FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE ON ADMINISTRATION AND IT'S EFFECT ON THE NIGERIAN ECONOMY (1997-2021)

Okeke Ijeoma Chinwe (Ph.D)[1] and Ukoh, Josephine Ekperechukwu (Ph.D)[2]
Department of Accountancy
Department of Banking and Finance, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
Anambra State, Nigeria.

Abstract
The study examined the Federal government expenditure on administration and its effect on the Nigerian economy (1997-2021).The cost of administration in Nigeria has been on the increase over the years to the extent that concerned citizens are apprehensive about its effect on the nation's economy. The objectives of the study are to determine the effect of recurrent administrative expenditure and capital administrative expenditure on the Nigerian economy, using Vector Autoregressive and Granger Causality Test. The findings made from the results reveals that cost of administration (represented by recurrent administrative expenditure) has a negative effect on gross domestic product in Nigeria. The study also reveals that cost of administration (represented by capital administrative expenditure) has a positive effect on gross domestic product in Nigeria. Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made ; the need to reduce recurrent administrative expenditure to a sustainable level through reducing irrelevant expenses, as well as, making capital spending more effective. Regulatory authorities in Nigeria should ensure that all salaries and allowances of civil servants, public servants including political office holders conform to appropriate process. Capital expenditures on administrative services should receive more attention, and expenditures should focus primarily on productive economic activities, to stimulate activities in the economic sectors for effective growth in RGDP.
Keywords: *Administration, recurrent, Capital expenditure, Nigerian economy*

Introduction

In every sector of an economy and stages of development, government expenditure plays a crucial role that enables the economy satisfactorily function irrespective of the type of economy whether less-developed or developed nations. (Onabote, Ohwofasa and Ogunjumo, 2023) Government expenditure is the fund, government spends on its affairs and promoting the growth of the affairs of the nation, it is an important instrument for government to control the economy (Ufoeze, Okoro and Ibenta 2017).

Government expenditure on administration is any cost associated with the operation of the government. It is the cost of performing political obligation, discharging civil services to the public and to support the administrative structure of government, for any society to make meaningful progress there should be an adept and cost effective management system that is proficient of maximizing the nation's meager resources

to the benefit of all. However, citizens would perceive government as a burden when its recurrent administrative expenditure is repeatedly higher that its capital administrative expenditure, which should impact positively on the economy, especially in the areas of employment generation, investment and other activities that induce growth. This is the challenge that Nigeria economy is facing.

In recent times, there had been reawaken interest among economists, policy makers and researchers on government expenditure on administration and it's productivity. The concern springs up from the continuous increase in government administrative expenditure. Available data on public finance of developed and developing economies shows remarkable growth in the size of government expenditure on administration in absolute term, in relation to gross domestic product (GDP) and by type of expenditure (Udo, Ekere and Inibeghe 2022).

Nigeria had its independence in 1960 from Britain. Its governance structure is comprised of 3 level, namely the federal, state and local governments. Currently, the Country has a total of 36 states, with a Federal Capital Territory located in Abuja and 774 Local governments (NBS 2022). Every government, be it federal, state or local government, is established with a vision to provide facilities that would advance the wellbeing of its citizens. For government to achieve this objectives, it is required to adopt measures which would ensure effective revenue generation, as well as, judicious utilization of resources at its disposal.

It is now irrefutable that the cost of running a government is elevated in Nigeria. In the 2021 budget a total of N2,168.45 billion was allocated for recurrent administration expenses, also in the 2020 and 2019 budget, a total of N2,294.2 billion and N2,105.20 billion respectively was also allocated to recurrent administrative expenditure. The capital administrative expenses allocated in the year 2019, 2020 and 2021 was N591.26 billion, N417.14 billion, N635.73 billion respectively (CBN statistical bulletin, 2022). The need to cut down the crushing and exorbitant cost of administration in Nigeria has been on the national agenda for years. Nigeria is currently in need of growth like most other nations of the world. The general view is that expanding cost of administration remains a major obstruction in the government policies and the welfare of the citizens. According to Nurudeem and Usman (2010), the increasing 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(World Bank). Evidences, reveals that investment and good governance are key determinants of sustainable long-term economic growth. Despite these propositions that government expenditure on administration should positively affect the economy, many researchers still report otherwise. Some factors responsible for

insignificant effect of the government spending are the high incidence of corruption and inequity in income distribution occasioned by poor corporate governance in both in the public and private sectors (Sanusi, 2010).

