

ANALYSIS OF AGRICULTURAL PUBLIC CAPITAL EXPENDITURE AND AGRICULTURAL ECONOMIC GROWTH IN NIGERIA 1961 - 2010

ABSTRACT

Aims: This study investigated the impact of agricultural public capital expenditure on agricultural economic growth in Nigeria over the period 1961 to 2010.

Methodology: Annual data was used for this study and was obtained from Central Bank of Nigeria 2010 statistical bulletin and annual report. The data was analyzed using Augmented Dickey-Fuller test, Johansen maximum likelihood test and Granger Causality test.

Results: The result of the Johansen cointegration test showed that there exist a long run relationship between all the explanatory variables and explained variable. The result of parsimonious error correction model showed that agricultural capital expenditure had a positive impact on agricultural economic growth. Also, granger causality test showed a unidirectional relationship between agricultural capital expenditure and agricultural economic growth. This means that agricultural economic growth does not cause expansion of agricultural public capital expenditure rather; it indicates that agricultural public capital expenditure raises the nation's agricultural economic growth. The Error Correction Mechanism (ECM) indicated that if the economy is out of equilibrium, 5.2% of disequilibrium will be corrected for annually.

Conclusion: The study therefore recommends that the proportion of government capital expenditure that goes into agricultural expenditure financing should be increased.

Keywords: Agricultural capital expenditure, Agricultural economic growth, cointegration, Long run, Error Correction Mechanism

1. INTRODUCTION

In an agrarian economy like the type that exists in Nigeria, agricultural production provides the needed fulcrum upon which a sustainable development would blossom [5]. Apart from being the main source of food for most of the population, the agricultural sector contributes substantially to GDP and thus has remained vital to the Nigerian economy [13]. It provides the means of livelihood for over 70 percent of the population, plus being a major source of raw materials for the agro-allied industries as well as a potent source of the much needed foreign exchange earnings ([38]; [30]). According to the [8], the Federal Government of Nigeria on a yearly basis often allocates funds to the various sectors of the economy for the overall development of the nation. Thus part of the seriousness of government to sustain the agricultural sector can be evidenced on its various allocations to this sector of the economy.

Government spending is referred to as an outflow of resources from government to other sector of the economy [28]. Government spending or public spending is sub-divided into current and capital expenditure. Capital expenditure has been defined as payment for non-financial assets used in production while current expenditures are payments for non-

30 repayable transactions within a year [8]. In Nigeria, government expenditure has continued
31 to rise due to the huge receipts from production and sales of crude oil, and the increase
32 demand for public goods like roads, communication, power, education, health, among others
33 [28]. Available statistics show that total government expenditure (capital and recurrent) and
34 its components have continued to rise in the last three decades. Government capital
35 expenditure rose from N5, 004.60 million in 1977 to N10, 163.40 million in 1980 and further
36 to N24, 048.60 million in 1990. The value of capital expenditure stood at N239, 450.90
37 million and N759, 323.00 million in 2000 and 2001, respectively. Furthermore, the
38 agricultural component of capital expenditure also shows a rising trend between 1977 and
39 2007 [28].

40
41
42 A catalogue of reasons has been advanced for the relative poor performance of Nigeria's
43 agricultural sector. Key among these include interest and foreign exchange rate volatilities,
44 poor infrastructure base, policy inconsistency and unnecessary intervention by the public
45 sector which sends wrong signal to the private sector [11]. Other important constraints
46 include inadequate public agricultural expenditure, over dependence on crude oil revenue,
47 rural-urban migration, inadequate processing and storage capacity, smallness of farm
48 holdings, ageing population, use of inefficient traditional technology and increasing
49 population pressure, etc. In an attempt to solve these problems of agricultural sector, the
50 federal and state governments of Nigeria intervene through some agricultural policies and
51 programmes. Notable among these policies are the National Accelerated Food Production
52 Programme (1973), Agricultural Development Programme (ADP) (1975), The River Basin
53 and Rural Development Authorities (1976), Operation Feed the Nation (OFN) (1976), Land
54 Use Decree (1978), Green Revolution (GR) (1980) , Fertilizer Company of Nigeria
55 (NAFCON), National Agriculture Land Development Authority (NALDA) (1991), Cassava
56 Multiplication Programme (1985-1999), and the latest is the Transformation Agenda of the
57 Federal Ministry of Agriculture (2011). Meanwhile, these policies have not helped much in
58 improving significantly the agricultural sector as the costs involved are still more than the
59 benefits realized.

