

# Approachability of Government Expenditures Proposal on Economic Growth in Nigeria.

Ani, Thomas Maduabuchi<sup>1</sup> & Obodo Chukwuebuka Valentine<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Dept of Accountancy, Enugu State University of Science and Technology (ESUT). Nigeria.

Correspondence author. E-mail: [aniht55@gmail.com](mailto:aniht55@gmail.com); +234-803-579-1160

<sup>2</sup>Dept of Insurance and Risk Management, Enugu State University of Science and Technology (ESUT). Nigeria.

Submitted: 05-03-2021

Revised: 18-03-2021

Accepted: 20-03-2021

**ABSTRACT:** the study determined approachability of government expenditures proposal on economic growth in Nigeria. This study adopted ex-post facto design. It uses annual time series data extracted from the central bank of Nigeria statistical bulletin and annual report. The data covered from 2009 -2018. For the data analysis, the study uses model, ANOVA, Coefficients and employed ordinary least squares (OLS) where gross domestic product is the dependent variable, responsive to expenditure on health, education and agriculture. The results revealed that government expenditure (health, education and agriculture) have significant positive on the growth of Nigeria economy. The study recommended that the Government should increase the percentage of public fund allocated to improve the state of health of the citizenry since it is a major factor driving productivity and makes meaningful contributions to the growth of economy and development of national output. The Nigerian government should monitor the movement of fund allocated to sectors of any economy through Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Commission and the Economic and Financial Crime Commission to promote transparency in the government spending. The Nigerian government should adopt system of compulsory annually audit on government spending to increase accountabilities.

**Keywords:** Government expenditure, Economic growth, health, Agriculture, Educatio.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The expenditure incurred by an entity to provide for goods and services collectively consumed by the society. Government expenditure is also known as public expenditure. Expenses incurred by public authorities at the central, state and local government levels and are allocated to make goods and service available, many of which are provided free to the households that consume

them (Adigwe, 2005). These public goods and services are provided for each individual to enjoy his or her taste (Samuelson, 1955). Purely public goods are wholly non-rival and non excludable in consumption (Pickhardt, 2001). Public expenditures are usually incurred by the central government, local government, and government agencies and in some cases by private firms under the umbrella of corporate social responsibility. This kind of expenditure is directed towards accelerating economic growth and development with the ultimate aim of transforming the nation into an industrialized economy as well as raising standard of living of the people. By and large, government expenditure is categorized into capital and recurrent expenditures. The capital expenditures are those government expenditures on capital projects such as roads, bridges, dams, electricity, education, health etc. while recurrent expenditures include expenditures of government on administration such as wages, salaries, interest, loan, maintenance etc. (Obinna, 2003, Okoro, 2013).

Sustained and equitable economic growth is clearly a predominant objective of public expenditure policy. Many public programs are specifically aimed at promoting sustained and equitable economic growth. Public expenditures can--and have--played an important role in physical and human capital formation over time. Appropriate public expenditures can also be effective in boosting economic growth, even in the short run, when limits to infrastructure or skilled manpower become an effective constraint to an increase in production.

The basis for the public sector pay out lies in the journey to market imperfect and the concern on equity (Foster & Fozzard, 2000).

## II. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The universal economic crisis has indeed posed difficult time for the economy of all states of the world resulting in gross failure in world trade,

unemployment, decline in GDP, currency depreciation etc. doubtful economic situation makes it hard for the state to compete favourably in the global economy. Despite the huge sum budgeted for economic growth: health, education, security, agriculture etc yet, little has been truly spent which makes economic growth dwarf and public suffer. Moreover, there has been the problem of misappropriation of amount budgeted for health, education, agriculture and security and others resulting to loss of life and property, poor education environment, lack of medical facilities has been prevalent in Nigerian and worse off in 2019.

Over the years budget allocation to the ministry of transport keep rising but roads are bad and death trap. Little effort is being made to minimize accidents on the highways. So in all, government expenditure proposal has not been channel properly to redeem the food shortage, insecurity, poor hospital environment, poor transportation system and other infrastructures.

Consequently, this study attempts to determine the approachability of economic growth to government expenditure proposal in Nigeria.

