GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE PATTERN AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA

Odogu, L. I.[1], Azubike J.U.B.[2] & Zibaghafa, S.[1]

1. Department of Accountancy School of Management Science, Bayelsa State College of Arts and Science, Elebele, Yenagoa, Bayelsa State.
2. Department of Accounting, College Of Management Sciences, Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike, Abia State.

ABSTRACT

Economic Development can also be described as a process that influences growth and restructuring of an economy to enhance the economic well being of a community. The desire for the attainment of economic stability is pursued by utilization of stabilization policy instruments which are government decision. The objective of this paper is to examine the government expenditure pattern and the economic development of Nigeria. To achieve this objective, data was collected from secondary sources. The secondary sources were from scholarly published and unpublished studies and CBN Statistical Bulletin, World bank data base etc. Multiple regression and Pearson's Correlation Coefficient were used in analyzing the data. The empirical analysis provided a significant relationship between Government expenditures and the Economic Development in Nigeria. On the basis of the empirical result, the paper predicts the collapse of the productive sectors of the economy unless the country would drastically reduce its dependence on imported products including food and services that are actually available locally, and encourage industrial investment and development, and entrepreneurship especially small scale businesses, Therefore, the paper recommends, amongst others, that government should show some degree of accountability and transparency. The Federal Government should address the lopsided budgetary and expenditure pattern, to move the country from a service economy to manufacturing economy and from a consuming economy to a producing economy, by strengthening the private sector and creating the enabling environment for private sector domination in the productive sector. .

Keywords: Expenditure pattern, Inflation Rate, Par Capita, Economic Development.

INTRODUCTION

The quest for ways to stimulate increments in real National Output in order to improve the standards of living in an economy occupies a paramount position in the priorities of a government, particularly those that would be responsible for their governance. This constitutes a desire for economic development. According to the International Economic Development Council (2010) economic Development is about the creation of jobs and wealth, and the improvement of quality of life. Economic Development can also be described as a process that influences growth and restructuring of an economy to enhance the economic well being of a community.

The desire for the attainment of economic stability is pursued by utilization of stabilization policy instruments which are government decision to keep output close to its full employment level and includes fiscal, monetary and income policies. While fiscal policy is government decisions to change the level of government expenditure or taxes, monetary policy is government decision to change the level of money supply in the economy. Income policy describes the regulations of income payments to factors by government. Consequently, government expenditure decisions fall under the category of fiscal policy which is a stabilization policy tool or instrument as it relates to

government expenditure. Government or public sector capital and recurrent expenditure therefore have implications on both investments and operations of fiscal policy as it leads to capital formation and budgetary considerations expenditure, a fiscal policy measure, respectively.

The recent revival of interest in growth theory has also revived interest among researchers in verifying and understanding the linkages between government spending and economic growth and development, especially in a developing country like Nigeria. Over the past decades, the public sector spending has been increasing in geometric term through government various activities and interactions with its Ministries, Departments and Agencies (Nurudeen & Usman, 2010). Although, the general view is that public expenditure either recurrent or capital expenditure, notably on social and economic infrastructure can be growth-enhancing although the financing of such expenditure to provide essential infrastructural facilities – including transport, electricity, telecommunications, water and sanitation, waste disposal, education and health – can be growth – retarding (for example, the negative effect associated with taxation and excessive debt).

The size and structure of public expenditure will determine the pattern and form for growth in output of the economy. The structure of Nigerian public expenditure can broadly be categorized into capital and recurrent expenditure. The recurrent expenditure are government expenses on administrations such as wages, salaries, interest on loans, maintenance etc., whereas expenses on capital projects like roads, airports, education, telecommunication, electricity generation etc., are referred to as capital expenditure. One of the main purposes of government spending is to provide infrastructural facilities.

Concerned experts in management and economics have suggested that poor fiscal policy measures of government as well as low investment levels by government is responsible for the poor state of the Nigeria economy. In the opinion of Fajingbesi and Odusola (1999) capital formation supported and sustained in a country can boost the level of economic activity in an economy. Capital formation is regarded as a flow concept since it takes place over an interval of time as it involves addition to existing capital stock. Capital stock, on the other hand, refers to the amount of capital stock at a particular point in time and this is regarded as a stock concept. The availability of capital resources input, therefore, strengthens the productive capability of an economy. Fiscal policy through the use of government expenditure can lead to increase in the size of national output as measured by the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) increase public sector spending is an indication of increased demand of goods and services from producers (suppliers) by government (Cooray, 2009; Ogiogio, 1995). These expenditure become incomes to recipients of the money who on account of such receipts are stimulated to further increase their spending (or demand).

