




Effect of Government Capital Expenditure on Agricultural Development of Katsina State

Rafiat Mohammed

Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Administration

Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.

rafiatmohd@gmail.com

&

Hamza A. Yusuf

Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Administration

Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.

hamzapad@yahoo.com

Abstract

The study is an attempt to examine the Effect of Government Capital Expenditure on Agricultural Development of Katsina State. It cannot be contested the fact that agriculture is the immediate basis for food production. Therefore, the main objective of the study was to examine the short run and long run dynamic relationship between Government Capital Expenditure and crop production. The study covers the period of 2000-2022 and using Vector Error Correction Model (VECM). Crop production was used as a proxy for agricultural development (dependant variable) and capital expenditure as independent variable. The result indicates that there is a positive and significant relationship between Capital Expenditure (CE) and Crop Production (CP) at 5% level of significance. A percentage increase in Capital Expenditure (CE) in the previous year causes Crop Production (CP) in the current year to increase by about 0.12%. This implies that a percentage increase in capital Expenditure (CE) in the current year will have a positive effect on Crop Production in the following year but at a very low percentage of 0.12. Therefore, the study recommends that; the States should adopt a financial policy framework for agricultural development that will promote public private partnership and reflect the need and intended use of public spending to include financial prudence and efficiency that will alignment with sectoral objectives with higher level of significance that will improve crop production.

Keyword: Capital Expenditure Agriculture Crop-production and Development

1.0 Introduction

The increase in prices of food commodities in the market are due to increase in the prices of agricultural input as the popular slogan of “what we buy is what we sell”, resulting in the need for government involvement as part of government economic activities to finance agriculture. There is a contention that market is not perfect and government intervention is required to minimize the distortions which results from market failure, (Edmund *et al*, 2017).

Correcting the market imperfections result in the roles of government to allocate, distribute and stabilize the economy whether primitive or modern society. This role of government demands the need for finance. Finance is a prerequisite for government to perform far reaching responsibilities not only the

provision of goods and services but also to be an agent and catalyst of economic growth and development through numerous programmes and policies (Jumare, 2016).

Government capital expenditures are funds used to develop buildings, machinery, equipment, educational, agriculture and healthcare facilities, etc. Additionally, it covers the costs incurred by the government to make investments that will yield dividends in the future and to acquire fixed assets. Spending on development or investment has benefits that last for years in the future, and these expenditures are referred to as capital spending. The long-term character of capital investment, which results in the formation of assets, enables the economy to generate income for many years by expanding or upgrading manufacturing facilities and increasing operational effectiveness (Okonkwo *et al.*, 2023).

While, Agriculture is the production of animals, fishes, crops and resources for the consumption and other benefits of man and industry. Agriculture is the most dominant Occupation, employing 60-70 percent of the population, although mostly practiced at a subsistence level and it is the life wire of the economies of West African. The United Nations Organization (2008) estimated that over 50% of the world population engage in agriculture or depend on agriculture, which includes farming, fishing, animal husbandry and forestry. In the words of Oji-Okoro (2011), the agricultural sector is the largest sector in the Nigerian economy with its dominant share of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

Agricultural development is the process whereby there is a revolution in the agricultural industry or sector to give birth to agriculture which is profit given an at the same time economic friendly by providing assistance to crop producers with the help of various agricultural resources such as research sphere, employing latest techniques, and facilitating diversity within the purview of agricultural development (Economic watch, 2010). The economic function is required for any economic system is not only to provide public goods but also to allocate goods to production and consumption, in addition to improving the distribution of income, maintain national stability, including political stability, as well as to accelerates economic growth (Jaelani, 2017).

Government capital expenditure on agricultural development has been quite low. Government budget over the years is less than 10% of the total budget that was agreed at the Second Ordinary Assembly of the African Union in July 2003 in Maputo, where African Heads of State and Government endorsed the “Maputo Declaration on Agriculture and Food Security in Africa”. The Declaration contained several important decisions regarding agriculture, but prominent among them was the “commitment to the allocation of at least 10 percent of national budgetary resources to agriculture and rural development policy implementation within five years”. Nigeria is one of the signatories to the declaration and spending on agriculture in Nigeria has been less than 10% of total federal expenditure for most years. The states in Nigeria of which Katsina state is among follow the same pattern of expenditure on agriculture.

