

Effect of Agricultural Funding on Food Security in Nigeria

Ifeyinwa Elizabeth Nnajeze

Department of Accountancy, Faculty of Management Science

Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Enugu

Email: Ifeyinwa.nnajeze@esut.edu.ng

doi: <https://doi.org/10.37745/ejaf.2013/vol14n11325>

Published February 19, 2026

Citation: Nnajeze I.E. (2026) Effect of Agricultural Funding on Food Security in Nigeria, *European Journal of Agriculture and Forestry Research*, 14(1), pp.13-25

Abstract: *This study examined the effect of government agricultural expenditure on food insecurity in Nigeria, with food inflation used as a proxy for food security. The study adopted an ex post facto research design and relied on annual time series data covering the period 1990 to 2023. Data were sourced from the Central Bank of Nigeria, the National Bureau of Statistics, and the World Development Indicators. The Ordinary Least Squares multiple regression technique was applied to analyse the relationship between government agricultural expenditure, exchange rate, interest rate, inflation rate, and food inflation. The results showed that government agricultural expenditure had a positive but statistically insignificant effect on food inflation at the 5 percent level. Inflation rate was the only variable that had a positive and statistically significant effect on food inflation. The findings indicated that government spending on agriculture, as currently structured and implemented*

Keywords: agricultural funding, food security, government expenditure, food inflation, Nigeria, agricultural finance, public spending, economic development.

INTRODUCTION

Agriculture is the backbone of Nigeria's economy. It employs about 70 percent of the workforce and contributes over 40 percent to the country's gross domestic product (GDP) (USAID, 2022). The sector provides livelihoods for millions of Nigerians, particularly in rural areas, and supplies food for a population of over 200 million people. Despite its importance, agricultural performance in Nigeria remains weak. The sector faces persistent challenges such as poor infrastructure, limited use of modern farming technologies, insecurity, and inadequate public investment. Nigeria continues to spend large amounts on food imports even though it has vast arable land and favourable climatic conditions. Between 2016 and 2019, agricultural imports amounted to ₦3.35 trillion, compared to exports of ₦803 billion (FAO Nigeria). This gap indicates that domestic agricultural production has not been sufficient to meet local food demand. Low government funding has constrained farmers' ability to improve productivity, thereby affecting food availability and prices. This study therefore examines the effect of

government agricultural expenditure on food security in Nigeria, using food inflation as a measure.

Food security has become a major concern in Nigeria due to rising food prices and widespread hunger. In January 2024, food inflation rose to 35.41 percent, from 33.9 percent in December 2023 (NESG, 2024). Rapid increases in food prices have reduced household purchasing power and made basic food items less affordable. The number of food insecure Nigerians increased sharply, reaching about 100 million in the first quarter of 2024, compared to 66.2 million in the same period of 2023 (NESG, 2024). Among this population, 18.6 million people experienced acute hunger, while many households adopted coping strategies such as skipping meals (NESG, 2024). Food insecurity remains more severe in rural areas, where about 89 percent of Nigerians living in extreme poverty reside (ActionAid Nigeria, 2023). Although agriculture has the potential to address food insecurity, its capacity to do so has been weakened by low public investment and structural constraints such as insecurity and climate change.

Government agricultural expenditure is a key instrument for improving agricultural productivity and food security. Public spending on agriculture is expected to support research and development, subsidise farm inputs, strengthen extension services, and provide infrastructure such as irrigation systems, storage facilities, and rural roads. However, government spending on agriculture in Nigeria has remained consistently low. The share of agriculture in the national budget has remained below 2 percent, far below the 10 percent target set under the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) (IFPRI and World Bank, 2008). This low level of expenditure has limited farmers' access to improved seeds, fertilisers, and irrigation facilities, thereby constraining productivity growth and food supply.

Government expenditure on agriculture has also shown little improvement over time. In the 2024 budget, allocation to agriculture was about 1.32 percent of total government expenditure, amounting to approximately ₦363 billion out of ₦27.5 trillion (ActionAid Nigeria, 2023). This pattern has remained largely unchanged over the past seven years, with agricultural allocations fluctuating between 1 and 2 percent of the total budget (ActionAid Nigeria, 2023). In comparison, countries such as Kenya and Brazil allocate about 6 percent and 18 percent of their national budgets to agriculture respectively (IFPRI and World Bank, 2008). Nigeria's low level of agricultural spending has limited the sector's ability to modernise, expand output, and compete effectively, thereby contributing to continued reliance on food imports despite significant domestic potential. Although programmes such as the Anchor Borrowers Programme and the National Agricultural Technology and Innovation Plan were introduced to support the sector, their impact has been constrained by low overall public investment (U.S. Commercial Service, 2023).

