Output Growth of Uganda's Agriculture Sector: Does Public Expenditure on Education Matter?

Charles Owuor[1*], Eric K. Bett[1] and Gabriel W. Mwenjeri[1]

*[1]Kenyatta University, School of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture Economics,
P.O.Box 43844 – 00100, Nairobi, Kenya.*

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Author CO designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol, managed the literature searches and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Authors EKB and GWM guided the entire research process, reviewed the draft manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

Original Research Article

ABSTRACT

We examine the multiple dimensions of the effect of public investment in education on agriculture sector output in a multivariate econometric framework. The study is underpinned by the growing interest in empirical investigations on the effects of public education expenditure on economic growth in developing countries to inform the education sector policy environment. The research employed a longitudinal study approach to examine the extent of public investment in education and effects on agriculture sector output in Uganda. The study relied on data from national statistics for the period 1982- 2017. Overall, public expenditure on education has a net positive effect on agriculture sector output. The impact of education on agriculture output has been proven to promote agriculture output through supporting farmer adoption of new productivity-enhancing technologies.

Keywords: Auto-regressive distributed lag (ARDL); agriculture output; education; public expenditure; economic growth.

_____

Corresponding author: E-mail: crowuor@yahoo.com, Charlesowuor.co@gmail.com;

1. INTRODUCTION

Investigations of human capital development through tracking public expenditure on education in developing countries are gaining traction from researchers, policymakers, and development economists alike. Financial capital for long has been considered the scarcest resource in an organization. In this regard, various strategies are in place to ensure optimisation of returns at organisation level. However, in the new paradigm of "knowledge economy" the scarcest resource is human capital, and the conventional measurement systems used to ensure maximum returns on human capital results in misallocation of resources [1]. The causal linkage between education, human capital development and economic growth is an issue that has both theoretical and practical significance. Human capital accounts for up to a third of cross-country income differences and is therefore a vital ingredient of economic growth [2]. According to the World Bank blog "why education matters for economic development", the estimated value of human capital is 62% of the total global wealth. This value is four times the combined value of produced physical capital and natural resources [3]. Despite the long lag period, increasing investment in human capital leads to reduction in poverty and this effect is most significant in poor countries [4].

Gillman M. [5] in his essay on "human capital theory of structural transformation" postulates that with investment in human capital, it is possible to have sectoral transformation along with a balanced growth path equilibrium accompanied by gradual shifts over time from less human capital-intensive sectors towards more human capital-intensive sectors. This transition and mobility of human capital within an economic ecosystem leads to significant economic output arising from increased productivity per worker and technological progress [6,7]. The increment in demand for knowledge in the production processes simultaneously leads to rapid human capital driven economic growth [8]. Therefore, a better understanding of the relationship between investments in education and agriculture sector growth for an agriculture-dependent country like Uganda that has over 70% of its labour force directly employed in the agriculture sector is critical.

Education is an important variable in human capital development as the country's stock of skills immensely matters in its prosperity and growth rate [9]. Education as an investment enriches people's understanding, improves the quality of their lives, and leads to broad social benefits at both individual and societal level [10,11]. The study of human capital serves multiple purposes of understanding the drivers of economic growth, assessing the long-term sustainability of the country's development trajectory and more importantly, to measure effects and productivity of the education sector [12,13]. That said, there is little attention given to Uganda's examination of the causal relationship between economic growth and human capital development within a multivariate framework. The centrality of human capital in an ever-increasing space of "knowledge economy" places strong connections between education and training, and acquisition of 21st Century skills to ensure that individuals thrive in a constantly changing environment where learning never stops.

The importance of the education sector is unquestioned, yet measures of its effect on economy sector output remains less studied and yet it is the critical pathway in human capital formation [14]. A country's human capital development success is dependent on policy and public investment choices underpinned by the age structure of its population. Uganda's age structure is a paradox of its own. Census data indicates that close to 63% of the total population is below the age of 24 years and 50% below the age of 15 years [15]. This young population demands purposive skilling and knowledge formation to enable them find meaningful and inclusive engagement in the economy [16]. Based on these demographic statistics, the country is characterised as "young". [17] argues that countries with significantly larger proportion of young populations under the age of 15 years, as for the case of Uganda, need to invest more in human capital development. While those with older populations where the greater proportion of the population is 65 years and above need to invest more in the health sector as the consequence of ageing kicks in. Uganda has less than 2% of the total population above 65 years of age and this fact underpins the need to invest in education.