Katsina State is agrarian state, farmers across the state engage in all year farming activities with much needed support from the state government. Katsina state relies so much on agricultural activities for economic growth and sustainability. The government of Katsina state is making special efforts through the ministry of agriculture to boost Rice, Tomato and Cowpea (beans) production in the state. According to the 2011 budget review, the government agricultural policy assisted farmers with subsidized agricultural inputs, support irrigation activities and supply 340 tractors to farmers. For the 2013 budget review, there was expansion of Strategic Grains Reserve Programme to stabilize price and the financing

of the sponsorship of youth training programme in different agricultural activities. For subsequent years and up-to-date, the Government of Katsina State had engaged in dam construction and rehabilitation, procurement of fertilizer, agro-chemicals and the supply of irrigation pumps, (An address by the Governor of Katsina State, 2011, 2013 and 2019 respectively).

2.0 Statement of the Research Problem

Increase adequate government spending on agricultural development is imperative. Agriculture is one of the important productive activities that contributed positively to the Nigeria's gross domestic product (GDP). In the 1960s and early 1970s, agriculture dominated the economy accounting for about 57% of the county gross domestic product, (Anyanwu, 1997). Nigeria has eighty million hectares of arable land and yet we cannot produce what we need to feed ourselves and to a large extent food commodities had to be imported to cushion the effect of short supply of food.

Katsina State government budget for Agriculture year in year out, executing various projects and implementing series of policies and programmes under the ministry of agriculture. According to the budget of Katsina State from 2012 till date there has always been allocation for agricultural inputs, heavy subsidy for fertilizer and expansion of irrigation activities. In 2011 there was allocation for the supply of 340 tractors, from 2013 to 2021 there has always been either construction of dam or rehabilitation of dam with budget allocation for the procurement of agric equipment, yet farmers do not have access to these agricultural equipment, the farmers are far from feeling the presence of the government, most farmers in the state are independent going about their farming privately or as a private business and struggling with the challenges of increasing crop production.

Ideally, capital expenditure is an investment on an asset or item with the hope that it will generate income or appreciate in future to create more wealth. And generally public expenditure is one of the important instrument used by the government to control and influence growth in the economy (Rewane, 2014; Ekakitie, 2014; Mordi, 2013; Rapu, 2012). But in the case of Katsina State, government capital spending in the agricultural sector has not translated into the development anticipated as the level of supply of modern farm implement such as agro-equipment, fertilizer procurement, provision of high yield seeds and storage facilities as well as construction of more dams for irrigation purposes are inadequate for crop production that will bring about agricultural development. Therefore, this study tries to trace the root of the problem empirically using crop production as a proxy for agricultural development, to find out why government capital expenditure on agricultural inputs has not translate to high crop production for agricultural development.

3.0 Research Question

What is the short run and long run dynamic relationship between Government Capital Expenditure and crop production for Agricultural Development in Katsina State?

4.0 Research Objective

To examine the short run and long run dynamic relationship between Government Capital Expenditure and crop production for Agricultural Development in Katsina State.

5.0 Hypothesis of the Study

Ho: There is no short run and long run dynamic relationship between Government Capital Expenditure and crop production for Agricultural Development in Yobe and Katsina State.

6.0 Literature Review

The concept of government capital expenditure is a sub-set of public expenditure. Government capital expenditure represent that part of public expenditure mainly for long term investment that is expected to yield, multiply and bring return on investment. Nwanne (2015) stated that Capital expenditure are capital stock in nature, they are expenditure earmark for specific project execution, that is, spending on the construction of physical assert such as schools, road, bridge, they are also investment on developmental projects like developing the agricultural sector, developing the health sector, the mining sector and so on. Government capital expenditure is to improve the productive capacity of the economy to ensure development.

