

Government Expenditure And Economic Growth In Nigeria, 1970-2008: A Disaggregated Analysis

Abu Nurudeen*, Abdullahi Usman

Department of Economics, University of Abuja, PMB 117, Nigeria

*Correspondence to: Abu Nurudeen, nibnabu@yahoo.com

Published online: June 18, 2010

Abstract

The paper observes that rising government expenditure has not translated to meaningful development as Nigeria still ranks among world's poorest countries. In an attempt to investigate the effect of government expenditure on economic growth, we employed a disaggregated analysis. The results reveal that government total capital expenditure (TCAP), total recurrent expenditures (TREC), and government expenditure on education (EDU) have negative effect on economic growth. On the contrary, rising government expenditure on transport and communication (TRACO), and health (HEA) results to an increase in economic growth. The authors' recommendations include among others the following. Government should increase both capital expenditure and recurrent expenditure, including expenditures on education, as well as ensuring that funds meant for the development of these sectors are properly managed. Secondly, government should increase its investment in the development of transport and communication, in order to create an enabling environment for business to thrive. Thirdly, government should raise its expenditure in the development of the health sector since it would enhance labour productivity and economic growth. Lastly, government should encourage and increase the funding of anti-corruption agencies in order to tackle the high level of corruption found in public office.

Keywords: Government expenditure; economic growth; regression; Nigeria.

1. Introduction

The relationship between government expenditure and economic growth has continued to generate series of debate among scholars. Government performs two functions- protection (and security) and provisions of certain public goods [1] and [2]. Protection function consists of the creation of rule of law and enforcement of property rights. This helps to minimize risks of criminality, protect life and property, and the nation from external aggression. Under the provisions of public goods are defense, roads, education, health, and power, to mention few. Some scholars argue that increase in government expenditure on socio-economic and physical infrastructures encourages economic growth. For example, government expenditure on health and education raises the productivity of labour and increase the growth of national output. Similarly, expenditure on infrastructure such as roads, communications, power, etc, reduces production costs, increases private sector investment and profitability of firms, thus fostering economic growth. Supporting this view, scholars such as [2], [1], [3], and [4] concluded that expansion of government expenditure contributes positively to economic growth.

However, some scholars did not support the claim that increasing government expenditure promotes economic growth, instead they assert that higher government expenditure may slowdown overall performance of the economy. For instance, in an attempt to finance rising expenditure, government may increase taxes and/or borrowing. Higher income tax discourages individual from working for long hours or even searching for jobs. This in turn reduces income and aggregate demand. In the same vein, higher profit tax tends to increase production costs and reduce investment expenditure as well as profitability of firms. Moreover, if government increases borrowing (especially from the banks) in order to finance its expenditure, it will compete (crowds-out) away the private sector, thus reducing private investment. Furthermore, in a bid to score cheap popularity and ensure that they continue to remain in power, politicians and governments officials sometimes increase expenditure and investment in unproductive projects or in goods that the

private sector can produce more efficiently. Thus, government activity sometimes produces misallocation of resources and impedes the growth of national output. In fact, studies by [5], [6], [7], and [8] suggested that large government expenditure has negative impact on economic growth.

In Nigeria, government expenditure has continued to rise due to the huge receipts from production and sales of crude oil, and the increased demand for public (utilities) goods like roads, communication, power, education and health. Besides, there is increasing need to provide both internal and external security for the people and the nation. Available statistics show that total government expenditure (capital and recurrent) and its components have continued to rise in the last three decades. For instance, government total recurrent expenditure increased from N3, 819.20 million in 1977 to N4, 805.20 million in 1980 and further to N36, 219.60 million in 1990. Recurrent expenditure was N461, 600.00 million and N1, 589,270.00 million in 2000 and 2007, respectively (see appendix 1). In the same manner, composition of government recurrent expenditure shows that expenditure on defense, internal security, education, health, agriculture, construction, and transport and communication increased during the period under review (see appendix 1). Moreover, government capital expenditure rose from N5, 004.60 million in 1977 to N10, 163.40 million in 1980 and further to N24, 048.60 million in 1990. The value of capital expenditure stood at N239, 450.90 million and N759, 323.00 million in 2000 and 2007, respectively (see appendix 2). Furthermore, the various components of capital expenditure (that is, defense, agriculture, transport and communication, education and health) also show a rising trend between 1977 and 2007 (see appendix 2).