60 61 **1.1 Statement of problem**

62 The agricultural sector has been affected with numerous problems which has been the result
63 of the poor performance of the sector itself. This has attracted various strategies including
64 expansion of public expenditure on agricultural activities by different government in the
65 country. Overtime this expenditure has perhaps been on the increase without expressly
66 translating to corresponding expansion or increase in agricultural economic growth. There is
67 still the massive importation of rice, fish, wheat and other agricultural products into the
68 country. There is still great variability in the income of farmers and food is still expensive for
69 consumers. Nigeria cannot be said to be food secure. The current transformation agenda of
70 the current government sets out to make a difference. Several studies have been carried out
71 on government expenditure and economic output. They include [31] who analyzed the
72 impact of government expenditure on economic growth in Nigeria; [22], examined the level
73 of government spending on the education sector and its contribution to GDP; [6] used a
74 disaggregated approach to determine the components (that include capital, recurrent,
75 administrative, economic service, social and community service, and transfer) of government
76 expenditure that enhances growth and those that do not. Most of these studies have
77 focused on using simple regression not minding the spurious correlation associated with
78 non-stationary series and some used data covering short period of time. However, [6] used
79 cointegration but his views limited to the components of government expenditure that
80 enhances growth and those that do not. There is seemingly paucity of information on the
81 impact of agricultural public or government capital expenditure on agricultural economic
82 growth over the period 1961 to 2010. Hence this research will fill this gap and provides the

required empirical information. The main objective of this research is to investigate the impact of agricultural capital expenditure on agricultural economic growth in Nigeria between 1961 and 2010.

1.2 Literature review

Several studies have been undertaken in Nigeria and elsewhere to assess the relationship between capital expenditure and economic growth. According to [25] the relationship between government (capital expenditure) and economic growth has continued to generate series of controversies among scholars in economic literature. The empirical literature includes: [6], [19], [21], [37], [35], [17] and [3]. [6] use of disaggregated approach in order to determine other components of government expenditure that enhances growth. He concluded that there was no significant relationship between most components of government expenditure and economic growth in Nigeria. [21] investigated the relationship between government expenditure and economic growth in Thailand for the period 1993 to 2006. They made use of the Granger causality tests and Ordinary Least Square (OLS) method. Their finding revealed that government expenditure and economic growth are not co-integrated but indicated a unidirectional relationship. This is because causality runs from government expenditure to growth, and also detected a significant positive effect of government spending on economic growth. [19] made use of the heterogeneous panel data to study the impact of government expenditure on economic growth. The result was that countries with large government expenditure tend to experience higher growth.

Government spending and economic growth are directly related. It has been established in literature by some authors that there is a link between economic growth and government spending; for example [27]. They believe that there is a nexus between government spending and economic growth. [37], [35], [17] and [4] confirmed a negative correlation between economic growth and spending on health and education. Also, [37] confirmed a short run negative correlation between education and economic growth. They went further to analyze the long run positive relationship between educational spending and economic growth. The relationship between spending on defense and health on economic growth is inconclusive. [37] reported a non significant and no impact of government spending on defense on economic growth.

The issue of whether government spending on the sector matters or not is further evidenced by the study carried out by [33] to investigate the growth effect of government expenditure in Lebanon over several years (1962 to 2007). They applied Johansen cointegration technique to examine the nature of government expenditure and its impact on economic growth. The study focused on different sectors and the results from the education sectors shows that government spending on education has a positive effect on growth in the long run and negative impact in the short run, while expenditure on defense and health are negatively correlated in the long run and insignificant in the short run.

[9] used an econometric model that takes government expenditure and quality of governance into consideration, in a cross-sectional study that includes 71 countries. The results revealed that both the expenditure and quality of the government are associated with economic growth. [2] employed multivariate co-integration and variance decomposition approach to examine the causal relationship between government expenditure 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 expenditure 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.

[24], 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. [23] 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 expenditure 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.

[7] also examined the effects of government expenditure on economic growth for a panel of 30 developing countries over the decades of 1970s and 1980s with a particular focus on sectoral expenditures and employed regression technique. Their results revealed that the share of government capital expenditure in GDP is positively and significantly correlated with economic growth with the exception of current expenditure which was insignificant. Furthermore, [10] analyzed the relationship between public expenditure and economic growth in Sri Lanka over the period 1952 to 2002 and applied Johansen cointegration technique and Granger causality test. The finding suggests that the growth of public expenditure in Sri Lanka is not directly dependent and determined by economic growth.