The persistent weakness of government agricultural expenditure has implications for food prices and food security. High food inflation, which stood at 35.41 percent in January 2024, indicates that food has become increasingly unaffordable for many Nigerians (NESG, 2024). With about 100 million Nigerians facing food insecurity, the situation has reached a critical level (NESG, 2024). Food inflation provides a useful measure of food security because it reflects the economic access dimension of food availability. This study therefore focuses on

the effect of government agricultural expenditure on food inflation in Nigeria. Agriculture remains central to employment, poverty reduction, and hunger alleviation, but persistently low public investment has limited its contribution to food security (ActionAid Nigeria, 2023). By examining this relationship, the study aims to provide evidence that can guide policymakers in improving the effectiveness of government agricultural spending and strengthening food security outcomes in Nigeria.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Food Inflation

Food inflation refers to the rate at which the prices of food items increase over time, serving as a critical indicator of food security in Nigeria. It directly impacts how affordable food is for the population, particularly for low-income households who spend a large portion of their income on food. In Nigeria, where poverty affects millions, high food inflation can push people into hunger and malnutrition, reducing their ability to access sufficient, nutritious food. For instance, in January 2024, food inflation reached 35.41%, contributing to 100 million Nigerians being food insecure, with 18.6 million facing acute hunger (National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), 2024; Nigerian Economic Summit Group (NESG), 2024). This study uses food inflation as a proxy for food security because it reflects the economic accessibility of food, when prices rise faster than incomes, fewer people can afford enough food, leading to reduced caloric intake and poorer health outcomes. Food inflation is typically measured using the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for food, which tracks the average price changes of a basket of food items like rice, yam, and vegetables over time. By focusing on food inflation, this research aims to understand how funding policies can influence food prices and, consequently, improve food security for Nigerians. However, food inflation is influenced by multiple factors beyond funding, such as insecurity, climate change, and transportation costs, which must be considered when analyzing its relationship with agricultural funding.

Government Agricultural Expenditure

Government agricultural expenditure encompasses all public funds allocated to the agricultural sector in Nigeria, aimed at enhancing productivity and stabilizing food prices. This includes budgetary allocations for agricultural research and development, subsidies for inputs like seeds and fertilizers, support for extension services to train farmers, and investments in infrastructure such as irrigation systems, storage facilities, and rural roads. The purpose of this spending is to increase agricultural output, which can boost food supply and potentially reduce food inflation by making food more available and affordable. For example, funding research can lead to high-yielding, pest-resistant crops, while subsidies lower production costs, encouraging farmers to grow more. Infrastructure improvements reduce post-harvest losses and transportation costs, helping food reach markets at lower prices.

However, Nigeria's government spending on agriculture is notably low. In 2025, the agricultural budget was NGN636.08 billion, only 1.28% of the total NGN49.74 trillion national budget, falling short of the 10% target set by the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), resulting in a funding gap of about NGN4.33 trillion (EnviroNews Nigeria, 2025). This low allocation limits the sector's ability to modernize and meet food demand, especially amidst challenges like insecurity and climate change. Moreover,

inefficiencies in fund utilization (often less than 15% in some quarters) due to corruption, poor planning, or mismanagement, further reduce the impact of this expenditure (EnviroNews Nigeria, 2025); (International Budget Partnership & BudgetIT, 2023). Thus, government agricultural expenditure is a key variable because it represents the public sector's role in supporting agriculture, which can influence food production and food inflation, but its effectiveness depends on proper allocation and management.