Nigerian government capital expenditure is expected to hasten the process of economic growth and development, Nigerian governments have been voting and spending enormous sums of money on infrastructure, overhead costs, and operating expenses over time. Nevertheless, the country's current circumstances seem to indicate that the economy is not experiencing a commensurate rate of output growth. According to the data that is currently available, Nigeria's public capital investment as a percentage of GDP has significantly decreased between 1981 and 2021. For example, the average public capital spending as a percentage of GDP for the years 1981 to 1989 was approximately 30.65 percent, with a mean of 3.41 and a mean growth rate of 1.72. Between 2001 and 2010, public capital expenditure as a percentage of GDP fell to 24.75 percent with a mean average of 2.5, and this downward trend has continued to the present as between 2015 and 2021, public capital expenditure as a percentage of GDP further decreased to 7.95 percent with a mean average of 1.14, while economic growth rate fell by an average of 1.09 during this time. The ongoing decline in public capital spending as a percentage of GDP is a sign that the Nigerian government is getting smaller and less involved in the economy, (Okonkwo *et al.*, 2023).

More so, between 1970 and 1999, capital expenditure as a proportion of total government expenditures had been high and on increase until 2000-2009 when it dipped to 30.88 percent from an average of about 48.87 percent and further decline to 16.16 percent in 2010-2019. This falling trend may be connected to the global economic crisis of 2008/09 and process of transition from military regime to democratic dispensation between 1998 and 1999. Additionally, total government expenditure has been on the increase unabatedly for the period 1970-2019 in Nigeria and a decadal breakdown shows that average annual growth rate of total government expenditure are around 31.70, 23.20, 41.24, 15.82 and 11.82 percent over the periods 1970-1979, 1980-1989, 1990-1999, 2000-2009 and 2010- 2019 respectively (CBN, 2020). Recurrent expenditure constitutes mostly the chunk of the expenditures with exception of 1979, 1980 and 1999. (Aluthge *et al.*, 2021).

6.1 Agricultural Development

Agriculture is the production of animals, fishes, crops and resources for the consumption and other benefits of man and industry. Agriculture is the most dominant Occupation, employing 60-70 percent of the population, although mostly practiced at a subsistence level and it is the life wire of the economies of West African. The United Nations Organization (2008) estimated that over 50% of the world population engage in agriculture or depend on agriculture, which includes farming, fishing, animal husbandry and forestry. In the words of Oji-Okoro (2011), the agricultural sector is the largest sector in the Nigerian economy with its dominant share of the GDP. The GDP from agriculture increased from an annual

average of 38% during 1992 to 1996 and 40% during 1997 – 2001 compared to GDP on crude oil which declined from an annual average of 13% in 1992 – 1996 and 12% during 1997 – 2001.

Lawal (2011) asserted that the role of agriculture in transforming both the social and economic framework of any economy cannot be over-emphasized. In effect, it has been the main source of gainful employment from which the nation can feed its teeming population, providing local raw materials to the industries and a good source of government revenue. Olufemi (2015) explained that Nigeria is blessed with abundant natural resources which include large hectares of land for crop production, tree crop, cash crops, horticulture, timber and wood, livestock production, forestry and wild life as well as rivers and ocean with wide variety of fishes. The development of agriculture According to Ogen (2007) agricultural output can increase the level of income of farmers and the people. It is believed that the level of agricultural output varies with the stage of economic development of a country. In the word of Anyanwu, Oyefusi, Oaikhenan and Dimowo (1997), the role of agriculture in transforming both the social and economic framework of an economy cannot be over emphasized.

7.0 Methodology

7.1 Sources of Data

The study used secondary sources data. The data were obtained from Agricultural Performance Survey (APS) under National Agricultural Extension and Research Liaison Service (NAERLS), for Katsina State crop output or crop production (CP), used as a proxy for agricultural development and measured in metric tonnes. While Government capital expenditure (CE) measured in million Naira was be obtained from Katsina state government's budget for the Ministry of Agriculture from 2000 to 2022.