[26] investigated the relationship between government expenditure and economic growth in Nigeria. He employed the Bounds Test approach to co-integration based on unrestricted Error Correction Model and Pair wise Granger Causality tests. The results from the Bounds Test indicate that there exists no long-run relationship between government expenditure and economic growth in Nigeria only when real GDP is taken as dependent variable. In addition, the causality results reveal that government capital expenditure granger causes economic growth. While no causal relationship was observed between government recurrent expenditure and economic growth.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1 The data

Secondary data were collected for this study. The data are annual and were obtained from Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) 2010 Statistical Bulletin and Annual report.

2.2 Model specification

2.2.1 Unit Root Tests

According to [15] a non-stationary time series has important asymptotic consequences; regression estimates do not converge in probability with increased sample size, R-square values have non-degenerated distributions, and divergence in t-value distributions often exist such that asymptotically correct critical values do not exist. Regressions involving non-stationary variables in levels often display first order serial correlation and lead to spurious results. To carry out the unit root test for stationarity, the Dickey-Fuller (DF) and Augmented

187 Dickey-Fuller (ADF) tests are used to examine each of the variable for the presence of a unit
 188 root (an indication of non-stationarity). The DF test assumes that the data generating
 189 process is AR(1) process, and so if this is not so the autocorrelation in the error term will
 190 bias the test since it includes the first difference in lags in such a way that the error term is
 191 distributed as white noise. The test for the stationary or order of the integration of the data
 192 series and testing for co-integration were carried out using Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF)
 193 tests. ADF test was used because it captures additional dynamic left out by the DF and
 194 ensures that the error term is white noise through the inclusion of additional lag length. The
 195 test procedure is given by:

$$197 \quad \Delta AGDP_t = \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \delta AGDP_{t-1} + \theta_i \sum_{i=1}^m \Delta AGDP_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t \quad \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

$$198 \quad \Delta ACEX_t = \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \delta ACEX_{t-1} + \theta_i \sum_{i=1}^m \Delta ACEX_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t \quad \dots \dots \dots (2)$$

$$199 \quad \Delta AFPI_t = \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \delta AFPI_{t-1} + \theta_i \sum_{i=1}^m \Delta AFPI_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t \quad \dots \dots \dots (3)$$

$$200 \quad \Delta ALF_t = \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \delta ALF_{t-1} + \theta_i \sum_{i=1}^m \Delta ALF_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t \quad \dots \dots \dots (4)$$

201 Where:

202 $AGDP_t$ = Agricultural Contribution to Gross Domestic Product (Million Naira)

203 $ACEX_t$ = Agricultural Capital Expenditure (Million Naira)

204 $AFPI_t$ = Agricultural Foreign Private Investment (Million Naira)

205 ALF_t = Agricultural Loanable Fund (Million Naira)

206 ε_t = Error term

207

208 N/B: The model is a deterministic trend with drift.

209 The decision rule is that the t-statistics on the coefficient of the variable β_1 which is expected
 210 to be negative, must be significantly different from the critical value for a given sample size.
 211 The null hypothesis is that the variable of interest is non-stationary (i.e. it is integral of order
 212 one 1(1)).

213

214 **2.2.2 Cointegration analysis**

215

216 Cointegration is the idea that the linear combinations of non-stationary series can be
 217 stationary, implying a long-run relationship, thus they can be modeled. In testing for
 218 Cointegration, the Johansen Efficient Maximum Likelihood test was used to examine the
 219 existence of a long-term relationship among the variables.

220 Consider a VAR of order P .

221

$$222 \quad y_t = A_1 y_{t-1} + \dots + A_p y_{t-p} + \beta x_t + \varepsilon_t \quad \dots \dots \dots (5)$$

223

224 Where y_t is a k - vector of non-stationary I (1) variables, x_t is a d -vector of deterministic
 225 variables, and ε_t is a vector of innovations. We can rewrite this VAR as:

226

$$227 \quad \Delta y_t = \Pi y_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \Gamma_i \Delta y_{t-i} + \beta x_t + \varepsilon_t \quad \dots \dots \dots (6)$$

228

229 Where,

230

231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279

$$\Pi = \sum_{i=1}^p A_i - I, \quad \Gamma = - \sum_{j=i+1}^p A_j \dots\dots\dots (7)$$

Granger's representation theorem asserts that if the coefficient matrix Π has reduced rank, $r < k$, then there exist $k \times r$ matrices α and β each with rank r such that $\Pi = \alpha \beta^1$ and $\beta^1 y_t$ is $I(0)$, r is the number of cointegrating relations (the rank) and each column of β is the cointegrating vector. As explained below, the element, the element of α are known as the adjustment parameters in the error correction model. Johansen's method is to estimate the matrix from an unrestricted VAR and to test whether we can reject the restrictions implied by the reduced rank of Π .

