*Lapai Journal of Economics; Volume 8, No.1; 2024*
*Print ISSN: 2659-028X*
*Online ISSN: 2659-0271*
*DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/lje.v8i1.10*
*Published by Department of Economics, IBB University Lapai, Niger State, Nigeria*

# Impact of revenue on budget implementation in Nigeria: an Appraisal of FCTA

Bappayo Masu-Gombe *[1] & Abdullahi Mohammed Alkali [2]

[1] Department of Economics, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Abuja
[2] Department of Finance and Accounts, FCDA, Abuja
*Correspondence Email: bappayomasu@gmail.com

**Abstract**

*The study examines the impact of Revenue on Budget Implementation in Nigeria with particular reference to Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA). The data was obtained from secondary sources. The variables studied were Actual Total Expenditure as dependent variable while Actual Recurrent Revenue Receipt and Actual Capital Receipt as independent variables. The methodology employed was OLS regression model. The Result suggests that, the Actual Recurrent Revenue Receipt has a positive and significant impact on Budget Implementation. On the other hand, Actual Capital Receipt had a positive but insignificant impact on Budget Implementation. The researcher concludes that Actual Recurrent Revenue Receipt and Actual Capital Receipt have positive impact on Budget Implementation; however, bureaucratic bottleneck militates against budget implementation efficiency. In view of that, the study recommends that, there is need for increase in capital grants to enhance capital receipts in order to finance capital projects. FCTA should improve on its revenue collection by exploring other sources of Internally Generated Revenue (IGR) like Property Taxes on unoccupied estates in the city so as to boost performance in revenue collection and improve on collection of water bills etc. Relying on the existing tax base, FCTA can maximize on the collection of taxable (withholding tax etc.) and vatable items on goods, supplies and services through proper inspection of taxable and valuable items before payment to all and sundry. There is also the need for digitization of the budget system, incentives and adequate training to serve as motivation, improve capacity, collection of revenues, enhance the budget preparation exercise and implementation, as well as to guard against all sorts of behaviors.*

**Keywords:** Revenue, Budget Implementation, FCTA, Nigeria

**JEL Classification**: H71, H72

## 1. Introduction

The importance of revenue to budget implementation cannot be over emphasised, this is because, revenue is the major source of financing government expenditure through budget implementation around the globe. This factor made it an indispensable element of government resources for addressing macroeconomic needs and the challenges of fiscal responsibilities. To this effect, the quantum of revenue is the major if not the only determining factor of government efficiency in discharging its responsibility in every society. The higher the revenue generated, the greater the capabilities of the government to discharge primary and secondary responsibilities through efficient budget implementation, vise vasa. Most of the underdeveloped and developing economies have problem of lower revenue, which creates difficulties in budget implementation as well as compel them to borrow money nationally and internationally in order to bridge the gap between planned budget and its implementation. In fact, it is the major factor that leads to their current debt burden that has become overwhelming and serious problem that leads to their persistent budget deficit, unbearable debt servicing, inability of debt repayment and retardant economic growth and development. Macroeconomic policies geared toward exploiting potential GDP, as against our practice in Nigeria is the most reliable means of creating sustainable sources of revenue generation. This should have been the hallmark of the macroeconomic policies of developing nations, that may consequently spur economic growth and development, not unproductive debt on infrastructural development that are adding fiscal burden to the countries. Thus, public sector revenues are inflows of monies that increase the Treasury's funds without attracting any debt obligations while Public receipts involve government revenues and borrowings. Borrowings arises because in most cases expenditures are more than revenues (Anyanwu, 1997). In other words, the most significant method in which governments acquire the resource to finance their expenditure or public spending is through taxation but the budget hardly balances for one, due to the urge to accelerate capital spending to a policy of economic stabilization. In view of that, governments may resort to borrowing (Kay, 1997). Another important thing to be noted here, apart from the quantum of revenue, is the issue of how the revenue is being efficiently utilised to actualise government planned expenditure through viable and effective budget implementation. Budget implementation is a phase in the budget process and refers to the execution of the budget (SEEDS, 2005). Therefore, budget implementation becomes evident with the actualization of the budget. Challenges are however encountered in the structure, process and approach of budget. The main emphasis was on developing an adequate system of expenditure control (Schick, 1966). According to Premchand (1989) the problem of budget in the developed economies such as US and UK in the 1920s could be traced to the undue interference from the Central Agencies in the case of UK while in the case of US the problem was the difficulty with the legislature formulating a budget which is their sole responsibility.