7.2 Model Specification

The estimation technique employed in this study commenced with a unit root test to check the Stationarity of the variables of the study. In order to test for the Stationarity of the variables, the study used ADF unit root test. This involves testing the order of integration of the variables of interest. This is necessary because most time series variables are not stationary. Therefore, the ADF unit root test can be specified as follows:

$$\Delta y_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 t + \phi y_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i \Delta y_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

7.3 Co-Integration Equation

Having ascertained Stationarity of the series, the next step is to test the presence or otherwise of co-integration between the series of the some order of integration by forming co-integration equation. The fundamental assumption when experimenting with co-integration is that the variable is integrated of the same order (Aremu, 2009: in Imoughele and Ismaila 2013). The set of variable X_t is said to be co integrated if a linear combination of the variable results in stationary process i.e. $1(0)$. For a regression relation to be robust and meaningful the various series must be co-integrated; otherwise, the equation retains its unit's roots properties and hence misleading regression. In this study the approach to be adopted is the maximum likelihood test procedure established by Juselius and Johansen (1990). The Johansen's technique is chosen because it is Vector Autoregression (VAR) based and there are clear evidence that it performs better than single equation and alternative multivariate method, Imoughele and

Ismaila (2013). The starting point of Johansen's approach is to specify the Vector Autoregression (VAR) of order is as follows:

$$\text{Log}(y_t) = \mu + \alpha_1 \text{Log}(y_{t-1}) + \dots + \alpha_p y_{t-p} + e_t \dots \dots \dots (2) \text{ or}$$

$$\Delta \text{Log}(y_t) = \mu + \alpha_1 \text{Log}(y_{t-1}) + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \beta_i \Delta \text{Log}(y_{t-i}) + e_t \dots \dots \dots (3)$$

Where Δy_t and Δy_{t-1} are I(1) variables. Therefore, the long –run equilibrium relationship among the variables is determine by the rank of α_1 , often denoted by r under the null hypothesis that there are at most r Cointegration vectors against the alternative that the number of vectors is less than or equal to r . The test of the null hypothesis of co-integrating vector will be conducted on the basis of the trace and maximum eigen value statistics as specify as:

$$\lambda_{\text{trace}} = -\left(\frac{T}{2}\right) \sum_{i=r+1}^n \text{Log}(1 - \hat{\lambda}_i), \lambda_{\text{max eig}} = -T \text{Log}(1 - \hat{\lambda}_{r+1}) \dots \dots \dots (4)$$

7.4 Vector Error Correction Model (VECM)

If co-integration is proven to exist, the next stage is to construct error correction mechanism to model dynamic relationship. The error correction model can be specified as:

$$\Delta y_t = \mu + \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i \Delta y_{t-i} + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i \Delta x_{t-i} \theta_{\text{ecm}_{t-1}} + e_t \dots \dots \dots (5)$$

8.0 Data Presentation and Analysis of the Result

The study reported on this paper is directed towards the effect of government capital expenditure on agricultural development of Katsina State. This section presents the data and analysis of results.

Table 1(a): Data for the Study

Agricultural Production Survey (APS) for Katsina State

PRODUCTION IN '000' METRIC TONS								
S/no	Year	Millet	Sorghum	Maize	Rice	Groundnut	Cowpea	TOTAL
1	2000	175.61	334.42	182.01	24.05	51.56	47.81	815.46
2	2001	145.70	350.00	140.12	26.77	64.32	52.06	778.97
3	2002	116.56	472.50	175.15	30.52	88.70	67.57	951.00
4	2003	199.77	258.10	147.88	21.06	53.47	49.40	729.68
5	2004	239.72	310.33	177.46	25.26	66.84	61.75	881.36
6	2005	199.40	331.83	195.39	39.57	65.27	58.16	889.62
7	2006	193.75	365.01	209.07	43.53	71.68	61.45	944.49
8	2007	191.31	343.11	205.67	59.61	74.95	60.71	935.37
9	2008	204.70	376.39	226.24	63.78	80.20	64.53	1015.84
10	2009	240.09	370.00	230.00	59.32	79.14S	61.26	1039.81
11	2010	249.53	382.95	238.05	61.40	81.91	63.41	1077.25
12	2011	83.98	387.69	273.13	56.82	85.71	69.03	956.36
13	2012	80.99	344.60	256.00	85.3	85.71	69.0	921.6
14	2013	82.91	363.40	295.00	96.1	85.70	70.2	993.31
15	2014	87.90	355.90	483.70	144.50	119.90	160.70	1352.6
16	2015	84.62	363.33	496.56	188.45	128.52	168.73	1430.21
17	2016	121.14	364.69	292.62	174.82	107.89	107.95	1169.11
18	2017	124.68	372.16	336.03	199.75	111.94	111.49	1256.05
19	2018	152.54	389.23	408.04	225.05	128.54	116.30	1419.7
20	2019	150.06	325.24	188.85	127.17	140.51	131.08	1062.91
21	2020	151.92	322.61	189.74	133.42	148.30	130.96	1076.95
22	2021	166.45	357.60	362.36	220.26	137.63	111.85	1356.15
23	2022	152.99	309.07	356.98	216.02	313.02	108.58	1348.08