2.2.3 Error Correction Model

This specification includes a short run dynamic process, consistent with data and converging to the long run equilibrium. The Error Correction Model (ECM) attempts to integrate economic theory useful in characterizing long run equilibrium with observed disequilibrium by building a model that explicitly incorporates behaviour that would restore equilibrium. Error Correction Mechanism has the cointegrated relations built into the specification so that it restricts the long-run behaviour of the endogenous variables to converge to their cointegrating relationships while allowing for short-run adjustment dynamics. The Error Correction Term (ECM) is the one-period lagged value of the residual from a static model.

In this study therefore, having established the cointegration relationships among variables, an over-parameterised error correction model was estimated which initially consisted of 2 lag length of each variable. The over-parameterised error correction model estimated is given in equation 8.

$$\Delta \text{LogAGDP}_t = \Phi_0 + \Phi_1 \Delta \text{LogACEX}_t + \Phi_2 \Delta \text{LogACEX}_{t-1} + \Phi_3 \Delta \text{LogACEX}_{t-2} + \Phi_4 \Delta \text{LogAFPI}_t - \Phi_5 \Delta \text{LogAFPI}_{t-1} - \Phi_6 \Delta \text{LogAFPI}_{t-2} + \Phi_7 \Delta \text{LogALF}_t + \Phi_8 \Delta \text{LogALF}_{t-1} - \Phi_9 \Delta \text{LogALF}_{t-2} + \Phi_{10} \Delta \text{LogAGDP}_{t-1} - \Phi_{11} \Delta \text{LogAGDP}_{t-2} - \text{ECM}_{t-1} \dots\dots\dots (8)$$

Where ECM = Error Correction term, other variables have been define in section 2.2.1

$$\text{ECM}_{t-1} = \text{LogAGDP}_t - \beta_0 - \beta_1 \text{LogACEX}_t - \beta_2 \text{LogAFPI}_t - \beta_3 \text{LogALF}_t \dots\dots\dots (9)$$

Following the 'general to specific' modelling methodology, the over-parameterised model was continually simplified and re-parameterised by removing variables with low explanation until a parsimonious and encompassing representation of the data generation process was obtained with the choice of optimum lag length guided by the Akaike and Schwarz Information Criteria. The parsimonious error correction model is given in equation 10.

$$\Delta \text{LogAGDP}_t = \Phi_0 + \Phi_1 \Delta \text{LogACEX}_t + \Phi_2 \Delta \text{LogACEX}_{t-1} + \Phi_3 \Delta \text{LogAGDP}_{t-1} - \Phi_4 \Delta \text{LogAGDP}_{t-2} - \text{ECM}_{t-1} \dots\dots\dots (10)$$

2.3.4 Granger Causality test

The test was conducted to know the causality that is whether Agricultural Gross Domestic Product Granger causes Agricultural Capital expenditure and vice versa. The procedure is given by:

$$AGDP_t = \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i ACEX_{t-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q \delta_j AGDP_{t-j} + U_t \quad \dots\dots\dots (11)$$

$$ACEX_t = \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i AGDP_{t-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q \delta_j ACEX_{t-j} + U_t \quad \dots\dots\dots (12)$$

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the results of unit root (stationarity) tests, cointegration tests, error correction model and granger causality test.

3.1 Stationarity test

The time series behavior of each of the series is presented in Table 1 below using ADF test at both level and first difference of the series. The null hypothesis of the presence of the unit root (non-stationary) was tested against the alternative hypothesis of the absence of a unit root (stationary). The variable; Agriculture Foreign Private Investment (AFPI) was stationary at level thus there was no need for differencing it. However, the variables; Agricultural Gross Domestic Product (AGDP), Agricultural Capital Expenditure (ACEX) and Agricultural Loanable Fund (ALF) were not Stationary at their levels thus the need differencing them to make stationary. On application of the Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test on their first differences, the non stationary variables became stationary as indicated by the t – values of the Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) which are all negative and larger (in absolute terms) than the standard critical values, thus leading to rejection of the null hypothesis. From the results, it is evident that the variables Agricultural Gross Domestic Product (AGDP), Agricultural Capital Expenditure (ACEX), Agricultural Loanable Fund (ALF) are integrated of order 1 that is are I(1). However, the variable; Agricultural Foreign Private Investment (AFPI) is integrated of order (0), that is I (0). We then proceed to discuss the results of cointegration between the explained and each of the explanatory variables.