In the Nigerian context, budget formulation and implementation are the responsibilities of executive, legislatives and government agencies. To this effect, Federal Capital Territory is one of the government agencies that are charged with the responsibility of administion, infrastructural development and maintaining law and order in the Seed of Government that was moved from Lagos to Abuja in 12$^{th}$ December, 1991. Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA) was created on February 3, 1976 to serve as the new capital of NIGERIA based on the recommendation of the Aguda Committee. Consequent to that, FCDA emerged via Decree No 6 now FCT Act 1990 as mandated with the responsibility of planning and developing the city. The master plan was approved in 1979. Like any other agency, FCTA is mandated by law to collect revenue, plan budget and implement it accordingly. In Nigeria, over the years, Federal Government's revenue and expenditure projections have both exhibited an increasing trend amidst some little fluctuations; however actual revenue collections and expenditure utilization have lagged behind these estimates. This scenario has always puzzled our minds. What actually is the problem? This brings forth the question of budget implementation and the need to investigate the relationship.Moreover, overtime, government has established institutions, systems, processes, legal framework and employed competent personnel to handle budget implementation efficiently. Issue of revenue and budget implementation are core issues in the study of public finance at all level of learning and macroeconomic policies particularly the fiscal policy. In view of that, the study will be of immense importance for its contribution to knowledge for having confirmed the previous researches done and arrived at new findings that are useful to the academic environment and otherwise. Surely, the research provided a basis for further research in the area. In addition to that, the research will benefit government, scholars, international organizations and policy makers in the area of public finance and economic development since it will contribute to a sound basis for policy actions.

## 2. Literature Review

*Concept of public Revenue and Expenditure*

The public sector revenues are inflows of monies that increase the Treasury's funds without attracting any debt obligations while Public receipts involve government revenues and borrowings. Borrowings arise because in most cases expenditures are more than revenues (Anyanwu, 1997). In other words, the most significant method in which governments acquire the resource to finance their expenditure or public spending is through taxation but the budget hardly balances for one, due to the urge to accelerate capital spending to a policy of economic stabilization so governments may resort to borrowing (Kay, 1997). Revenue is categorized into Direct Taxes and Indirect Taxes and Non-Tax Revenue. Direct taxes are paid directly to the government, they are taxes charged on Income and wealth, their incidence cannot be shifted, burden is upon whom the tax is levied, while Indirect taxes are paid indirectly, they are taxes charged on expenditure, their incidence can be shifted, burden is passed on to some others in the form of higher prices. It is a tax charged on outlay (expenditure). It is called outlay tax and made up of Custom Duties that is Import Duty and Export Duty, excise duty, Value Added Tax (VAT), Tax on Pump Price of Petroleum Products (Mbanefoh, 1989; Grant, 1994; States Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy Manual, 2005). Non-Tax Revenue include Interest and Repayment, Mining (Royalties & Rent), Miscellaneous Revenue, Licenses, Fees, Earnings and Sales- Earnings from Oil Sales, Rent on Government Property. This was the structure before 1984 in Nigeria (Anyanwu, 1997). In 1959, direct taxes accounted for 12.8% and indirect taxes accounted for 65% and 72% in 1961 (Mbanefoh, 1989). Direct taxes accounted for in between 72% and 84.7% between 2003-2008 (Nwosu, 2010).

Public expenditure is further categorized into recurrent and capital expenditure. Recurrent expenditure can be broken down into Overhead Costs and Personnel Costs or an alternative categorization is into compositions consisting of Administration (general administration, defence, internal security); Economic services (agriculture, construction, transport and communications) and others; Social and community services (education, health, and others);

Transfers (public debt charges or interests for both internal and external debts, pensions and gratuities, and others such as transfer to Contingency Fund, net depreciation on the revaluation of investments and extra budgetary expenditures). The recurrent component of the budget is divided into recurrent non-debt expenditure or Ministry, Department, Agency (MDA) expenditure, debt service and statutory transfers (Effiom and Edet, 2019, Smith, 2015). Statutory Transfers are compulsory payments backed by law made on a yearly basis to some bodies like National Judicial Council (NJC), National Assembly (NASS), Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) etc., debt service are repayments of principal and interest on government borrowings while MDA expenditures are personnel costs, overhead costs and capital expenditures (Smith, 2015). Capital expenditure is composed of Administration (general administration, defence, internal security); Economic Services (agriculture and natural resources, manufacturing, mining and quarrying, transport and communications, special projects; and others; Social and community services (education, health, housing, and others); Transfers (financial obligation, capital repayment for internal and external loan, outstanding domestic liabilities, special projects, loans to parastatals and government-owned companies, loans on-lent to states, and others).

