Published by

British Journal of Contemporary Research

BEXFORD PUBLISHING

BEYOND ECONOMIC REFORMS: RETHINKING NIGERIA'S DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY THROUGH STATE-LEVEL COMPETITIVENESS AND PRODUCTIVE FEDERALISM

Original Research Article | Volume 1 | Issue 3 | 2026 | Article Number: 047

Accepted: 04 August 2026 | Published: 10 August 2026 | ISSN: 2979-8582 (Online)

Crossref : **https://doi.org/10.67693/BJCR-63LWRZZG**

Jo Odama[1], FC Okpo[1], Mukhtar Imam[1]

[1]National Institute for Security Studies, Abuja-Nigeria, Nigeria

Correspondence: Mukhtar Imam, mukhtarimam01@gmail.com

Abstract

Nigeria has implemented numerous economic reforms over the past four decades with the objective of achieving sustainable economic growth, reducing poverty, attracting investments, and diversifying its economy. Despite these efforts, development outcomes have remained below expectations. While successive governments have emphasized macroeconomic stabilization, fiscal consolidation, privatization, deregulation, and monetary reforms, comparatively less attention has been devoted to strengthening subnational competitiveness and institutional arrangements capable of driving productive economic transformation. This article argues that Nigeria's development challenge extends beyond economic reforms to encompass the need for a new development paradigm anchored on state-level competitiveness and productive federalism. Drawing upon New Institutional Economics, Competitive Federalism Theory, Endogenous Growth Theory, and Developmental State perspectives, the study adopts a qualitative analytical methodology based on documentary research and comparative policy analysis. Secondary data are obtained from government reports, World Bank publications, African Development Bank reports etc. The study critically evaluates Nigeria's reform trajectory from the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) era to the contemporary reform agenda under the Renewed Hope economic framework. The findings suggest that although macroeconomic reforms have generated episodic improvements in economic indicators, institutional weaknesses, excessive fiscal centralization, weak state-level productive capacity, and limited inter-state competitiveness continue to constrain inclusive development. Comparative evidence from countries such as India, China, Germany, Brazil, and Ethiopia demonstrate that decentralized productive governance, competitive subnational economies, and place-based industrial strategies significantly enhance national development outcomes. The article proposes a framework of productive federalism that encourages healthy competition among states in investment attraction, industrial development, agricultural modernization, innovation ecosystems, infrastructure provision, and human capital development. It concludes that Nigeria's future prosperity depends less on repeated macroeconomic reforms and more on transforming states into competitive productive economies capable of driving national growth from the bottom upward.

Keywords: Nigeria, Economic Reforms, Productive Federalism, State Competitiveness, Development Strategy, Institutional Economics, Regional Development, Competitive Federalism

1. INTRODUCTION

Nigeria occupies a unique position within Africa owing to its demographic size, abundant natural resources, strategic geopolitical influence, and significant economic potential. As Africa's most populous country, with an estimated population exceeding 230 million people, Nigeria possesses considerable human and natural capital capable of supporting sustained economic transformation (United Nations, 2024). The country also possesses one of the continent's largest reserves of crude oil, natural gas, solid minerals, arable land, and entrepreneurial talent. Despite these endowments, Nigeria continues to grapple with persistent developmental challenges that undermine its aspiration to become one of the world's leading economies. Over the last four decades, successive Nigerian governments have pursued extensive economic reform programmes intended to stabilize the economy and promote growth. These reforms include the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) introduced in 1986, banking sector consolidation, privatization of public enterprises, trade liberalization, fiscal responsibility reforms, monetary tightening, fuel subsidy reforms, exchange rate liberalization, tax modernization, digital governance initiatives, and public financial management reforms (Iyoha & Oriakhi, 2008; World Bank, 2023).

Although these reforms have generated periods of macroeconomic stability, they have not translated into broad-based structural transformation. Nigeria continues to experience high unemployment, inflationary pressures, widening income inequality, weak manufacturing performance, low productivity, infrastructure deficits, insecurity, and declining investor confidence (African Development Bank [AfDB], 2024). According to the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS, 2023), multidimensional poverty affects a significant proportion of Nigerians, while youth unemployment and underemployment remain major policy concerns. The persistence of these development challenges raises an important question: why have repeated economic reforms failed to produce sustained national development?

One explanation lies in the dominant emphasis on macroeconomic reforms at the expense of productive institutional transformation. Most reform efforts have focused on exchange rates, fiscal deficits, monetary policies, debt restructuring, privatization, and subsidy removal. While these reforms are important, they often overlook the institutional and spatial dimensions of development that determine productive capacity at subnational levels (Rodrik, 2008).

Development is increasingly understood not merely as a function of national economic policies but as the cumulative outcome of productive local economies, competitive regions, efficient institutions, and innovation-driven enterprises (Porter, 1990). Countries that have achieved sustained development—including Germany, China, India, Canada, and the United States—have done so partly by empowering subnational governments to compete in attracting investment, developing infrastructure, promoting industrial clusters, and expanding local productive capacity (Weingast, 1995).

Nigeria's federal structure presents a significant opportunity for such transformation. The country consists of 36 states and the Federal Capital Territory, each possessing unique comparative advantages in agriculture, mining, manufacturing, tourism, renewable energy, technology, and logistics. Yet, many states remain heavily dependent on federally allocated oil revenues rather than internally generated productive activities (Suberu, 2001). This dependence has weakened incentives for innovation, investment promotion, and industrial competitiveness. This article argues that Nigeria requires a shift from a reform-centric development model toward a competitiveness-driven federal development strategy. Instead of viewing states primarily as administrative units dependent on federal transfers, they should be repositioned as productive economic entities competing to attract investments, create jobs, improve infrastructure, strengthen institutions, and generate sustainable growth. The concept of productive federalism extends beyond constitutional decentralization. It emphasizes the creation of incentives that encourage states to develop their comparative advantages while contributing to national economic resilience. Under such a framework, fiscal arrangements, infrastructure investments, innovation policies, and governance reforms are designed to stimulate productive competition rather than fiscal dependency.