Table 1: Result of the unit root test

Logged Variables	Level	First Difference	Order of Integration
Agricultural Gross Domestic Product (AGDP)	-2.77	-4.80***	I(1)
Agricultural Capital Expenditure (ACEX)	-2.03	-10.39***	I(1)
Agricultural Foreign Private Investment (AFPI)	-3.59**	-	I(0)
Agricultural Loanable Fund (ALF)	-2.69	-6.55***	I(1)

Critical value at 1% = -4.16; 5% = -3.50; ** - P<0.05; *** - P<0.01; tests were performed by including intercept and trend.

3.2 Johansen Cointegration test

The result of Johansen cointegration tests are extracted into the table 2. The test statistics indicate that the hypothesis of no cointegration, H_0 , among the variables can be rejected. The result reveal three cointegrating vectors exist among the variables of interest, since the

variables are cointegrated, there is therefore, a long run relationship among the variables. It also means that the study can proceed to estimating the Error Correction Model.

317
318
319
320

Table 2: Johansen cointegration result

Trace Test k=2				Maximum Eigenvalues Test k=2			
H ₀	H _A	Trace statistic	Critical Values (5%)	H ₀	H _A	Max-Eigen statistic	Critical values (5%)
$r \leq 0$	$r > 0$	216.7877	47.85613*	$r \leq 0$	$r > 0$	100.0533	27.58434*
$r \leq 1$	$r > 1$	116.7344	29.79707*	$r \leq 1$	$r > 1$	80.09372	21.13162*
$r \leq 2$	$r > 2$	36.64066	15.49471*	$r \leq 2$	$r > 2$	35.84853	14.26460*
$r \leq 3$	$r > 3$	0.792129	3.841466	$r \leq 3$	$r > 3$	0.792129	3.841466

Note: r represents number of cointegrating vectors and k represents the number of lags in the unrestricted cointegration test. * denotes rejection of the null hypothesis at 5% level.

321
322
323
324

3.3 Error Correction Model

325
326

The error correction modeling involves three steps. The first is to estimate a long-run model ; the second is to include the error term (ECM) from the long run model in a dynamic over-parameterised model and the third is to work on this model until one obtains the parsimonious model which is then interpreted.

327
328
329
330
331
332

Table 3: Overparameterised model

Dependent Variable: DLOG(AGDP)				
Method: Least Squares				
Date: 07/08/13 Time: 18:07				
Sample (adjusted): 1964 2010				
Included observations: 47 after adjustments				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.100664	0.055806	1.803816	0.0801
DLOG(ACEX)	0.037868	0.040820	0.927687	0.3601
DLOG(ACEX(-1))	0.026753	0.039498	0.677328	0.5028
DLOG(ACEX(-2))	0.027906	0.042133	0.662325	0.5122
DLOG(AFPI)	0.102148	0.140823	0.725366	0.4732
DLOG(AFPI(-1))	-0.009374	0.131023	-0.071543	0.9434
DLOG(AFPI(-2))	-0.040168	0.072151	-0.556714	0.5814

DLOG(ALF)	0.047421	0.081369	0.582784	0.5639
DLOG(ALF(-1))	0.025606	0.079623	0.321593	0.7497
DLOG(ALF(-2))	-0.038385	0.078998	-0.485897	0.6302
DLOG(AGDP(-1))	0.458947	0.164165	2.795637	0.0085
DLOG(AGDP(-2))	-0.204087	0.176699	-1.154997	0.2561
ECM(-1)	-0.059766	0.052241	-1.144049	0.2606
R-squared	0.632577	Mean dependent var		0.185580
Adjusted R-squared	0.599369	S.D. dependent var		0.168250
S.E. of regression	0.165761	Akaike info criterion		-0.527130
Sum squared resid	0.934213	Schwarz criterion		-0.015387
Log likelihood	25.38755	Hannan-Quinn criter.		-0.334558
F-statistic	1.115987	Durbin-Watson stat		1.965044
Prob(F-statistic)	0.379616			

333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340

Therefore an over-parametrised model was estimated. Every variable was set at 2 lag. The parsimonious interaction involves dropping insignificant variables. Therefore, the size of the model was reduced by imposing zero coefficients on those lags where t – statistics is low. Through simplification, a more parsimonious and interpretable model was produced as shown in equation 10 and Table 4.