*Concept of budget*

From the historical perspective, the word budget has its roots from the old French “bougette”, diminutive of “boulge”, a purse (Buxton, 1925). It is derived from the old French bougette which means little bag (Kay, 1997) or a leather bag or a wallet (Jhingan, 1997) as it was customary for the chancellor of the Exchequer to prepare and package his yearly financial proposals or estimate divided into the consolidated fund and supply services in a leather bag to the House of Commons and when he makes his financial statement, he is said to open his budget (receptacle of documents).The term budget refers to the content of a package and it is termed a budget because it brings together all the government’s tax and spending plans (Black, 2002). Generally speaking, a budget is defined as an annual statement of the government’s planned expenditure and revenue or receipts for the following year (Buxton,1925; Britannica, 1997; Black, 2002; Pearce, 1992; Webster, 2004; Hicks, 1965; Jhingan, 1997, Anyanwu, 1997; Samuelson, and Golit, 2011). In principle, it is accompanied by a statement of the actual receipts and revenues of the previous year (Black, 2002; Buxton, 1925; Hicks, 1965 and Jhingan, 1997) together with the realized surplus or deficiency followed by a detail of the expenditures of the coming year, the “ways and means” of financing the expenditure, the estimates of revenue and the comparison between the expenditure and revenue which shows the surplus or deficit (Buxton, 1925). Budget has approaches such as Zero-base budgeting (ZBB), according Black, (2003), defines it as the proposal that the budgets of government and other organizations be designed starting from first principles, defining the aims of the organization and adopting the best method of achieving them. It is apriori planning. Activity-Based Budgeting (ABB) is the analysis of all the costs, and revenues relating to one Activity: Capital, Staff Recurrent, Other Recurrent and Revenues. This is done so as to calculate the full unit-costs of that activity (SEEDS Manual, 2005). Output budgeting, is an accounting system that categorizes costs based on output instead of inputs purchased. He cites an example of a conventional police budget that allocates costs to salaries, raw materials, equipment etc. whereas an output budget uses budget headings such as ‘crime prevention’, ‘crime detection’, ‘traffic control’. The aim he states is to improve decision making in organizations in which expenditures are now classified by objectives instead of departments. Another name for it is Programme Budgeting or Planning Programming Budgeting System (PPBS) most especially when difficulties are encountered in identifying the final output and so costs are allocated based on programmes or policies (Pearce 1992). Outcome budgeting is a budget system that focuses on the outcomes of the funded activity'. Some authors referred to it as an extension of program budgeting that is the allocation of organizational costs to major programs in order to derive unit costs per outcome but not a subset of performance budgeting since its focus is outcome, performance, transparency and communication and the target audience is external. It is about making government programs transparent and communicating information about these programs to stakeholders.\

*Empirical Review on Revenue and Budget Implementation*

Eghe and Paul (2015); Effiom and Edet (2019) associate the challenges of budget implementation to shortfall in revenue and non-remittance of a greater portion of the revenue respectively. The shortfall in revenue is as a result of the crisis in the Niger Delta which affect production and hence oil revenue. This buttress the position of Mr Festus Okotie Eboh when he stated that smuggling was also a challenge as it affected revenue inflows as mentioned in his 1961, 1962 budget speeches (Ogunyemi, 2017). Tax evasion was a constraint as noted in his 1958 budget and tax evasion and avoidance were constraints to the 1962 budget. Distortions in oil production due to the situation in the Niger Delta were challenges to the 2005 and 2006 budget (Obasanjo, 2007). Obadan (2010) points out that Federal Capital Territory Capital Budget Performance in November, 2008 was 68.52%. It rose to 75.99% in December, 2008 and came down to 45.75% in December, 2009. He attributes that to underperformance of revenue receipts of both oil and non-oil sectors but the shortfall was rectified. President Muhammadu Buhari noted that low oil prices in the first quarter of 2016 and disruptions in crude oil production which affected inflows of projected revenue were major challenges to the implementation of the 2016 Budget (Budget Speech, 2017). The 1960 Stability Budget paid attention to expansion of basic infrastructure out of its ten point's budget policy (Asiodu, 2010) but the problem remained lack of finance (Ogunyemi, 2017). Mbindyo (2010) is neutral on lack of financial resources being a challenge.