2. BACKGROUND AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Since independence in 1960, Nigeria has pursued various development strategies aimed at achieving economic modernization and social progress. These strategies have evolved from state-led industrialization during the post-independence period to market-oriented reforms beginning in the mid-1980s. While each reform agenda has addressed particular macroeconomic challenges, their cumulative impact on structural transformation has remained limited.

During the 1970s, Nigeria benefited from substantial oil revenues generated by the global oil boom. Rather than investing these windfalls in productive industrialization and economic diversification, much of the revenue financed recurrent government expenditure and large-scale public sector expansion (Lewis, 2007). Consequently, the economy became increasingly dependent on crude oil exports, rendering it vulnerable to external commodity price shocks. The collapse of global oil prices during the early 1980s exposed structural weaknesses within the Nigerian economy. In response, the government introduced the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) in 1986 under the guidance of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. SAP sought to restore macroeconomic stability through exchange rate deregulation, trade liberalization, privatization, subsidy removal, and fiscal discipline (World Bank, 1994).

Although SAP improved certain macroeconomic indicators, it also generated significant social costs, including increased poverty, unemployment, inflation, and reduced public investment in education and healthcare (Mkandawire & Soludo, 1999). Subsequent reform initiatives attempted to address these shortcomings through poverty reduction programmes, banking reforms, debt relief, and governance improvements. Nigeria's democratic transition in 1999 ushered in another wave of reforms focused on strengthening institutions, improving fiscal transparency, combating corruption, and modernizing public administration. Reforms during the administrations of Presidents Olusegun Obasanjo, Umaru Musa Yar'Adua, Goodluck Jonathan, Muhammadu Buhari, and Bola Ahmed Tinubu have included banking consolidation, Treasury Single Account (TSA), Integrated Payroll and Personnel Information System (IPPIS), the Petroleum Industry Act (PIA), exchange rate reforms, tax administration modernization, and fuel subsidy removal.

Despite these efforts, Nigeria continues to experience weak structural transformation. Manufacturing contributes a relatively small share to GDP, agricultural productivity remains below global averages, electricity generation remains insufficient for industrialization, and infrastructure deficits continue to impede competitiveness (AfDB, 2024).

A major explanation lies in the country's highly centralized fiscal architecture. Nigeria operates one of the world's most centralized federal systems in terms of revenue collection. The Federal Government controls the largest share of nationally generated revenues, while states rely heavily on statutory allocations from the Federation Account (Suberu, 2001). Such fiscal dependence discourages innovation, entrepreneurship, and long-term productive planning at the state level. Internally Generated Revenue (IGR) disparities further illustrate this challenge. While states such as Lagos have developed relatively diversified revenue bases through taxation, commerce, and investment promotion, many others remain dependent on federal allocations for more than 80 percent of their budgets (National Bureau of Statistics, 2023). This imbalance limits fiscal autonomy and reduces incentives for economic diversification.

Institutional quality also varies considerably across Nigerian states. Differences in regulatory efficiency, ease of doing business, infrastructure quality, human capital, security, and governance have produced uneven development outcomes. States that have invested in transport infrastructure, digital governance, education, and investment facilitation generally attract greater private investment than those with weaker institutions. International experience demonstrates that decentralized competition can stimulate economic growth. China's provincial competition, India's state-level investment reforms, Germany's Länder innovation systems, and Brazil's decentralized industrial policies illustrate how subnational governments can become engines of national development (Qian & Weingast, 1997).

Nigeria has yet to fully exploit similar opportunities. Rather than encouraging healthy competition among states, existing institutional arrangements often reinforce dependence on centrally distributed oil revenues. Consequently, many states devote substantial portions of their annual budgets to recurrent expenditure while allocating relatively limited resources toward productive investment. The challenge therefore is not merely one of economic policy but of institutional design. Sustainable development requires governance systems that reward productivity, innovation, accountability, and investment attraction at all levels of government.

The emergence of global knowledge economies further reinforces the urgency of this transition. Contemporary development increasingly depends upon innovation ecosystems, digital infrastructure, research institutions, entrepreneurial networks, logistics efficiency, renewable energy, and skilled human capital. States capable of creating conducive environments for these factors become magnets for domestic and foreign investment. Without a deliberate strategy to strengthen state competitiveness, Nigeria risks perpetuating a cycle in which macroeconomic reforms produce temporary stabilization without achieving structural transformation. Reimagining federalism as an instrument for productive competition therefore represents both an institutional necessity and a strategic opportunity for long-term national development.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Conceptualizing Economic Reforms

Economic reforms refer to deliberate policy interventions designed to improve the efficiency, productivity, and resilience of an economy by addressing structural distortions, enhancing market performance, and promoting sustainable economic growth. Such reforms typically encompass fiscal restructuring, monetary stabilization, deregulation, privatization, trade liberalization, exchange rate management, public sector modernization, financial sector reforms, and institutional strengthening (World Bank, 2023).