Unfortunately, rising government expenditure has not translated to meaningful growth and development, as Nigeria ranks among the poorest countries in the world. In addition, many Nigerians have continued to wallow in abject poverty, while more than 50 percent live on less than US\$2 per day. Couple with this, is dilapidated infrastructure (especially roads and power supply) that has led to the collapse of many industries, including high level of unemployment. Moreover, macroeconomic indicators like balance of payments, import obligations, inflation rate, exchange rate, and national savings reveal that Nigeria has not fared well in the last couple of years [9].

Given the issues raised above, this paper seeks to examine the effect of government expenditure on economic growth in Nigeria. The paper is organized as follows. Section 1 is the introduction, while section 2 contains literature review and theoretical framework. Section 3 consists of methodology and model estimation, while section 4 contains discussion of results. Section 5 is for recommendations and conclusion.

2. Literature review and theoretical framework

This section discusses relevant literature and theoretical framework on the linkage between government expenditure and economic growth. In the Keynesian model, increase in government expenditure (on infrastructures) leads to higher economic growth. Contrary to this view, the neo-classical growth models argue that government fiscal policy does not have any effect on the growth of national output. However, it has been argued that government fiscal policy (intervention) helps to improve failure that might arise from the inefficiencies of the market. The seminal work of [10] opened new ground for the investigation of the impact of fiscal policy (government expenditure) on economic growth. In line with this, [11], [12] and [13], emphasized that government activity influences the direction of economic growth. Similarly, [14] pointed out that in the endogenous growth models, fiscal policy is very crucial in predicting future economic growth.

Many researchers have attempted to examine the effect of government expenditure on economic growth. For instance, [15] examined the effect of government (consumption) expenditure on economic growth for a sample of 96 countries, and discovered a negative effect of government expenditure on growth of real output. [16] examined the association between government expenditures and economic growth in Thailand, by employing the Granger causality test. The results revealed that government expenditures and economic growth are not co-integrated. Moreover, the results

indicated a unidirectional relationship, as causality runs from government expenditures to growth. Lastly, the results illustrated a significant positive effect of government spending on economic growth. [17] investigated the relationships between government expenditure and economic growth for a group of 30 OECD countries during the period 1970-2005. The regression results showed the existence of a long-run relationship between government expenditure and economic growth. In addition, the authors observed a unidirectional causality from government expenditure to growth for 16 out of the countries, thus supporting the Keynesian hypothesis. However, causality runs from economic growth to government expenditure in 10 out of the countries, confirming the Wagner's law. Finally, the authors found the existence of feedback relationship between government expenditure and economic growth for a group of four countries.

In their paper, [8] studied the relationship between government expenditure and economic growth for a sample of wealthy countries for 1970-95 period, using various econometric approaches. The authors submitted that more meaningful (robust) results are generated, as econometric problems are addressed. In India, [3] examined the effect of government development expenditure on economic growth during the period 1950-2007. The authors discovered a significant positive impact of government expenditure on economic growth. They also reported the existence of co-integration among the variables. [2] indicated that government spending has a positive relationship with economic growth in Saudi Arabia. On his part, [18] studied the linkage between government expenditure and economic growth for a group of 115 countries during the period 1950-1980. The author used both cross section, time series data in his analysis, and confirmed a positive influence of government expenditure on economic growth.

[4] used an econometric model that takes government expenditure and quality by governance into consideration, in a cross-sectional study that includes 71 countries. The results revealed that both the size and quality of the government are associated with economic growth. [19] employed multivariate co-integration and variance decomposition approach to examine the causal relationship between government expenditures and economic growth for Egypt, Israel, and Syria. In the bivariate framework, the authors observed a bi-directional (feedback) and long run negative relationships between government spending and economic growth. Moreover, the causality test within the trivariate framework (that include share of government civilian expenditures in GDP, military burden, and economic growth) illustrated that military burden has a negative impact on economic growth in all the countries. Furthermore, civilian government expenditures have positive effect on economic growth for both Israel and Egypt.