Table 4: Parsimonious model result

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-statistic	Prob.
Constant	0.1150	0.03976	2.8944	0.0061
DLOG(ACEX)	0.0313***	0.02548	3.2307	0.0054
DLOG(ACEX(-1))	0.02724	0.02474	1.1012	0.2772
DLOG(AGDP(-1))	0.4747***	0.15013	3.1622	0.0029
DLOG(AGDP(-2))	-0.1781	0.15424	1.1549	0.2548
ECM (-1)	-0.0528***	0.04683	3.1284	0.0057
R ² = 0.63		Schwarz criterion = - 0.5235		

Adj R ² = 0.59	Durbin – Watson = 1.985
F-stat = 2.50**	

** - $P < 0.05$; *** - $P < 0.01$

The parsimonious result is shown in table 4. According to the result R² value of 0.63 shows that all the variables can explain about 63% of variation in Agricultural Gross Domestic Product. The F- statistics was significant at 5%, showing the joint significant of the variables included in the model and the Durbin Watson value of 1.985 implies that the model does not suffer from autocorrelation problem.

In terms of the significant of the individual explanatory variables, it was observed that Agricultural Capital Expenditure (ACEX) and the past value of Agricultural Gross Domestic Product (AGDP (-1)) are the two significant determinants of agricultural economic growth in Nigeria for the period of analysis. Agricultural capital expenditure was statistically significant at 1% and had a positive effect on agricultural economic growth. This agrees with the apriori expectation, meaning that in the short-run, agricultural capital expenditure has a positive impact on agricultural economic growth in Nigeria. Statistically, the result shows that holding other variables constant a unit increase in agricultural capital expenditure will lead to a unit increase in agricultural economic growth. This result agrees with [21] who found out that there exists a significant positive effect of government spending that include capital expenditure on economic growth in Thailand during the period of study. The findings of this study also disagrees with [25], who showed that government spending on agriculture has a significant but negative impact on economic growth in Nigeria. The lagged variable of the dependent variable (DLOGAGDP(-1)) was significant at 1% and had a positive effect. This it means that the previous agricultural gross domestic product affect the current agricultural gross domestic product. This implies that there exists a positive influence or significant relationship between the agricultural gross domestic product or agricultural economic growth of the previous year on the agricultural economic growth of the current year in Nigeria. The ECM also has the correct sign and it is statistically significant at 1%; with the speed of convergence to equilibrium at 5.2% of the past years deviation from equilibrium. This adjustment is essential for maintaining long-run equilibrium in order to reduce the existence of disequilibrium over time.

3.4 Granger Causality test

Table 5 shows the result of Pairwise Granger Causality test. Granger causality talks about the nature of relationship between variables. It answers the question – what is the type of relationship that exists between the variables? Granger causality test was conducted to see whether Agricultural Gross Domestic Product granger causes Agricultural Capital expenditure and vice-versa. The results suggest that the null hypothesis that Agricultural capital expenditure does not granger cause agricultural economic growth was rejected which indicated that causality runs from agricultural capital expenditure to agricultural economic growth because of the high F-statistic and low probability value. This also shows a unidirectional relationship between the two variables (Agricultural capital expenditure and agricultural economic growth). Consequently, from the results, it therefore means that Agricultural economic growth does not cause expansion of agricultural public capital expenditure rather; it indicates that agricultural public capital expenditure raises the nation's agricultural economic growth. This result is in line with the study conducted by [21]. They studied the economy of Thailand using Granger causality tests. Their finding was that government expenditure and economic growth are not co-integrated but indicated unidirectional relationship because causality runs from government expenditure to growth.

390 Also, [24], examined the causal relationship between GDP and Public expenditure for US
391 data during the period 1947 to 2002. The causality results revealed that total government
392 expenditure causes growth of GDP.
393

394 **Table 5: Pairwise Granger causality test**

Null hypothesis	Observation	F- statistic	Probability
AGDP does not Granger Cause ACEX	48	22.820	2.E-07***
ACEX does not Granger Cause AGDP	48	1.670	0.2002