Statement Of The Problem

There is need for a significant economic growth and development in Nigeria, with it's vision on improving the standard of living of citizens. The cost of running government in Nigeria has been on the increase over the years, without much effect . Economic activities of Nigeria has been uneven over the years, and this impelled Nigerians to express their opinions on the productivity of the money spent by the government . This problem has continued to generate public concern and national discourse because of the negative implication on investment, industrial expansion, infrastructural development and growth of the real sectors of the economy. Based on this challenge, some measures are put in place to work on the high cost of administration in Nigeria and its productivity, the measures include, restructuring fiscal and monetary policy, providing and maintaining the Infrastructure, conducting periodic auditing in the ministries and stern execution of the budget. Despite all these measures, the cost of administration does not have significant effect on the economic growth and development in Nigeria. This prompted the researcher to work on the topic; Federal government expenditure on administration and it's effect on the Nigerian economy.

The broad objective of the study is to investigate the effect of administrative expenditure on the economic growth of Nigeria. The specific objectives include:

1. To examine the effect of recurrent administrative expenditure on the Nigerian economy.
2. To examine the effect of capital administrative expenditure on the Nigerian economy

Conceptual issue

Cost of administration

Cost of Administration refers to the expenses which government incurs to run the operations and the affairs of the economy. Adewole and Osabuohien (2007) decomposed cost of administration into two: recurrent administrative expenses and capital administrative expenses.

Economic Growth

Economic growth is an increase in the production of economic goods and services in one period of time compared with a previous period. It can be measured in nominal or real (adjusted to remove inflation) terms. Economic growth according to Ogbulu and Torbira (2012) "is defined as a sustained rise in the output of goods,

services and employment opportunities with the sole aim of improving the economic and financial welfare of the citizens".

Theoretical Framework

Keynesian theory of public expenditure

This study anchors on Keynesian theory of public expenditure. According to John Maynard Keynes (1883–1946), the government must run the economy through taxation and government spending in order to advance output, growth, and employment. The theory consists of two components: adjustments to government spending and adjustments to taxes. According to Keynesian economics, spending is what increases output, which in turn produces income and employment. This theory is founded on the idea that overall expenditure, or aggregate demand, encourages businesses to provide goods and services.

Empirical Review of Related Studies

A number of studies were conducted to ascertain the relationship between government expenditure on administration and the economy of different countries. These authors include, Andinyanga and Anietie (2023) analyzed the effect of Government Consumptions on Performance of Annual Capital Expenditure in Nigeria. (1981-2021). The data collected were analyzed using Johansen Co-integration test and vector error correction model (VECM). The findings revealed that besides administrative consumption, other explanatory variables economic service consumption, social and community services consumption, and transfers' consumption had positive and significant effect on the performance of annual capital expenditure.

Okonkwo, Ojima, Ogwuru, Echeta, Duru, Akamike, and Manasseh (2023) scientifically examine the effects of government capital expenditure in its disaggregated form (administration, social and community service, economic services, transfers, and government deficit) on Nigeria's economic growth rate from 1981 to 2021 in addition to evaluating how well government expenditure performed in the years following the pandemic in 2021. Secondary data sourced from the CBN statistical bulletin, 2021, were used in the analysis. the study used the autoregressive distributed lag model. The bounds test showed a longrun association between the studied variables. The error correction model showed a strong and positive association between administrative and economic services and the rate of economic growth in Nigeria. Onabote, Ohwofasa and Ogunjumo (2023) examined the effects of government sectoral spending on human development in Nigeria using annual data spanning the period 1986–2021. This study contributed to the literature by examining the effects of government sectoral spending on human development using a robust human development index that captures the multifaceted state of economic development in terms of educational attainment, life expectancy and per capita

income, the results from the Autoregressive Distributed Lag (ARDL) model employed indicated that both in the short and long run, there is no link between government sectoral spending and human development in Nigeria.