### III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The main objective of this study is to determine approachability of government expenditures proposal on economic growth in Nigeria. The specific objectives include:

1. To determine the relationship between expenditure on health and economic growth in Nigeria.
2. To assess the relationship between expenditure on education and economic growth in Nigeria.
3. To evaluate the relationship between expenditure on agriculture and economic growth in Nigeria.

### IV. STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESES

Ho<sub>1</sub>. There is no relationship between expenditure on health and economic growth in Nigeria.

Ho<sub>2</sub>. There is no relationship between expenditure on education and economic growth in Nigeria.

Ho<sub>3</sub>. There is no relationship between expenditure on agriculture and economic growth in Nigeria.

### V. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### 5.1. Economic Growth

Economic growth represents the increase of a nation's potential gross domestic product or national output (Samuelson & Nordhaus, 2003). Put differently, economic growth occurred when a

nation's Production-Possibility Front (PPF) shifts outwards. Economist usually measures economic growth in terms of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) or related indicators such as Gross National Product (GNP) and Gross National Income (GNI), which are derived from the GDP calculation. GDP is calculated from a country's national accounts that reports annual data on incomes and investment for each sector of the economy (UNDP report, 2007). There are three different approaches to measuring GDP: a). the income approach, measures income of individuals, organizations and governmental bodies and agencies. b) Output approach, also measures the value of the goods and services used to generate income while expenditure approach measures the expenditure on goods and services.

In theory, each of these approaches should lead to the same result. So in real sense, if the output of the economy increases, income expenditures should increase by the same amount. Figures for economic growth are usually presented as the annual percentage increase in real GDP. Real GDP is calculated by adjusting nominal GDP to take account of inflation which would otherwise makes growth rates appear much higher than they really are, especially during periods of high inflation. Gross National Expenditure (GNE) refers to a country total expense both public and private, excluding export expenses. This is contrast to Gross Domestic Product (GDP), which includes export expenses. The Economic growth rate is the difference between the GDP of the current year less the GDP of the preceding year, then divided by GDP of preceding year

#### 5.2.1 Expenditure on Health

This refers to expenditures incurred by central, state or region and local government authorities. Included is non-market, non-profit institutions that are controlled and mainly financed by government units (OECD Health Data 2001). The state of health of the population of a country is a major factor driving productivity as only a healthy labour force can make meaningful contributions to production and growth of national output. As is the case in a typical production function, the quantity / level of inputs has a corresponding effect on the quantity / level of output depending on the scale of production and returns to scale. Hence, this make the health of the citizens of a country imperative and as such adequate provision for health should be one of the primary goals of government as it has a positive impact on economic growth, one of the

macroeconomic goals of every government (Ogunjimi & Adebayo, 2018).

Similarly, the health of the population is influenced by both the type of health system and of their resources. The relationship between resources and outcomes helps one to effectively assess how functional the health system of a country is. A country has a health system with a better performance than another country, if, for the same level of resources, it generates better health outcomes, or if it generates the same outcomes but with fewer resources (Elola, Daponte & Navarro, 1995). Health systems are financed either through taxes, in the case of healthcare services owned by the state (national health services), or through income-related social contributions (social security systems) (Elola, Daponte and Navarro, 1995). The contribution of social security to the sustenance of the finance of the health system is phenomenal in countries with high income per capita.

Health care is one of the vital parts that every government should provide fund for social welfare of citizenry. Thus, government allocates public fund to the health care services to improve the health of the citizenry so as to enable them make significant contributions to economic growth and development in the country. It is believed that an increase in budgetary allocation to social services should enhance service delivery but this is not the case in Nigeria. In many developing countries, budget misappropriation and/or mismanagement is one of the primary causes of ineffective public spending (World Bank, 1998).

### 5.2.2 Expenditure on Education

Education is crucial for building a nation's human capital, and the government's investments in education reflect its priority in promoting human capital development. In fact, many empirical studies have shown that education provides positive returns to society as more education leads to higher productivity (Hanusheck and Woessman, 2010). Education expenditure refers to the current operating expenditures in education, including wages and salaries and excluding capital investments in buildings and equipment (indexmundi.com). In 2018, Federal budget expenditure on education in Nigeria amounted to seven percent of the total and between 2012 and 2018; the allocation of federal budget invested on education experienced an increase. Overall, the highest figure was reached in 2014, when over ten percent of the national budget was allocated to the education sector (Simona, 2020).

