IJAAR PUBLISHING®

American Research Journal of Contemporary Issues | ISSN: 3027-0189
Vol. 2, Issue 3 (July-September, 2024) | www.ijaar.org

EFFECT OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CAPITAL EXPENDITURE ON THE PERFOMANCE OF NIGERIAN ECONOMY (2007-2022)

Ukoh, Josephine E. and Nwaoha Chinedu Daniel
Department of Banking
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
Mail: je.ukoh@unizik.edu.ng

Abstract

This research investigated the Effect of Federal Government Capital Expenditure on the performance of the Nigerian economy from 2007 to 2022. The objectives include assessing the effects of capital expenditure in administration, economic service, on the performance of the Nigerian economy.Employing an ex-post facto research design, the study utilizes existing data from the Nigerian Bureau of Statistics and the Central Bank of Nigeria. The economic models adopted, expressed in log-linear econometric formats, explore the relationship between Federal Government Capital Expenditure on Administration (CEAD), and Economic Services (CEES), with the Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The findings reveal a robust positive correlation between Government Expenditure on Administration, Economic Services, with GDP. Increased capital expenditure in these domains is found to enhance economic growth and development in Nigeria. Specifically, Government Expenditure on Administration significantly contributes to GDP growth, highlighting the importance of investments in administrative infrastructure. Similarly, Government Expenditure on Economic Services demonstrates a substantial positive impact onGDP, emphasizing the importance of allocating funds to projects that directly contribute to economic development. The recommendations emphasize the need for increased expenditure in critical sectors, effective budget preparation, and cautious borrowing practices to ensure sustainable economic growth and development.

Keywords: Capital expenditure in administration, Economic service, and Gross Domestic Product

Ukoh, J. E. & Nwaoha, C. D. (2024). Effect of Federal Government Capital Expenditure on the Performance of Nigerian Economy (2007-2022). *American Research Journal of Contemporary Issues. 2*(3), 82-93. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.13626091

INTRODUCTION

Nigeria's budget has always been on the deficit. It is a situation where a country prepares or plan to spend more than what the country generate. Federal government expenditure and Nigeria Economy has been a sensitive discussion over the years. It is worthy to note that the public are well interested to know the impact Government spending has made in the Economy considering the fact that Government borrows or seek for funds from internal and external source, in the long run, to be able to achieve their national goals. The citizens are so eager to also see where their taxes are going, because it is the duty of the Government to collect tax and spend the money judiciously. It is Paramount to note that Government expenditure is the most important macroeconomic management tool that controls the level of demand and money supply in an economy. It can put an economy on the path of sustainable growth and development if it is well sustained.

Apparently, Federal Government performs two major/main functions in the economy, which is: protection and provision of basic infrastructure/amenities (Abdullah, 2010). The protection function of the government consists of the creation of the rule of law and enforcement of rights which help minimize risk of criminality and external aggression. Under the provision of basic infrastructure/amenities, the function includes the provision of good health facilities, education, power, agriculture, and transportation, build bridges, road etc. Performing both functions, the federal government is required to spend huge number of resources, especially in nations where the level of these infrastructure/amenities is low like in Nigeria. The Nigeria government operates a cash budget system where expenditure proposals are anchored on projected revenue. To meet this projected revenue,

The federal government of Nigeria spent 12,164.1 billion naira in 2021 compared to 10,231.7 billion naira in 2020, an increase of 18.87%. Government deficit spending increased from 6,248.6 billion naira in 2020 to 7,118.7 billion naira in 2021, an increase of 13.9%, but it still does not leave much to be desired (CBN, 2023). Even after the pandemic is over, all economic indicators continue to fall, and markets kept contracting as output plunged. It is clear that the main goals of government spending, such as the provision of public goods and resource redistribution, are still far from being met. Economic growth should be expected to follow a pattern consistent with government capital expenditures on administration, social and community service, economic services, transfers, and government deficits.