[20] examined the causal relationship between GDP and public expenditure for the US data during the period 1947-2002. The causality results revealed that total government expenditure causes growth of GDP. On the other hand, growth of GDP does not cause expansion of government expenditure. Moreover, the estimation results indicated that public expenditure raises the US economic growth. The authors concluded that, judging from the causality test Keynesian hypothesis exerts more influence than the Wagner's law in US. [21] employed the trivariate causality test to examine the relationship between government expenditure and economic growth, using data set on Greece, United Kingdom and Ireland. The authors found that government size granger causes economic growth in all the countries they studied. The finding was true for Ireland and the United Kingdom both in the long run and short run. The results also indicated that economic growth granger causes public expenditure for Greece and United Kingdom, when inflation is included.

[22] used the heterogeneous panel to investigate the impact of government expenditure on economic growth. The authors employed the GMM technique, and discovered that countries with large government expenditure tend to experience higher growth, but the effect varies from one country to another. In Saudi Arabia, [1] analyzed the relationship between government expenditure and economic growth. The author reported that the size of government is very important in the performance of economy. He advised that government should increase its spending on infrastructure, social and economic activities. In addition, government should encourage and support the private sector to accelerate economic growth. [23] investigated the differential effects of various forms of expenditures on economic

growth for a sample of 58 countries. Their findings indicated that government expenditures on education and defense have positive influence on economic growth, while expenditure on welfare has insignificant negative impact on economic growth. [24] used a disaggregated approach to investigate the impact of public expenditure on economic growth for 30 developing countries in 1970s and 1980s. The authors confirmed that government capital expenditure in GDP has a significant positive association with economic growth, but the share of government current expenditure in GDP was shown to be insignificant in explaining economic growth. At the sectoral level, government investment and expenditure on education are the only variables that had significant effect on economic growth, especially when budget constraint and omitted variables are included. [25] examined the relationship between government expenditure and economic growth, by proposing a new framework for New Zealand. The empirical results showed that higher government expenditure does not hurt consumption, but instead raises private investment that in turn accelerates economic growth.

[26] argued that the American government expenditure has grown too much in the last couple of years and has contributed to the negative growth. The author suggested that government should cut its spending, particularly on projects/programmes that generate least benefits or impose highest costs. In Sweden, [27] examined the effects of government expenditure on economic growth during 1960-2001 period. The author emphasized that government spends too much and it might slowdown economic growth. [28] studied the relationship between the composition of government expenditure and economic growth for a group of developing countries. The regression results illustrated that capital expenditure has a significant negative association with growth of real GDP per capita. However, the results showed that recurrent expenditure is positively related to real GDP per capita.

In Nigeria, many authors have also attempted to examine government expenditure-economic growth relationship. For example, [29] examined the relationship between the Nigeria's defence sector and economic development, and reported a positive impact of defence expenditure on economic growth. [30] empirically investigated the relationship between government expenditure and economic growth in Nigeria. The econometric results indicated that real government capital expenditure has a significant positive influence on real output. However, the results showed that real government recurrent expenditure affects growth only by little. Also, study by [31] revealed a long-term relationship between government expenditure and economic growth. Moreover, the author's findings showed that recurrent expenditure exerts more influence than capital expenditure on growth. [32] used a disaggregated approach to determine the components (that include capital, recurrent, administrative, economic service, social and community service, and transfers) of government expenditure that enhances growth, and those that do not. The author concluded that there was no significant association between most components of government expenditure and economic growth in Nigeria.

This study is an improvement on other studies on economic growth-government expenditure relationship in Nigeria for two reasons. Firstly, it considers government expenditure on defence as an important variable that affects economic growth. Recent studies like [32] did not include the variable (expenditure on defence) in the growth model. Secondly, our paper extends the study period to 2007.