395 *** denotes $P < 0.01$
396

397 4. CONCLUSION

398
399 The study investigated the impact of agricultural capital expenditure on agricultural economic
400 growth in Nigeria from 1961 to 2010. Using the assumptions of Partial equilibrium analysis,
401 other sectors of the economy were assumed to be constant while analyzing the agricultural
402 sector. The empirical findings showed that the explanatory variables, agricultural capital
403 expenditure and the past values of agricultural gross domestic product were the two
404 significant determinant of agricultural economic growth in Nigeria. The result of parsimonious
405 error correction model showed that agricultural capital expenditure had a positive impact on
406 agricultural economic growth. The result of granger causality test further validated this
407 finding. It showed a unidirectional relationship between agricultural capital expenditure and
408 agricultural economic growth. This means that agricultural economic growth does not cause
409 expansion of agricultural public capital expenditure rather; it indicates that agricultural public
410 capital expenditure raises the nation's agricultural economic growth. To conclude, this
411 research shows that agriculture, if properly funded could bring about sustainable economic
412 growth and a reduction in agricultural capital expenditure by government would have
413 negative repercussions on agricultural economic growth in Nigeria. The study therefore
414 recommends that the proportion of government capital expenditure that goes into agricultural
415 expenditure financing should be increased since this component exerts significant positive
416 effect on agricultural economic growth. To achieve this increment, Maputo declaration of the
417 commitment to the allocation of at least 10 percent of National budgetary resources to
418 agriculture and rural development policy implementation within five years should be taking
419 into cognizance. Though this fall short of the 25 percent recommendation of Food and
420 Agricultural Organization.

421 422 COMPETING INTERESTS

423
424 All the contributing authors have declared that there is no competing interest among us.
425

426 REFERENCES

- 427
428 1. Abdulai A, Rieder P. The Impacts of Agricultural Price Policy on Cocoa Supply in
429 Ghana; an Error Correction Estimation, Journal of African Economies. 1995; 4(3):
430 315 – 335.
431 2. Abu-Barder S, Abu-Qarn AS. Government Expenditures, Military Spending and
432 Economic Growth: Causality Evidence from Egypt, Israel, and Syria. Journal of
433 Policy Modeling. 2003; 25(6-7):567–583.
434 3. Abuzeid F. Foreign aid and the “Big Push” theory: Lessons from Sub-Saharan
435 African. Stanford Journal of International Relations. 2009; 11(1): 16 – 23.
436

- 437 4. Adebisi MA. Debt Service-Education Expenditure Nexus: "The Nigerian
438 Experience", Human Resource Development in Africa: Selected Papers for the year
439 2002 Annual Conference, the Nig. Econ. Soc. (NES). 2002; 243 – 267.
440
- 441 5. Adefila JJ, Adeoti JO. Improving Agricultural Budget to Enhance Rural Development
442 in Nigeria. Nassarawa University Journal of Administration: 2005; 2(1) 1 – 9
443
- 444 6. Akpan N. "Government Expenditure and Economic Growth in Nigeria". A
445 Disaggregated Approach. CBN Econ. Financial. Rev. 2005; 43(1).
446
- 447 7. Bose N, Hague ME, Osborn DR. Public Expenditure and Growth in Developing
448 Countries: Education is the Key. Discussion Paper Series No. 80. 2003.
449
- 450 8. Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN). Annual Report and Statement of Account, Abuja,
451 Nigeria. 2003
452
- 453 9. Cooray A. Government Expenditure, Governance and Economic Growth.
454 Comparative Economic Studies. 2009; 51(3): 401-418.
455
- 456 10. Dilrukshini WA. Public Expenditure and Economic Growth: Cointegration Analysis
457 and Causality Testing. Staff Studies Central of Sri Lanka. 2002; 34(1): 51-68.
458
- 459 11. Eboh E, Oduh M, Ujah O. Drivers and Sustainability of Agricultural Growth in
460 Nigeria; African Institute for Applied Economics Research Paper 8, Nigeria. 2012
461
- 462 12. Eboh EC. An analysis of competitiveness and performance in the Nigerian
463 Agriculture Sector. Study report submitted to World Bank Country office, Abuja.
464 2013.
465
- 466 13. Emeka OM. Improving the Agricultural Sector Toward Economic Development and
467 Poverty Reduction in Nigeria CBN Bullion.2007;(4): 23 – 56.
468
- 469 14. Engle RF, Granger CWJ. Co-integration and Error Connection Representation,
470 Estimation and Testing. Econometrica. 1987; 55(2).
471
- 472 15. Engle RF, Granger CWJ. Long-run Economic Relationship Advanced Texts in
473 Econometrics. Oxford University Press. United States. 1991; 11 – 15.
474
- 475 16. Ekpo AH, Umoh OJ. An overview of the Nigerian Economic Growth and
476 Development. 2012. Available at <http://www.online.nigeria.com/eeconomics/com>.
477 Retrieved on 3/03/13

478

479 17. Fosu AK. A Proposal for Alleviating the African External Debt Problem: A
480 Preliminary Report for Submission to the Organization of African Unity. 2001.
481