Udo, Ekere and Inibeghe (2022) examined the effects of government expenditure on economic growth in Nigeria for the period (1981-2018) using bound test (ARDL) approach. ARDL result shows that total government expenditure (LTGE) impacted positively on economic growth in Nigeria. The granger causality test result indicates the existence of uni-directional causal relationship from LGDP to LTGE. Edet (2018) examines the effect of institutions infrastructure on economic performance in Nigeria. Time series data from 1986 to 2016 were sourced from the Central Bank of Nigeria, World Bank, etc. Multiple regression model was employed for data analysis and ECM was adopted. The findings shows that economic and regulatory institutions significantly impact economic growth.

Ben, Udo, Abner, Ike Ttingir and Ibekwe (2018) examined the effect of administrative capital outflow on recurrent outflow on economic development in Nigeria, with the fundamental intent to examine the effect, causes, and affiliation between government overheads and economic growth and development in Nigeria. The study adopted annual time series data from 1999-2016. The Classical Regression Model, Augmented Dickey-Fuller test along with an array of a diagnostic test where employed. The Johansen test for co-integration was equally employed with two co-integrating factors. Empirical proof bared a long-run affiliation flanked by government outflow and growth in Nigeria. The Results documented the manifestation of a significant affiliation flanked by real gross domestic product, total recurrent expenditure and community services, with a non-significant affiliation flanked by GDP and economic services.

Ufoeze, Okoro, and Ibenta (2017) studied, the effect of cost of governance on economic growth in Nigeria. The variables of cost of governance are broken into general administration, defense, internal security and national assembly and used as the explanatory variable while GDP served as the dependent variable and proxy for economic growth. The study covered the civil rule in Nigeria forth republic of 1999 to 2014. The review of the hypotheses indicated that the federal government cost of general administrations has no positive significant effect on economic growth in Nigeria; federal government cost of defense has positive significant effect on economic growth in Nigeria, federal government cost of internal security has negative significant effect on economic growth in Nigeria; and government cost of national assembly has positive significant effect on economic growth in Nigeria.
Ifere, Okoi and Bassey (2015) examined the relationship between institutional quality, macroeconomic policy and economic development in Nigeria. The study used data obtained from Central Bank of Nigeria for the period from 1995 to 2013.

Their results revealed an insignificant impact of domestic institutions on Nigeria development indices. Nwanne (2015).
Evaluated the effect of government capital expenditure on the manufacturing sector output in Nigeria. The study used quantitative time series data and multiple regression techniques in the analysis. The result of the co-integration test indicates long run relationship between dependent and independent variables. It also reveals that capital expenditure on road infrastructure (CEXR) and telecommunication (CEXT) affects the manufacturing sector output in Nigeria significantly while government capital expenditure on power has insignificant effect on manufacturing sector in Nigeria.

Agu(2013) assessed cost of governance and revenue assurance mechanisms at states level in Nigeria. The methodology adopted by the paper involves the use of quantitative data for 9 years, from 2002 to 2010, which was generated from the annual report and accounts of the Central Bank of Nigeria. The findings shows that Cost of governance in Nigeria has to a great extent increased due to superfluous increase in the number of government agencies, high number of Commissioners, Special Advisers, Special Assistants and Personal Assistants, gigantic pay of political office holders. Ejuvbekpokpo (2012) studied the impact of cost of governance on economic development in Nigeria using recurrent and capital administrative expenditures as proxy for cost of governance and gross domestic product is used as a proxy for economic growth. Using data from 1970 to 2010 and the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) technique of analysis, the study reveals that cost of governance impedes economic development in Nigeria. Nworji, Okwu, Obiwuru and Nworji (2012) examined the effect of public expenditure on economic in Nigeria for the period 1970 – 2009. Using OLS multiple regression models .The major objective of the study was to analyze the effect of public government spending on economic in Nigeria based on time series data on variables considered relevant indicators of economic growth and government expenditure. The findings from the analysis showed that capital and recurrent expenditure on economic services had insignificant negative effect on economic growth during the study period. Also, capital expenditure on transfers had insignificant positive effect on growth. But capital and recurrent expenditures on social and community services and recurrent expenditure on transfers had significant positive effect on economic growth.