3. Methods

This paper uses the co-integration and error correction methods to analyze the relationship between government expenditure and economic growth. The framework for the study has its basis on the Keynesian and endogenous growth models. The Keynesian model states that expansion of government expenditure accelerates economic growth. Although, endogenous growth models do not assign any important role to government in the growth process, authors like [10], [11], and [12] emphasized the importance of government (activity) policy in economic growth. Moreover, some authors focused on the components of government expenditure that are productive or unproductive [33], while others submitted that composition of government expenditure might exert more influence compare to the level of government

expenditure [34]. From the foregoing discussion, the level of government expenditure and composition of government expenditure are important determinants of growth. Thus, our model expresses economic growth (GRY) as a function of various levels and components of government expenditure that include total capital expenditure (TCAP), total recurrent expenditure (TREC), expenditures on defense (DEF), agriculture (AGR), transport and communication (TRACO), education (EDU) and health (HEA). In addition, we include inflation (IFN) and overall government fiscal balance (FISBA), since they can have lasting impact on economic growth. Thus, the growth model is specified as:

$$GRY = \beta_0 + \beta_1 TREC + \beta_2 TCAP + \beta_3 DEF + \beta_4 AGR + \beta_5 EDU + \beta_6 HEA + \beta_7 TRACO + \beta_8 FISBA + \beta_9 IFN + U \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

The variables are measured as follows. Economic growth refers to the changes in real GDP. Real GDP in turn is obtained by dividing GDP at current market price by the consumer price index (CPI). TREC is measured as total recurrent expenditure divided by the CPI. TCAP is captured by the total capital expenditure divided by the CPI. DEF is measured as government expenditure on defence divided by CPI. AGR is captured by government expenditure on agriculture divided by CPI. HEA is measured as government expenditure on health divided by CPI. EDU is captured by government expenditure on education divided by CPI. TRACO is measured as government expenditure on transport and communication divided by CPI. FISBA is the overall fiscal balance, while IFN is the inflation rate. U refers to the error term. The various expenditure items used are defined [9] as payments for transactions within one year (in the case recurrent expenditure), and payments for non-financial assets used in the production process for more than one year (in the case of recurrent expenditure). Thus, we assumed the expenditure items to be actual expenditures. Prior to estimation of the growth model above, standard econometric tests like stationarity test and co-integration test were conducted in order to avoid the generation of spurious regression results. The result of stationarity (unit root) test is shown in the table below:

Table 1: Results of stationarity (unit root) test.

Variables	ADF-statistic	Critical values	Order of integration
GRY	-5.784369 (0.0000)	1% = -2.647120 5% = -1.952910 10% = -1.610011	Stationary at level
TREC	-7.734957 (0.0000)	1% = -2.647120 5% = -1.952910 10% = -1.610011	Stationary at first difference
TCAP	-8.620840 (0.0000)	1% = -2.647120 5% = -1.952910 10% = -1.610011	Stationary at first difference
DEF	-2.083667 (0.0376)	5% = -1.952473 10% = -1.610211	Stationary at level
AGR	-5.991573 (0.0000)	1% = -2.650145 5% = -1.953381 10% = -1.609798	Stationary at first difference
TRACO	-4.461950 (0.0001)	1% = -2.644302 5% = -1.952473 10% = -1.610211	Stationary at level
EDU	-7.621234 (0.0000)	1% = -2.647120 5% = -1.952910 10% = -1.610011	Stationary at first difference
HEA	-6.270276 (0.0000)	1% = -2.647120 5% = -1.952910 10% = -1.610011	Stationary at first difference
FISBA	-5.582961	1% = -2.647120	Stationary at first difference

	(0.0000)	5% = -1.952910 10% = -1.610011	
IFN	-5.249600 (0.0000)	1% = -2.650145 5% = -1.953381 10% = -1.609798	Stationary at first difference
ECM	-6.442021 (0.0000)	1% = -2.647120 5% = -1.952910 10% = -1.610011	Stationary at level

The results of the stationarity (unit root) test indicate that TREC, TCAP, AGR, EDU, HEA, FISBA, and IFN are stationary at first difference, while GRY, DEF, and TRACO are stationary at level. Moreover, the error correction variable ECM is stationary at level implying that the variables are co-integrated. Finally, we estimated the growth function above. The regression result is presented in the table below:

Table 2: Regression results.