Furthermore, Effiom and Edet (2019); Eghe and Paul (2015), Ugoh and Ukpere (2009), Agba (1986), Mbindyo (2010); and Kazeem, Bwala and Dung (2019) all agree that corruption is another factor that poses a threat to budget implementation. Gamgum and Ezekiel (2017) view budget padding as a challenge. Oluchi and Chukwudi (2017); and Onaolapo and Oladipupo (2013) adduce the factor affecting budget implementation to procedural indiscipline as was seen in the case of missing budget of 2016 and internal factors that have to do with lack of adherence to budget rules and regulation respectively. Sila (2016) views employee behavioural factor affecting budget implementation and Mbindyo (2010) mentions lack of staff motivation as another challenge impinging upon budget preparation. Feese (2016) adds that lack of incentive Based Rewards and Sanctions Systems- Performance vs nonperformance (for example, funding based on Monitoring and Evaluation results) are challenges to monitoring budget implementation.

Ganecho (2013) adds that contractors' capacity, diverting funds and auditing system are the major causes affecting budget utilization but staff capacity, inland revenue collection are lesser factors. Rotich and Ngahu (2015) further add that tax compliance affects budget utilization positively while VAT policy, government policy and inflation affects budget utilization negatively. In other words, complexity of the tax system affects budget utilization thereby retarding economic development. Mburu (2013) finds that the challenges to public budgeting remain lack of fiscal discipline, lack of prioritization of projects, leakage of allocated resources to target projects and improper implementation monitoring. Obara (2013) sees the way out of the adverse continuous budgeting performance through Value for Money Audit, Due Process and Cost Audit. Feese (2016) laments that capital budget implementation has only averaged 50% since 1999 due to other challenges like non inclusive bottom up participatory approach, bureaucratic red tape, procurement and capacity constraints, poor coordination and collaboration among tiers of government, weak plan-budget link. Ekpo (2010) points out that some Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) like FCDA, Aviation and Niger Delta performed below overall average and this is attributed to challenges that are both systematic and organizational. Systemic include weak budget framework, lack of proper accounting, lack of proper audit and incremental budgeting. Organizational challenges include lack of political will, cumbersome procurement procedures, lack of feasibility studies, uncertainty in actual warrant releases for capital budget, inaccurate revenue forecast. Ajimokunola, Oludowole, Okonjo & Green (2004) see no link between the capital and recurrent budget. Agba (1986) links among others the factors that inhibits the agencies operations to a general lack of management and administrative autonomy and organizational instability.

*Theoretical Framework*

The Tax-Spend hypothesis developed by Buchanan and Wagner (1978) argue that a negative causal relationship exist between government revenue and expenditure. What Buchanan and Wagner mean is that the increase in government revenues has the tendency of making tax-payers become unsatisfied with the consequential increase in government expenditure because they are wary of the burden of the increase in tax that they will bear while Friedman (1978) maintains that there is a positive causal relationship between government revenue and expenditure. In essence, government revenue is the sole determinant of its expenditure and this signifies a unidirectional causality running from revenues to expenditure that is, as government revenues increase, expenditure also increases leading to budget deficits. On the other hand, the Spend-and-Tax Hypothesis was stated by Peacock and Wiseman (1979). Their argument was that government determines its expenditures before its revenues, that is, economic or political crisis lead to temporary increases in expenditures which in turn leads to increase in taxes and permanent increases in government revenues. There is a unidirectional causality running from government expenditure to revenues. Lojanica (2015) finds a unidirectional causality from government expenditure to government revenue in Serbia. The study bases the analysis most especially on the Principal-Agent Theory and Economic Theory of Bureaucracy to understand the challenges.

**3, Methodology**

The data was obtained from secondary sources comprising of recurrent revenue such as statutory allocation, VAT, IGR etc. and capital receipts for FCTA obtained from FCTA National and Statutory Appropriation Act and; Amendment Act (2009-2018)..