The intellectual foundations of economic reforms are largely rooted in neoclassical economics, which assumes that market efficiency, competition, and limited government intervention produce optimal allocation of resources (Williamson, 1990). The Washington Consensus, introduced by Williamson (1990), became one of the most influential frameworks guiding reforms across developing countries during the 1980s and 1990s. Its principal recommendations included fiscal discipline, tax reforms, privatization of state enterprises, deregulation of markets, liberalization of trade, and protection of property rights.

Nigeria embraced many of these reforms beginning with the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) in

1986. Subsequent administrations expanded reform efforts through banking consolidation, telecommunications liberalization, debt restructuring, public financial management reforms, Treasury Single Account (TSA), Integrated Payroll and Personnel Information System (IPPIS), fuel subsidy reforms, exchange-rate adjustments, and improvements in tax administration (Soludo, 2007).

Despite these interventions, development outcomes have remained mixed. Although reforms improved macroeconomic indicators during certain periods, they did not fundamentally transform Nigeria's productive structure. Manufacturing has remained relatively weak, agricultural productivity has been constrained by low mechanization and inadequate value addition, while unemployment and multidimensional poverty continue to affect millions of Nigerians (African Development Bank [AfDB], 2024; National Bureau of Statistics [NBS], 2023).

This apparent disconnect between macroeconomic reforms and developmental outcomes has generated increasing scholarly interest in alternative development paradigms emphasizing institutional quality, productive capacity, innovation systems, and regional competitiveness (Rodrik, 2008; Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012).

Increasingly, development economists argue that reforms focusing exclusively on macroeconomic stabilization are insufficient in countries characterized by institutional weaknesses and structural rigidities. Sustainable development requires complementary investments in productive infrastructure, governance institutions, technological capabilities, and human capital. Consequently, many scholars advocate a transition from reform-oriented policy frameworks toward development strategies centered on productivity and institutional transformation (Lin, 2012).

3.2 Understanding Development Strategy

Development strategy refers to the comprehensive set of policies, institutional arrangements, and governance mechanisms adopted by governments to promote long-term economic transformation, improve living standards, and enhance national competitiveness (Todaro & Smith, 2021). Unlike isolated economic reforms, development strategies integrate macroeconomic management with industrial policy, infrastructure development, education, technological innovation, and institutional reforms.

Historically, development thinking has evolved through several paradigms. Early modernization theorists argued that developing countries should emulate the industrial trajectories of advanced economies through capital accumulation and technological adoption (Rostow, 1960). Dependency theorists, however, challenged this view by emphasizing structural inequalities within the global economy that constrain development in peripheral countries (Frank, 1967).

The developmental state literature introduced another perspective by highlighting the role of capable governments in coordinating industrialization, supporting strategic sectors, and fostering technological learning (Johnson, 1982; Evans, 1995). Countries such as Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, and later China demonstrated that state-led coordination, when combined with market incentives, could accelerate structural transformation.

More recently, scholars have emphasized place-based development strategies that recognize the importance of regional institutions, local innovation systems, industrial clusters, and decentralized governance in driving economic growth (Barca et al., 2012). These approaches argue that development is inherently spatial and that national prosperity depends upon the productivity of regions, cities, and local economies.

Nigeria's development strategies have historically emphasized centralized planning and resource allocation. While national development plans have articulated ambitious goals for industrialization and diversification, implementation has often been constrained by weak institutions, political instability, and fiscal dependence on petroleum revenues (Lewis, 2007).

The emerging concept of productive federalism offers an alternative by shifting attention toward subnational economic transformation. Rather than concentrating developmental responsibility within the federal government, productive federalism encourages states to become engines of innovation, investment attraction, and industrial development.

3.3 State-Level Competitiveness

Competitiveness generally refers to the ability of an economy to produce goods and services that meet international market standards while simultaneously improving the living standards of its citizens (Porter, 1990). Although competitiveness is often examined at the national level, increasing attention has been devoted to competitiveness among subnational governments.

State-level competitiveness encompasses the institutional, infrastructural, human capital, and economic conditions that enable individual states to attract investment, foster entrepreneurship, promote innovation, and generate sustainable employment (World Economic Forum, 2020). Competitive states possess efficient public institutions, quality infrastructure, skilled labor, effective regulatory systems, and supportive business environments. Michael Porter's theory of competitive advantage provides an important conceptual foundation for understanding regional competitiveness. According to Porter (1990), economic prosperity emerges from productivity rather than resource endowments alone. Competitive regions create favorable conditions through innovation, specialized industries, efficient institutions, and dynamic business ecosystems. Within federal systems, competition among subnational governments can stimulate policy innovation and institutional improvements. States compete by improving infrastructure, simplifying regulations, investing in education, strengthening public services, and supporting private sector development. This competition enhances efficiency while creating incentives for continuous institutional improvement (Weingast, 1995).

Nigeria exhibits substantial disparities in state competitiveness. Lagos State, for example, has developed relatively sophisticated financial services, transportation infrastructure, digital governance systems, and internally generated revenue mechanisms that distinguish it from many other states. Conversely, numerous states remain heavily dependent on federal allocations and possess limited industrial capacity.

Several indicators demonstrate these disparities:

- Variations in internally generated revenue (IGR)
- Ease of doing business rankings
- Infrastructure quality
- Electricity access
- Educational attainment
- Industrial concentration
- Agricultural productivity
- Digital infrastructure
- Security conditions
- Institutional effectiveness

These differences suggest that Nigeria's states possess varying capacities to drive economic growth. Strengthening state competitiveness therefore requires tailored policy interventions that recognize each state's comparative advantages while addressing institutional constraints.