This paper attempts to describe a simplified method of estimating the relationship between investments in Human Capital Development and Agriculture sector growth using the Autoregressive Distributed Lag (ARDL)

regression model. The purpose is to test and estimate the long-run relationship between Public expenditure in education, Physical Capital accumulation and labour force on agriculture sector output for the period 1982 to 2018. The article seeks to add to the ongoing free market belief that public investment is wasteful and to a larger extent less efficient even if it is in the field of education [18]. Particular, attention is paid to growth in labour, public investment at primary, secondary and tertiary level and physical capital accumulation. This article is organised as follows; literature review, data sources, empirical estimation, results, and concludes with recommendations to guide future public investment priorities and policy direction.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of human capital serves multiple purposes of understanding the drivers of economic growth, assessing the long-term sustainability of the country's development trajectory and more importantly, to measure output and productivity of the education sector [12,13]. Such studies help improve the fitness of growth models which have explanatory variables of physical capital, education investment and labour inputs in explaining the level of economic development and growth disparities across countries [19]. Indeed [20] posits that replacement of physical capital accumulation by human capital accumulation as a main driver of growth is critical for economies to transition from industrial revolution era to modern growth. Despite the multifaceted definition of human capital, which includes several aspects of education, training, and health, this paper is restricted to public expenditure on education at three levels of education, i.e. primary, secondary and tertiary. This follows persistent calls for African countries to prioritise primary education catastrophically at the expense of tertiary education as the estimated returns to the former are higher [21]. Education is a key input into the research, development and innovation sub-sector that produces new knowledge and products that translate into economic outputs [22]. Education raises people's productivity, creativity, promotes entrepreneurship and technological advancement of humankind leading to output growth [23]. A decennial review of global literature on returns to education from 139 countries for the period 1954-2014 reveals that the private average global return to a year of schooling is 9% per year, while social returns to

school remain much higher especially in developing countries [24]. These estimates of private returns to education are in tandem with earlier cross-country estimates of 10% per year [25]. Critically, women continue to experience higher returns facilitated with enabling spaces promoting gender equality [26]. Whereas the neoclassical growth theory postulates that physical capital and labour are the critical pathways through which economic growth could be achieved, the new growth theories contend that human capital accumulation is a fundamental determinant of a nation's economic growth due to increase in productivity and technological innovation [27–29].

The Human Capital Theory considers education as an investment with both long-run and short-run effects on economic growth rather than a consumptive policy decision [30–33]. At the national level, it is the qualified and skilled individuals, rather than its physical capital and material resources that determine the character and pace of economic growth [34]. There is extensive literature that attributes the phenomenal growth of most of the Asian countries to deliberate and intensive investment in human capital development that led to the accumulation of skilled and employable labour force with innovative capacities and high productivity translating to economic growth [35–38]. Human Capital is an accelerator of scientific, technological progress and innovation. At the societal level, education is crucial in securing economic and social progress and reducing inequality through improving income distribution [39,40]. The recent economic downturn coupled with the saturation of the business market in a globalised economy has pushed firms to realise the importance of human capital [41]. At a firm level, investment in human capital development is a critical factor that pushes the competitive edge and innovation envelope maximising returns on investment [42,43].

It is critical to note that agriculture plays a critical role not only in the survival of people but also in the well-being and economic prosperity of nations. For this very reason, the sector occupies a conspicuous space among the United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). At sectoral level and specifically for the agriculture sector, there is evidence that many modern technologies have met with only partial success, as measured by observed rates of adoption [44]. It is postulated that Human Capital directly influences agricultural productivity by

affecting how inputs are used and combined by farmers, improves the efficiency of acquisition, assimilation and implementation of new technology, with the that are efficient [45]. The conventional wisdom to this lack of rapid adoption of innovations has been attributed to the usual suspects, namely; lack of credit, limited access to information, risks in the sector, and land fragmentation, while conveniently forgetting the insufficient human capital that has failed to adopt the new innovative rural outreach models [46,47]. Technological change in agriculture plays a critical role in transformation of the sector but this requires substantial investment [48]. There is evidence that under-investment in education will constrain the skills, knowledge, and competency leading to the economic stagnation of a country [49–54]. At the sector level, growth and prosperity are positively correlated to a reduction in rural poverty that is still a characteristic of an agriculture-dependent household [55].

Therefore, we examine the multiple dimensions of the effect of public investment in education on agriculture sector output in the multivariate econometric framework. The re-examination of the level of investment in human capital development and agriculture sector output is imperative, and this study is poised to unravel this problem and add to the existing literature in this area. Below is the conceptual framework.

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

3.1 Data Description

Data were drawn from national accounts statistics. Relevant permission was obtained from the Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) to access and use data that is not in the public domain. Additional data were obtained from Annual statistical abstract publication for the period 1982 to 2018, UNESCO statistics for education statistics, ILO for employment statistics.

Public expenditure on education expressed in monetary terms at 2010 constant USD is defined as the current, capital, and transfers at both national and local governments' level. It critical to note that Uganda public financing mechanism is decentralised with local governments playing a significant role at the primary level of education. This expenditure also includes transfers from international sources to the government in support of the education sector In this paper we segregate the public expenditure at primary level (*prim*), Secondary level (*Sec*) and Tertiary level (*Tert*). The latter also includes public expenditure on vocational training.

The labour force (L) is defined as the sum of persons of working age 15-64 years who furnish the supply of labour for the production of goods and services. However, in the context of this study this definition explicitly refers the sum of all persons of working age employed in industry, service and agriculture sectors.