$ATE_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 ARRR_t + \beta_2 ACR_t + ut$ ………………………………………………….… 1

Where $ATE_t$ = Actual Total Expenditure at time t. $ATE_t$ comprised of the total actual recurrent expenditure made up of overhead costs and personnel costs; and capital expenditure. $ARRR_t$ = Actual Recurrent Revenue Receipt at time t. $ARRR_t$comprised of the total actual receipt of recurrent revenue items such as Statutory Allocation, VAT, Excess Crude, IGR, Miscellaneous revenue etc. $ACR_t$ = Actual Capital Receipt at time t. ACR comprised of the total actual capital receipts such as United Nation Development Assistance Fund (UNDAF) Counter Part-Funds, foreign funds accruable to Abuja Geographic Information System (AGIS), loan from capital market to finance special projects, Debt Management Office (DMO) financing of Airport and Outer Northern Express Way (ONEX) and Chinese loan for railway project. u is Random Variable, $\beta_0$, $\beta_1$, $\beta_2$ = the parameter estimators. Such that,

$\partial ATE_t/\partial ARRR_t = \beta_1 > 0$ ………………………………………………………………….. 2

$\partial ATE_t/\partial ACR_t = \beta_1 > 0$ ………………………………………………………….……… 3

$ATE_t$ is dependent on $ARRR_t$ and $ACR_t$. Therefore, we expect that increase in $ARRR_t$ and $ACR_t$ will result to increases in government expenditure. So, we expect the equations to have positive signs.

**4. Result**

Table 1: distribution of Descriptive Statistics Result on the effect of revenue collection performance on budget implementation

| (One-sample z-test / Two-tailed test (Q1REV) | 95% confidence interval on the mean |
|---|---|
| [ 3.765, | 4.137 ] |
| Difference | 0.951 |
| z (Observed value) | 10.024 |
| \|z\| (Critical value) | 1.960 |
| p-value (Two-tailed) | <0.0001 |
| Alpha | 0.05 |

*Source: Author's Computation*

From the result, based on the hypothesi, as the computed p-value is lower than the significance level alpha=0.05, one should reject the null hypothesis $H_0$,.

$z^* = 10.02$ ………………………………………………………………………….…. 4

Since the theoretical (tabular) value of z at the 5 percent level of significance is 1.96

$z^* > z$ (10.02 > 1.96). We reject that the true value of the population mean $\mu=3$ which reveals that there is a statistically significant relationship between poor performance in revenue collection and budget implementation.

*Impact of Revenue on the Budget Implementation in Federal Capital Territory Administration*

Under this subheading, the results of regression analysis and its inferential statistics were presented and analyzed. The result demonstrates the relationship between the dependent variable and independent variables to establish the impact of revenue on the budget implementation in FCTA.

Table 2: *Distribution of Inferential Statistics Results of Revenue on Budget Implementation of Federal Capital Territory Administration*

| Independent Variables | Coefficient | Significance |
|---|---|---|
| (Constant) | -36.493 | 0.241 |
| ARRR | 1.304 | 0 |
| ACR | 0.422 | 0.075 |
| R | 0.92 | |
| $R^2$ | 0.847 | |
| Adj $R^2$ | 0.803 | |
| F stat | 19.373 | |

*Source: Author's Computation*

*Inferential Statistics Result*

The reult shows that the coefficient of ARRR is 1.304 and that of ACR is 0.422 and; a constant negative term of 36.493. A unit change in ARRR would lead to a 1.304 unit change in ATE in the positive direction. While a unit change in ACR would lead to a 0.422 change in ATE in the positive direction. The result of Table 4.20 shows that the dependent variable ATE is associated with the independent variables ARRR and ACR to the tune of 92% as shown by the R value of 0.920. The result reveals that 84.7% of the changes in budget implementation as measured by Actual Total Expenditure (ATE) are explained by the two independent variables of revenue as revealed by an $R^2$ value = 0.847. The remaining 15.3% is not explained by the model. The F statistics calculated which equals 19.373 is significant with a p-value of 0.001 is greater than the F statistics tabulated which equals 5.32 at 5% level of significance. This shows that for the test of overall significance, the regression is significant. The value of DW statistic was 1.716 which is within the neighbourhood of 2 which rules out the possibility of autocorrelation. In other words, the error term in one-time period is not positively correlated with the error term in the previous period.

The variable ARRR is significant at 5% level of significance as shown by the p-value = 0.000 < 0.05 and the t statistic, since $t^* = 6.18 > t_{0.025}$, the null hypothesis is rejected, that is there is no significant relationship between ARRR and budget implementation and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The variable ACR is not significant at 5% level of significance as shown by a p-value = 0.075 > p-value of 0.05 and the t statistics $t^* = 2.09 < t_{0.025}$, we accept the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between ACR and budget implementation. Equation shows that taking all factors constant at zero, budget implementation will be -36.493. This constant value is the average value of budget implementation in the absence of revenue. Keeping the other independent variable ACR and error term at zero, a unit increase in ARRR result into 1.304 increase in expenditure (budget implementation) and estimated significant value is 0.000. Holding the other variable ARRR and the error term constant, a unit increase in ACR result into 0.422 increase in expenditure (budget implementation). Both ARRR and ACR have positive relationship with ATE.