The relationship between government expenditure and the level of economic growth in Nigeria has attracted widespread attention. Economists, The Public, Researchers are not comfortable with the level of economic growth and development in Nigeria compared to what the Government is spending which is outrageous. Nigeria economy is collapsing daily while the Government kept insisting that much money is being injected in the economy yearly. It is a game of "the more you look, the less you see". Also, some funds which is supposed to be put into Nigeria Economy are being diverted or embezzled. The expenses of Government do not reflect in the economy. It may be of interest to note that many researchers have established the impact of government spending on economic growth in the past and presently. But the outcome of their work has been more confusing than it has been helpful, because of the lack of consensus on the results and conclusions reached.

There are also some studies that concluded that government spending has no significant impact on economic growth (see Schaltegger, Torgler, 2006; Hasnul, 2015). With government spending still on the rise in many economies, on the one hand, and declining economic growth rates in these economies, on the other, the debate on whether government spending has a positive, negative or neutral impact on economic growth is still raging today – with some studies

going an extra mile disaggregating government expenditure into various components. Still, the outcome has been largely inconclusive. Also, what has been the impact of expenditure the government has made on administration,economic service, social community, and transfers and what has been the effect on NigeriaEconomy. It is against this backdrop, that this study wants to review, research, and have a deep study of the effect of federal government capital expenditure on the performance of Nigeria Economy now that Nigeria Economy is facing the worst hit.

The general objective of this study is to determine the effect of Federal Government capital expenditure on the performance of Nigeria Economy from (2007-2022). The specific objectives were to:

i. Determine the effect of Federal Government Capital Expenditure in Administrationon the Nigeria Economy.
ii. Evaluate the effect of Federal Government Capital Expenditure in Economicservice on the Nigeria Economy.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Government expenditure

This is the spending of public income by government to provide social, political and economic infrastructures that will grow and provide higher standard of living for its citizens. Osiegbu, Onuorah and Nnamdi (2010) posited that public expenditure is an offshoot of the inevitable loophole that is inherent in either of political systems (capitalism and communism) that is practice all over the world. A communist state makes public expenditure mandatory as the public sector commands all the productive resources available in such a country. According to Barro and Grilli (1994), Government spending (or government expenditure) includes all government consumption and investment but excludes transfer payments made by a state. Government expenditure can be for the acquisition of goods and services for current use to directly satisfy individual or collective needs of the members of the community or it can be for acquisition of goods and services intended to create future benefits such as infrastructure investment and the expenditures can represent transfers of money, such as social salaries and cost of administration. In Ijaiya 2003, government expenditure is determined by rapid population growth and subsequent demographic transitions, increase in income and taste of the people in a country that had led to increase in demand for government goods and services, increase in technological requirements for industrialization, increase in urbanization, increase in inflation over time, balance in productivity growth between public and private sector, and the need to address natural disasters among other things. Similarly, government expenditure is influenced by the expanded roles of government which include among others, the provision of pure public goods for, example, defense, law and order, properly rights, macroeconomic management, public health and education, protecting the poor through the provision of anti-poverty programmes and disaster, relief programmes, addressing externalities, for example, environmental protection, provision of social insurance, coordinating private sector activities and redistribution of income and assets (2006). Government expenditure in Nigeria is more often necessitated by the failure of capitalist system to harmonized and bridge the gap between the rich and the poor. The extreme competitive nature of the market system results in externalities that without the presence of the public sector may result to chaos and disorder. Furthermore, public should fill vacuum if the society must continue to grow. The public sectoris needed to provide social, formidable political and legal structure to ensure good behaviour. The federal government should provide economic infrastructure for sustainable growth, ensure good health and better education facilities and above all; to provide employment and security for its citizen. All these requires huge amount of capital and human resources that cannot be provided by individuals or corporate bodies alone in a market system where selfish interest reigns

supreme.

2.1.1 Government Expenditure and Economic Growth

Governments all over the world are statutorily saddled with the responsibility of providing the enabling environment for a private sector led economic growth. But the case of Africa is quite different, as one of the critical Indices of under-development has remained a very weak private sector. This has led to the unfortunate situation where the government has remained the major financier of the economy.

