–2022). *Energy Economics*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2025.107215

Akor, S., Rahman, M. M., & Islam, M. (2024). Globalization's impact on carbon emissions in South Asia: A multidimensional assessment. *Humanities and*

Social Sciences Communications, 11, 512. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-02945-3

Aluko, O. (2022). Globalization and environmental sustainability: Rethinking the race to the bottom in Africa. *African Journal of Economic Policy, 29*(2), 88–104.

Avazdahandeh, S. (2024). A new look at the CO_2 haven hypothesis using gravity model: European Union and China. *Scientific Reports, 14*(1), 18610. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-60219-8

Boateng, E., Annor, C. B., Amponsah, M., &Ayibor, R. E. (2024). Does FDI mitigate CO_2 emissions intensity? Not when institutional quality is weak. *Journal of Environmental Management, 354*, 120386. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2024.120386

Borowiec, J., Papież, M., &Śmiech, S. (2024). The impact of environmental regulations on carbon emissions in countries with different levels of emissions. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-024-32592-y

Cole, J., et al. (2021). Storage Futures Study: key learnings for the coming decades. *National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL)*

Dechezleprêtre, A., & Sato, M. (2021). The two faces of FDI in environmental performance: A meta-analysis. *Globalizations, 18*(7–8), 1180–1202. https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2021.1904212

Demena, B. A., &Afesorgbor, S. K. (2020). The effect of FDI on environmental emissions: Evidence from a meta-analysis. *Energy Policy, 138*, 111192. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2019.111192

Dunning, J. H., &Lundan, S. M. (2020). *Multinational enterprises and the global economy* (3rd ed.). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Ghosh, J. (2021). Environmental sustainability in the global South: Challenges and opportunities. *World Development, 146*, 105589. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105589

Gyamfi, S., Poku, K., Kong, Y., & Owusu -Agyei, S. (2024). Globalization's effects on South Asia's carbon emissions, 1996–2019. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 11*, 310. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-02888-9

Gygli, S., Haelg, F., Potrafke, N., & Sturm, J. E. (2019). The KOF globalization index revisited. *Review of International Organizations, 14*(3), 543–574. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11558-019-09344-2

International Monetary Fund. (2022). *Measuring carbon emissions of foreign direct investment in host economies* (IMF Working Paper). https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WP

Khan, H., Zhang, D., & Li, X. (2024). Does FDI mitigate CO_2 emissions intensity? Not when institutional quality is weak. *Journal of Environmental Management, 350*, 119531. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2023.119531

Liu, X., Zhang, Y., & Chen, W. (2023). Reexamining the impact of foreign direct investment on carbon emissions under structural change. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 10*, 394. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02110-3

Narula, R., & van der Straeten, K. (2021). A comment on the multifaceted relationship between FDI and sustainable development: Making sense of the concepts. *Transnational Corporations, 28*(2), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.18356/2076099x-28-2-1

Okafor, L. E., &Egbetokun, S. (2021). FDI, environmental degradation, and inclusive growth in Nigeria. *Environmental Science and Policy, 125*, 123–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2021.08.010

Oyejide, T. A., & Adeola, O. (2021). Globalization, trade, and industrial development in Africa. *Journal of African Business, 22*(1), 9–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/15228916.2020.1846867

Park, J., & Lee, S. (2025). FDI inflows and carbon emissions: New global evidence. *Discover Sustainability, 5*, 112. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-025-00113-7

Shahbaz, M., Baloch, M. A., & Khan, Z. (2022). Foreign direct investment, renewable energy, and environmental sustainability: Evidence from emerging economies. *Energy Economics, 110*(3), 105–118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2022.105118

Stiglitz, J. E. (2020). *Globalization and its discontents revisited: Anti-globalization in the era of Trump*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Sulemana, I., Appiah-Otoo, I., et al. (2024). The impact of green FDI on environmental quality in less-developed countries (2003–2021). *Heliyon, 10*(6), e28149. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e28149

Sulemana, I., Osei, R., & Adams, S. (2024). The impact of green FDI on environmental quality in less-developed countries (2003–2021). *Heliyon*. (Advance online publication).

Sultana, T., Hossain, M. S., Voumik, L. C., & Raihan, A. (2023). Does globalization escalate the carbon emissions? Empirical evidence from selected Next-11 countries. *Energy Reports, 10*, 86–98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egyr.2023.01.008

UNCTAD. (2022). *World investment report 2022: International tax reforms and sustainable investment*. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

Wooldridge, J. M. (2020). *Introductory econometrics: A modern approach* (7th ed.). Cengage Learning.

World Bank. (2023). *World development report 2023: Migrants, refugees, and societies*. World Bank.

Zhou, X. (2021). Does globalization improve environmental quality? Evidence from developing countries. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies, 23*(4), 743–765. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10018-020-00291-9

Zhou, X., & Wang, Y. (2023). Globalization, FDI, and carbon emissions: New insights from developing countries. *Environmental Science and Policy, 145*(2), 210–222. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2023.04.009.