PURPOSE OF STUDY

Generally, the purpose of this study is to evaluate and analyze the effect of government expenditure pattern on economic development in Nigeria. Specifically however, the study evaluated and analyzed the following:

1. The impact of government capital expenditure on per capital income in Nigeria;
2. The impact of government recurrent expenditure on inflation rate in Nigeria;
3. The impact of government expenditure on Gross Domestic Product in Nigeria.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions below were provided in order to give appropriate direction for the study.

1. To what extent does government capital expenditure impact on per capita income in Nigeria ?
2. To what extent does government recurrent expenditure impact on inflation rate in Nigeria?
3. To what extent does government expenditure impact on Gross Domestic Product in Nigeria?

Tests of significance were conducted on the following null hypotheses in the study:

H_{01}: Government Capital expenditure has no significant impact on per capita income in Nigeria.
H_{02}: Government recurrent expenditure has no significant impact on inflation rate in Nigeria.
H_{03}: Government expenditure has no significant impact on Gross Domestic Product in Nigeria.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The theory of public expenditure may be discussed in the context of increasing public expenditure, the range of public expenditure and/or in terms of the division of a given amount of public expenditure into different items like recurrent and capital expenditure. The later of the two parts may also be conceived terms of allocation of the economy's resources between providing public goods on the one hand and private goods on the other.

THEORY OF INCREASING PUBLIC EXPENDITURE

There are two important and well-known theories of increasing public expenditure. The first one is connected with Wagner and other with Wiseman and Peacock Akpan, (2005).

Wagner's Law of Increasing State Activities: Adolph Wagner (1835 - 1917) was a German economist who based his Law of Increasing State Activities on historical facts, primarily Germany. According to Wagner, there are inherent tendencies for the activities of different layers of a government (such as central, state and local governments) to increase both intensively and extensively. There is a functional relationship between the growth an economy and government activities with the result that the governmental sector grows faster than the economy Akpan, (2005), Ghali (1998). From the original version of this theory it is not clear whether Wagner was referring to an increase in: **(**a) Absolute level of public expenditure

(b). The ratio of government expenditure to GNP or (c). Proportion of public sector in the economy. Akpan, (2005) believe that Wagner was thinking of proportion of public sector in the economy. Junko and Vitalis (2008) not only supported Wagner's thesis but also concluded with empirical evidence that it was equally applicable. **Wiseman – Peacock:** The second theory dealing with the growth of public expenditure was put forward by Wiseman and Peacock in their study of public expenditure in United Kingdom for the period 1890 – 1955. The main thrust of the thesis is that public expenditure does not increase in a smooth and continuous manner, but in jerks or in step-like fashion Akpan, (2005). At times, some social or other disturbance takes place creating a need for increased public expenditure which the existing public revenue cannot meet. While earlier, due to an insufficient pressure for public expenditure, the revenue constraint was dominating and restraining an expansion in public expenditure, now under changed requirements such restraint gives way. The public expenditure increases and makes the inadequacy of the present revenue quite clear to everyone. The movement from the older level of expenditure and taxation to a new and higher level is the *displacement effect.* The inadequacy of the revenue as compared with the required public expenditure creates an inspection effect. The government and

the people review the revenue position and the need to find a solution of the important problems that have come up and agree to the required adjustments to finance the increased expenditure. They attain a new level of tax tolerance. They are now ready to tolerate a greater burden of taxation and as a result the general level of expenditure and revenue goes up. In this way, the public expenditure and revenue get stabilized at a new level till another disturbance occurs to cause a displacement effect. Thus, each major disturbance leads the government assuming a larger proportion of the total national activity. In other words, there is a *concentration effect*. The concentration effect also refers to the apparent tendency for central government economic activity to grow faster than that of the state and local government levels.