The result for the test for heteroscedasticity after regressing the squared residual on the explanatory variables revealed that the F statistic value of 3.066 has a p-value of 0.111 which is greater than the p-value of 0.05 on the basis of which the null hypothesis $H_0$: that the data is homoscedastic is accepted. In other words, the variance of the error term is constant for all observations.

*Discussion of Findings*

Federal Capital Territory Administration regression result of Budget Implementation revealed that the Actual Recurrent Revenue Receipt and Actual Capital Receipt jointly impacted positively and significantly on Actual Total Expenditure but individually only Actual Recurrent Revenue Receipt impacted positively and significantly on the Actual Total Expenditure. This is in agreement with the findings of Chukwunweike and Ogomegbunam (2014) who established a positive significant relationship between Total Actual Expenditure as dependent variable and Actual Revenue but together with Actual Recurrent Expenditure and Actual Capital Expenditure as additional independent variables. Our findings suggest that Actual Recurrent Revenue Receipt is a very strong factor in explaining the changes to Actual Total Expenditure or rather in explaining the increase in Actual Total Expenditure. In other words, budget implementation heavily depends on Actual Recurrent Revenue Receipt.

**5. Conclusion and Recommendations**

The factors that affect budget implementation in FCTA are poor performance in revenue collection has statistically significant effect on budget implementation in FCTA. The inferential Statistics result reveals that, Actual Recurrent Receipt (ARRR) of FCTA has a positive significant relationship with budget implementation (ATE) while Actual Capital Receipt (ACR) of FCTA has a positive insignificant relationship with budget implementation (ATE). Based on the above findings, the researcher arrived at the conclusion that Revenue has impacted positively on Budget Implementation. However, poor performance in its collection and bureaucratic bottleneck impeded budget implementation efficiency.

In view of the above findings and conclusion, the study recommends that there is need for increase in capital grants to improve capital receipts in order to help finance capital projects. Similarly, FCTA should improve on its revenue collection by exploring other sources of Internally Generated Revenue (IGR) like Property Taxes on unoccupied estates in the city so as to boost performance in revenue collection and improve on collection of water bills etc. Relying on the existing tax base, FCTA can maximize on the collection of taxable (withholding tax etc.) and vatable items on goods, supplies and services through proper inspection of taxable and vatable items before payment to all and sundry. There is need to provide incentives and motivation to staff in order to improve performance, collection of revenues, enhance the budget preparation exercise and implementation and to guard against all sorts of behaviours.

**Reference**

Agba, E. C. G. (1986). *A study of problems in new urban development and construction: The case of Abuja. The New Federal Capital of Nigeria*. Doctoral Thesis. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Ajimokunola, E., Oludowole, E., Okonjo, P. & Green, T. (2004). *Assessment of financial status of the Ministry of Federal Capital Territory, Abuja, SLGP Consultants Report Number 306*, DFID CNTR: 00 0512A, March 2004.

Anyanwu, J. C. (1993). Fiscal Policy. In J. C. Anyanwu,*Monetary Economics: Theory, policy and institutions, Fiscal Policy*,ch. 4, pp. 62-63. Hybrid Publishers Ltd.

Anyanwu, J. C. (1997). *Nigerian Public Finance*,1st ed.,ch. 7, pp. 95-96& 99, ch. 13, pp. 249 - 252. Joanee Educational Publishers Ltd.

Asiodu, P. C. (2010). *Opening Remark*. One-Day National Policy Seminar on 2010 Federal Government Budget at Bankers House, Lagos. NES & CIBN.

Begg, D., Stanley, F. and Dornbusch, R. (2000). *Economics*, 6th ed., part 4, pp. 364-365. Mc Graw Hill Publishing Co.

Black, J. (2003). *Oxford Dictionary of Economics*,2nd ed., pp. 40-41, 367& 338. Oxford University Press.

Britannica (1997). *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica. Micropaedia*,15th ed., Vol. 5, p. 394, Vol. 7, pp. 673-676, Vol. 10, pp. 68-70 &p. 71. Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc.