Agriculture output (AGRI) variable is defined as the net output of a sector after adding up all outputs and subtracting intermediate inputs. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or depletion and degradation of natural resources. The origin of value added is determined by the International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC), revision 3 or 4. Data are in constant 2010 U.S. dollars.

Physical capital formation (K) variable is defined as a real capital stock, which represents gross fixed capital formation and increases in stocks (e.g., buildings, equipment, and other infrastructure) in the domestic economy. This series is also measured US dollar at 2010 constant prices.


Fig. 1. Conceptual framework

3.2 The ARDL Econometric Model

The econometric model takes the form of augmented Cobb-Douglas function within labour augmented theoretical framework that considers human capital as an independent factor of production [56].

$$AGRI_t = K_t^{\alpha} H_t^{\beta} (AL)_t^{1-\alpha-\beta} \qquad (1)$$

Where $\alpha < 0$, $\beta > 0$, $\alpha + \beta < 1$

Where *AGRI* is output, *K* is physical capital, *H* is human capital, *L* is labour number of works the country and *A* level of technology. The $(AL)_t$ component implies the effective units of labour; α is the elasticity of capital with respect to *AGRI*, β is the elasticity of human capital with respect to *AGRI*. The model assumes that *α + β < 1*, which implies a diminishing, return to capital. Based on the above Human Capital (*H*) is substituted proxies; public expenditure in Primary Education (*Prim*), Secondary Education (*Sec*) and Tertiary Education referring to post-secondary education level to include university level and Business and Technical Vocational T (*Tert*). After substituting the instrumental variables in the equation above and taking the natural logarithm, the above the following equation is derived.

$$ln\,AGR_t = \alpha lnK_t + \beta lnH_t + (1 - \alpha - \beta)\,ln\ (AL)t + \varepsilon t \qquad (2)$$

Further, substituting H proxies *Prim, Sec* and *Tert,* the above equation can be rewritten as below.

$$lnAGRI_t = \alpha lnK_t + \beta(lnPrim_t + lnSec_t + lnTert + (1-\alpha-\beta)\,ln\ (AL)t + \varepsilon t \qquad (3)$$

From the equation above, the equation below is derived to estimate both long-run and short-term regressions using $\emptyset_i$ and β_i respectively, as applied by [57,26]. Where, are the short –run coefficients. The error correction terms are assumed to lie within 0-1.

3.3 ARDL Model Specification

$$\Delta lnAGR_t = \propto_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \emptyset_1 \Delta lnYAGR_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_1 lnAGR_{t-1} + \sum_{i-1}^{n} \emptyset_2 \Delta lnK_{t-1} + i-1n\beta22lnKt-1+i=1n\emptyset3\Delta lnLt-1 + \sum_{i-1}^{n} \beta_3 lnL_{t-1} + \sum_{i-1}^{n} \emptyset_4 \Delta lnPrim_{t-1} + \sum_{i-1}^{n} \beta_4 lnPrim_{t-1} + \sum_{i-1}^{n} \emptyset_5 \Delta lnSec_{t-1} + \sum_{i-1}^{n} \beta_5 \ lnSec_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \emptyset_6 \Delta lnTer_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_6 \ lnTer_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t \qquad (4)$$

Where β_i are the long-run regression coefficients, $\emptyset_i$ are the short-run coefficients and ε_t is the error term.

3.4 Bounds Testing

A bound test was estimated using OLS to investigate the existence of a long-run relationship. The bound test applied F or T statistics testing the hypothesis below.

$$H_0: \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \cdots \beta_i \qquad (5)$$

$$H_i: \beta_1 \neq \beta_2 \neq \cdots \beta_i \qquad (6)$$

The model was subjected to misspecification tests which included normality test, serial correlation test, heteroscedasticity test to check robustness and stability and as well validate the bound test hypothesis.

In a case H_0 was rejected, an error correction parameter would be introduced to measure the speed of adjustment towards the long-run equilibrium. The error correction term (*ECT*) is derived from the corresponding long-run model whose coefficients are obtained by normalising the equation The unclosing of an error term transforms the model into an error correction model (ECM). The advantage of the ECM model is that it integrates the short-run dynamics with the long-run equilibrium without losing long-run information. The ECM model also avoids problems of spurious relationship resulting from non-stationary time series data, that is normally experienced in linear multivariate regressions.