Dependent Variable: GRY

Method: Least Squares

Date: 03/22/10 Time: 18:21

Sample(adjusted): 1979 2007

Included observations: 29 after adjusting endpoints

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	58.96014	14.18445	4.156673	0.0006
TREC(-1)	-0.004600	0.002202	-2.089280	0.0512
TCAP(-2)	-0.003974	0.001957	-2.030053	0.0574
DEF(-2)	-0.019637	0.019272	-1.018927	0.3217
AGR	-0.000862	0.017026	-0.050603	0.9602
TRACO(-1)	0.034998	0.013163	2.658855	0.0160
EDU(-1)	-0.066705	0.024736	-2.696711	0.0148
HEA(-1)	0.062409	0.036844	1.693857	0.1075
IFN	-0.299800	0.196188	-1.528124	0.1439
FISBA(-2)	-0.000206	6.21E-05	-3.311905	0.0039
ECM(-1)	-0.482955	0.198567	-2.432202	0.0257
R-squared	0.589566	Mean dependent var	4.815990	
Adjusted R-squared	0.361547	S.D. dependent var	18.62344	
S.E. of regression	14.88073	Akaike info criterion	8.519708	
Sum squared resid	3985.852	Schwarz criterion	9.038338	
Log likelihood	-112.5358	F-statistic	2.585600	
Durbin-Watson stat	1.960831	Prob(F-statistic)	0.038196	

4. Discussion

The estimation results reveal that the explanatory variables jointly account for approximately 58.96 percentage changes in economic growth. The Durbin Watson statistic (1.96) illustrates the absence of auto correlation. The estimation results show that the variables- total capital expenditure (TCAP), total recurrent expenditure (TREC), expenditures on transport and communication (TRACO), education (EDU), and health (HEA), including inflation (IFN) and overall fiscal balance (FISBA) are statistically significant in explaining changes in economic growth. However, expenditures on defence (DEF) and agriculture (AGR) are not significant in explaining economic growth. For instance, 1 percentage increase in total capital expenditure in the previous two year causes economic growth to decline by 0.004 percentage. Similarly, a 1 percentage increase in total recurrent expenditure in the previous one year leads to 0.005 percentage decrease in economic growth. These findings are in line with the one reported by [5], [6], [7], and [8] that government expenditure may slowdown economic growth. The negative impact of total capital and recurrent expenditures may not be unconnected with mismanagement and diversion of public funds by government officials and political appointees. Furthermore, 1 percentage increase on government expenditure on transport and communication in the previous one year results to an increase in economic growth by approximately 0.035 percentage. Thus, higher government expenditure on transport and communication creates an enabling environment for businesses to strive through reduced cost of production. Besides, the estimation shows that a 1 percentage increase in government expenditure on education in the previous one year causes economic growth to decline by approximately 0.07 percentage. This is not surprising because funds meant for the development of the education sector have not been properly utilized and in most cases embezzled, thus precipitating the incessant strike by Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) and National Union of Teachers (NUT). Moreover, the estimation results indicate that a 1 percentage increase in expenditure on health in the previous one year leads to approximately 0.06 percentage increase in economic growth. Thus, increases in government expenditure on health raise the health status and productivity of the people, thereby promoting economic growth. The regression results also illustrate that any increase in inflation and overall fiscal balance results to a decrease in economic growth. Lastly, the error correction has been found to be significant and correctly signed, implying that a long run equilibrium or relationship exists between the variables.

5. Conclusion

Following the results reported in the preceding section, the authors make the following recommendations. Firstly, government should ensure that capital expenditure and recurrent expenditure are properly managed in a manner that it will raise the nation's production capacity and accelerate economic growth. Secondly, government should increase its investment in transport and communication sectors, since it would reduce the cost of doing business as well as raise the profitability of firms. Thirdly, government should encourage the education and health sectors through increased funding, as well as ensuring that the resources are properly managed and used for the development of education and health services. Lastly, government should increase its funding of anti-graft or anti-corruption agencies like the Economic and Financial Crime Commission (EFCC), and the Independent Corrupt Practices Commission (ICPC) in order to arrest and penalize those who divert and embezzle public funds.

6. Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

7. Authors' Contributions

AN prepared the introduction, model estimation and specification, interpretation of results and policy implication of findings, including recommendations and conclusion. AU prepared the literature review, theoretical framework and assisted in the drafting of the manuscript.