Brittain, H. (1959). *The British Budgetary System*, 1st ed., pp. 13-15, pp. 20,ch. 2, pp. 30-31. George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Buxton, S. C. (1925). Budget. In Higgs H. *Palgrave's Dictionary of Political Economy.* Vol. 1, pp. 185. Macmillan and Co. Ltd.

Central Bank of Nigeria Annual Report (2015). *Fiscal policy and government finance*, ch. 5, pp. 110.

Central Bank of Nigeria Annual Economic Report (2018). *Fiscal policy and government finance*, ch. 5, pp. 133-136.

Chukwunweike, E. V. & Ogomegbunam, 2014). Application of Budgeting Techniques in Fiscal Institutions in Nigeria. *Developing Country Studies*, *4*(6). www.iiste.org.

Effiom, L. & Edet, S. (2019). Challenges to Capital Budget implementation in Nigeria. African Research Review, *International Multi-Disciplinary Journal, Ethiopia AFRREV*, *13*(3), S/N 55.http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/afrrev.v13:3.15.

Eghe, E. V. & Paul, C. (2015). Budget and implementation of Public Policy in Nigeria. *British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade*, 1093), 1-8. http://doi.org/10.9734/BJEMT/2015/19707

Ekpo, A. H. (2009, June). *Review of 2009 Federal Budget*. Technical session at a One-Day National Policy Seminar on 2010 Federal Government Budget at Bankers House, Lagos. NES & CIBN.

Federal Republic of Nigeria Approved Budget (2012).

Federal Republic of Nigeria, Fourth National Development Plan 1981-85, Vol II, Project Summary. National Planning Office, Federal Ministry of National Planning, Lagos.

Federal Inland Revenue Service (2010). http://www.firs.gov.ng/business.corporations.aspx, http://www.firs.gov.ng/value-added-tax.aspx, http://www.firs.gov.ng/companies-income-tax.aspx http://www.firs.gov.ng/petroleum-profits-tax.aspx, http://www.firs.gov.ng/information-technology-development-levy.aspx,.

Feese, B. T. (2016, August). *Budget implementation and monitoring and effective control*. Paper presentation at a training of government personnel on integrated and coordinated procurement processes and monitoring budget implementation at Southern Sun, Ikoyi. *ICPC & UNDP*.

Gamgum W. A. A. & Ezekiel, I. D. (2017). Public Administration: The challenges of falling oil price, budget padding and implementation in Nigeria. *Journal of Public Administration and Social Welfare Research*, 2(2), 65-79. www.iiardpub.org

Ganecho A. G. (2018). Challenges and prospects of budget preparation and utilization: a study in selected finance bureau of Kaffa Zone. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 9(21), 27-34. ISSN 2222-2847.

Ganti, S. & Kolluri, B. R. (1979). Wagner's law of Public Expenditure: Some efficient results

Golit, P. D. (2011). The Budget Process, Economic Development and the Need for Legislative Reforms in Nigeria. *Selected Papers Presented at the 52nd NES Annual Conference 2011 on Planning and the Transformation of the Nigerian Economy. Nigeria*: Nerves.

Government Notice No. 1205 official Gazette No. 55, Vol. 66 (1979).

Hicks, U. K. (1965). Budgeting and the control of expenditure. In U. K. Hicks, *Development Finance: Planning and Control*, ch. 8, pp. 158-161.Oxford University Press.

Jhingan, M. L. (1997). *Microeconomic Theory*, 5th ed., ch. 66, pp. 770. Vrinda Publications (P) Ltd.

Kay, J. A. (1997). Government Finance. In J. A. Kay. *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica, Macropaedia*, 15th ed.Vol 20, pp. 148 - 149. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.

Kazeem, N., Bwala, N. J. and Dung, S. Y. (2019). Constraints to budget implementation in Nigeria. *World Journal of Innovative Research (WJIR), 7(4*), 74-80.https://doi.org/10.31871/WJIR.7.4.31

Koutsoyiannis, A. (2001), Elements of statistical inference. In A. Koutsoyiannis, *Theory of econometrics*, 2nd ed., pp. 543-568. Palgrave.

Leruth, L. and Paul, E. (2007). A Principal-Agent Theory Approach to Public Expenditure Management Systems in Developing Countries.*OECD Journal on Budgeting, 7*(3), 4-7. ISSN 1608-7143.