Therefore, the above equation is rewritten and specified as an ECM model as shown below.

$$\Delta lnY_t = \propto_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \emptyset_1 \Delta lnY_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_1 lnY_{t-1} + \sum_{i-1}^{n} \emptyset_2 \Delta \ lnK_{t-1} + \sum_{i-1}^{n} \beta_{2_2} \ lnK_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \emptyset_3 \Delta lnL_{t-1} + \sum_{i-1}^{n} \beta_3 \ lnL_{t-1} + \sum_{i-1}^{n} \emptyset_4 \Delta lnPrim_{t-1} + \sum_{i-1}^{n} \beta_4 \ lnPrim_{t-1} + \sum_{i-1}^{n} \emptyset_5 \Delta lnSec_{t-1} + \sum_{i-1}^{n} \beta_5 \ lnSec_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \emptyset_6 \Delta lnTer_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_6 \ lnTer_{t-1} + \delta ECT_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t \qquad (7)$$

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Description of Productivity Variables

The productivity variables and their distributed statistics have been depicted in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of study variables

Variables	Obs	Mean ('000')	Std. Dev. ('000')
Dependent variable			
Agriculture Sector output (AGRI)	37	3,150,000	1,850,000
Explanatory variables			
Expenditure on tertiary education (*Tert*)	37	56,400	36,800
Expenditure on secondary education (*Sec*)	37	137,000	90,000
Expenditure on primary education (*Prim*)	37	192,000	132,000
Capital formation (*K*)	37	2,420,000	2,450,000
Employed in Agriculture Sector	37	7,140,000	1,790,000
Employed in industry Sector	37	737,000	201,000
Employed in Service Sector	37	2,200,000	583,000

Exchange rate UGX3700=1USD

4.2 Testing Fitness and Stability of Model

Before running the ARDL model, the appropriate lag length was determined using three selection information criteria; namely Akaike Information Criteria (AIC). The optimal lag length structure estimates for the endogenous variables namely; l*nY, lnPrim, lnSec, lnTert*, *lnK* and *lnL* across all information selection criteria was four as this level had the least absolute values (see Table S1). Unit root test was done to test stationarity of data, using the Augmented Dickey-Fuller unit root test methodology. The purpose was to establish whether all variables were integrated in the order I (0) or I (1) and none I (2). The results of the unit root tests of all study variables are presented in Table S2. The results indicate that the natural logs of the variables were not stationary at level apart from public investment in education (*prim*) which was stationary at I(0). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected on this account as the series were stationary at 1(0) after first differencing for the remaining variables. The results also show that the remaining dependent variables were not stationary in their natural logarithm or at their level form. However, after the first differencing all the variables attained stationarity with t-statistic value significant at 0.01. An indication that the series was integrated with I (1) and none were of order I(2).

Results of the bounds test are shown in Table S3. The estimates reveal that the F-statistic of 2.309 was lower than the critical value of all 1(0) regressors of 2.62 and 3.41, respectively. Similarly, the t-test statistic also estimated that the critical value was less than 1(1) regressors and greater than I(0) regressors at both 5 % and 1% significance level. This implies that the series

are not cointegrated and as such, they do not exhibit long-run relationships. Therefore, accepting the H_0 hypothesis that postulates a no level relationship among the variables and hence justifying the application of the ARDL model. The model was further subjected to Breusch-Godfrey LM test for autocorrelation that confirmed the presence of serial correlation in its structure that was significant at 1%, though with a much smaller chi-squared value of 6.635. The presence of serial correlation was further confirmed by the Durbin Watson statistic of 2.653 that was higher than 1.35 and 1.05 critical values at 5% and 1% level of significance, respectively. However, as discussed earlier, serial correlation is not a problem when using ARDL modelling. The test for a linear form of heteroscedasticity was done using Cameron & Trivedi's decomposition of IM-test for unrestricted heteroskedasticity. The heteroscedasticity test had *p* values of 0.4180 that was not significant at all levels and therefore, accepting the null hypothesis that the model was homoscedastic.

4.3 ARDL Estimates of the Effect of Public Expenditure on Education on Agriculture Sector Growth

The ARDL model for estimating the effects of public investment in education on agriculture sector output had a lag structure of (4,4,0,2,3,3) as shown in Table 2. Under primary education, data shows that an increase in public expenditure by one unit leads to 0.9 units increase in agriculture sector output after a period of one year holding other factors constant. After two and three years, the returns to public investment in primary education declines and in the fourth year affects the sector output negatively, though with no statistical significance.

Fig. 2. Effect of investment in education on productivity outcomes
Data source: World Bank Development Indicators

Table 2. ARDL Estimates of the effect of public expenditure on education on agriculture sector growth

Dependent variable	ARDL (4,4,0,2,3,3) regression			
Agric Sector output	**Coef.**	**Std.Err.**	**t**	**P>t**
lnAgricoutput (-1)	0.679**	0.273	2.480	0.030
lnAgricoutput (-2)	0.630**	0.284	2.220	0.048
lnPrim (0)	-0.159	0.206	-0.770	0.456
lnPrim (-1)	0.904***	0.208	4.350	0.001
lnTert (-1)	-0.746***	0.204	-3.670	0.004
lnTert (-2)	0.502***	0.159	3.160	0.009
lnK (0)	0.648**	0.300	2.160	0.054
lnK (-1)	-0.719**	0.273	-2.630	0.023
lnK (-3)	-0.559*	0.280	-2.000	0.071
lnL (-2)	0.805***	0.515	3.500	0.005
lnL (-3)	-0.818**	0.310	-2.640	0.023
_cons	-9.996*	5.297	-1.890	0.086
Prob > F	0.0000			
R-squared	0.9873			
Adj R-squared	0.9630			
Log likelihood	46.650353			
Root MSE	0.1019			