Source: National Agricultural Extension and Research Liaison Services (NAERLS), ABU, Zaria

Table 1(b): Data for the Study
Katsina State Government Approved Budget (Capital Expenditure on Agric)
and APS from 2000 to 2022

S/no	Year	Crop Produce In Tonne (000)	Capital Expenditure
1	2000	815.46	447,118,265
2	2001	778.97	830,660,660
3	2002	951.00	967,308,625
4	2003	729.68	786,306,262
5	2004	881.36	1,067,651,965
6	2005	889.62	909,274,000
7	2006	944.49	-----
8	2007	935.37	-----
9	2008	1015.84	4,118,136,660
10	2009	1039.81	4,311,481,937
11	2010	1077.25	5,503,545,530
12	2011	956.36	6,991,246,720
13	2012	921.6	8,713,381,100
14	2013	993.31	7,861,276,570
15	2014	1352.6	7,746,989,285
16	2015	1430.21	5,376,611,290
17	2016	1169.11	6,422,121,185
18	2017	1256.05	1,035,863,210
19	2018	1419.7	1,368,159,210
20	2019	1062.91	8,832,837,080
21	2020	1076.95	9,286,254,768
22	2021	1356.15	2,048,062,310
23	2022	1348.08	2,547,911,332

In order to check the time series property, the study conducted stationarity test using Augmented Dicky Fuller (ADF) unit root test to avoid spurious result. The result of ADF unit root test result presented in table 2, shows that both Crop Production (CP) and Capital Expenditure (CE) are not stationary at their levels at 5% level of significance. However, the variables CP and CE are stationary at their first difference at 1% level of significance.

Table 2: Stationarity Test

Variables	At Level			At First Difference		
	t-Statistic	Prob.	Inference	t-Statistic	Prob.	Inference
CP	-1.870367	0.3390	Not Stationary	-5.766261	0.0002 *	Stationary
CE	-2.072772	0.2565	Not Stationary	-5.215753	0.0010*	Stationary

Source: Author's Computation

Cointegration Test

Since all the variables are stationary at their first difference, the next stage is to conduct cointegration test. The result of the cointegration test presented in table 3, shows that the trace statistics indicates 1 cointegration equation while the maximum-eigen value indicates no cointegration. Therefore, it can be concluded it that the variables are cointegrated. This implies that there is long-run relationship between crop production and capital expenditure in Katsina State.

Table 3: Cointegration Test

Hypothesized No. of CE(s)	Trace Statistic	0.05 Critical Value	Prob.**	Max- Eigen Statistic	0.05 Critical Value	Prob.**
None	15.83562	15.49471	0.0444	14.04706	14.26460	0.0541
At most 1	1.788559	3.841466	0.1811	1.788559	3.841466	0.1811

Source: Author's Computation

Trace test indicates 1 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level

Max-eigen value test indicates no cointegration at the 0.05 level

Lag Selection Criteria

Lag selection model was estimated using various lag selection criteria from var model. The result represented in table 4, Shows that three out of five lag selection criteria which include; Final Prediction Error, Akaike Information Criteria, and Hannan-Quinn suggested choosing lag two; while the remaining two which include Sequential Modified LR test statistics and Schwarz information criterion suggested choosing lag 1. Therefore, it can be concluded that the maximum lag for the model is lag 2.