Economic growth of a country is a process by which country advances from one economic condition to a higher and more prolonged one that is also more desirable and sustainable one.

This high condition is characterized by both quantitative and qualitative increase in the availability of goods and services, aimed at increasing the living standard of the people. On the other hand, government expenditure can be seen as the expenses, which the government incurs for its own maintenance, for the benefit of the society, the economy, external bodies and for other countries. It is simply government spending from revenues derived from taxes, exports, grants, aids and other sources. Anyafo (1996), in a more elaborate form defined government (public) expenditure to consist of the following.

Expenditure incurred either directly or in forms of subsidies on the provision of goods and services by government ministries and departments.

All transfer payments by government ministries and departments on cost centers that do not attract my corresponding transfer of real resources and; Capital expenditures by government parastatals.

Capital Expenditure

Capital expenditure are budgeted expenses incurred by the government of any economyto ensure the certainty of projects execution which are of economic benefit to the government, citizens, and economy of the country. The federal government capital expenditure over time has covered major infrastructures in the economic which includes; construction and rehabilitation of federal roads, fixed assets for the administration of the federal government running of its activities, agriculture equipment's, power supply, industrialization for economic services, building of hospitals, schools and social amenities for social community services, payment of debts owed locally and internationally by the government to liquidate its debts obligations as transfers. All these expenditures are categorized as major expenditure which only the federal governments will solely take responsibility in ensuring that these facilities and services are being provided for the growth of its economy. Osiegbu *et al* (2010) posited that the federal government capital expenditure is another means of stimulating the economic growth of Nigeria by means of its fiscal policies consideration. When the federal government seems to boost the economy activities, it executes projects through the approved budgeted funds meant for its capital expenditure for that year. In other words, it is termed the "federal government capital expenditure fiscal year policy"; since it is possessing the characteristics and role of fiscal policy towards the growth of an economy then federal government capital expenditure should be a fundamental element of economic variables which could characterize the wellbeing of productivity within the Nigerian economy.

Review of related Empirical literature

Aluthge *et al*. (2021) evaluated the effect of government spending on Nigeria's economic

expansion. The study's results, which used the Autoregressive Distributed Lag model, showed that capital spending had a positive and significant impact on economic growth both in the short term and the long term. Ibrahim, *et al*. (2022) investigated the effect of public health spending in Nigeria health indices. The study used the Error Correction model, and its results showed a long-term connection between health indicators, healthcare spending, gross domestic product (GDP) per person, carbon dioxide emissions, literacy level, and urban population. Ikubor, *et al*. (2022) evaluated government capital investment in the economic services sector and economic growth in Nigeria. They used the ARDL model in their study and the results showed a substantial positive association between government spending and economic growth. Mohammed and co. (2021) examined Public spending and economic growth in Nigeria: Using the Smooth Transition Regression (STR) model in a non-linear study, it was discovered that public spending had a positive and significant influence on economic growth in Nigeria. Aremu, Babalola, Aninkan, and Salako (2020) investigated the impact of government expenditures on critical sectors on economic growth in Nigeria (1984-2019). The study employed Autoregressive Distributed Lag model (Bound Test Co-integration Approach) to estimate both short and long run impact of Government expenditures on economic growth. The result revealed that government expenditure on defence impacts negatively on economic growth while government expenditure on agriculture enhances economic growth. Government expenditure on education, transport and communication did not impact on economic growth in the long run. Nworji, Okwu, Obiwuru and Nworji (2018) studied the effect of public government spending on economic growth in Nigeria based on variables considered relevant indicators of economic growth and government expenditure for the period 1970 – 2017. The Ordinary Least Square (OLS) multiple regression model specified on perceived causal relationship between government expenditure and economic growth was used. Results of the analysis showed that capital and recurrent expenditure on economic services had insignificant negative effect on economic growth. Capital expenditure on transfers had insignificant positive effect on growth.