Theoretical Framework

This study examined the effect of government agricultural expenditure on food security in Nigeria, with food inflation used as a proxy for food security. The framework was anchored on the High Payoff Input Model and the Theory of Public Investment in Agriculture. These theories explained how public spending on agriculture could influence agricultural productivity, food supply, and food prices. Nigeria experienced persistent food inflation, which reached 35.41 percent in January 2024 (National Bureau of Statistics [NBS], 2024), alongside low public investment in agriculture, which accounted for about 1.28 percent of the national budget (Federal Ministry of Budget and National Planning, 2024). These conditions made the theories relevant, given Nigeria's heavy dependence on agriculture for employment and food supply amid rising food costs.

The High Payoff Input Model, developed by D. Gale Johnson (1961), explained that agricultural productivity increased when farmers adopted modern inputs such as improved seeds, fertilisers, irrigation, and farm machinery. These inputs raised output per hectare and expanded food supply, which could help moderate food prices. Government agricultural expenditure was central to this model because public spending financed agricultural research, input subsidies, and infrastructure that made modern inputs accessible to farmers. Evidence from the Green Revolution showed that public investment in agricultural technology significantly increased food production and reduced food shortages in developing economies (Evenson & Gollin, 2003). In the Nigerian context, low and poorly structured government spending limited farmers' access to high payoff inputs, which constrained productivity growth and contributed to rising food prices.

The Theory of Public Investment in Agriculture, developed by Lele and Meyers (1989), emphasised the role of government expenditure in correcting market failures that hinder agricultural development. According to the theory, public investment in areas such as agricultural research, extension services, irrigation, rural roads, and storage facilities created an enabling environment for increased food production and efficient distribution. These investments reduced production costs, post-harvest losses, and market inefficiencies, which could lower food prices. Empirical studies showed that well targeted public agricultural expenditure improved food availability and reduced-price pressures, especially when spending focused on capital projects rather than recurrent items (Fan et al., 2000; Moguees et al., 2012). In Nigeria, where government agricultural expenditure remained low and was often concentrated on recurrent spending, the theory suggested that limited and poorly allocated public investment weakened the transmission of spending to food supply and prices.

Together, these theories provided a basis for examining the effect of government agricultural expenditure on food inflation in Nigeria. The High Payoff Input Model explained how public

spending could raise productivity through modern inputs, while the Theory of Public Investment in Agriculture explained how government expenditure could improve the broader agricultural environment. The framework supported the study's focus on assessing whether government agricultural expenditure, as implemented in Nigeria, had been effective in influencing food inflation and improving food security outcomes.

Empirical Review

A wide range of studies has explored government expenditure on agricultural output and economic growth in Nigeria and other African countries. Chris et al. (2016) and Egwu (2016) both found a positive and significant relationship between commercial bank credit and agricultural output in Nigeria. Specifically, both studies emphasized the positive roles of the Agricultural Credit Guarantee Scheme Fund and government spending on agriculture. They used Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression and time-series data to demonstrate that increased credit and government intervention significantly support agricultural productivity. Similarly, Nwokoro (2017) and Bada (2017) observed that bank credit positively influenced agricultural output but warned that high interest rates negatively affect productivity. These findings reinforce the argument that affordable credit is crucial for sustaining agricultural growth in Nigeria.

Other researchers have focused on the broader economic implications of agricultural financing. For instance, Ikpore et al. (2016) studied the effect of agriculture financing on rural economic diversification using variables like budget allocation, bank credit, interest rates, and demand deposits. They found that bank credit and demand deposits enhanced diversification, while high interest rates hampered it. In a related study, Nakazi and Sunday (2020) analyzed Uganda's commercial bank agricultural credit, finding that while short-run impacts were minimal, long-run impacts were significantly positive, especially when credit was directed towards production rather than processing or marketing. These findings suggest that strategic and sustained agricultural credit can drive rural transformation and economic diversification over time.

The role of government expenditure on agriculture has been a recurring theme. Jimmy and Guluwa (2021), Chikezie et al. (2020), and Olumba et al. (2021) all established a positive correlation between government agricultural spending and economic growth. However, some studies provided a more nuanced picture. Sebastian et al. (2019) found a negative relationship between government spending and agricultural output, despite a positive impact from bank loans and the index of agricultural production. Alabi and Abu (2020) showed that only capital expenditure (especially in areas like irrigation) had a meaningful, positive effect on agricultural productivity, while recurrent spending had no significant impact. This suggests that the structure and composition of government expenditure, rather than the overall amount, determine its effectiveness.