Table 4: Lag Selection Criteria

Lag	LogL	LR	FPE	AIC	SC	HQ
0	-452.0456	NA	6.72e+23	60.53941	60.63382	60.53841
1	-441.7463	16.47880*	2.93e+23	59.69951	59.98273*	59.69650
2	-437.3714	5.833223	2.91e+23*	59.64952*	60.12156	59.64450*
3	-434.5267	3.034333	3.76e+23	59.80357	60.46441	59.79653

Source: Author's Computation

Indicates lag order selected by the criterion

LR: sequential modified LR test statistic (each test at 5%level)

FPE: Final prediction error , HQ: Hannan-Quinn information criterion

SC: Schwarz information criterion

AIC: Akaike information criterion,

Vector Error Correction Model

The result presented in table 5, shows that the coefficient of Error Correction Term (ECT) is negative and statistically significance at 5% level of significance. This implies that the short-run disequilibrium will converge to equilibrium in the long-run at a speed of about 37.6%. This confirmed the existence of cointegration between the variables, meaning that there is long-run relationship between crop production and capital expenditure in Katsina State.

Similarly, in the short-run, there is a positive but insignificant relationship between Capital Expenditure (CE) and Crop Production (CP) at 5% level of significance in Katsina State. A percentage increase in Capital Expenditure (CE) in the previous year causes Crop Production (CP) in the current year to increase by about 0.12%. This implies that a percentage increase in Capital Expenditure (CE) in the current year will have a positive impact on Crop Production in the following year. Also in the result, the coefficient of determination (R^2) shows that the independent variables account for about 56.0% of variation in the dependent variable while the remaining 44% was captured by the residual. The probability value of F-statistics shows that the independent variables are jointly significant at 5% ; while the coefficient of Durbin-Watson indicated that the model has no problem of autocorrelation.

Table 5: Vector Error Correction Model

Dependent Variable: D(LOG(CP))				
	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
ECT(-1)	-0.376287	0.150548	-2.499443	0.0279
D(LOG(CP(-1)))	-0.295479	0.232218	-1.272422	0.2273
D(LOG(CP(-2)))	-0.246186	0.214147	-1.149613	0.2727
D(LOG(CE(-1)))	0.128129	0.050889	-2.517808	0.0270
C	0.021942	0.031093	0.705695	0.4939
R2	0.5596			
F-statistic (Prob.)	3.812691 (0.0317)			
Durbin-Watson stat	1.5772			

Source: Author's Computation

Diagnostic Test

In order to ensure the validity and reliability of the result, various diagnostic test were conducted as shown in table 6, Breusch-Godfrey serial correlation LM test was conducted to check whether the independent variables are independent. The probability value 0.1158 is greater than 5% which implies that the model has no problem of serial correlation. Similarly, Heteroskedasticity test was conducted using Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey approach to check whether the residuals of the model have constant variance. The probability value is 0.0873 is greater than 5% which implies that the model has no problem of hetroskedasticity at 5% level of significance. Also, normality test was conducted using Jarque-Bera approach to check whether the residuals of the model are normally distributed. The probability value 0.6119 is greater than 5% which implies that the residuals of the model are normally distributed at 5% level of significance.

Table 6: Diagnostic Test

F-statistic	Prob.
-------------	-------

Breusch-Godfrey Serial Correlation LM Test	2.695145	0.1158
Heteroskedasticity Test: Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey	2.592429	0.0873
Jarque-Bera	0.982252	0.6119

Source: Author's Computation

9.0 Summary of Findings

The study shows that there is long-run relationship between crop production and capital expenditure in Katsina State. Also, there is a positive but insignificant relationship between Capital Expenditure (CE) and Crop Production (CP) at 5% level of significance in Katsina State. A percentage increase in Capital Expenditure (CE) in the previous year causes Crop Production (CP) in the current year to increase by about 0.12%. This implies that a percentage increase in capital Expenditure (CE) in the current year will have a positive impact on Crop Production in the following year. Also in the result, the coefficient of determination (R^2) shows that the independent variables account for about 56.0% of variation in the dependent variable, while the remaining 44% was captured by the residual. The probability value of F-statistics shows that the independent variables are jointly significant at 5%, while the coefficient of Durbin-Watson indicated that the model has no problem of autocorrelation.