Smilarly, public investment in secondary education though positive did not affect the agriculture sector output in statistically significant terms keeping other factors constant. While public expenditure on tertiary education, there were mixed results. For instance, in the first year, there are no noticeable effects on the sector output. However, after one year, a percentage increase in public expenditure on tertiary education leads to a reduction of 0.7% in the sector output and this effect was significant at 1% confidence interval. After two years, a percentage point increase in public expenditure

on tertiary education led to growth of the sector by a margin of 0.5% and the effect was significant at 1% level of significance, holding other factors constant.

Overall, public expenditure on education has a net positive effect on agriculture sector output. The impact of education on agriculture output has been proven to promote agriculture output through supporting farmer adoption of new productivity enhancing technologies. [58] while investigating public expenditure and poverty reduction in rural Uganda, observed that

whereas public expenditure on agriculture research and development was a key driver to rural poverty reduction, public expenditure on education effects ranked second. An educated farmer is more likely to adopt new and efficient means of production to maximise returns on investment consequently improving the rural well-being and status [59]. The wellbeing is attributed to the fact the communities with higher rates of adoption of improved agricultural technologies and, consequently, higher crop yields enjoy lower food prices, higher real wages and welfare indicators [60,61] while investigating the determinants of farmer adoption of soil fertility management practices concluded that increasing literacy level supported farmers to acquire new knowledge and to calculate appropriate input quantities in a rapidly changing environment.

While investigating the nexus of education and agricultural productivity in Uganda, [62] found that primary schooling of neighboring farm workers increased productivity. The core argument was that education complements capital and substitutes for labour. Agriculture productivity increases arise through education increasing physical capital and purchased inputs. Similar evidence was also observed elsewhere. [63] observed that only four years of education among rural households in Nigeria raised cowpea production under improved technology by 25.6% and concluded that education has a higher payoff.

Singh SP and Sharma SSP [45] argues that with the rapid advances and fall in prices of communication and information technologies, farm people of the future will need strong basic schooling to adopt and technologies to enable them to take part meaningfully in the new global information system of the 21st century and their recent evidence that supports this argument. [64] using the switching regression model to examine the role of education on agriculture productivity in South East Asian countries, observed that for economies where agricultural productivity exhibits obvious improvements throughout the entire period, education constitutes a major determinant of the change in productivity. This result confirms the long-held view that countries in sub-Saharan Africa to effectively diversify their economies, improve productivity and build value chains for agriculture will require significant investment in human capital [22,65]. These results indicate that basic and advanced human capital has a positive impact on agriculture output and therefore a balanced educational policy that promotes basic education, as well as tertiary education, is perhaps still a viable public investment option.

In respect to physical capital accumulation, a percentage increase leads to an increase of 0.648% in agriculture sector output, which estimates are significant at a 95% confidence interval. This is attributed to flows from investments in physical capital stock that includes equipment, structures, inventories, and land that enhances agriculture output through improving the efficiency of production [66]. Investments in physical capital and capacity building have been considered as the two main cornerstones of a place-based approach to rural development. Physical capital reduces costs for economic agents to access urban markets leading to higher technical knowledge and the elimination of diminishing returns [67,68] concluded that accumulation of physical capital is a principal factor in national economic growth. Physical capital complemented by human capital physical capital investments can be viewed as an indirect contribution of education to macroeconomic growth. [69] made similar conclusions on the complementarity of human and physical capital while investigating the relative importance of the growth of physical and human capital on total factor productivity (TFP) using data from 145 countries that spans more than 100 years. It can as well be concluded that physical capital accumulation resulting predominantly from rural infrastructure facilities like irrigation, electricity, and roads lead to increased sector output, and this creates the rationale for such investment to spur rural growth.

While estimating the effect of the labour force on agriculture sector output, the study did not apply concepts of labour productivity which estimate the efficiency of resource use. The empirical estimate reveals that in the first two years, any increase in labour has a negative effect on agriculture sector output though not significant. However, after the second lag period, a percentage increase in labour leads to a 0.18% increase in agriculture sector output holding other factors constant, and these effects are significant at 5% level. While in the later years the effect is negative. These disparities can be attributed to labour mobility within the different sectors of the economy, with the more educated workforce moving to service and industry sectors.

Fig. 3. CUSUMSG test for lnagricout, lnPrim, lnSec lnTert lnK lnL cs(cusum) uw (upper)

Whereas agriculture indeed employs close to 70% of the labour force, most of this labour force is unskilled, produce at subsistence scale and have low marginal productivity. As such, the agriculture sector seems to benefit less from social returns to schooling [24,70] reinforces this argument that pushing the under the skilled segment of the population into the labour market is a no-win situation, as they will remain destined for a hand-to-mouth existence based on vulnerable employment and for the economy which gains little in terms of boosting its labour productivity potential.