Beyond Nigeria, studies in countries like Lesotho and South Africa offer further insight. Megbowon et al. (2022) concluded that current patterns of government agricultural spending in Lesotho are insufficient to stimulate meaningful growth, and domestic investment should instead be prioritized. In contrast, Ngobeni and Muchopa (2022) showed that while government expenditure in agriculture does not directly cause increased output, it can lead to higher agricultural production when supported by variables like rainfall and population growth. This

underlines the importance of contextual and environmental factors in shaping the effectiveness of fiscal interventions in agriculture, suggesting that policies must be tailored to local conditions for maximum impact.

Finally, recent studies have emphasized the importance of governance and the broader institutional environment in determining the success of agricultural financing. Agbana and Ebisine (2022) affirmed that both government expenditure and the Agricultural Credit Guarantee Scheme Fund significantly contribute to Nigeria's economic growth, with a 71.3% explanatory power. Similarly, Ogundipe and Adesola (2022) highlighted that government spending on agriculture, education, and health are significant predictors of the standard of living in Nigeria. Dankumo et al. (2023) expanded this view to Sub-Saharan Africa, concluding that good governance is essential for maximizing the poverty-reducing effects of government expenditure. These findings collectively point to a need for well-targeted, well-managed, and strategically structured credit and expenditure frameworks, backed by strong governance, to effectively boost agricultural productivity and economic development across Africa.

Gap in Empirical Review

Most empirical studies on agriculture and food security in Nigeria focused on the relationship between government agricultural expenditure and agricultural output or overall economic growth, with limited attention given to food inflation as a direct measure of food security. Many studies assumed that increased public spending on agriculture would automatically translate into improved food availability and reduced poverty, without examining whether such spending influenced food prices and affordability. In addition, several studies concentrated on the size of government expenditure rather than its effectiveness, composition, or transmission to food markets. Existing evidence also relied largely on older datasets or shorter time periods, which did not capture recent conditions characterised by persistent inflation, climate shocks, insecurity, and rising food prices in Nigeria. As a result, empirical evidence on the effect of government agricultural expenditure on food inflation remained limited. This study addressed this gap by focusing specifically on government agricultural expenditure and examining its effect on food inflation using more recent time series data, thereby providing clearer evidence on whether public spending on agriculture improved food affordability and food security outcomes in Nigeria.

METHODOLOGY

The current study used an ex-post-facto research design. This means the researcher did not control or manipulate the independent variables because the events had already taken place. This type of design helps other researchers repeat the same process to confirm or question the findings, as noted by Tama and Haliba (2022). The study was carried out in Nigeria and focused on the effect of agricultural funding on food security, using food inflation as the measure. The independent variables are government agricultural expenditure and commercial bank loans to the agricultural sector. The study relied on secondary data collected from sources such as the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN), National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), and World Development Indicators of the World Bank. Other materials like academic journals, newspapers, and magazines were also reviewed. Time series data covering a specific period were gathered for analysis.

Model Specification

The functional relationship showing how agricultural funding affects food inflation can be specified following Gujarati and Porter (2009) as:

$$FI = f(\text{GAE}) \quad - \quad - \quad - \quad - \quad \text{[Equation (1)]}$$

The linear model becomes:

$$FI_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{GAE}_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad - \quad - \quad - \quad \text{[Equation (2)]}$$

Introducing the moderating variables, we have:

$$FI_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{GAE}_{it} + \beta_2 \text{EXR}_{it} + \beta_3 \text{INTR}_{it} + \beta_4 \text{INFR}_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad - \quad \text{[Equation (3)]}$$

Where;

FI = Food Inflation (proxy for food security)

GAE = Government Agricultural Expenditure

EXR = Exchange Rate

INTR = Interest Rate

INFR = Inflation Rate

β_0 is the constant term or intercept for firm i in the year t .

$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4,$ and β_5 are linear regression coefficients to be estimated.

ε_{it} is the disturbance or error term for firm i in the year t .

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The normality of the distribution of the data series is shown by the coefficients of Skewness, Kurtosis, and the probability values of the Jarque-Bera test for normality.