Ernest Engel's Theory of Public Expenditure: Perhaps, the contribution of Ernest Engels will also be useful to us. Ernest Engel was also a German economist writing almost the same time as Adolph Wagner in the 19th century. Engel pointed out over a century ago that the composition of the consumer budget changes as family income increases. A smaller share comes to be spent on certain goods such as work clothing and al larger share on others, such as for coasts, expensive Jewelry. As average income increase, smaller changes in the consumption pattern for the economy may occur. At the earlier stages of national development, there is need for overhead capital such as roads, harbors, power installations, and pipe-borne water. But as the economy developed, one would expect the public share in capital formation to decline over time. Individual expenditure pattern is thus compared to national expenditure and Engel's finding is referred to as the declining portion of outlays on foods (Taiwo and Abayomi, (2011).

MEASUREMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

There are many parameters or indices of measuring economic development. The major ones include: Gross Domestic Product (GDP), Human Development Index (HDI), Per Capita Income (PCI), Unemployment Rate (UR), and Inflation Rate (IR).

Gross Domestic Product (GDP)

Gross domestic product (GDP) is the market value of all officially recognized final goods and services produced within a country in a given period. GDP per capita is often considered an indicator of a country's standard of living; GDP per capita exactly equals the gross domestic income (GDI) per capita. GDP is related to national accounts, a subject in macroeconomics. It is not to be confused with Gross National Product (GNP) which allocates production based on ownership. GDP can be determined in three ways, all of which should in principle, give the same result. They are the product (or output) approach, the income approach, and the expenditure approach. The income approach works on the principle that the incomes of the productive factors must be equal to the value of their product, and determines GDP by finding the sum of all producers' income (World Bank, 2009).

One of the fundamental questions that must be addressed in preparing the national economic accounts is how to define the production boundary-that is, what parts of the myriad human activities are to be included in or excluded from the measure of t he economic production. All output for market is at least in theory included within the boundary. Market output is defined as that which is sold for economically significant prices; economically significant prices are prices which have a significant influence on the amounts producers are willing to supply and purchasers wish to buy. An exception is that illegal goods and services are often excluded even if they are sold at economically significant price (Australia and the United State exclude them).

Standard of living Gross domestic product, inflation and per capita is not a measurement of the

standard of living in an economy. However, it is often used as such an indicator, on the rationale that all citizens would benefit from their country's increased economic production. Similarly, GDP per capita is not a measure of personal income. GDP may increase while real incomes for the majority decline. The major advantage of GDP per capita indicator of standard of living is that it is measured frequently, widely, and consistently. It is measured frequently in that most countries provide information on GDP on a quarterly basis, allowing trends to be seen quickly. It is measured widely in that some measure of GDP is available for almost every country in the world, allowing inter-country comparisons. It is measured consistently in that the technical definition of GDP is relatively consistent among countries (Beggs, 2004).

The major disadvantage is that it is not a measure of standard of living. They are intended to be a measure of total national economic activity – a separate concept. The argument for using them as a standard-of-living proxy is not that it is a good indicator of the absolute level of standard of living but that living standards tend to move with them, so that changes in living standards are readily detected through changes in them.

Method of data collection

Method employed in Carrying out this research work was by secondary data. Secondary data is the name given to data that has been used for some purpose other than that for which they were originally collected. Secondary data generally used when the term manpower resources necessary for survey are not available and of course the relevant information required. Secondary data were gotten from different sources e.g. CBN Statistical Bulletin and World Bank statistical Bulletin . The duration of this research was basically from 1984-2014 which is in the range of 31yrs. This duration was used because it is detailed enough to give a good result and analysis. This study employs annual data on the rate of Government Capital expenditure, Government Recurrent expenditure, Real GDP, Per Capita Income and inflation rate. Data were obtained from the CBN Statistical Bulletin and World Bank Statistical Bulletin.

Data Analysis Techniques

The analysis was carried out in two forms and they are regression analysis and correlation. Regression analysis includes many techniques for modeling and analyzing several variables, when the focus is on the relationship between a dependent variable and independent variables.

The regression analysis was guided by the following linear model:

$Y3 = f(X1, X2, X3)$ ……(1)

$PCI,IFR,GDP = f(Gex+Cex+Rex)$ ……(2)

$PCI=f(Cex1+\varepsilon)$ ……(3)

$IFR=f(Rex2+\varepsilon)$ ……(4)

$GDP=f(Gex3+$ ……(5)

That is $B1-\beta3>0$

PCI =Per capita income: IFR =Inflation rate; GDP = Gross Domestic Product; Gex = Government Expenditure; Cex= capital expenditure; Rex= Recurrent expenditure; $\beta1$, $\beta2$, $\beta3$ are the coefficients of the regression, while ε is the error term capturing other explanatory variables not

explicitly included in the model. However, the model was tested using the diagnostic tests of heteroskedasitcity, multiple regression, serial correlation, normality and misspecification (Gujarati and Porter, 2009; Asterious and Hall, 2007). Augmented Dickey-Fuller was also used in the study for stationarity of data.