Mbanefoh, G. F. (1989). Public Finance. In M. O. Kayode and Y. B. Usman, *Nigeria since independence: The first 25 years, the economy,* 1st ed.Vol 2, ch. 8, pp. 207-208. Heinemann Educational Books (Nigeria) Ltd.

Mbindyo, O. M. (2010). *Challenge of budget implementation in Local Authorities in Kenya: A Case Study of Municipal Council of Thika*. Master's Thesis, University of Nairobi.

Mburu, H. K. (2013). Public budgeting, a challenge for development in Africa: Evidence from Kenya. *Kenya Studies Review*, 6(1), 128-143.

Ndianefo, M. (2015, October). Nigeria to adopt Zero Based Budgeting (ZBB). October,12, 2015. https:/ww.cp-africa.com

Nwosu, D. (2010). *Tax structure and economic growth in Nigeria*. Master's thesis. Munich, GRIN Verlag. https://www.grin.com/document/183035.

Obadan, M. I & Ogiogio, G. O. (1995). *Planning and budgeting in Nigeria: Institutional and policy reforms*. NCEMA.

Obadan, M. I. (2010, February). *A review of the 2009 Federal Capital Budget Implementation Experience: issues and way forward*. Paper presented at a participant workshop.

Obadan, M. I. (2016). Strengthening the budget-plan link for inclusive development in Nigeria. Public Lecture Series, No 12, 2016. *Proceedings of the 12th Annual Public Lecture of the*

*Nigerian Economic Society delivered at Central Bank of Nigeria International Training Institute, Abuja* on June 28, 2016.

Obara, C. (2013). Budget preparation and implementation in the Nigerian Public Sector. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting, 4(16),* 50-54. ISSN 2222-2847

Ogunyemi, A. O. (2017). Managing Nigeria's development through the Public Budget: Lessons from the foundations laid by Okotie-Eboh, 1958-1965.*Africa's Public ServiceDelivery & Performance Review*, *5*(1).

Okoroafor, E. N. (2015). Challenges ahead for institutional implementation of Performance-Based Budgeting in the Nigerian Public Sector. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting, 6*(4), 10-19. ISSN 2222-2847

Oluchi, N. L. & Chukwudi, O. R. (2017). Budgeting for Change in the Nigerian Public Sector: A Qualitative Research. *African Research Review, AnInternational Multi-Disciplinary Journal, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia, AFRREV, 11*(4), S/N 48, 7-16. http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/afrrev.v11i4.2

Pearce, D. W. (1992). *Macmillan Dictionary of Modern Economics*, 4th ed., pp.27,45, 46-47, 105, 110, 154, 157, 319, 344, 427, 451-452, 458-459.Palgrave Macmillan.

Premchand, A. (1989). *Government Budgeting and Expenditure Controls. Theory and Practice*, ch. 2, pp. 35-40, ch. 6, p. 176 – 181 &ch. 11, pp. 320-321. IMF.

Samuelson, P. A and Nordhaus, W. D. (2005). Policies for growth and stability. In P. A. Samuelson and W. D. Nordhaus, *Economics*, 18th ed., ch. 14, pp. 710. Tata Mc Graw-Hill Publishing Company Limited.

Schick, A. (1966). The road to PPB: The stages of Budget Reform. In A. Schick, PPBS Symposium, Planning-Programming-Budgetary System: A symposium. *Public Administration Review*. December 1966, p. 243, p. 245.

Schick, A. (2004). Twenty-five years of budgeting reform. *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 4(1), 82-102.

SEEDS Manual, (2005). Public Financial Management. *A Framework Guide for Development Planning. From Strategy to Action*. Appendix 3, pp. 48, 151-152, 155, 172. Nigeria: National Planning Commission.

Statutory Budget, Federal Capital Territory Administration (2018).

Supplement to Official Gazette Extra Ordinary No. 7, Vol. 63, 5th February (1976)- Part A, Federal Capital Territory Decree 1976, A15 – A17.

Ugoh, S. C. and Ukpere (2009). Problems and prospects of budgeting and budget implementation in Local Government System in Nigeria. *African Journal of Business Management, 3*(12), pp. 836-846. http://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM09.301.

Websters (1994). *Dictionary of the English Language* (pp. 1147).

Websters (2004). *The New Webster's Dictionary of the English Language*. International ed., p. 96, 126 & 598. Lexicon Publications, Inc.

Wiseman, J. & Peacock, A. (1961). In J. C. Anyanwu (1993), *Monetary Economics, Theory, Policy and Institutions*.