Bashir, Hamza and Rafiat (2017) studied the impact of government expenditure on economic growth in Nigeria. The study covered the period of 1981-2016 using Ordinary Least Square (OLS) technique and granger causality test were employed. The result obtained indicated that there was negative and insignificant relationship between human capital and GDP, the relationship between physical capital and GDP as well as between government capital expenditure (GCE) and GDP were positive but insignificant. The granger causality test showed that government expenditure granger caused GDP, but GDP did not granger cause government expenditure. Idris and Bakar (2017) examined the relationship between government expenditure andeconomic growth with the aim of establishing a stable relationship. To estimate the existence or otherwise of the equilibrium relationship among the examined variables the study employedan ARDL model. The data covered a period of thirty-five (35) years from 1980 to 2015.The result from the ARDL estimation indicated an existence of positive and long-run equilibrium relationship between economic growth and government expenditure in Nigeria. Suanin (2015) empirically examined the effects of different types of government expenditure on economic growth in Thailand. The authors used different econometric techniques to estimate the short- and long- run effects of these expenditures on growth and employ quarterly data over the period 1993–2014. The finding indicated that while budgetary expenditure has the potential to promote economic growth in the long-run, extra-budgetary expenditure as well as quasi-fiscal spending can also stimulate short-run economic growth. Muhammad and Karim (2015) had to explore the impact of expenditure on economic growth in Pakistan, using the time series data for the period 1972 to 2013. Secondary data was acquired from World Development indicators and Pakistan Bureau of Statistics. Augmented Dicky Fuller Test (ADF) test was applied to check the stationary of the data. Johansen Co-integration and Granger Causality tests

were applied to empirically investigate the relationship between given variables (expenditure and economic growth) in Pakistan. The cointegration results indicated that there is not any relationship between expenditure and national income in the longrun. Aregbe and Edame (2015) examined the impact of government spending on economic growthin Nigeria. The time series data for the period: 1970–2010 was used in the study. Data for this study were obtained from the Central Bank of Nigeria statistical Bulletin. Some selected macro-economic variables such as government expenditure, educational expenditure, health expenditure, and government investment expenditure and government consumption were captured in the model, after which the model was estimated. The results showed that overall government expenditure on health and transport are positive and significantly related to economic growth.

METHODOLOGY

This research work used ex post facto research design to determine the effect of federal government capital expenditure on the performance of Nigerian economy from 2007 to 2022. The ex post facto research design involves the use of facts, data or information already availableto make critical evaluation of the variables or situation being studied.

Secondary was used in this study and was collected from Central Bank of Nigeria Statistical Bulletin covering the period 2007 to 2022.

Model Specification

This study adapted the model of Darma (2014) as stated:

RGDP = f (TCE, ADM, ECO, SCS, TRF) 1

RGDP = $\alpha + \beta 1TCE + \beta 2ADM + \beta 3ECO + \beta 4SCS + \beta 5TRF + \mu t$

Where, RGDP is the Real gross domestic product at time t. α and μt are the constant and error term respectively, while $\beta 1$, $\beta 2$, $\beta 3$, $\beta 4$ and $\beta 4$ are the coefficients of total capital expenditure, capital expenditure on administration, capital expenditure on economic services, capital expenditure on social community services and capital expenditure on transfers respectively.

Thus, this study modified the model of Darma (2014) as follows: GDP = f (GEA, GEES, GECS)

GDP = f (GEA) - - - i

GDP = f (GEES) - - - ii

The econometric model is stated as follows$GDP = \beta 0 + \beta 1GEA + \mu t$ - iii $GDP = \beta 0 + \beta 1GEES + \mu t$ iv

Where:

GDP = Gross Domestic Product

GEA = Government Capital Expenditure on Administration GEES = Government Capital Expenditure on Economic Services

Method of Data Analysis

The data was analyzed with econometric techniques involving descriptive statistics and the Ordinary Least Square (OLS) for hypothesis testing.

A priori Expectation

A priori expectation refers to the anticipated outcome of the study. It is based on intuition and assumed principles or facts without analysis, rather than on actual observed or analyzed facts.