Methodology

The econometric method of analysis was employed to empirically examine federal government expenditure on administration and it's effect on the Nigerian economy. The data collected were subjected to different kind of tests namely Unit root test to examine the stationarity property of the time series data, Co-integration test to ascertain the existence of long and short run effect of the variables.

Model of the Study

This study adapted and modified the model of (Udo, Ekere and Inibeghe,2022) on Government expenditure and economic growth in Nigeria: aggregate level analysis using the bound test approach

$Y = F(K, L, TPE)$ (1)

$Y = F(K, L, TPE, FISB, INFL, M2, TOP)$ (2)

variables are fiscal balance (FISB), inflation rate (INFL), broad money (M2) and trade openness (TOP) which are assumed to affect economic growth are included in the model.

Modified model for the study

$RGDP = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 RAD + \alpha_2 CAD + \mu_t$ (3)

$RGDP = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 RAD + \mu$ (4)

$RGDP = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 CAD + \mu_t$ (5)

Description of the Variables

For the purpose of this study, the variables studied in this research work are split into two categories; the dependent variables and the independent variables.

The dependent variable is

RGDP: Gross Domestic Product (Proxy for economic growth)

The independent variables are described as follows;

RAD: Recurrent Administrative Expenses

CAD: Capital Administrative Expenses

Data Analysis

Table 1: Descriptive statistics results

Variables	Obs	Mean	Standard Dev	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis
RGDP	25	49870.68	18228.62	23469.34	73382.77	-0.144250	1.478488
RAD	25	886.1244	671.9282	50.68000	2294.720	0.600911	2.424063
CAD	25	227.2620	162.4981	35.27000	635.7300	0.968732	3.462792

Source: Computer analysis using E-views 12.0

Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics findings for the entire study sample. We found that the mean (or standard deviation) values for gross domestic product, recurring administration costs, and capital administrative expenses, respectively, for the entire sample are 49870.68, 886.1244, and 227.2620 (or 18228.62, 671.9282, and 162.4981). The three variables have maximum and minimum values that fall between 73382.77 and 23469.34, respectively. The skewness has both negative and

positive values, indicating that the distribution is both negatively and positively skewed.

Table 2CorrelationMatrix

	RGDP	RAD	CAD
RGDP	1.000000	0.922471	0.805630
RAD	0.922471	1.000000	0.898077
CAD	0.805630	0.898077	1.000000

Source: Computer analysis using E-views 12.0

From the findings on the correlation analysis between RGDP and the other study variables in table 2 indicates a positive correlation coefficient RAD (0.922471), CAD (0.805630) and RGDP respectively. In order to ascertain the stationarity of the variables, augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) unit root text was employed.

Tables 3, 4, and 5 demonstrate that none of the variables are stationary at the level, only at the first and second differences.

Table 3: Result of ADF Unit Root Test at Level

Variables	ADF Test Statistic	Test Critical Value at 1%	Test Critical Value at 5%	Remark
RGDP	-0.763227 (0.8115)	-3.737853	-2.991878	Not Stationary
RAD	0.466830 (0.9817)	-3.737853	-2.991878	Not Stationary
CAD	-0.190624(0.9273)	-3.737853	-2.991878	Not Stationary

Source: Author's Computation, Computer analysis using E-views 12.0

Table 4: Result of ADF Unit Root Test at 1st Diff

Variables	ADF Test Statistic	Test Critical Value at 1%	Test Critical Value at 5%	Remark
RGDP	-2.970415(0.0528)	-3.752946	-2.998064	Not Stationary
RAD	-3.774198(0.0095) **	-3.752946	-2.998064	Stationary
CAD	-5.976288 (0.0001) **	-3.752946	-2.998064	Stationary

Source: Author's Computation, Computer analysis using E-views 12.0

Table 5: Result of ADF Unit Root Test at 2nd Diff

Variables	ADF Test Statistic	Test Critical Value at 1%	Test Critical Value at 5%	Remark
RGDP	-5.603969(0.0002) **	-3.769597	-3.004861	Stationary
RAD	-5.320624(0.0003) **	-3.769597	-3.004861	Stationary
CAD	-9.000506 (0.0000) **	-3.769597	-3.004861	Stationary

Source: Author's Computation, Computer analysis using E-views 12.0

Phillips-Perron (PP) unit root text was used to verify the variables' stationarity, and the text also demonstrates that the variables were stationary at the first and second difference, which led to the employment of Vector Autoregressive Estimates (VAR) as a method of data analysis.