Table 4.2.1: Descriptive Statistic

	FI	LOG(AGREX)	EXRATE	INTRATE	INFRATE
Skewness	0.040589	-0.065791	3.329687	0.902657	1.241174
Kurtosis	5.244807	2.190003	14.46387	3.846327	5.007695
Jarque-Bera	5.255986	0.701467	183.0912	4.141072	10.61759
Probability	0.072223	0.704171	0.000000	0.126118	0.004948
Observations	25	25	25	25	25

Source: Researcher's Computation, 2025 (Eviews-10)

Table 4.2.1 presented the descriptive statistics of the variables used in the study. Food inflation (FI) recorded a skewness value of 0.04, indicating an almost symmetric distribution, while the kurtosis value of 5.24 indicated a leptokurtic distribution. The Jarque-Bera probability of 0.07 indicated approximate normality of the series. Government agricultural expenditure (LOG(AGREX)) recorded a skewness value of -0.07 and a kurtosis value of 2.19, indicating a near normal distribution, which was supported by a Jarque-Bera probability of 0.70. The exchange rate (EXRATE) recorded high positive skewness of 3.33 and a kurtosis value of 14.46, indicating a highly skewed and peaked distribution, with a Jarque-Bera probability of 0.00, confirming non-normality. Interest rate (INTRATE) had moderate skewness and a kurtosis value of 3.85, with a Jarque-Bera probability of 0.13, indicating a distribution close to normal. Inflation rate (INFRATE) recorded positive skewness of 1.24 and a kurtosis value of 5.01, with a Jarque-Bera probability of 0.0049, indicating non-normality of the series. All variables were based on 25 observations.

Table 4.2.2: Correlation Matrix Results

	FI	AGREX	CBL	EXRATE	INTRATE	INFRATE
FI	1.000000	0.690584	0.696365	0.698975	0.074059	0.857586
AGREX	0.690584	1.000000	0.984272	0.836385	-0.249912	0.689965
EXRATE	0.698975	0.836385	0.870456	1.000000	0.246866	0.792473
INTRATE	0.074059	-0.249912	-0.162155	0.246866	1.000000	0.263084
INFRATE	0.857586	0.689965	0.729928	0.792473	0.263084	1.000000

Source: Researcher's Computation, 2025 (Eviews-10)

Table 4.2.2 presented the correlation matrix of the variables used in the study. Food inflation (FI) recorded strong positive correlations with government agricultural expenditure (AGREX), exchange rate (EXRATE), and inflation rate (INFRATE), with correlation coefficients of 0.69, 0.70, and 0.86 respectively. Interest rate (INTRATE) recorded a very weak positive correlation with food inflation at 0.07. Government agricultural expenditure showed strong positive correlations with exchange rate and inflation rate, while a negative relationship existed between government agricultural expenditure and interest rate. Exchange rate recorded positive correlations with food inflation, government agricultural expenditure, and inflation rate. Interest rate maintained weak correlations with most variables, including a negative relationship with government agricultural expenditure. Inflation rate recorded strong positive correlations with food inflation and exchange rate. The correlation results indicated strong associations among several explanatory variables, particularly between government agricultural expenditure and exchange rate, suggesting the possibility of multicollinearity in the model.

Table 4.2.3: Ordinary Least Square Multiple Regression Analysis (FI)

Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error	t-Stat	p-Value
LOG(AGREX)	8.529144	5.417588	1.574343	0.1319
EXRATE	-0.017322	0.011350	-1.526190	0.1434
INTRATE	0.789199	0.661724	1.192640	0.2477
INFRATE	1.543066	0.304802	5.062512	0.0001
C	-53.23277	26.41641	-2.015140	0.0583

$R^2 = 0.807262$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.756541$, F-Stat 15.91585, Prob(F-stat) = 0.000003, DW = 2.02

Source: Researcher's Computation, 2025 (Eviews-10)

Table 4.2.3 presented the Ordinary Least Squares regression results on food inflation. Government agricultural expenditure (LOG(AGREX)) recorded a positive coefficient of 8.53, but the relationship with food inflation was not statistically significant at the 5 percent level, as indicated by a p value of 0.13. The exchange rate (EXRATE) had a negative coefficient and was not statistically significant, with a p value of 0.14. Interest rate (INTRATE) recorded a positive coefficient of 0.79, but the effect on food inflation was also not statistically significant at the 5 percent level, with a p value of 0.25. Inflation rate (INFRATE) had a positive coefficient of 1.54 and was statistically significant at the 5 percent level, with a p value of 0.0001, indicating a strong influence on food inflation. The coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.81 indicated that about 81 percent of the variation in food inflation was explained by the explanatory variables, while the adjusted R^2 of 0.76 confirmed a good fit of the model. The F

statistic was statistically significant, indicating joint significance of the model, and the Durbin Watson statistic of 2.02 indicated the absence of serious autocorrelation in the residuals.