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Table 1 Presentation of Data for Variables

YEAR	GDP (₦ billion)	GEA (₦ billion)	GEES (₦ billion)
2007	34,675.94	226.97	358.38
2008	39,954.21	287.10	504.29
2009	43,461.46	291.66	506.01
2010	55,469.35	260.20	412.20
2011	63,713.36	231.80	386.40
2012	72,599.63	190.50	320.90
2013	81,009.96	283.65	505.77
2014	90,136.98	229.63	393.45
2015	95,177.74	226.81	348.75
2016	102,575.42	147.72	278.95
2017	114,899.25	328.94	542.19
2018	129,086.91	446.25	753.49
2019	145,639.14	591.26	994.19
2020	154,252.32	417.14	701.40
2021	176,075.50	635.73	1,102.46
2022	202,365.03	789.81	1,369.66

Source: CBN Statistical Bulletin 2023

Data Analysis

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of the variables

	GDP	GEA	GEES
Mean	100068.3	349.0728	592.4047
Median	92657.36	285.3765	505.0259
Maximum	202365.0	789.8060	1369.662
Minimum	34675.94	147.7208	278.9489
Std. Dev.	50310.96	181.1876	315.1094
Skewness	0.512168	1.204677	1.254167
Kurtosis	2.270871	3.381938	3.503467
Jarque-Bera	1.053928	3.967239	4.363479
Probability	0.590395	0.137570	0.112845
Sum	1601092.	5585.164	9478.476
Sum Sq. Dev.	3.80E+10	492434.3	1489409.
Observations	16	16	16

Source: Output data from E-views 10

The descriptive statistics of the variables of interest were examined in order to evaluate the mean, median, maximum, minimum and other vital descriptive statistics including the Kurtosis. The mean of GDP of the studied years was 100,068.3 while its median value was 92,657.36. The standard deviation of 50310.96 indicates that data are more spread out. The maximum

value of GDP was 202,365.0 while the minimum was 34,675.94. The Jarque-Bera statistic value was 1.053928 with a probability value of 0.590395 shows that the variable follows a normal distribution.

The mean of GEA of the studied years was 349.0728 while its median value was 285.3765. The standard deviation of 181.1876 means that data are clustered around the mean. The maximum value of GEA was 789.8060 while the minimum was 147.7208. The Jarque-Bera statistic value was 3.967239 with a probability value of 0.137570, this shows that the variable was normally distributed.

The mean of GEES of the studied years was 592.4047 while its median value was 505.0259. The standard deviation of 315.1094 indicates that data are clustered around the mean. The maximum value of GEES was 1369.662 while the minimum was 278.9489. The Jarque-Bera statistic value was 4.363479 with a probability value of 0.112845, this indicates that the variable was normally distributed.

Test of Hypotheses

Test of Hypothesis One

H_0: Federal government capital expenditure on administration has no significant effect on the Nigerian economy.

H_1: Federal government capital expenditure on administration has a significant effect on the Nigerian economy.

Table 3: OLS output for the test of hypothesis one

Dependent Variable: GDPMethod: Least Squares
Date: 02/21/24 Time: 16:03 Sample (adjusted): 2008 2022
Included observations: 15 after adjustments

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-StatisticProb.
GEA	25.30594	7.510583	3.3693710.0056
C	-341.3307	1938.936	-0.1760400.8632
GDP(-1)	1.026606	0.031667	32.418810.0000

R-squared	0.996630	Mean dependent var	104427.8
Adjusted R-squared	0.996068	S.D. dependent var	48848.64
S.E. of regression	3063.162	Akaike info criterion	19.06914
Sum squared resid	1.13E+08	Schwarz criterion	19.21075
Log likelihood	-140.0185	Hannan-Quinn criter.	19.06763
F-statistic	1774.176	Durbin-Watson stat	2.018904
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000		

Source: E-Views 10 output, 2024

The coefficient of GEA is 25.30594 which shows that federal government expenditure on administration positively affects gross domestic product. The F-statistic value of 1774.176 and its associated p-value of 0.00000 show that GEA significantly influenced variations in gross domestic product. The regression R-squared value of 0.996630 and the Adjusted R-squared value of 0.996068 show that about 99% of the systematic variations in GDP were explained by the GEA. The Adjusted R-squared is often preferred to account for sample size adjustments. The Durbin Watson stat of 2.018904 indicates that there is no auto correlation problem in the model.