3.4 Productive Federalism

Federalism refers to a constitutional arrangement in which governmental authority is divided between national and subnational governments (Watts, 2008). Traditional analyses of federalism focus primarily on constitutional powers, political representation, and fiscal arrangements. Productive federalism extends this perspective by emphasizing the economic functions of decentralized governance.

Productive federalism encourages states to become active producers of economic value rather than passive recipients of fiscal transfers. It promotes healthy competition in investment attraction, industrialization, technological innovation, agricultural modernization, infrastructure provision, and human capital development. Unlike distributive federalism, which primarily allocates centrally generated revenues among constituent units, productive federalism creates incentives for states to expand their own productive capacities and revenue bases. Such systems reward innovation, entrepreneurship, institutional quality, and economic diversification.

The concept closely aligns with market-preserving federalism proposed by Weingast (1995), who argued that decentralized governments can promote economic development by maintaining competitive markets, protecting property rights, and limiting arbitrary government intervention. China's economic reforms provide a notable example. During the post-1978 reform era, provincial governments were granted considerable autonomy to attract foreign direct investment, establish industrial parks, support manufacturing, and experiment with policy innovations. Competition among provinces became a major driver of China's extraordinary economic growth (Qian & Weingast, 1997).

Similarly, India's economic liberalization enhanced the role of state governments in attracting investment through improvements in infrastructure, industrial policy, and business regulation. States such as Gujarat, Karnataka, Maharashtra, and Tamil Nadu emerged as major investment destinations because of proactive governance and competitive policy environments (Ahluwalia, 2002). Germany's federal model demonstrates how decentralized governance can support technological innovation through regional research institutions, vocational education systems, and specialized industrial clusters. The German Länder play significant roles in education, innovation policy, infrastructure development, and regional industrial planning (Scharpf, 2009). These international experiences suggest that productive federalism can enhance national development by mobilizing local knowledge, encouraging institutional experimentation, and fostering competition among subnational governments.

3.5 Fiscal Federalism and Economic Development

Fiscal federalism concerns the allocation of expenditure responsibilities, taxation powers, and revenue-sharing arrangements among different levels of government (Oates, 1972). Effective fiscal federalism promotes efficiency by assigning responsibilities to the level of government best positioned to deliver public services. Nigeria's fiscal federalism has long been characterized by significant centralization. Petroleum revenues account for a substantial proportion of federally collected revenues, which are subsequently distributed among federal, state, and local governments through statutory allocation formulas.

While this arrangement ensures national redistribution, it also creates dependency. Many states derive the majority of their revenues from federal allocations rather than internally generated economic activities. Consequently, incentives for expanding tax bases, attracting investment, and promoting industrial development remain relatively weak. Several scholars argue that excessive fiscal dependence contributes to institutional complacency and weak governance (Suberu, 2001; Arowolo, 2011). States with limited fiscal autonomy often prioritize short-term expenditure management over long-term productive investments.

Conversely, competitive fiscal federalism encourages states to strengthen revenue administration, improve investment climates, and diversify economic activities. Fiscal autonomy increases accountability because governments become more dependent on locally generated revenues than centrally distributed transfers. However, fiscal decentralization alone is insufficient. Productive federalism requires complementary investments in institutional capacity, infrastructure, human capital, digital governance, and industrial policy.

3.6 Institutional Quality and Development

Institutional economics emphasizes that long-term development depends not only on capital accumulation but also on the quality of formal and informal institutions (North, 1990). Institutions establish the rules governing economic interactions, property rights, contract enforcement, regulatory systems, and public administration. Acemoglu and Robinson (2012) distinguish between inclusive institutions, which promote innovation and broad participation in economic activities, and extractive institutions, which concentrate economic opportunities among narrow elites.

Nigeria's development experience illustrates the importance of institutional quality. Weak regulatory systems, policy inconsistencies, corruption, bureaucratic inefficiencies, and governance challenges have frequently undermined the effectiveness of economic reforms. State-level institutions are particularly important because investors interact more frequently with subnational governments than with federal authorities. Efficient land administration, transparent taxation, effective dispute resolution, infrastructure maintenance, and investment promotion agencies significantly influence business decisions. Consequently, improving institutional quality across Nigerian states represents a critical prerequisite for enhancing competitiveness and promoting sustainable development.

3.7 Empirical Review

Empirical studies increasingly demonstrate that institutional quality and regional competitiveness exert stronger influences on long-term economic development than macroeconomic reforms alone. Rodrik (2008) argues that successful development experiences across East Asia, Europe, and Latin America were driven less by standardized reform packages and more by context-specific institutional innovations that enhanced productivity and structural transformation.

Acemoglu and Robinson (2012), using comparative historical analysis across multiple countries, conclude that inclusive political and economic institutions are the principal determinants of sustained prosperity. Their findings suggest that reforms lacking institutional transformation are unlikely to produce durable development outcomes. Similarly, Lin (2012) emphasizes that structural transformation depends upon governments' ability to facilitate industrial upgrading, infrastructure development, and technological learning rather than relying exclusively on market liberalization.

Within Nigeria, empirical studies consistently identify institutional weaknesses, fiscal dependence, and inadequate infrastructure as major constraints on economic competitiveness. For example, studies by Suberu (2001), Soludo (2007), and Arowolo (2011) indicate that Nigeria's highly centralized fiscal system weakens incentives for productive governance at the state level. The African Development Bank (2024) further notes that improving subnational governance, infrastructure quality, and regional value chains is essential for achieving inclusive and sustainable growth across African economies.