TEST OF HYPOTHESIS

Statement of Decision Criteria

According to Gujarati and Porter (2009), the decision rule involves rejecting the null hypothesis (H_0) and accepting the alternative hypothesis (H_1) if the P-value of the t-Statistic < 0.05 . This means that if the P-value is less than 0.05, then there is sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the coefficient is statistically significant and different from zero. Conversely, if the P-value is greater than 0.05, then there is insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis and we accept H_0 .

Hypotheses One

H_{01} : Government agricultural expenditure has no significant effect on food inflation.

H_{a1} : Government agricultural expenditure has a significant effect on food inflation.

Decision: The null hypothesis stated that government agricultural expenditure had no significant effect on food inflation in Nigeria, while the alternative hypothesis stated that government agricultural expenditure had a significant effect on food inflation. The Ordinary Least Squares regression result showed that government agricultural expenditure had a p value of 0.1319, which was greater than the 5 percent level of significance. Based on the decision rule, the null hypothesis was not rejected. This indicated that government agricultural expenditure did not have a statistically significant effect on food inflation during the period under review.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The result showed that government agricultural expenditure had no significant effect on food inflation in Nigeria during the period under review. This outcome was unexpected because public spending on agriculture was intended to improve production, expand food supply, and reduce food prices. One possible explanation was poor targeting of public funds, as budgetary allocations may not have reached productive farming activities or core agricultural needs. Another issue related to the composition of spending, where a large share of agricultural expenditure was directed toward recurrent items rather than capital projects such as irrigation, storage facilities, and rural infrastructure. Delays in budget releases and weak implementation may also have reduced the effectiveness of government spending, especially when funds were disbursed outside critical farming seasons.

This finding differed from several earlier studies. Chris et al. (2016) and Egwu (2016) reported that government spending supported agricultural output, while Jimmy and Guluwa (2021) found a positive relationship between agricultural expenditure and economic growth. However, the present result aligned with studies that questioned the effectiveness of public spending. Alabi and Abu (2020) showed that only capital expenditure had a meaningful effect on agricultural productivity, while recurrent spending had little impact. Sebastian et al. (2019) also reported that poorly structured government spending could fail to improve agricultural

outcomes. External factors such as insecurity, climate shocks, and weak infrastructure may have further weakened the transmission of public agricultural expenditure to food prices, limiting its effect on food inflation.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study examined the effect of government agricultural expenditure on food inflation in Nigeria. The regression results showed that government agricultural spending had no significant effect on food inflation at the 5 percent level. This result contradicted some earlier studies that linked public agricultural spending to improved output and growth. The finding suggested that, although government allocations to agriculture existed, they did not translate into improved food affordability. Weak allocation patterns, dominance of recurrent spending, delayed budget releases, and implementation challenges may have limited the impact of government expenditure on food supply and food prices.

Government agricultural expenditure should be restructured to prioritise capital investments that directly support food production, such as irrigation systems, rural roads, storage facilities, and mechanisation. Budget implementation should be strengthened to ensure timely release and effective utilisation of funds. Greater transparency and monitoring are needed to reduce leakages and ensure that public resources reach productive agricultural activities. In addition, policies addressing insecurity and climate risks should accompany increased public spending, as these factors continue to undermine agricultural performance. Without improvements in spending quality and implementation, higher government expenditure alone may not reduce food inflation.