4.4 Robustness Test of the Model

The test results are shown in the Fig. 3. The result indicated the model was structurally stable as shown by the cumulative sum of recursive residuals with most of the data points lying within the confidence interval limits at 5% threshold hence showing no evidence of the ECM's instability. There were only five occasions between the period 2003 and 2008 where the data points lied outside the limits of significance interval at the 5% threshold revealing instability of the coefficients on the test variables.

5. CONCLUSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, public expenditure on education had a net positive effect on agriculture sector output. There is no doubt that growth in the sector can

be stimulated from innovations emanating from the country's agricultural training and research innovation system. Even with the current raging debate between economic growth and structural change, the study confirms that it is possible to increase agriculture output and stimulate transformation of the sector through having an educated population. The study strongly recommends strengthening education investment in rural areas that have their economies driven by agriculture. This should be a vigorous effort to sufficiently equip staff rural schools and substantially improve the learning environment. At policy level, there will be a need to explore whether the current curriculum is appropriate to train and deliver high quality and skilled learners to meet the capacity needs of the agriculture sector to promote better and faster rural economic transformation. Based on enrolment data at tertiary education level, the study recognises that there is still a challenge of attracting students to study agriculture as a discipline. As a result, the sector has a deficit of critical mass of skilled and appropriate human capital to apply skills technology and innovation to unlock the critical value chains. Therefore, for the country to fully reap human capital dividends for the benefit of the agriculture sector, it will require a multifaceted approach with a sustained public investment, institutional reforms and policy implementation devoid of ambiguous and narrow-minded interventions such as the civil-military operation, the so-called operation wealth creation.

13

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Angrist N, Djankov S, Goldeberg P, Patrinos H. Measuring human capital. Washington DC 20433; 2019. Available:https://doi.org/10.1177/15234223 0000200107

2. Abrigo MRM, Lee S, Park D, Capital H, Asia M. Human capital spending, inequality, and growth in middle income Asia, Emerg. Mark. Financ. Trade. 2018; 54:1285–1303. Available:https://doi.org/10.1080/1540496X .2017.1422721

3. Patrinos HA, Tue ON, Harris S. Why education matters for economic development. World Bank Blogs; 2017. Available:http://blogs.worldbank.org/educat ion/why-education-matters-economic-development

4. Collin M, Weil D. The effect of increasing human capital investment on economic growth and poverty: A simulation exercise. Washington, DC; 2020. Available:https://doi.org/10.1086/708195

5. Gillman M. Working paper series a human capital theory of structural transformation. Prague; 2019.

6. Bloom D, Khoury A, Kufenko V, Prettner K. Spurring economic growth through human development: Research results and guidance for policymakers, IZA discuss. Pap; 2020.

7. Galor O, Tsiddon D. The distribution of human capital and economic growth. J. Econ. Growth. 1997;2:93–124. Available:https://doi.org/10.1023/A:100978 5714248.

8. Cebeci E, Algan N, Cankaya S. The returns of the education in the context of micro-macro analysis, procedia. Soc. Behav. Sci. 2015;174:916–925. Available:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2 015.01.712

9. Burgess S. Human capital and education: The state of the art in the economics of education, IZA discuss. Pap. 2016;9885: 1–95.

10. Barbiero O, Cournede B. New Econometric estimates of long-run growth effects of different areas of public spending; 2013.

11. Kucharčíková A. Investment in the Human capital as the source of economic growth, period. Polytech. Soc. Manag. Sci. 2014; 22:29–35. Available:https://doi.org/10.3311/PPso.742 6

12. Liu G. Measuring the stock of human capital for international and intertemporal comparisons. University of Chicago Press. Chicago; 2014. Available:http://www.nber.org/books/jorg12 -1%0Ahttp://www.nber.org/books/jorg12-1

13. Nowak AZ, Dahal G. The contribution of education to Economic growth: Evidence from Nepal. Int. J. Econ. Sci. V. 2016; 22–41. Available:https://doi.org/10.20472/ES.2016 .5.2.002

14. Diagne A, Diene B. Estimating returns to higher education: A survey of models, methods and empirical evidence. J. African Econ. 2011;20:80–132. Available:https://doi.org/10.1093/jae/ejr021

15. UBOS, Uganda bureau of statistics. The 2018 statistical abstract; 2018.

16. Mberu B, Kabiru C, Donatien B, Ezeh A. Consolidating research on population dynamics and health of the urban poor in Sub-Saharan Africa. An Overview, African Popul. Stud. 2016;30:3016–3019.

17. Han JS, Lee JW, Demographic change, human capital, and economic growth in Korea; 2019.

18. Landau D. Government Expenditure and economic growth: Government expenditure a cross-country study. South. Econ. Journal. 1983;49:783–792. Available:http://www.jstor.org/stable/10587 16.