10.0 Conclusion and recommendation

The importance of giving greater priority to agriculture is that, agriculture is and will continue to be the dominant sector of the economy. Therefore, the study concludes that government needs to increase capital expenditure to develop agriculture in order to achieve the objective of crop production for food sufficiency as empirical evidence has shown in this study clearly demonstrated that the major agricultural inputs are inadequately provided by the government to the farmers which have strong impact on the achievement of high output in crop production for agricultural development. Katsina States government needs to invest massively through capital expenditure to develop agriculture because States have comparative advantage in agriculture. Hence, the study recommends that Katsina States should adopt a financial policy framework for agricultural development that will promote public private partnership and reflect the need, demand, and intended use of public spending to include financial prudence and efficiency that will alignment with sectoral objectives with higher level of significance that will improve level of crop production.

References

- Alluthge, C., Jibir, A. and Abdu, M., (2021). Impact of government expenditure on economic growth in Nigerian, 1970-2019. *CBN Journal of Applied Statistics* Vol. 12 No. 1 (June, 2021).
- Anyanwu, J.C, Oyefusi, O., Oaikhenan, H. And Dimowo, F. A, (1997). *The structure of the Nigeria economy*. Joanee Educational Publishers Limited. Onisha, Anambra State, Nigeria.
- Budget of Katsina State, (2022). Ministry of Agriculture, Ja-Abdulkadir Secretariat Complex, IBB way, Kano road, Dandagoro. P.M.B. 2028, Katsina State, Nigeria.
- Edmund, L.K., Choong, C.K. and Lau, L.S. (2017). Government expenditure, efficiency and economic growth: A Panel Analysis of Sub-Saharan Low Income Countries. *African Journal of Economic Review*, Volume V, Issue II.

- Imoughele, L.E. and Ismaila, M. (2013). Determinants of public healthcare expenditure in Nigeria: An error correction mechanism approach. *International Journal of Business and Social Science* Vol. 4 No. 13; October 2013
- Jaelemi, A. (2017). Public expenditure management In Indonesia: *Islamic Economic Review on state budget 2017*.doi: 20944/preprints 201706.0122.v1
- Jumare, B. (2016). *Public financial management*. Department of Local Government and Development Studies, Faculty of Administration, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.
- Juselius, K. And Johansen, S. (1990). Maximum likelihood estimation and *inference on cointegration with applications to the demand for money*. [https://www. researchgate. net/ publication/4994438](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/4994438)
- Lawal, W. A. (2011). “An analysis of government spending on agricultural sector and its contribution to GDP in Nigeria”. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(20), 244 – 250.
- National Report, (2022). *Wet season Agricultural Performance in Nigeria*. ISSN: 2408-7459 National Agricultural Extension and Research Liaison Services (NAERLS) Ahmadu Bello University. Zaria. www.naerls.gov.ng
- Nwanne, T. and Godfrey, O. (2015). Implications of government capital expenditure on the manufacturing sector in Nigeria. *European Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance Research* Vol.3, No.10, pp.19-33, October 2015. Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)
- OECD (2022). Economic importance of agriculture for poverty reduction. OECD Food, Agriculture and Fisheries *Working Papers*, 23.doi:10
- Ogen, O. (2007). *The agricultural sector and Nigeria’s development: Comparative perspective from the Brazilian agro-industrial sector economy (1960 – 1995)*.. Nebula March 2007@Noble World Achieves.
- Oji – Okoro, I. (2011). Analysis of the contribution of agricultural; Sector on the Nigerian economic development”. *World Review of Business Research* 1(1).
- Okonkwo, O.N. (2023). Impact of government capital expenditure on the economic growth rate of Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Allied Research* Vol.8, Issue 1 (March, 2023). ISSN: 2536 7447335/page.
- Olufemi, R.A. (2015). Agricultural policies formulation and implementation in Nigeria- issues and challenges. *International Journal of Agricultural Science and Natural Resources* 4(2), 9-14
- UNDP (2008). *MDGs in Nigeria: Current progress*, Retrieved May 7, 2020 from <http://www.ng.undp.org/mdgsnprogress.shtml>
- United Nations Organization (2008). Global food crisis.