This study contributed to the literature by providing evidence that government agricultural expenditure, in its current form, was insufficient to reduce food inflation in Nigeria. Unlike studies that focused on output growth, this research emphasised food prices and affordability as key food security outcomes. The findings highlighted the gap between public spending and actual food security outcomes and underscored the need to shift attention from the size of agricultural budgets to the effectiveness and composition of expenditure. The study provided recent empirical evidence to inform policy debates on public agricultural spending and food inflation in Nigeria

REFERENCES

- ActionAid Nigeria (2023). *Analysis of the 2024 proposed agriculture budget*. ActionAid Nigeria. <https://nigeria.actionaid.org/publications/2023/analysis-2024-proposed-agriculture-budget>
- Central Bank of Nigeria (n.d.). *Agricultural Credit Guarantee Scheme Fund*. CBN. <https://www.cbn.gov.ng/devfin/acgsf.asp>
- Dataphyte (2022). *Commercial bank loans to agric sector in Nigeria is poor (less than 6% in 7 years)*. Dataphyte. <https://dataphyte.com/latest-reports/agriculture/commercial-bank-loans-to-agric-sector-in-nigeria-is-poor-less-than-6-in-7-years/>
- FAO (n.d.). *Nigeria agriculture at a glance*. FAO. <https://www.fao.org/nigeria/fao-in-nigeria/nigeria-at-a-glance/en/>

- IFPRI & World Bank (2008). *Nigeria agriculture public expenditure review*. CGIAR. <https://cgspace.cgiar.org/items/275b767f-0af6-490c-919b-30607659492b>
- NESG (2024, March 25). *Status of food security: Dimensioning the crisis, policy options, and strategic responses*. NESG. <https://nesgroup.org/blog/NESG-Issues-a-Policy-Brief-on-the-Status-of-Food-Security-in-Nigeria>
- U.S. Commercial Service (2023). *Nigeria country commercial guide: Agriculture sector*. <https://www.trade.gov/country-commercial-guides/nigeria-agriculture-sector>
- USAID (2022). *Agriculture and food security in Nigeria*. USAID. <https://www.usaid.gov/nigeria/agriculture-and-food-security>
- Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN). (2018). *Commercial Agriculture Credit Scheme (CACS) evaluation and impact assessment report*. [PDF]. Retrieved from https://www.cbn.gov.ng/out/2018/std/cacs%20evaluation%20and%20impact%20assessment%20report_compressed.pdf
- Dataphyte. (2022, August 10). *Commercial bank loans to agric sector in Nigeria is poor, less than 6% in 7 years*. Retrieved from <https://archive.dataphyte.com/topics/latest-reports/audit/page/3/>
- Dergipark. (2023). The impact of commercial bank loans and ACGSF on agricultural growth in Nigeria. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 11(04), 856-871. [PDF]. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/3700988>
- EnviroNews Nigeria. (2025, June 7). *2025 Budget: Addressing gaps, challenges, opportunities for Nigeria's agricultural sector*. Retrieved from <https://www.environewsigeria.com/2025-budget-addressing-gaps-challenges-opportunities-for-nigerias-agricultural-sector/>
- International Budget Partnership & BudgIT. (2023). *Improving budget credibility for access to agricultural inputs and services in Nigeria*. [PDF]. Retrieved from <https://internationalbudget.org/wp-content/uploads/Improving-Budget-Credibility-for-Access-to-Agricultural-Inputs-and-Services-in-Nigeria.pdf>
- Nairametrics. (2024, June 26). *Only 7% of farming communities receive agricultural loans from banks in Nigeria - NBS*. Retrieved from <https://nairametrics.com/2024/06/26/only-7-of-farming-communities-receive-agricultural-loans-from-banks-in-nigeria-nbs/>
- National Bureau of Statistics (NBS). (2024, February). *Consumer Price Index (CPI) January 2024 report*. [PDF]. Retrieved from https://www.nigerianstat.gov.ng/pdfuploads/CPI_JANUARY_2024_REPORT.pdf
- Nigerian Economic Summit Group (NESG). (2024). *NESG policy brief on food security*. [PDF]. Retrieved from https://nesgroup.org/download_resource_documents/ONLINE_1711528123.pdf
- D. Gale Johnson (1961). Agricultural Economics: The High-Payoff Input Model.
- Evenson, R. E., & Gollin, D. (2003). Assessing the Impact of the Green Revolution, 1960 to 2000. *Science*, 300(5620), 758-762.
- Fan, S., Hazell, P., & Thorat, S. (2000). Government Spending, Growth and Poverty in Rural India. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 82(4), 1038-1051.
- Lele, U., & Meyers, R. J. (1989). The Theory and Practice of Agricultural Policy.
- Mogues, T., Fan, S., & Benin, S. (2012). Public Investments in and for Agriculture. *European Journal of Development Research*, 24(2), 283-313.
- National Bureau of Statistics (NBS). (2024). *Consumer Price Index Report: January 2024*.