3.8 Research Gap

Although extensive literature exists on Nigeria's economic reforms, fiscal federalism, and development planning, relatively few studies integrate these themes within a unified framework emphasizing state-level competitiveness and productive federalism as complementary drivers of structural transformation. Most Nigerian studies continue to evaluate reforms primarily through macroeconomic indicators such as inflation, GDP growth, fiscal deficits, exchange rates, and public debt. Comparatively limited attention has been devoted to understanding how institutional competition among states can reshape national development outcomes. Furthermore, existing studies seldom combine insights from New Institutional Economics, Competitive Federalism Theory, Endogenous Growth Theory, and Developmental State perspectives into a comprehensive analytical model applicable to Nigeria's contemporary governance context. This article addresses these gaps by proposing an integrated framework that repositions Nigeria's states as productive economic actors rather than passive administrative units. It argues that sustainable development requires a transition from centralized distributive federalism toward a model of competitive, innovation-driven, and productivity-oriented federal governance.

4. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is anchored on four complementary theoretical perspectives that collectively provide a robust analytical lens for understanding the relationship between economic reforms, institutional quality, state competitiveness, and sustainable development in Nigeria. These theories are New Institutional Economics (NIE), Competitive Federalism Theory, Endogenous Growth Theory, and Developmental State Theory. Individually, each explains a dimension of development; collectively, they demonstrate why macroeconomic reforms alone are insufficient for achieving structural transformation without productive institutions and competitive subnational governments.

4.1 New Institutional Economics (NIE)

New Institutional Economics emerged as a response to the limitations of neoclassical economics in explaining differences in economic performance among countries with similar resource endowments. While traditional economic theory emphasizes capital accumulation, labor, and technology, NIE argues that institutions determine how effectively these factors are utilized (North, 1990). North (1990) defines institutions as the "rules of the game" that shape political, economic, and social interactions. These include constitutions, laws, property rights, judicial systems, bureaucracies, informal norms, and governance structures. Institutions reduce uncertainty, lower transaction costs, facilitate cooperation, and create incentives for productive investment. Within the Nigerian context, institutional weaknesses have consistently undermined the effectiveness of economic reforms. Exchange-rate adjustments, privatization, tax reforms, and monetary policies often produce only temporary improvements because implementation is constrained by weak regulatory institutions, policy inconsistency, corruption, bureaucratic inefficiency, and limited administrative capacity.

Acemoglu and Robinson (2012) further distinguish between inclusive institutions and extractive institutions. Inclusive institutions encourage entrepreneurship, innovation, and investment by guaranteeing property rights, enforcing contracts, and ensuring equal economic opportunities. Extractive institutions concentrate power and wealth within narrow political elites, discouraging productivity and long-term investment.

The persistence of institutional weaknesses across many Nigerian states suggests that national economic reforms cannot achieve sustainable outcomes unless accompanied by institutional strengthening at the subnational level. States require transparent regulatory systems, efficient land administration, credible judicial processes, accountable public financial management, and investment-friendly governance structures to become competitive economic actors. Consequently, New Institutional Economics provides a strong theoretical justification for shifting Nigeria's development strategy beyond macroeconomic reforms toward institutional transformation across all levels of government.

4.2 Competitive Federalism Theory

Competitive Federalism Theory explains how decentralized governance structures stimulate innovation, efficiency, and economic growth by encouraging competition among subnational governments. The theory builds upon the work of Tiebout (1956), Oates (1972), and Weingast (1995). Tiebout argued that decentralized governments compete by providing public goods and services that attract residents and businesses. Oates later formalized this argument by demonstrating that decentralized provision of public services often improves efficiency because local governments possess better information about local preferences. Weingast (1995) extended these ideas through his concept of market-preserving federalism, arguing that economic development flourishes when subnational governments enjoy sufficient autonomy to encourage markets while remaining constrained by national constitutional rules.

Competitive federalism promotes:

- policy innovation;
- regulatory efficiency;
- investment attraction;
- infrastructure development;
- industrial specialization;
- human capital investment; and
- fiscal responsibility.

Rather than relying solely on central government initiatives, states compete to attract businesses, improve infrastructure, simplify regulations, develop industrial parks, strengthen educational institutions, and promote entrepreneurship. International evidence supports this perspective. In China, provincial competition became one of the principal drivers of rapid industrialization following the 1978 reforms (Qian & Weingast, 1997). India's economic liberalization similarly empowered state governments to compete for domestic and foreign investment through infrastructure improvements and regulatory reforms (Ahluwalia, 2002).

Nigeria's federal system possesses similar potential. However, excessive dependence on federally distributed oil revenues has weakened competitive incentives among states. Instead of competing to create productive economies, many states remain dependent upon monthly statutory allocations. This study therefore argues that productive federalism requires restructuring fiscal incentives so that states derive greater benefits from expanding internally generated productive activities rather than depending primarily on federally allocated revenues.

4.3 Endogenous Growth Theory

Traditional growth theories explain economic expansion primarily through capital accumulation and technological progress originating outside the economic system. Endogenous Growth Theory, developed by Romer (1986) and Lucas (1988), challenges this assumption by arguing that technological progress results from deliberate investments in knowledge, education, innovation, and human capital.

According to Endogenous Growth Theory, sustained economic growth depends upon:

- human capital development;
- research and development;
- technological innovation;
- entrepreneurship;

- institutional learning;
- knowledge spillovers; and
- innovation ecosystems.