Decision Rule:

Since the p-value of GEA is less than 0.05 at 0.0056; we reject the null and accept the alternate; thus, federal government capital expenditure on administration has a significant effect on the Nigerian economy.

Test of Hypothesis Two

H_0: Federal government capital expenditure on economic service has no significant effect on the Nigerian economy.

H_1: Federal government capital expenditure on economic service has a significant effect on the Nigerian economy.

Table 4.4: OLS output for the test of hypothesis two

Dependent Variable: GDPMethod: Least Squares
Date: 02/21/24 Time: 16:14 Sample (adjusted): 2008 2022
Included observations: 15 after adjustments

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-StatisticProb.
GEES	14.48485	4.320324	3.3527230.0058
C	-197.7654	1937.528	-0.1020710.9204
GDP(-1)	1.027562	0.031566	32.552690.0000

R-squared	0.996613	Mean dependent var	104427.8
Adjusted R-squared	0.996049	S.D. dependent var	48848.64
S.E. of regression	3070.528	Akaike info criterion	19.07394
Sum squared resid	1.13E+08	Schwarz criterion	19.21555
Log likelihood	-140.0546	Hannan-Quinn criter.	19.07243
F-statistic	1765.646	Durbin-Watson stat	2.023114
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000		

Source: E-Views 10 output, 2024

The coefficient of GEES is 14.48485 which shows that federal government capital expenditure on economic services positively affect gross domestic product. The F-statistic value of 1765.646 and its associated p-value of 0.0000 shows that GEES significantly influenced variations in gross domestic product. The regression R-squared value of 0.996613 and the Adjusted R-squared value of 0.996049 show that about 99% of the systematic variations in GDP were explained by the GEES. The Adjusted R-squared is often preferred to account for sample size adjustments. The Durbin Watson stat of 2.023114 indicates that thereis no auto correlation problem in the model.

Decision Rule:
Since the p-value of GEES is less than 0.05 at 0.0058; we reject the null and accept the alternate; thus, federal government capital expenditure on economic services has a significant effect on the Nigerian economy.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Findings of the study indicate that federal government capital expenditure has a positive and significant effect on the Nigerian economy. Thus, the study concludes that the allocation, execution and proper implementation of federal government capital expenditure projects

positively affects the growth of the Nigerian economy.

The study, therefore, recommends the following to policymakers and regulators:
The government should prioritize critical infrastructure projects that align with long term economic development goals and ensure sufficient budgetary allocations for identified infrastructure projects.

The government should conduct thorough project planning and budgeting, clearly outlining the scope, costs and timelines. This would allow for effective monitoring of project implementation. They should also utilize public-private partnerships to bring in expertise, innovation and additional funding thereby enhancing the efficiency of projectdelivery.

REFERENCES

Abu-Bader S, Abu-Qarn AS, 2003. Government expenditures, military spending, and Economic growth: causality evidence from Egypt, Israel, and Syria. Journal of Policy Modeling, 25(6- 7), pp 567-583.

Akintunde, T. S., & Olaniran, O. D. (2022). Financial development, public health expenditure and health outcomes: evidence from Nigeria. Journal of economics and allied research, 7(1), 13–24. https://jearecons.com/index.php/jearecons/article/view/198.

Akpan, N. I. (2005), Government expenditure and economic growth in Nigeria, a disaggregated approach. Central Bank of Nigeria Financial Review, 43(1).

Aluthge C., Jibir A., and Abdu M. (2021). "Impact of government expenditure on economic growth in Nigeria, 1970-2019" CBN Journal of Applied Statistics. 12(1), 139-174.