- Federal Ministry of Budget and National Planning. (2024). *2025 Proposed Budget Summary*.
- Miftahu, I. & Bawa, S. S. (2023). Effect of Commercial Bank Credit Facilities to Agriculture on Real Output Growth in Nigeria. *Journal of Development Economics and Finance*, 4(2), 359-374. <https://DOI: 10.47509/JDEF.2023.v04i02.05>
- Bada O. T. (20217). The effect of bank's credit on the development manufacturing and agricultural sector of Nigeria's economy. *International Journal of Advanced Studies in Economics and Public Sector Management*.
- Chris, O. U., Mbat, D. T., & Stephen B. D. (2016). The effect of Commercial Bank's Credit on Agricultural Production in Nigeria. *Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 4(1), Doi 10.12691/fa-4-1-1.
- Egwu, P. N. (2016). Impact of agricultural financing on agricultural output, Economic Growth and Poverty Alleviation in Nigeria. *Journal of Biology, Agriculture and Healthcare*, 6(2),
- Ikpor, M. I., Afam, I. I., & Eneje, B. C. (2016). Agricultural financing and rural economic diversification in Nigeria. Does access to credit matters? *International research journal of finance and economics*, 4(2), 181-196
- Nakazi F. & Sunday N. (2020). The effect of commercial bank's agricultural credit on agricultural growth in Uganda. *African Journal of Economic*, 8(1),
- Nwokoro, A.N. (2017). Analysis of Bank's credit and agricultural output in Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovative Finance and Research*, 1(1), 54-66.
- Agbana, E. Z., & Ebisine, L. (2022). Government expenditure on agriculture and economic growth in Nigeria. *Journal of Good Governance and Sustainable Development in Africa*, 7(2), 47-60.
- Alabi, R. A. & Abu, G. A. (2020). the impact of agricultural public expenditure on agricultural productivity in nigeria. Paper submitted for presentation at AERC virtual biannual workshop slated for 8-11 June.
- Chikezie, R. N., Nkamigbo, C. D., & Ozor, U. M. (2020). Economic assessment of government expenditure on the agricultural sector with relevance to economic growth (1981-2017). *International Journal of Agricultural Policy and Research*, 8(4), 97-106.
- Dankumo, A. M., Is'Hak, S., Auta, Y. and Denthe, A. (2023). Impact of Public Expenditure on Poverty: Role of Governance. *Jurnal Ekonomia Malaysia*, 2(1), 21-30.
- Jimmy, V. G. & Guluwa, S. E. (2021). Government expenditure on the agricultural sector and economic growth in Nigeria. *International Journal of Management Studies, Business & Entrepreneurship Research*, 6(2), 47 - 73. <http://www.casirmediapublishing.com>
- Megbowon, E. T., Mothae, L. and Relebohile, J. R. (2022). Effect of government agricultural expenditure on economic growth: evidence from a developing country. *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai Oeconomica*, 67(2), 1-20.
- Ogundipe, M. and Adesola, A. (2022). Examine the impact of government expenditure on standard of living in Nigeria (1981 - 2018). Retrieved from <https://assets.researchsquare.com/files/rs-2202229/v1/eea3a3dc-80e4-48cd-b3b1-20e942fa3a17.pdf?c=1666880565>.
- Olumba, C. C., Onunka, C. & Ume, C. (2020). Government expenditure on agricultural development and economic growth in Africa. *Journal of Gender, Information and Development in Africa*, 9(2), 12-24.

European Journal of Agriculture and Forestry Research, 14(1), pp.13-25, 2026

Print ISSN: 2054-6319 (Print),

Online ISSN: 2054-6327(online)

Website: <https://www.eajournals.org/>

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development -UK

Sebastian, O. U., Alexander, O. E. & Abraham, I. O. (2019). A review of impact of government expenditure and bank credit on agricultural productivity of Nigeria. *Ann Soc Sci Manage Studies*; 3(4), 103 - 112. DOI:10.19080/ASM.2019.03.555620.