Unlike natural resources, knowledge exhibits increasing returns because ideas can be shared and improved without being depleted. This theoretical perspective is particularly relevant to Nigeria because the country's future competitiveness depends increasingly upon knowledge-intensive industries rather than petroleum exports alone. States that invest strategically in universities, vocational education, digital infrastructure, research institutes, innovation hubs, and entrepreneurship ecosystems are more likely to attract investment and generate sustained economic growth. Lagos State illustrates this dynamic through the growth of Nigeria's technology ecosystem, commonly referred to as "Yabacon Valley." Concentrations of technology firms, universities, venture capital, and digital entrepreneurs have transformed Lagos into West Africa's leading innovation hub.

Other states possess comparable opportunities based on their comparative advantages:

- Kaduna – manufacturing and ICT
- Kano – commerce and agro-processing
- Ogun – industrial manufacturing
- Benue – agro-industrial value chains
- Cross River – tourism
- Plateau – horticulture
- Nasarawa – mining
- Akwa Ibom – blue economy
- Edo – digital services
- Ekiti – knowledge economy

Endogenous Growth Theory therefore reinforces the argument that development strategies should prioritize productive investments capable of generating continuous innovation and productivity improvements.

4.4 Developmental State Theory

Developmental State Theory emerged from studies of East Asian industrialization, particularly Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and Singapore (Johnson, 1982; Evans, 1995).

Unlike laissez-faire approaches, developmental states actively coordinate industrial transformation through:

- strategic planning;
- industrial policy;
- infrastructure investment;
- export promotion;
- technological upgrading;
- public-private partnerships;
- investment in education; and
- institutional coordination.

The developmental state does not replace markets but instead facilitates markets by reducing coordination failures and supporting productive sectors. China's remarkable economic transformation similarly illustrates developmental state principles. Provincial governments compete to attract investment while national authorities coordinate infrastructure, industrial policy, and macroeconomic stability. Nigeria's experience demonstrates that markets alone cannot overcome structural constraints such as inadequate electricity, poor transportation networks, limited industrial finance, weak logistics, and insufficient technological capabilities. Consequently, productive federalism should incorporate developmental state principles by enabling state governments to coordinate strategic investments in sectors where they possess comparative advantages.

4.5 Integrated Analytical Framework

The four theoretical perspectives complement one another.

- New Institutional Economics explains why institutions matter.
- Competitive Federalism explains why decentralized competition enhances efficiency.
- Endogenous Growth Theory explains why innovation drives long-term prosperity.
- Developmental State Theory explains how governments coordinate structural transformation.

Together they provide a comprehensive framework for understanding why Nigeria must move beyond repeated macroeconomic reforms toward institution-driven, innovation-led, and state-centered development.

5. METHODOLOGY

5.1 Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative explanatory research design using documentary analysis and comparative policy analysis. Qualitative methodology is particularly appropriate because the study investigates institutional arrangements, governance systems, public policies, and development strategies that cannot be adequately understood through quantitative indicators alone (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Rather than testing causal hypotheses statistically, the study seeks to explain how institutional structures influence development outcomes across different federal systems.

6. NIGERIA'S ECONOMIC REFORM TRAJECTORY (1986–2026)

6.1 The Structural Adjustment Programme (1986–1993)

Nigeria's contemporary reform history began with the Structural Adjustment Programme introduced in July 1986 under General Ibrahim Babangida. SAP sought to address severe macroeconomic imbalances arising from the collapse of global oil prices during the early 1980s. Key objectives included restoring fiscal balance, improving external competitiveness, reducing public sector inefficiencies, and promoting private-sector-led growth (World Bank, 1994).

Major policy measures included:

- exchange-rate deregulation;
- abolition of commodity boards;
- trade liberalization;
- privatization of state-owned enterprises;
- removal of import licensing;
- financial sector reforms; and
- reduction of government expenditure.

Although SAP improved certain macroeconomic indicators, it also generated significant social costs. Currency depreciation increased production costs, inflation accelerated, real wages declined, and poverty expanded during much of the adjustment period (Mkandawire & Soludo, 1999). Perhaps more importantly, SAP focused predominantly on macroeconomic stabilization while devoting comparatively limited attention to strengthening productive institutions, industrial capabilities, and regional competitiveness.

6.2 Democratic Reform Era (1999–2007)

Nigeria's return to democratic governance in 1999 ushered in another phase of economic reforms.

The Obasanjo administration implemented several important initiatives, including:

- banking consolidation;
- anti-corruption reforms;
- telecommunications liberalization;
- pension reforms;
- debt relief negotiations;
- fiscal responsibility initiatives; and
- public procurement reforms.

One of the most successful reforms involved the liberalization of the telecommunications sector. Mobile telephone subscriptions increased dramatically, stimulating digital entrepreneurship and improving financial inclusion. Banking consolidation under the leadership of Central Bank Governor Charles Soludo strengthened financial institutions through recapitalization, reducing systemic vulnerabilities and enhancing financial stability (Soludo, 2007). However, manufacturing growth remained relatively modest, electricity shortages persisted, and many states continued to rely overwhelmingly on federally distributed revenues.

6.3 Reform Continuity (2007–2015)

Subsequent administrations pursued additional reforms emphasizing:

- financial inclusion;
- agricultural transformation;
- infrastructure investment;
- public financial management;
- sovereign wealth management; and
- industrial policy.

The Agricultural Transformation Agenda sought to reposition agriculture as a business rather than merely a development programme. Fertilizer distribution reforms, value-chain development, and private-sector participation contributed to improvements in selected agricultural commodities. Despite these gains, insecurity, infrastructure deficits, weak logistics, and governance challenges constrained broader structural transformation.