Public expenditure on education involves current and capital public expenditure on education

includes government spending on both public and private educational institutions, education administration as well as subsidies for private entities (students/households and other private entities)

(<https://knoema.com/atlas/Nigeria/Education-expenditure>). A sum of N691.07 billion constituting 6.7% has been contained in the Appropriation Bill allocated to the Nigeria's Federal Ministry of Education in the 2020 national budget. (<https://educelb.com/nigerian-2020-budget-education-ministry/>).

### 5.2.3 Expenditure on Agriculture and economic growth

Agricultural sector is seen as an engine that contributes to the growth of the overall economy of Nigeria, despite these efforts the sector is still characterized with low yields, low level of inputs and limited areas under cultivation due to government dependence on mono-cultural economy based on oil.

Agriculture contributes 40% of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and employs about 70% of the working population in Nigeria (CIA, 2013). Agriculture is also the largest economic activity in the rural area where almost 50% of the population lives. Agriculture is the art and science of cultivating the soil, growing crops and raising livestock. It includes the preparation of plant and animal products for people to use and their distribution to markets.

It provides most of the world's food and fabrics. Cotton, wool, and leather are all agricultural products. Agriculture also provides wood for construction and paper products. These products, as well as the agricultural methods used, may vary from one part of the world to another. The agriculture sector accounts for approximately 18.78 percent of economic activities in Nigeria. The crop production remains dominant and drives the sector.

Several studies have focused on understanding the association between agriculture and economic growth, yet there is some disagreement. While some researchers have argued that agriculture should be the foundation of economic growth (Gollin, Parente & Rogerson, 2002; Thirtle, Lin & Piesse, 2003), others claim that the linkages agriculture has with other sectors are too weak and its innovative structures inadequate for promoting economic growth (Ranis and Fei, 1961; Jorgenson, 1961).

Oji-Okoro (2011) examines the impact of the agricultural sector on the Nigerian economy.

Multiple regression was used to analyze the data, the result indicated a positive relationship between Gross Domestic Product (GDP). It is recommended that government provides more funding for agricultural universities in Nigeria to carry out researches on all areas of agricultural production this will lead to more exports and improvement in the competitiveness of Nigeria agriculture production in international markets. The Central bank of Nigeria should also come up with a stable policy for loan disbursement to farmers at a reasonable interest payback.

Tolulope & Chinonso (2013) investigate the contribution of the agriculture sector to economic growth in Nigeria using the growth accounting framework and time series data from 1960 to 2011. We find that the agriculture sector has contributed positively and consistently to economic growth in Nigeria. We also find that the crop production subsector contributes the most to agriculture sector growth and that growth in the agriculture sector is overly dependent on growth of the crop production subsector. This indicates the importance of this subsector and probably, lack of attention or investment to the other subsectors. Therefore, increased efforts in developing the livestock, fisheries and forestry subsectors will foster the contributions of agriculture sector to the Nigerian economy.

Matthew & Adegboye (2010) examine the role of the Agricultural sector in Economic Development. The Johansen Co-integration technique of regression was used to analyze the data. The results show that, there is no significant impact of the agricultural sector on economic development in Nigeria. The study recommends that research and technology would drive agricultural development and increase agricultural productivity and that the Government should establish agricultural fund to finance and facilitate medium/large scale agricultural production, to enhance employment, production for local consumption and for export. Therefore, the study concludes that any policy thrust that addresses poverty would inevitably focus on agriculture, by increasing rural opportunities that could generate agricultural induced development. Hence, the development of agriculture is a sine qua non for the alleviation of poverty and achievement of sustainable development.

### 5.3 Empirical Review

Driton & Lirim (2017) identify the impact of public expenditure on economic growth of Kosovo over the period 2000-2016. public expenditure and economic growth have a positive

relation, but public expenditure does not have a direct impact on economic growth. The results of the econometric model showed that none of the public expenditure categories in Kosovo had any impact on economic growth of Kosovo over the period 2000-2016. The general conclusion is that public expenditure in Kosovo has been characterized by an unproductive public expenditure, for the period 2000-2016, the effect of public expenditure on economic growth has not had the necessary and reasonable impact on achieving the economic target in Kosovo. The findings of the paper can be used by Kosovo's own government to orient the fiscal policies in Kosovo. The study seeks to contribute to the provision of an effective public expenditure structure in Kosovo, with particular emphasis on the best categorization of their impact on Kosovo's economic growth.