Data Presentation

HYPOTHESIS 1:

This hypothesis was designed to measure the magnitude of the influence which Federal Government capital expenditure exerts on per capita income in Nigeria in the period under study.

Variables	**#**	**Person's Correlation Coefficient**	**Sign**	**Remark**
Government Capital Expenditure	31	0.782	0.000	Significant
Per Capital Income	31			

Source: SPSS 20.0 researchers Output

This table shows that the value of Person's Correlation Coefficient r = 0.782 is found to be significant at 0.000. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected at 0.01 alpha level. The impact of Government capital expenditure on per capita income in Nigeria is significant.

Hypothesis 2:

The hypothesis was designed to measure the size of the influence which Federal Government recurrent expenditure has on inflation rate in Nigeria during this period.

Variables	**#**	**Person's Correlation Coefficient**	Sign	Remark
Government Recurrent Expenditure	31	-0.291	0.112	Not Significant
Inflation Rate	31			

Source: SPSS 20.0 researchers Output

This table shows that the value of Person's Correlation Coefficient r = -0.291 is found to be non significant at 0.112. The null hypothesis is therefore accepted at 0.01 alpha level. Government recurrent expenditure has no significant impact on inflation rate in Nigeria.

Hypothesis 3:

Variables	**#**	**Multiple Regression (R)**	**R^2**	**F-Value**	**Sign**	**Remark**
Governmen t	31	0.988	0.976	560.790	0.000	Significant

Expenditure						
Real Gross Domestic Product	31					

Source: SPSS 20.0 researchers Output

This table reveals that Multiple Regression (R), Coefficient of Multiple Regression (R^2) and calculated F-value are 0.988, 0.976, and 560.79 respectively. The F-value of 560.79 has been found to be significant at 0.000. i.e. F calculated > F critical and 0.000 < 0.01. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected at $\alpha = 0.01$. Government expenditure has a significant effect on and gross domestic product in Nigeria.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The study concludes that the problem of inflation in Nigeria is not actually caused by government expenditure or its pattern but on the collapse of the productive sectors of the economy. If the country would drastically reduce its dependence on imported products including food and services that are actually available locally, and encourage industrial investment and development, and entrepreneurship especially small scale business, the rate of inflation will plummet naturally. In this regard, the decision of the president muhammadu Buhari to ban the importation of rice in 2016 is a step in the right direction if and only if appropriate realistic steps are taken to develop rice production and processing locally.

However, on the strength of the discussed findings and conclusions, the following recommendations have been put forward. It is hoped that if they are considered and incorporated in the policy formulation, Nigeria would experience an unprecedented level of economic growth and development that will change the fortune of the country:

- The Federal Government should address the lopsided budgetary and expenditure pattern which characterized the country since 1980 wherein recurrent expenditure has been far higher than capital expenditure.
- Power is the most critical sector of the economy and until it is addressed, there can be no meaningful and lasting economic development. Industrialization is impossible where there is no stable power supply. This is why the present scenario where manufacturing companies in Nigeria are shutting down operation and relocating to neighboring West African countries to produce the same goods and import same to Nigeria.
- There is dire need to transform the country from a service economy to manufacturing economy and from a consuming economy to a producing economy. By strengthening the private sector and creating the enabling environment for private sector domination in the productive sector.
- Corruption is the bane of Nigeria's long quest for economic development and global relevance. The reason for influencing the pattern of government expenditure and sectional allocation is because those who are behind such actions want to enrich themselves at the expense of the nation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors are grateful to all Ph.D student of accountancy, Michael Opkara University of Agriculture Umudike for encouragement in this research work, we are also grateful to Hon.

Loveday Uriel, Professor J. U. Ihendinihu, and Dr. Ebimobowei Appah for their encouragement, we are also grateful to all our lecturers and professional colleges and specially to our families for their patience and love and most importantly to the Almighty God for protection and guidiance.