Table 6: Result of PP Unit Root Test at Level

Variables	PP Test Statistic	Test Critical Value at 1%	Test Critical Value at 5%	Remark
RGDP	1.546838 (0.9989)	-3.752946	-2.998064	Not Stationary
RAD	2.693598 (1.0000)	-3.752946	-2.998064	Not Stationary
CAD	-2.047711 (0.2660)	-3.752946	-2.998064	Not Stationary

Source: Author's Computation, Computer analysis using E-views 12.0

Table 7: Result of PP Unit Root Test at 1st Diff

Variables	ADF Test Statistic	Test Critical Value at 1%	Test Critical Value at 5%	Remark
RGDP	-3.005110(0.0480)	-3.769597	-3.004861	Not Stationary
RAD	-3.434676(0.0206) **	-3.769597	-3.004861	Stationary
CAD	-7.026733 (0.0000) **	-3.769597	-3.004861	Stationary

Source: Author's Computation, Computer analysis using E-views 12.0

Table 8: Result of PP Unit Root Test at 2nd Diff

Variables	ADF Test Statistic	Test Critical Value at 1%	Test Critical Value at 5%	Remark
RGDP	-3.025110(0.0480) **	-3.769597	-3.004861	Stationary
RAD	-3.434676(0.0206) **	-3.769597	-3.004861	Stationary
CAD	-7.026733 (0.0000) **	-3.769597	-3.004861	Stationary

Source: Author's Computation, Computer analysis using E-views 12.0

Short Run Relationship

Table 9: Results of Vector Autoregressive Estimates Normalised on RGDP

Parameters	Coefficient	Standard Error	t-statistic
RGDP (-1)	1.418361	0.20142	7.04180
RAD (-1)	-5.855597	2.61112	-2.24256
CAD (-1)	2.225605	4.56956	0.48705
C	3572.821	1354.71	2.63733

Adjusted R-squared = 0.99 *F-Statistic = 718.2563*

Source: Output Data from E-views 12.0

Table 9 shows the result of VAR analysis and it indicates that RGDP, CAD and C have positive effect on RGDP while RAD has negative effect on RGDP. A one percent change in one-year lag of RGDP, CAD and C will result to a positive change in RGDP by 1.42 percent, 2.225 percent and 3572.821 percent respectively. On the other hand, a one percent change in one-year lag of RAD will result to negative change in RGDP by -5.855597 percent. On the performance of the individual variables, the results reveal that only one-year lag of RGDP, RAD and C are statistically significant given the high value of the t-statistic. The result revealed that government expenditure on administration has positive and insignificant effect on Nigeria economic growth for the period of the study.

According to the adjusted R-squared value of 0.99%, the combined effects of the independent variables account for nearly 99% of the fluctuations in RGDP. Additionally, it suggests that the model does a decent job of describing the relationship. Additionally, the F-statistic, which assesses the model's overall significance, had a high value of 718.2563.

Table 10 Granger Causality Test

Null Hypothesis:	Obs	F-Statistic	Prob.
RAD does not Granger Cause RGDP	23	5.49927	0.0137
RGDP does not Granger Cause RAD		1.82946	0.1891
CAD does not Granger Cause RGDP	23	0.72238	0.4991
RGDP does not Granger Cause CAD		3.51737	0.0514

Source: Output Data from E-views 12.0

According to Table 10, there is a unilateral causal relationship between RAD and RGDP, with a progression from RAD to RGDP. The causal relationship between CAD and RGDP is insignificant. The likelihood level of less than 5% indicates that the causality shifts from ongoing administrative costs to real gross domestic product

(RGDP). The findings suggest that raising recurrent administrative costs will support Nigeria's economic expansion, which will increase job opportunities and lower the rate of poverty in the country and improve the economic activities.