482 18. Galor O. From Stagnation to Growth: Unified growth theory. Handbook of economic
483 growth. 2005; Volume 1A. 264 – 274.
484

485 19. Gregorious A, Ghosh S. The Impact of Government Expenditure on Growth:
486 Empirical Evidence from Heterogeneous Panel. 2007. Available at
487 <http://www.brunel.ac.uk/9379/efwps/0701.pdf>. Retrieved on 03/03/13.
488

489 20. Hallam D, Zanolli R. Error Correction Models and Agricultural Supply Response:
490 European Review of Agricultural Economics.1993; (2): 111-20
491

492 21. Komain J, Brahmasrene T. The Relationship between Government Expenditure
493 and Economic Growth in Thailand. Journal of Economics and Economic Education
494 Research. 2007; 8(1):93-102
495

496 22. Lawal WA, Abdulkadir RI. An Analysis of Government Spending on Educational
497 Sector and Its Contribution to GDP in Nigeria. International Journal of Financial
498 Economics and Econometrics. 2011; 3(1): 163 – 17.
499

500 23. Liozides J, Vamvoukas G. Government Expenditure and Economic Growth:
501 Evidence from Trivariate Causality Testing. Journal of Applied Economics. 2005;
502 8(1): 125 – 152.
503

504 24. Liu Chih-H L, Hsu C, Younis MZ. The Association between Government
505 Expenditure and Economic Growth: The Granger Causality Test of the US Data,
506 1974 – 2002. Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting and Financial Management.
507 2008; 20(4): 439 – 452.

508 25. Loto MA. Impact of Government Sectoral Expenditure on Economic Growth. Journal
509 of Economics and International Finance. 2011; 3(11): 646 – 652.
510

511 26. Nasiru I. Government Expenditure and Economic Growth in Nigeria: Cointegration
512 Analysis and Causality Testing. Academic Research International.2012; 2(3) 718-
513 723.
514

515 27. Niloy B, Emranul HM, Denis OR. Public Expenditure and Economic Growth: A
516 Disaggregated Analysis for Developing Countries. 2003; Available at
517 www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/cgbcfr/dpcgbr.30.pdf
518

519 28. Nurudeen A, Usman A. Government Expenditure and Economic Growth in Nigeria,
520 1970 – 2008: A Disaggregated Analysis: Business and Economics Journal, 2010;

521

522 29. Nkang NM, Abang SO, Akpan OE, Offem KJ. Price and Income Elasticities of Palm
523 Kernel Exports Supply in Nigeria. *Journal of International Food and Agribusiness*
524 *Marketing*. 2007; 19(4): 61-71
525

526 30. Okuneye B. The Rising Cost of Food/Food Insecurity in Nigeria and its Implications
527 for Poverty Reduction. *CBN Economic and Financial Review*. 2001; 39(4): 92-94
528

529 31. Olopade BC, Olopade DO. The Impact of Government Expenditure on Economic
530 Growth and Development in Developing Countries: Nigeria as a Case Study.
531 Igbinedion University Okada, Edo State, Nigeria. 2010.
532

533 32. Philip D, Nkonya E, Pender J, Oni, OA. Constraints to Increasing Agricultural
534 Productivity in Nigeria. A Review. IFPRI-NSSP Background paper 6. 2009.
535

536 33. Saad W, Kalkechi K. The Nature of Government Expenditure and its Impact on
537 Sustainable Economic Growth. *Middle Eastern Finance and Economics*. 2009; 1(4):
538 1450-2889
539

540 34. Tambi NE. Co-integration and Error Correction Modeling of Export Supply in
541 Cameroon. *Agricultural Economics*. 1999; 20, 57 – 67.
542

543 35. Tomori S, Adebisi MA. External Debt Burden and Health Expenditure in Nigeria: An
544 Empirical Investigation. *Nig. J. Health Biomed. Sci*. 2002; 1(1): 1 – 5.
545

546 36. Townsend R, Thirtle C. Dynamic Acreage Response: an Error Correction Model
547 for Maize and Tobacco in Zimbabwe: University of Reading, Discussion Papers in
548 Development Economics, Series G, 2(20). 1995.
549

550 37. Wadal S, Kamel K. The Nature of Government Expenditure and Its Impact on
551 Sustainable Economic Growth, *Middle Eastern Finance and Economics*. 2009. 1450
552 – 2889.
553

554 38. World Bank. Nigeria, Poverty in the midst of Plenty: The Challenge of growth with
555 inclusions Washington, D. C. 1998.