Nworji, Okwu, Obiwuru. & Nworji, (2012) examined the effect of public expenditure on economic in Nigeria for the period 1970 – 2009. The tool of analysis was the OLS multiple regression model. Results of 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. Consequently, the study recommended more allocation of expenditures to the services with significant positive effect

Chude, Chude, Anah & Chukwunulu, (2019) examines the relationship between government expenditure, economic growth and poverty reduction in Nigeria using time series data over the period 1980-2013. Unit root tests, bound test co-integration approach and error correction techniques were employed. It is found that government spending affect economic growth positively and significantly by increasing real private investment and fixed capital accumulation which increase capital accumulation, reduction in current account deficit, external debt burden and improve education/skills of the households by improving human capital. Findings emerge from this study that government expenditure has significant short run impact on poverty reductions in its lag form in which it might be examined by the role of fiscal policy in alleviating poverty of current year in Nigeria. The study suggested policies the role of government should be extended to ensure the magnitude and the quality of private investment as high as possible.

Robinson, Eravwoke, Ukavwe, (2014) investigate the empirical relationship between government expenditure and economic growth. The ordinary least square (OLS) was applied to ascertain the short-run relationship between variables, however, the Augmented Dickey Fuller (ADF) test, was used to examine long-run relationship between variables in the equation. Results of the test show that there is an inverse relationship between government expenditures on health and economic growth; while government expenditure on education sector, is seen to be insufficient to cater for the expanding sector in Nigeria. It was also discovered that government expenditure in Nigeria could increase foreign and local investments. The paper recommended that government should spend more on key macro-variables, such as health, infrastructure, power, etc. This it is believed that judicious expenditure of government, will power the transformation agenda of government as well as engender growth in the Nigerian economy.

## VI. METHODOLOGY

This study adopted ex-post facto design. It uses annual time series data extracted from the central bank of Nigeria statistical bulletin and annual report. The data covered from 2009 -2018.

## VII. DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

### Data presentation

**Table1: Time Series Data for Nigeria Expenditure and GDP**

YEARS	EXPH #’B	EXPED #’B	EXPAG #’B	GDP #’B
2009	90.20	137.12	22.44	49,856.10
2010	99.10	170.80	28.22	54,612.26
2011	231.80	335.80	41.20	57,511.04
2012	197.90	348.40	33.30	59,929.89
2013	179.99	390.42	39.43	63,218.72
2014	195.98	343.75	36.70	67,152.79
2015	257.70	325.19	41.27	69,023.93
2016	200.82	339.28	36.30	67,931.24
2017	245.19	403.96	50.26	68,490.98
2018	296.44	465.30	53.99	69,799.94

Source: CBN 2015 statistical bulletin

### 7.1 Data analysis

**Test of Hypothesis One:** There is no relationship between expenditure on health and economic growth in Nigeria.

**Table 2:**

Variables	B	Beta	T	P-value
Expenditure on Health	87.500	.820	4.055	.004 <sup>b</sup>
.673				R <sup>2</sup>
16.443				F-value
.004 <sup>b</sup>				P-value

Ex-post facto design was used because variables are already documented facts which the researcher has no power to neither change nor manipulate. The study is on the approachability of government expenditures proposal on economic growth in Nigeria. The study uses ANOVA, Coefficients and employed ordinary least squares (OLS)

### 6.1.1 Model specification

The model is a ordinary least square (OLS) which states that the dependent variables Y is a function of the independent variables, X. mathematically,  $Y = f(x_i)$

Such that  $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1x_1 + \beta_2x_2 + \beta_3x_3 + e_t$  in this study, we have that

$$GDP = \beta_0 + \beta_1EXPH_1 + \beta_2EXPED_3 + \beta_3EXPAG_3e_t$$

Where

$GDP_t$  =Gross Domestic Product at time t (dependent variable)

$EXPH_t$  = Expenditure on Health at time (independent variable)

$EXPED_t$  = Expenditure on Education at time (independent variable)

$EXPAG_t$  = Expenditure on Agriculture at time (independent variable)

$\beta_0$  = Constant

$\beta_1, \beta_2$  and  $\beta_3$

$e_t$  = Schochastic error associated with the model.