19. Sunde U, Vischer T. Human capital and growth: Specification matters. Economica. 2015;82:368–390. Available:https://doi.org/10.1111/ecca.121 16

20. Galor O, Moav O. From physical to human capital accumulation: Inequality and the process of development. Rev. Econ. Stud. 2004;71:1001–1026.

21. Psacharopoulos G, Patrinos HA, Returns to Investment in education: A further update; 2002.

22. Hanushek EA. Economic growth in developing countries: The role of human capital, Econ. Educ. Rev. 2013;37:204–212.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2013.04.005

23. Schutt F. The importance of human capital for economic growth. Inst. World Econ. Int. Manag; 2003.
Available:http://www.iwim.uni-bremen.de/publikationen/pdf/W027.pdf

24. Psacharopoulos G, Patrinos HA. Returns to investment in education: A decennial review of the global literature. Educ. Econ. 2018;26:445–458.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1080/09645292.2018.1484426

25. Patrinos HA, Montenegro C. Comparable estimates of returns to schooling around the world; 2014.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-7020

26. Orisadare OG, Olabisi MAA, Olanrewaju A. Gender analysis of the effects of human capital development on economic growth in Nigeria. African J. Appl. Res. 2017;3: 85–96.

27. Duan Y. The role of human capital in china' s rural vitalization. Adv. Soc. Sci. Educ. Humanit. Res. 2019;319:530–533.

28. McDonald S, Roberts J. Growth and multiple forms of human capital in an augmented Solow model: A panel data investigation. Econ. Lett. 2002;74:271–276.

29. Nnyanzi JB, Kilimani N. Estimation of disaggregated impacts of education expansion on economic growth in Sub-Saharan Africa. Mod. Econ. 2018;09: 2119–2149.
Available:https://doi.org/10.4236/me.2018.912132

30. Clarke T, Gholamshahi S. Developing human capital for knowledge based economies. Innov. Asia Pacific. Chapter. 2018;12:247–270.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5895-0_12

31. Gillies D. Human capital theory in education. Peters MA, (Ed). Encycl. Educ. Philos. Theory. Sect. Math. Educ. Philos. Theory. Springer Sci. Bus. Media Singapore. 2015-2016;1–6.
DOI: 10.1007/978-981-287-532-7_254-1
Available:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-532-7

32. Li T, Wang Y. Growth channels of human capital: A Chinese panel data study, China. Econ. Rev; 2016.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chieco.2016.11.002

33. Sefa H, Ling YS, Mehmet U, Effects of government education and health expenditures on economic growth: A meta-analysis. Econstor Make Your Publ. Visible this Version is; 2015.
Available:Http//Hdl.Handle.Net/10419/110901

34. Aremu YS. The analysis of impact of investment in education on economic growth in Nigeria: Veracity of association of staff union of University of Nigeria's (ASUU) Agitation, Munich. Pers. RePEc Arch. MPRA Paper. 2014;0–33.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1227/01.NEU.0000349921.14519.2A

35. Azam M, Ahmed AM. Role of human capital and foreign direct investment in promoting economic growth: Evidence from commonwealth of dependent States. Int. J. Soc. Econ. 2015;42.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSE-05-2014-0092

36. Maitra B. Investment in human capital and economic growth in Singapore. Glob. Bus. Rev. 2016;17.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150915619819

37. Pegkas P. The link between educational levels and economic growth: A neoclassical approach for the case of Greece. Int. J. Appl. Econ. 2014;11: 38–54.

38. Reza A, Valeecha S. Impact of education on economic growth of Pakistan-econometric analysis. J. Bus. Manag. 2012;5:20–27.

39. Kabir Usman F. Effect of human capital development on economic growth of ECOWAS member states. Adv. Sci. Humanit. 2019;5:27.
Available:https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ash.20190501.14

40. Ma L. Review and prospect of the measurement and application of human capital. Adv. Econ. Bus. Manag. Res. Antlantis Press. 2019;94:617–620.

41. Lim SS, Updike RL, Kaldjian AS, Barber RM, Cowling K, York H, Friedman J, Xu R, Whisnant JL, Taylor HJ, Leever AT, Roman Y, Bryant MF, Dieleman J, Gakidou E, Murray CJL, Measuring human capital: A systematic analysis of 195

countries and territories, 1990–2016. Lancet. 2018;392:1217–1234. Available:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31941-X

42. Antonelli C, Colombelli A. External and internal knowledge in the knowledge generation function. Ind. Innov. 2015;22: 273–298.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1080/13662716.2015.1049864

43. Van Der Pol J, Rameshkoumar J. The co-evolution of knowledge and collaboration networks in, STI 2016 Peripher. Front. Beyond. 2016;1–27.