7. NIGERIA'S ECONOMIC REFORM TRAJECTORY (2015–2026): CONTINUITY, INNOVATION AND EMERGING CHALLENGES

The period between 2015 and 2026 represents one of the most consequential phases in Nigeria's economic history. Successive administrations implemented ambitious reforms in public finance, petroleum governance, taxation, digitalization, and exchange-rate management. These reforms sought to stabilize the economy amid declining oil prices, recession, the COVID-19 pandemic, global inflationary pressures, and mounting fiscal challenges. Nevertheless, while several reforms improved macroeconomic governance, their impact on structural transformation remained constrained by persistent institutional weaknesses, inadequate infrastructure, insecurity, and limited productive capacity at the state level.

7.1 Economic Reforms under the Buhari Administration (2015–2023)

The administration of President Muhammadu Buhari inherited an economy facing declining crude oil prices, shrinking foreign exchange earnings, and increasing fiscal pressures. In response, the government introduced several policy initiatives aimed at restoring macroeconomic stability and improving governance. One of the most significant reforms was the expansion of the Treasury Single Account (TSA), which consolidated government revenues into a unified account at the Central Bank of Nigeria. The TSA significantly improved transparency in public financial management by reducing revenue leakages and enhancing cash management (Central Bank of Nigeria [CBN], 2021). Similarly, the Integrated Payroll and Personnel Information System (IPPIS) was expanded to eliminate "ghost workers," strengthen payroll administration, and reduce recurrent expenditure. Complementary reforms such as the Government Integrated Financial Management Information System (GIFMIS) further enhanced public expenditure control. The administration also prioritized infrastructure through increased investments in road networks, rail transportation, airport modernization, and power transmission. Projects such as the Abuja–Kaduna Railway, Lagos–Ibadan Railway, Second Niger Bridge, and several expressway rehabilitation projects reflected renewed emphasis on physical infrastructure as a catalyst for economic growth. In agriculture, the Anchor Borrowers' Programme (ABP) sought to improve food production through subsidized credit to smallholder farmers linked to agro-processing firms. While the programme expanded agricultural financing, evaluations revealed mixed outcomes due to loan recovery challenges, insecurity, climate-related disruptions, and implementation inefficiencies (CBN, 2022).

Perhaps the most transformative legislative achievement during this period was the enactment of the Petroleum Industry Act (PIA) 2021, which restructured Nigeria's petroleum governance framework, commercialized the Nigerian National Petroleum Company Limited (NNPC Ltd.), and introduced new fiscal and regulatory arrangements intended to attract investment into the oil and gas sector. Despite these reforms, Nigeria experienced two economic recessions (2016 and 2020), rising inflation, foreign exchange shortages, increasing public debt, and deteriorating investor confidence. Economic diversification remained slower than anticipated, highlighting the limitations of macroeconomic reforms without complementary institutional and productive transformation.

7.2 Renewed Hope Reforms (2023–2026)

The inauguration of President Bola Ahmed Tinubu in May 2023 marked another significant reform phase characterized by bold macroeconomic adjustments. Among the earliest policy decisions were:

- Removal of the long-standing petrol subsidy;
- Liberalization of the foreign exchange market;
- Tax reform initiatives;
- Fiscal consolidation measures;
- Renewed infrastructure investment;
- Expansion of social protection programmes.

The removal of fuel subsidies was intended to reduce fiscal distortions and redirect public resources toward infrastructure, education, healthcare, and social investment. Although economically rational in the long term, the reform generated substantial short-term inflationary pressures due to increased transportation and production costs. Similarly, exchange-rate reforms sought to eliminate multiple exchange-rate windows and improve foreign exchange market efficiency. These reforms were expected to enhance investor confidence and improve foreign capital inflows. However, exchange-rate volatility contributed to rising import costs, inflationary pressures, and temporary business uncertainty.

The administration also introduced comprehensive tax reform proposals aimed at broadening the tax base, simplifying tax administration, and improving revenue mobilization while reducing the burden on productive investment. These reforms received support from several international financial institutions, including the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, which argued that macroeconomic stabilization constituted an essential foundation for long-term development (IMF, 2024; World Bank, 2024). Nevertheless, the reforms also highlighted a critical policy dilemma. Macroeconomic stabilization, although necessary, cannot by itself generate inclusive development unless accompanied by substantial improvements in productive capacity, institutional quality, industrial competitiveness, and human capital development. This observation reinforces the central argument of this article: Nigeria's development challenge extends beyond macroeconomic reform to encompass the transformation of states into productive, competitive economic actors.

8. STATE-LEVEL COMPETITIVENESS: THE MISSING DIMENSION OF NIGERIA'S DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

8.1 Conceptual Foundations

State competitiveness refers to the capacity of subnational governments to create economic environments that attract investment, stimulate entrepreneurship, enhance productivity, generate employment, and improve citizens' welfare. Competitive states provide quality infrastructure, efficient public services, effective regulatory institutions, skilled human capital, and stable governance environments conducive to business growth (Porter, 1990). In federal systems, national prosperity increasingly depends upon the collective competitiveness of constituent states or provinces. Rather than functioning merely as administrative subdivisions, states become engines of innovation, industrialization, agricultural modernization, and technological advancement. Nigeria possesses considerable diversity in natural resources, demographic characteristics, educational institutions, cultural assets, climatic conditions, and geographic advantages. Properly harnessed, these differences can become sources of competitive advantage rather than regional inequality.

8.2 Dimensions of State Competitiveness

Drawing upon the World Economic Forum's competitiveness framework and regional development literature, state competitiveness can be conceptualized across eight mutually reinforcing dimensions.