REFERENCES

Adelman, I. & Morris, C. (2007). "Measurement of Economic development in Developing Countries". (http://www.economicsconcepts.com/approaches to economic development.htm).

Anumihe, I. (2011). "Federal Government Dares States: Launches Sovereign Wealth Fund with $1Bn". Daily Sun,

Akpan, N. I. (2005). "Government Expenditure and Economic Growth: A Disaggregated Approach" CBN Economic Financial Review 43(1),11-23.

Andolfatto, D. (2005). Macroeconomic Theory and Policy Simon Fraser University Press.

Arpaia, A; and Turrini, A (2008). "Government Expenditure and Economic Growth in the Long-Run Tendencies and Short-Term Adjustment". Retrieved from http://ec.euopa.eu/economy finance/publication.

Begg, D. (2004). *Economics*. London: McGraw-Hill Book Company

Black, J (2003). *A Dictionary of Economics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bhatia H.L (2002). *Public Finance*, New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, PVT Limited.

Bose, N., Emranul-Haque, M & Osborn, D. R. (2003). "Public Expenditure and Economic Growth: A Disaggregated Analysis for Developing Countries". Retrieved from http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/cgbcr/dpcgbcr/dpcgbcr30.pdf.

Chamberlin, C. & Yueh, L. (2006). *Macroeconomices*. New York: Thompson Learning.

Cooray, A. (2009). "Government Expenditure, Governance and Economic. Growth". Journal of Comparative Economic Studies. Vol. 51 (3):401-418. Retrieved from (http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/pal/ces;jsessionid=q1g81gkzfvms.alice).

Dilts, D. A. (2006). Introduction to Macroeconomics. Indiana – Purdue University.

Doepke, M. Lehnert, A. & Sellgreen, A. (2001). Macroeconomics. University of California, Los Angeles.

Ekanem, O. T. & Iyoha, M. A. (2000). Macroeconomic Theory. Bennin City, March Publishers.

Gbosi, A. N. (2005). "The Dynamics of Managing Chronic Unemployment in Nigeria's Depressed Economy". An Inaugural Lecture Delivered at the University of Port Harcourt, June 2005, No 42.

Gregoriou, A. & Ghosh, S. (2007). "The Impact of Government Expenditure on Growth: Empirical Evidence from Heteogeneous Panel". Retrieved from http://www.brunel.ac.uk/9379/efwps/0701.pdf).

Hailstone, T. (2003). Basic Economics (6th ED) South-Western Publishing Co, Cincinnati, Ohio.

International Monetary Fund (IMF) (2002). "Increasing Public Expenditure: Wagner's Law in OECD Countries. Rome.

Iyoha, M. A. (2000). Macroeconomics. Benin City: Ambik Press.

Jansen, D. W., Deforne, C. D. & Ekelund, R. B. (2008). Intermediate Macroeconomics. UK: Thomson Learning.

Jochumzen, P. (2010). Essentials of Macroeconomics NY: BookBoon.

Joshaphat, P. K. & Olive, M. (2000). "Growth Spending and Economic Growth in Tanzania". CREDIT Research Paper.

Junko, K. & Vitalis, R. (2008). "Impact of Government Expenditure on growth". Retrieved from http://www.junko.org/files/papers/2315.pdf.

Krauth, B. (2004). Macroeconomic Theory. Simon Fraser University.

Kunst, R. M. (2006). Introduction to Macroeconomics. University of Vienna.

Miller, R. L. & Van-Hoose, D. D. (2007). Macroeconomics: Theories, policies and International Applications. South-Western College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Nurudeen, A; and Usman, A. (2010). Government Expenditure and Economic Growth in Nigeria, 1970-2008: A Disaggregated Analysis. Retrived from http://astonjounals.com/manuscrips/Vol2010/BEJ-4 Vol2010.pdf.

O'Sullivan, A. & Sheffrin, S. M. (2004). Macroeconomics: Principles and tools (3rd Ed). New Jersey: Prentice-Hill Inc.

Oloapade, B. C. & Oloapade, D. O. (2010): "The Impact of Government Expenditure on Economic Growth and development in Developing Countries: Nigeria as a Case Study". Retrieved from http://www.ecomod.org/files/papers/1369.pdf..

Peterside, C. S. (2011): Nigeria's Sovereign Wealth Fund (SWF) Act: How much can it Help Secure the Future?" Retrieved from www.nigerisworld.com/sovereighwealthfund.