Assi, R., Dimson, J. Goodman, A. & Andersen, J. S. (2019). Spending reviews: a more powerful approach to ensuring value in public finances. Public and Social Sector Insights, London: McKinsey & Company.

Awode, S. S. & Akpa, E.O. (2018). Testing Wagner's law in Nigeria in the short and long-run. AUDOE, 14(7), 7-23.

Babatunde, S. A. (2018). Government spending on infrastructure and economic growth in Nigeria.

Economic Research-Ekonomska Istrazˇivanja, 31(1), 997-1014.

Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) (2021). Central Bank of Nigeria Statistical Bulletin. www.cenbank.org.

Central Bank of Nigeria (2023). Central Bank of Nigeria Statistical Bulletin. Abuja:

Chimobi, O. P. (2016). Government expenditure and national income: A causality test for Nigeria. European Journal of Economic and Political Studies, 2(2), 1-11.

Churchill, S. A., Ugur, M., & Yew, S. L. (2017). Does government size affect per-capita income growth? A hierarchical meta-regression analysis. Economic Record, 93(300), 142-171.

Cooray A, 2009. Government expenditure, governance, and economic growth. Comparative economicstudies, 51(3), pp 401-418.

Darma, N. A. (2014). Federal capital expenditure and its impact on economic growth in Nigeria;1980-2010. Developing Country Studies, 4(4), 24-33.

Dickey, D., and W. A. Fuller (1979). Distribution of the estimates for autoregressive time series with a unit root. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 74 (June), 427–31.

Diyoke, K. O., Yusuf, A., & Demirbas, E. (2017). Government expenditure and economic growth in lower-middle-income countries in Sub-Saharan Africa: an empirical investigation. AsianJournal of Economics, Business, and Accounting, 5(4) 1-11.

Ebong, F., Ogwumike, F., Udongwo, U., & Ayodele, O. (2016). Impact of government expenditure oneconomic growth in Nigeria: a disaggregated analysis. Asian Journal of

Economics and Empirical Research, 3(1), 113-121.

Fajingbesi, A. A. and Odusola, A. F. (1999): "Public expenditure and growth". A paper presented at a training program on fiscal policy planning management in Nigeria, organized by NCEMA, Ibadan, Oyo State, pp 137-179.

Forte, F. & Magazzino, C. (2016). Government size and economic growth in Italy: a time-series analysis. European Scientific Journal, 12(7), 149-168.

Gupta, R. (2018). The impact of government expenditure on economic growth in Nepal. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3099218.

Ibrahim, T. M., & Ditep, N. R. (2022). The impact of public health expenditure on health indicators in Nigeria. Journal of economics and allied research, 7(1), 25–34. Retrieved from https://jearecons.com/index.php/jearecons/article/view/111

Idris, M., & Bakar, R. (2017). Public sector spending and economic growth in Nigeria: In search of a stable relationship. Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences,3(2), 1-19.

Ikubor, O. J., Oluwaseun, O. A., Saheed, Z. S., & Abraham, A. A. (2022). Government capital expenditure in the economic services sector and economic growth in Nigeria. Journal of economics and allied research, 7(2), 296–308. Retrieved from https://jearecons.com/index.php/jearecons/article/view/198.

Katrakilidis, C. & Tsaliki, P. (2009). Further evidence on the causal relationship between spending and economic growth: the case of Greece, 1958-2004. Acta Oeconomica, 59(1), 57-78.

Komain J, Brahmasrene T. (2007): "The relationship between government expenditures and economic growth in Thailand". Journal of Economics and Economic Education Research.

Laudau D. (1983): "Government expenditure and economic growth: a cross country study". SouthernEconomic Journal, 49, 783-792.

Liu Chih-HL, Hsu C. and Younis M. Z. (2008). "The association between government expenditure and economic growth: the granger causality test of the US data, 1974-2002". Journal of PublicBudgeting, Accounting, and Financial Management, 20(4), pp 439-52.

Loizides J. and Vamvoukas G. (2005). "Government expenditure and economic growth: evidence fromtrivariate causality testing". Journal of Applied Economics, 8(1), pp 125-152.