Conclusion

The findings made from the results presented and interpreted above, reveals that cost of administration (represented by recurrent administrative expenditure) has a negative effect ongross domestic product in Nigeria. An increase in expenditure on administration reduces expenditure on development projects, which adversely affect growth. Also, the study reveals that cost of governance (represented by capital administrative expenditure) has a positive effect on gross domestic product in Nigeria.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that there should be the need to trim down recurrent expenditure to sustainable level through reducing waste, of resources, as well as, make capital spending more effective. Policy makers in Nigeria should ensure that all salaries and allowances of civil servants, public servants including political office holders conform to the constitutional rules and regulations. Capital expenditures on administrative services should receive more attention, and expenditures should be focused primarily on productive economic activities, to stimulate activities in the economic sectors for effective growth in RGDP.

References

Adewole, A.N. and Osabuohien, E..C. (2007) "Analysis of the Cost of Governance and Options for its Reduction in Nigeria", *Nigerian Journal of Economic and Social Studies, 49*(1),137 – 159.

Agu, O. C.(2013) . Democracy and Cost of Governance in Nigeria. *Journal of Culture, Society and Development,2* ,41-51.

Andinyanga, U. S. & Anietie, P. A. (2023). Effect of Government Consumptions on Performance of Annual Capital Expenditure in Nigeria. *Saudi Journal of Economics and Finance,* 7(1): 57-67.

Ben,E.U. ,Udo,E.S. ,Abner I.P. ,Ike, R. N., Ttingir,T.J. & Ibekwe, U.J. (2018). Effect of Administrative Capital Expenditure on Economic Development: An emerging Nation outlook. *Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce,* 23(1): 1-17.

Central Bank of Nigeria (2022). Statistical Bulletin Central Bank of Nigeria. *1*(1)

Edet ,O.A. (2018). Economic Growth and Development in Nigeria: Which Institutions Infrastructure Matter. *Journal of Business & Economic Policy,5*(1)66-75.

Ejuvbekpokpo, S (2012). Cost of Governance on Economic Eevelopment in Nigeria. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research, 12*(13), 56-62.

Ifere, E. O., Okoi, O. B. & Bassey, C. E. (2015). Institutional quality, macroeconomic policy and economic development in Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Development Studies, 3* (2),140-145.

National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) 2022 Issues

Nurudeen, A. and Usman, A. (2010). Government Expenditure and Economic Growth in Nigeria, 1970-2008: A Disaggregated Analysis. *Business and Economics Journal, 4*, 1-11.

Nwanne, T. F. I. (2015). Implications of government capital expenditure on the Manufacturing sector in Nigeria. *European Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance Research*,3(10),19-33.

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), 2226-8235.

Ogbulu, O.M. and Torbira, L.L. (2012) Budgetary Operations and Economic Growth: The Nigerian Perspective. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences, 4*, 181-191.

Okonkwo, O.N., Ojima, D.,Ogwuru, H.O.,Echeta, D.O.Duru, E.E., Akamike, O.J. &Manasseh, C.O.(2023). Impact of Government Capital Expenditure on the Economic growth rate of Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Allied research,* 8(1), 335 – 348.

Onabote,A.A., Ohwofasa, B.O. & Ogunjumo, R.A. (2023) Government sectoral spending and human development in Nigeria: Is there a link?.*ScienceDirect Journals & Books*, 9(7).

Onyishi, T. O. & Eme, O. I. (2013). The presidency and cost of governance in Nigeria: a case of Jonathan's administration.. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review* . *3*(2),1-24.

Sanusi, L. S.(2010). Growth prospects for the Nigerian economy Convocation lecture at the Igbinedion University Eighth Convocation Ceremony, Okada, Edo State.

Ufoeze .L.O., Okoro, C. O. & Ibenta, S.N.O. (2017). Effect of Cost of Governance on Economic Growth of Nigeria .*International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development (IJTSRD),2(1),* 1523 – 1533.

Udo N. E.,Ekere, J. D. & Inibeghe, M. O.(2022). Government expenditure and economic growth in Nigeria: aggregate level analysis using the bound test approach. *International Journal of Developing and Emerging Economies,10*(1), 1-20.

Wikipedia(2022)

World Bank report(2021)