References

- [1] Abdullah HA, 2000. The Relationship between Government Expenditure and Economic Growth in Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Administrative Science*, 12(2): 173-191.
- [2] Al-Yousif Y, 2000. Does Government Expenditure Inhibit or Promote Economic Growth: Some Empirical Evidence from Saudi Arabia. *Indian Economic Journal*, 48(2).
- [3] Ranjan KD, Sharma C, 2008. Government Expenditure and Economic Growth: Evidence from India. *The ICFAI University Journal of Public Finance*, 6(3): 60-69. [<http://ssrn.com/abstract=1216242>]
- [4] Cooray A, 2009. Government Expenditure, Governance and Economic Growth. *Comparative Economic Studies*, 51(3): 401-418. [<http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/pal/ces;jsessionid=q1g8lgkzfvms.alice>]
- [5] Laudau D, 1986. Government and Economic Growth in LDCs: An Empirical Study. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 35: 35-75.
- [6] Barro R, 1991. Economic Growth in Cross-Section of Countries. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106(2): 407-443.
- [7] Engen EM, Skinner J, 1992. Fiscal Policy and Economic Growth. NBER Working Paper 4223.
- [8] Folster S, Henrekson M, 2001. Growth Effects of Government Expenditure and Taxation in Rich Countries. *European Economic Review*, 45(8): 1501-1520. [<http://ssrn.com/abstract=998262>]
- [9] Central Bank of Nigeria Statistical Bulletin, 2008.
- [10] Barro R, 1990. Government Spending in a Simple Model of Endogenous Growth. *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5): 103-125.
- [11] Barro R, Sala-i-Martin X, 1992. Public Finance in Models of Economic Growth. *Review of Economic Studies*, 59: 645-661.
- [12] Easterly W, Rebelo S, 1993. Fiscal Policy and Economic Growth: An Empirical Investigation. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 32: 417-458.
- [13] Brons M, de Groot HLF, Nijkamp P, 1999. Growth Effects of Fiscal Policies. Tinbergen Discussion Paper, Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit.
- [14] Dar Atul A, AmirKhalkhali S, 2002. Government Size, Factor Accumulation and Economic Growth: Evidence from OECD Countries. *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 24(7/8): 679-692.
- [15] Laudau D, 1983. Government Expenditure and Economic Growth: A Cross Country Study. *Southern Economic Journal*, 49: 783-792.
- [16] Komain J, Brahmasrene T, 2007. The Relationship Between Government Expenditures and Economic Growth in Thailand. *Journal of Economics and Economic Education Research*. [http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa5529/?tag=content;col1]

- [17] Olugbenga AO, Owoye O, 2007. Public Expenditure and Economic Growth: New Evidence from OECD Countries. [http://iaes.confex.com/iaes/Rome_67/techprogram/S1888.HTM]
- [18] Ram R, 1986. Government Size and Economic Growth: A New Framework and Some Evidence from Cross-Section and Time-Series Data. *American Economic Review*, 76: 191-203.
- [19] 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): 567-583. [http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/01618938]
- [20] Liu Chih-HL, Hsu C, Younis MZ, 2008. The Association between Government Expenditure and Economic Growth: The Granger Causality Test of the US Data, 1974-2002. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting and Financial Management*, 20(4): 439-52.
- [21] Loizides J, Vamvoukas G, 2005. Government Expenditure and Economic Growth: Evidence from Trivariate Causality Testing. *Journal of Applied Economics*, 8(1): 125-152.
- [22] Gregoriou A, Ghosh S, 2007. The Impact of Government Expenditure on Growth: Empirical Evidence from Heterogeneous Panel. [http://www.brunel.ac.uk/9379/efwps/0701.pdf]
- [23] Donald NB, Shuanglin L, 1993. The Differential Effects on Economic Growth of Government Expenditures on Education, Welfare, and Defense. *Journal of Economic Development*, 18(1).
- [24] Niloy B, Emranul HM, Osborn DR, 2003. Public Expenditure and Economic Growth: A Disaggregated Analysis for Developing Countries. [www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/cgbcr/dpcgbr.30.pdf]
- [25] Erkin B, 1988. Government Expenditure and Economic Growth: Reflections on Professor Ram's Approach, A New Framework and Some Evidence from New Zealand Time Series Data. *Keio Economic Studies*, 25(1): 59-66.
- [26] Mitchell JD, 2005. The Impact of Government Spending on Economic Growth. *Backgrounder*, 1831. [www.heritage.org/research/budget/bg1831.cfm]
- [27] Peter S, 2003. Government Expenditures Effect on Economic Growth: The Case of Sweden, 1960-2001. A Bachelor Thesis Submitted to the Department of Business Administration and Social Sciences, Lulea University of Technology, Sweden.
- [28] Devarajan S, Swaroop V, Zou H, 1996. The Composition of Public Expenditure and Economic Growth. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 37: 313-344.
- [29] Oyinlola O, 1993. Nigeria's National Defence and Economic Development: An Impact Analysis. *Scandinavian Journal of Development Alternatives*, 12(3).
- [30] Fajingbesi AA, Odusola AF, 1999. Public Expenditure and Growth. A Paper Presented at a Training Programme on Fiscal Policy Planning Management in Nigeria, Organized by NCEMA, Ibadan, Oyo State, 137-179.
- [31] Ogiogio GO, 1995. Government Expenditure and Economic Growth in Nigeria. *Journal of Economic Management*, 2(1).