**Source:** Author's Computation Using SPSS 2.0 Statistical Software

$R^2$  reveals that expenditure on health of Nigeria economy had a positive correlation with economic growth during the period under study. It also explains that expenditure on health only accounted .673 (67.3%) of the changes in economic growth in Nigeria. This is encouraged economic growth in Nigeria.

**Decision Rule:** Accept  $H_{01}$  if p-value > 0.05, otherwise reject.

**Decision:** since p-value = .004 < .05 we reject  $H_{01}$  and conclude that There is significant and positive relationship between expenditure on health and economic growth in Nigeria.

**Test of Hypothesis Two:** There is no relationship between expenditure on education and economic growth in Nigeria.

**Table 3: Model summary**

Variables	B	Beta	T	P-value
Expenditure on Education	57.309	.825	4.133	.003 <sup>b</sup>
.681				$R^2$
17.083				F-value
.003 <sup>b</sup>				P-value

**Source:** Author's Computation Using SPSS 2.0 Statistical Software

$R^2$  indicates that expenditure on education predict.681% of variation of effect on economic growth in Nigeria. It reveals that expenditure on education of economic growth in Nigeria had a positive correlation with economic growth during the period under study.

**Decision Rule:** Accept  $H_{01}$  if p-value > 0.05, otherwise reject.

**Decision:** since p-value = .003 < .05 we reject  $H_0$  and conclude that There is significant and positive relationship between expenditure on education and economic growth in Nigeria.

**Test of Hypothesis Three:** There is no relationship between expenditure on agriculture and economic growth in Nigeria.

**Table 4: Model summary**

Variables	B	Beta	T	P-value
expenditure on agriculture	588.651	.793	.793	.006
.629				$R^2$
13.580				F-value
.006				P-value

**SOURCE:** Author's Computation Using SPSS 2.0 Statistical Software

The effect of predictor (expenditure on agriculture) independently has significant and positive effect on the economic growth with beta value (.793) and statistical since the p-value < .05 and t = .793 respectively.

### VIII. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

1. There is significant positive relationship between expenditure on health and economic growth in Nigeria.
2. There is significant positive relationship between expenditure on education and economic growth in Nigeria.
3. Expenditure on agriculture has significant positive effect on the economic growth in Nigeria.

### IX. CONCLUSION

The study carried on approachability of government expenditure on economic growth in

Nigeria, examined empirical government expenditure and economic growth in Nigeria. It revealed that variables used on government expenditure proposal have positive significant on economic growth. The regression analysis disclosed that variables were statistically significant to economic growth since  $p < 0.05$ . Government expenditures have positive and significant relationship on economic growth in Nigeria; ( $p < 0.05$ ).

### X. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Government should increase the percentage of public fund allocated to improve the state of health of the citizenry since it is a major factor driving productivity and makes meaningful contributions to the growth of economy and development of national output.
2. The Nigerian government should monitor the movement of fund allocated to sectors of any

economy through Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Commission and the Economic and Financial Crime Commission to promote transparency in the government spending.  
3. The Nigerian government should adopt system of compulsory annually audit on government spending to increase accountabilities.