44. Singh SP, Sharma SSP. Human capital in agriculture: Developmental role, current stock, and emerging issues. Indian J. Labour Econ. 2004;47:761–772.
Available:https://doi.org/http://www.isleijle.org/ijle/Archive.aspx

45. Huffman WE. Human capital Education and agriculture. in: Pap. Plenary Sess. III 24 Int. Congr. Agric. Econ. Berlin, Ger. 2000-2002;13-18:333–381.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1016/S1574-0072(01)10010-1

46. Signh SP, SSP, Sharma. Human capital in agriculture: Developmental role, current stock, and emerging issues. Ndian J. Labour Econ. 2004;8:41–59.
Available:https://doi.org/10.2307/1818907

47. Tsai CL, Hung MC, Harriott K. Human capital composition and economic growth, Soc. Indic. Res. 2010;99:41–59.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9565-z

48. Dietrich JP, Schmitz C, Lotze-Campen H, Popp A, Müller C. Forecasting technological change in agriculture-An endogenous implementation in a global land use model. Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change. 2014;81:236–249.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2013.02.003

49. Fraumeni BM. The output of the education sector as determined by education's effect on lifetime income, in: Work. Meas. Output Educ. Sect., Brookings Program on Output and Productivity Measurement in the Service Sector, Brookings Institution, Washington, DC; 2000.

50. Sianesi B, Van Reenen J. The returns to education: Macroeconomics. J. Econ. Surv. 2003;17:157–200.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6419.00192

51. Bakkabulindi FEK. Financing higher education in Uganda, Nkumba Univ. Sch. Educ. J. 2006;1:42–59.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

52. Bloom BDE, Canning D, Chan K, Luca DL. Chronicle of African higher education spurring economic growth in Africa : The role of higher education. Chronicla High. Educ; 2014.

53. Katunguka S. The role of higher education in poverty eradication in Uganda: The experience of makerere university through innovations at makerere committee 1. Uganda High. Educ. Rev. 2015;2.

54. Marginson S. Rethinking education, work and 'employability'': Foundational problems of human capital theory.' SRHE Conf. Newport. 2015;44:1–21.

55. Arndt C, McKay A, Tarp F. Growth and poverty in sub-saharan Africa; 2016.

56. Mankiw NG, Romer D, Weil ND. A contribution to the emperics of economic growth. Q. J. Econ. 1992;107:407–437.
Available:http://michau.nazwa.pl/aska/uploads/Students/mankiw_romer_weil.pdf

57. Ifa A, Guetat I. Does public expenditure on education promote Tunisian and Moroccan GDP per capital ARDL approach. J. Financ. Data Sci. 2018;4:234–246.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfds.2018.02.005

58. Fan S, Zhang X. Public expenditure, growth and poverty reduction in rural Uganda. Africa Dev. Bank. 2008;466–496.

59. Nchuchuwe FF, Adejuwon KD. The challenges of agriculture and rural development in Africa: The Case of Nigeria. Int. J. Acad. Res. Progress. Educ. Dev. 2012;1:45–61.

60. Minten B, Barrett CB. Agricultural technology, productivity, and poverty in Madagascar. World Dev. 2008;36:797–822.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2007.05.004

61. Aura S. Determinants of the Adoption of integrated soil fertility management technologies in mbale division, Kenya. African J. Food, Agric. Nutr. Dev. 2016;16: 10701–10714.
Available:https://doi.org/10.18697/ajfand.73.15735

62. Appleton S, Balihuta A. Education and agricultural productivity: Evidence from Uganda. J. Int. Dev. 1996;8:415–444.

Available:https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1328(199605)8:3<415::AID-JID396>3.0.CO;2-9

63. Alene AD, Manyong VM. The effects of education on agricultural productivity under traditional and improved technology in northern Nigeria: An endogenous switching regression analysis. Empir. Econ. 2007;32: 141–159.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1007/s00181-006-0076-3

64. Luh Y. The impact of education on agricultural productivity: Evidence from East Asian economies. Int. J. Food Agric. Econ. 2017;5:11–24.

65. Darvas P, Gao S, Shen Y, Bawany B. Sharing Higher education's promise beyond the few in sub-saharan Africa; 2017.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1050-3

66. Abdih Y, Joutz F. Relating the knowledge production function to total factor productivity: An endogenous growth puzzle; 2005.

67. Zasada I, Reutter M, Piorr A, Lefebvre M, Paloma SGY. Between capital investments and capacity building-development and application of a conceptual framework towards a place-based rural development policy. Land Use Policy. 2015;46:178–188.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2014.11.023

68. Blundell R, Dearden L, Meghir C, Sianesi B. Human capital investment: The returns from education and training to the individual, the firm and the economy. Fisc. Stud. 1999;20:1–23.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5890.1999.tb00001.x

69. Baier SL, Dwyer GP, Tamura R. How important are capital and total factor productivity for economic growth? Econ. Inq. 2006;44:23–49.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1093/ei/cbj003

70. Alani J. Role of human capital in the promotion of technological progress, economic growth and development in Africa: A case study of Kenya. African Eval. J. 2018;1(12):2310-4988.
ISSN: 2306-5133.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/59623