Mohammed, H. N., Idris, Y., & Shehu, Y. (2021). Public expenditure and economic growth in Nigeria: A non-linear analysis. Journal of economics and allied research, 6(2), 245–254. Retrieved fromhttps://jearecons.com/index.php/jearecons/article/view/154.

Molefe, K., & Choga, I. (2017). Government expenditure and economic growth in South Africa: a vector error correction modeling and Granger Causality Test. Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies, 9(4), 164-172.

Nworji, I.D, Okwu, A.T., Obiwuru T.C., Nworji, L.O. (2012). Effects of public expenditure on economic growth in Nigeria: a disaggregated time series analysis. International Journal of Management Sciences and Business Research, 1(7). (ISSN: 2226-8235).

Nurudeen, A. and Usman, A. (2010): "Government expenditure and economic growth in Nigeria, 1970-2008: a disaggregated analysis". Business and Economics Journal, BEJ-4.

Ogiogio, G. O. (1995): "Government expenditure and economic growth in Nigeria". Journal of Economic Management, 2(1).

Oktayer, A., & Oktayer, N. (2012). Testing Wagner's Law for Turkey: Evidence from a Trivariate Causality Analysis. Prague Economic Papers, 2, 284-301.

Okwu, A. T., Nissi, M., Owolabi, T. J., & Adejola, D. K. (2022). "Government education expenditureand human capital development in Nigeria: empirical investigation". Journal

of Economics and
Allied Research, 7(2), 206-222. Retrieved from https://jearecons.com/index.php/jearecons/article/view/199.

Olayungbo, D. O. & OlayemI, O. F. (2018). Dynamic relationships among non-oil revenue, government spending, and economic growth in an oil producing country: Evidence from Nigeria. Future Business Journal, 4(2), 246-260.

Olugbenga, A. O. and Owoye, O. (2007): "Public expenditure and economic growth: new evidence from OECD countries".

Oriakhi, M. O. (2021). Poverty reduction, government expenditure, and economic growth in Nigeria. Journal of economics and allied research, 6(2), 282–297. Retrieved from https://jearecons.com/index.php/jearecons/article/view/148

Oyinlola O. (1993): "Nigeria's national defense and economic development: an impact analysis". Scandinavian Journal of Development Alternatives, 12(3).

Oyinlola, M. A., & Akinnibosun, O. (2013). Public expenditure and economic growth nexus: Further evidence from Nigeria. Journal of Economics and International Finance, 5(4), 146-154.

Ranjan K. D. and Sharma C. (2008): "Government expenditure and economic growth: evidence fromIndia". The ICFAI University Journal of Public Finance, 6(3), pp 60-69.

Suleiman, A. S. Aruwa (2009): "Public Finances and Economic Growth in Nigeria: Fiscal Policy Implications in Crises Era". www.academia.com.

Temidayo, O. A., Oderinu, K. H., & Abiodun, S. O. (2022). Public expenditure and infrastructural development in Nigeria: a comparative analysis of democratic and military regimes. Journal of Economics and Allied Research, 7(2), 16–32. Retrieved from https://jearecons.com/index.php/jearecons/article/view/209.

Usman, A., Mobolaji, H. I., Kilishi, A. A., Yaru, M. A., & Yakubu, T. A. (2011). Public expenditure and economic growth in Nigeria. Asian Economic and Financial Review, 1(3), 104- 113.

Vtyurina, S. (2020). Effectiveness and equity in social spending: the case of Spain. IMF Working Paper, No. WP/20/16.

Wagner, A., (1883), "three extracts on public finance". Translated and reprinted in R.A. Musgrave and A.T. Peacock (eds), Classics in the Theory of Public Finance, London: Macmillan, 1958.

World Bank (2008). Public Expenditure Management Handbook. Washington, D.C.: The World BankGroup.

World Bank (2015). Introduction to Public Sector Governance and Accountability Series: PublicExpenditure analysis. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank Group.