### REFERENCES

- [1]. Adigwe, P. K (2005). Public finance: A contemporary approach. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). Kinsman Publishers Ltd: Enugu.
- [2]. Chude, N. P., Chude, Chude, D. I., Anah, S. A. & Chukwunulu, J. I. (2019). Relationship between government expenditure, economic growth and poverty reduction in Nigeria. IOSR Journal of Economics and Finance. 10(2) 01-08
- [3]. CIA. (2013). World Fact Book. Retrieved May 3, 2020, from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ni.html>
- [4]. Driton Balaj & Lirim Lani (2017). Impact of Public Expenditure on Economic Growth of Kosovo. Acta Universitatis Danubius. (Economica. 13(5).
- [5]. Elola J., Daponte A. and Navarro V. (1995). Health indicators and the organization of health care systems in Western Europe. American journal of public health, 85(10), 1397-1401.
- [6]. Foster, M., & Fozzard, A. (2000). Aid and public expenditure: A guide. (2000 ed.). London: Overseas Development Institute.
- [7]. Gollin, D., Parente, S. & Rogerson, R. (2002). The Role of Agriculture in Development. The American Economic Review, 92(2), 160-164.
- [8]. Hanuschek, E., and Woessmann, L. (2010). Education and economic growth. In Dominic J. Brewer and Patrick J. McEwan (ed.), Economics of Education. Elsevier, pp. 60-67.
- [9]. Indexmundi (2019, December 28). Nigeria - Education expenditure. Retrieved From <https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/nigeria/education-expenditure>
- [10]. Johnston, B. & Mellor, J. (1961). The Role of Agriculture in Economic Development. The American Economic Review, 51(4), 566-593.
- [11]. Matthew, A. O & Adegboye, B. F (2010). Agricultural sector and economic development: The Nigerian experience.
- [12]. <http://eprints.covenantuniversity.edu.ng/2605/1/Adegboye%20F.%20B.%202.pdf>
- [13]. Nworji, I. D., Okwu, A. T., Obiwuru T. C. & Nworji, L. O. (2012). Effects of public expenditure oneconomic growth in Nigeria: a disaggregated time series analysis. International Journal of Management Sciences and Business Research, 1(7).
- [14]. Obinna, O.E. (2003). Public finance. Nigeria: Nsukka, AP and P Press Ltd. 210.
- [15]. OECD Health Data (2001). A comparative analysis of 30 countries, OECD, Paris 2001, data sources, definitions and methods.
- [16]. Ogunjimi, J. & Adebayo, A. (2018). Health expenditure, health outcomes and economic growth in Nigeria. Retrieved from [https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/94989/1/MPRA\\_paper\\_94989.pdf](https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/94989/1/MPRA_paper_94989.pdf)
- [17]. Oji-Okoro, I (2011). Analysis of the contribution of agricultural sector on the Nigerian economic development. World Review of Business Research. 1(1). 191 - 200
- [18]. Okoro, A.S. (2013). Government spending and economic growth in Nigeria:1980-2011). Global Journal of management and business research, economic and commerce, 13(5).
- [19]. Pickhardt, M. (2001). Fifty years after Samuelson's 'the pure theory of public expenditure.' Paper presented at the 52nd International Atlantic economic conference, Philadelphia, USA. Ranis, G., & Fei, J. (1961). A theory of economic development. The American Economic Review, 51(4), 533-565.
- [20]. Robinson, M. O, Eravwoke, K. E. Ukavwe, A. (2014). Government expenditures and economic growth: The Nigerian Experience. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences. 5(10).
- [21]. Samuelson, P. A. (1955). A diagrammatic exposition of a theory of public expenditure. The review of economics and statistics, 37(37), 350-356
- [22]. Samuelson, P. A & Nordhaus, W. D (2003). Economics. Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Ltd: New Delhi.
- [23]. Simona, V (2020). Expenditure on education in Nigeria 2012-2018. Retrieved from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1130218/expenditure-on-education-in-nigeria/>
- [24]. Thirtle, C., Lin, L. & Piesse, J. (2003). The Impact of Research Led Agricultural Productivity Growth on Poverty Reduction in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Contributed paper for the 25th

- conference of the International Association of Agricultural Economists. Durban
- [25]. Tolulope, O and Chinonso, E (2013). Contribution of agriculture to economic growth in Nigeria. Senior Research Assistants, International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Abuja, Nigeria. The 18<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the African Econometric Society (AES) Accra, Ghana.
- [26]. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2007). [www.undpreports.com](http://www.undpreports.com) World Bank (1998). World development report 1998, Washington, DC.
- [27]. Yomi, K (2019, November 25). Nigerians are spending half a billion dollars to school in the United States. Africa reporter. RetrievedFrom<https://qz.com/africa/1755266/nigerians-spend-half-a-billion-dollars-to-school-in-the-us/>





**International Journal of Advances in  
Engineering and Management**

**ISSN: 2395-5252**



# IJAEM

**Volume: 03**

**Issue: 03**

**DOI: 10.35629/5252**

**[www.ijaem.net](http://www.ijaem.net)**

**Email id: [ijaem.paper@gmail.com](mailto:ijaem.paper@gmail.com)**