[32] Akpan NI, 2005. Government Expenditure and Economic Growth in Nigeria: A Disaggregated Approach. CBN Economic and Financial Review, 43(1).

[33] Kneller R, Bleaney M, Gemmell N, 1999. Fiscal Policy and Growth: Evidence from OECD Countries. Journal of Public Economics, 74: 171-190.

[34] Nijkamp P, Poot J, 2004. Meta-analysis of the Effect of Fiscal Policy on Long-Run Growth. European Journal of Political Economy, 20: 91-124.

Appendix 1: Government recurrent expenditure and its components (Nmillion).

Years	Total recurrent expenditure	Defense	Education	Health	Agriculture	Communication and transport
1977	3,819.20	817.70	238.60	109.50	19.50	41.30
1978	2,800.00	596.10	268.20	72.90	19.70	29.10
1979	3,187.20	724.20	368.90	87.50	34.30	43.70
1980	4,805.20	652.50	597.20	155.30	32.50	58.50
1981	4,846.70	725.10	543.70	119.80	33.90	59.10
1982	5,506.00	660.80	646.70	155.80	34.10	53.80
1983	4,750.80	535.40	620.80	143.60	29.30	49.70
1984	5,827.50	569.20	716.30	139.10	32.80	42.30
1985	7,576.40	656.60	669.50	167.70	32.70	125.80
1986	7,696.90	742.40	652.80	279.20	32.90	125.80
1987	15,646.20	717.70	514.40	166.90	29.20	114.20
1988	19,409.40	830.00	802.30	260.00	54.30	142.80
1989	25,994.20	957.30	1,719.90	326.60	81.10	170.40
1990	36,219.60	1,410.50	1,962.60	401.10	208.10	232.40
1991	38,243.50	1,834.20	1,265.10	619.40	121.10	245.40
1992	53,034.10	2,023.40	1,676.30	837.40	161.50	356.30
1993	136,727.10	3,085.40	6,436.10	2,331.60	1,015.50	350.10
1994	89,974.90	4,205.10	7,878.10	2,066.80	919.00	381.40
1995	127,629.80	5,344.40	9,421.30	3,335.70	2,236.00	890.00
1996	124,491.30	11,425.70	12,136.00	3,192.00	1,681.20	2,183.60
1997	158,563.50	11,607.20	12,136.00	3,179.20	1,682.20	1,290.20
1998	178,097.80	15,130.80	13,928.30	4,860.50	2,963.80	1,969.40
1999	449,662.40	28,091.40	23,047.20	8,793.20	31,347.20	5,877.60
2000	461,600.00	33,119.40	44,225.50	11,612.60	4,834.70	2,315.70
2001	579,300.00	47,071.60	39,884.60	24,523.50	7,064.90	33,935.10
2002	696,800.00	86,053.80	100,240.20	50,563.20	12,439.40	36,579.40
2003	984,300.00	51,043.60	64,755.90	33,254.50	7,534.30	22,669.80
2004	1,032,700.00	65,400.20	72,217.90	33,377.40	11,725.60	4,592.30
2005	1,223,700.00	90,333.80	92,594.70	50,032.80	10,858.80	7,780.80
2006	1,290,201.90	83,674.00	129,421.90	67,550.20	18,739.80	9,468.90
2007	1,589,270.00	102,597.27	137,478.26	71,228.99	15,781.42	10,080.69

Source: Central Bank of Nigeria (2007, 2008)

Appendix 2: Government capital expenditure and its components (Nmillion).