Ritternberg, L. & Tregarthen, T. (2009) Principles of Macroeconomics Flat World Knowledge.

Schmitt, S. & Uribe, G. M. (2008). International Macroeconomics. Duke University.

Taiwo, M. & Abayomi, T. (2011). "Government Expenditure and Economic Development: Empirical Evidence from Nigeria". European Journal of Business and Management. 3(9), 15-23.

Thirlwall, A. P. (2006). Growth and Development: with Special Reference to Developing Economies. New York: Polgrave Macmillan.

APPENDIX

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ON GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE AND GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT IN NIGERIA, 1984-2014 (Hypothesis three)

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the estimate
1	.988[a]	.976	.974	1.40464E6

- Predictors: (Constant), govt_recurr_exp, capital_exp

ANOVA[b]

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	2.213E15	2	1.106E15	560.790	.000[a]
Residual	5.524E13	28	1.973E12		
Total	2.268E15	30			

- Predictors: (Constant), govt_recurr_exp, capital_exp
- Dependent Variable: real_gdp

Coefficients[a]

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (constant)	-341983.304	330264.014		-1.035	.309
Capital_exp	6.240	1.990	.210	3.136	.004

Govt_recurr_exp	8.948	.848	.773	10.555	.000

- Dependent Variable: real_gdp

Appendix

RAW DATA ON GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA: 1984-2014

Year	Govt. Capital Expenditure (#'Million)[a]	Govt. Recurrent expenditure (#'Million)[a]	Real GDP (#'Million)[b]	Per Capita Income (#'Million)[a]	Inflation Rate (%)[a]
1984	10,163.40	4,805.20	49,632.32	45,234.96	9.97
1985	6,567.00	4,846.70	47,619.66	53,154.22	20.55
1986	6,417.20	5,506.00	49,069.28	51,190.58	5.88
1987	4,885.70	4,750.80	53,107.38	47,326.60	22.22
1988	4,100.10	5,827.50	59,266.53	45,137.91	40.91
1989	5,464.70	7,576.40	67,908.55	47,563.22	3.23
1990	8,526.80	7,696.90	69,146.99	42,187.77	6.25
1991	6,372.50	15,646.20	105,222.84	36,583.81	11.77
1992	8,340.10	19,409.40	139,085.30	38,218.17	34.21
1993	15,034.10	25,994.20	216,797.54	39,528.87	49.02
1994	24,048.60	36,219.60	267,549.99	43,315.58	7.90
1995	28,340.90	38,243.50	312,139.74	41,844.96	12.20
1996	39,763.30	53,034.10	532,613.83	40,900,54	44.57
1997	64,501.80	136,727.10	683,869.79	40,363.85	57.14
1998	70,918.30	89,974.90	899,863.22	39,907.96	57.42
1999	121,138.30	127,629.80	1,933,211.55	38,719.38	72.73
2000	212,926.30	124,491.30	2,702,719.13	39,563.79	29.30
2001	269,651.70	158,563.50	2,801,972.58	39,582.83	10.67
2002	309,015.60	178,097.80	2,708,430.86	39,568.51	7.86
2003	498,027.60	449,662.40	3,194,014.97	38,691.06	6.62
2004	239,450.90	461,600.00	4,582,127.29	39,657.00	6.94
2005	438,696.50	579,300.00	4,725,086.00	41,745.54	18.87
2006	321,378.10	696,800.00	6,912,381.25	49,230.81	12.88

2007	241,688.30	984,300.00	8,487,031.57	52,863.81	14.03
2008	351,300.00	1,032,700.00	11,411,066.91	56,893.28	15.00
2009	519,500.00	1,223,700,00	14,572,239.12	58,354.86	17.86
2010	552,385.80	1,290,201.90	18,564,594.73	60,318.82	8.22
2011	759,323.00	1,589,270.00	20,657,317.67	62,797.15	5.41
2012	960,900.00	1,919,300,00	24,296,329.29	64,773.45	11.58
2013	1,152,796.60	1,964,216.00	24,794,238.66	67,427.29	12.54
2014	883,870.00	2,961,850.00	29,205,782.96	71,131.20	13.72

SOURCES: CBN Statistical Bulletin for various years; and World bank data base and Adaptation from several authors.