Years	Total capital expenditure	Defense	Agriculture	Transport and communication	Education	Health	GDP at current market prices	Consumer price index
1977	5,004.60	97.70	105.50	2,300.40	500.00	114.10	31,520.30	0.66
1978	5,200.00	39.80	128.40	1,331.10	301.40	49.60	34,540.10	0.7
1979	4,219.50	44.40	321.90	1,865.70	533.20	96.20	41,974.70	0.75
1980	10,163.40	127.50	435.60	2,349.30	952.60	147.20	49,632.30	0.88
1981	6,567.00	96.20	775.10	1,625.70	440.90	128.40	47,619.70	1.03
1982	6,417.20	82.20	1,035.10	1,283.90	488.00	130.20	49,069.30	1.1
1983	4,885.70	200.80	1,185.20	1,094.40	346.60	136.00	53,107.40	1.53
1984	4,100.10	38.40	252.50	261.90	144.90	51.10	59,622.50	1.87
1985	5,464.70	30.60	985.40	241.00	180.70	56.20	67,908.60	1.89
1986	8,526.80	209.00	892.50	516.10	442.00	81.20	69,147.00	2.15
1987	6,372.50	18.50	365.10	375.10	139.10	69.50	105,222.80	2.36
1988	8,340.10	271.30	595.70	704.00	281.80	183.20	139,085.30	3.80
1989	15,034.10	124.10	981.50	683.80	221.90	126.00	216,797.50	5.50
1990	24,048.60	196.40	1,758.50	877.00	331.70	257.00	267,550.00	5.70
1991	28,340.90	411.10	551.20	353.40	289.10	137.60	312,139.70	7.00
1992	39,763.30	683.20	763.00	625.00	384.10	188.00	532,613.80	10.42
1993	54,501.80	1,085.60	1,820.00	1,436.70	1,563.00	352.90	683,869.80	16.80
1994	70,918.30	1,286.80	2,800.10	1,294.00	2,405.70	961.00	899,863.20	29.70
1995	121,138.30	2,031.20	4,691.70	3,800.30	3,307.40	1,725.20	1,933,211.60	45.03
1996	212,926.30	2,670.10	3,892.80	8,820.00	3,215.80	1,659.50	2,702,719.10	51.47
1997	269,651.70	3,820.80	6,247.40	7,147.70	3,808.00	2,623.80	2,801,972.60	56.73
1998	309,015.60	6,147.70	8,876.60	6,228.00	12,793.00	7,123.80	2,708,430.90	63.49
1999	498,027.60	4,856.30	6,912.60	3,313.70	8,516.60	7,386.80	3,194,015.00	63.63
2000	239,450.90	6,954.90	5,761.70	3,021.00	23,342.60	6,569.20	4,582,127.30	72.87
2001	438,696.50	16,400.00	57,879.00	19,241.00	19,860.00	20,128.00	4,725,086.00	84.90
2002	321,378.10	22,093.60	32,364.40	17,083.00	9,215.00	12,608.00	6,912,381.30	95.20
2003	241,688.30	10,679.70	8,510.90	6,639.60	14,680.20	6,431.00	8,487,031.60	117.90
2004	351,300.00	10,657.10	48,047.80	9,751.00	21,550.00	26,410.00	11,411,066.90	129.70
2005	519,500.00	21,535.20	79,939.40	19,982.50	27,440.80	21,652.60	14,572,239.10	144.70
2006	552,385.80	14,686.00	15,176.80	6,531.00	35,791.80	38,039.80	18,564,594.70	157.10
2007	759,323.00	14,717.24	22,518.58	35,529.35	48,293.51	51,171.01	20,657,317.70	167.40

Source: Central Bank of Nigeria (2007, 2008)