(a) Institutional Competitiveness

Institutional competitiveness encompasses governance quality, regulatory efficiency, transparency, accountability, judicial effectiveness, and policy consistency.

Investors generally prefer jurisdictions characterized by:

- predictable regulations;
- transparent procurement;
- efficient dispute resolution;
- secure property rights;
- low bureaucratic delays;
- political stability.

States capable of delivering these institutional attributes become more attractive investment destinations.

(b) Infrastructure Competitiveness

Infrastructure remains one of the strongest determinants of regional productivity.

Competitive infrastructure includes:

- reliable electricity;
- quality road networks;
- railway connectivity;
- airports;
- inland ports;
- broadband internet;
- water supply;
- industrial parks;
- logistics facilities.

Infrastructure reduces production costs while improving market access.

(c) Human Capital Competitiveness

Human capital determines the productivity of firms and the innovative capacity of economies.

Competitive states invest strategically in:

- quality primary education;
- technical education;
- universities;
- vocational training;
- digital literacy;
- research institutions;
- healthcare.

Knowledge-intensive industries increasingly locate where skilled workers are available.

(d) Innovation Competitiveness

Innovation ecosystems consist of:

- universities;
- research institutes;
- technology hubs;
- venture capital;
- startup incubators;
- patent systems;
- digital infrastructure.

States supporting innovation generate higher productivity growth than those relying solely on natural resource extraction.

(e) Industrial Competitiveness

Industrial competitiveness reflects the capacity to develop manufacturing clusters, value chains, export industries, and processing industries. Rather than exporting raw agricultural products, competitive states encourage value addition through agro-processing, manufacturing, packaging, logistics, and branding.

(f) Agricultural Competitiveness

Agriculture remains Nigeria's largest employer.

Competitive agricultural states emphasize:

- mechanization;
- irrigation;
- improved seedlings;
- storage facilities;
- extension services;
- processing industries;
- export certification;
- value-chain integration.

Agriculture should therefore be viewed not merely as farming but as an integrated agribusiness ecosystem.

(g) Fiscal Competitiveness

Fiscal competitiveness concerns the ability of states to mobilize internally generated revenue while maintaining prudent expenditure management.

Competitive states:

- expand tax bases rather than tax rates;
- attract investment;
- improve compliance;
- digitalize revenue administration;
- reduce wasteful expenditure.

Greater fiscal autonomy enhances accountability and long-term planning.

(h) Environmental Sustainability

Modern competitiveness increasingly incorporates environmental sustainability. States capable of balancing economic growth with environmental protection become more resilient to climate change while attracting environmentally responsible investment.

9. MEASURING STATE COMPETITIVENESS IN NIGERIA

To operationalize competitiveness, this study proposes the **Nigeria State Competitiveness Index (NSCI)** comprising measurable indicators across eight dimensions.

Dimension	Sample Indicators
Institutional Quality	Ease of business registration, judicial efficiency, transparency index
Infrastructure	Electricity access, road quality, broadband penetration
Human Capital	Literacy rate, tertiary enrollment, vocational training
Innovation	Research expenditure, startup density, technology hubs
Industrialization	Manufacturing output, SME growth, export volume
Agriculture	Productivity per hectare, agro-processing capacity
Fiscal Strength	Internally generated revenue, debt sustainability
Sustainability	Renewable energy adoption, climate resilience initiatives

Such an index would enable annual benchmarking of states while encouraging healthy competition in governance and economic performance.

10. WHY NIGERIAN STATES PERFORM DIFFERENTLY

Significant disparities exist across Nigerian states because competitiveness is shaped by multiple interacting factors.

- **Historical Path Dependence**

  States inherit different institutional capacities, educational traditions, infrastructure endowments, and industrial legacies.

- **Governance Quality**

  Leadership continuity, policy consistency, and bureaucratic competence significantly influence investment outcomes.

- **Geographic Location**

  Coastal states generally enjoy logistical advantages, while inland states often depend upon transport connectivity.

- **Security Conditions**

  Persistent insecurity discourages investment, disrupts agricultural production, and increases business costs.

- **Revenue Structure**

  States heavily dependent on federal allocations often exhibit weaker incentives for economic diversification than those with robust internally generated revenue systems.

11. CONSTRAINTS TO STATE-LEVEL COMPETITIVENESS

Despite considerable potential, several structural obstacles continue to constrain competitiveness across Nigerian states.

11.1 Fiscal Centralization

Nigeria remains among the most fiscally centralized federations globally. States depend heavily on monthly allocations from the Federation Account, reducing incentives for expanding productive economic activities.

11.2 Weak Infrastructure

Electricity shortages, inadequate transport networks, poor logistics, and limited broadband infrastructure increase production costs.

11.3 Institutional Weaknesses

Lengthy administrative procedures, inconsistent regulations, corruption, and weak contract enforcement reduce investor confidence.

11.4 Human Capital Gaps

Educational quality, technical skills, research capacity, and vocational training remain uneven across states.

11.5 Limited Industrial Policy

Many states lack coherent industrial development strategies linked to their comparative advantages.

11.6 Policy Discontinuity

Frequent changes in government often interrupt long-term development programmes.

11.7 Insecurity

Banditry, insurgency, kidnapping, communal conflicts, and farmer–herder conflicts significantly reduce investment and agricultural productivity.

12. DISCUSSION

The analysis demonstrates that Nigeria's development challenge cannot be adequately addressed through macroeconomic reforms alone. While reforms in exchange rates, taxation, subsidy policy, and public financial management are necessary for macroeconomic stability, they do not automatically generate structural transformation. Countries that have successfully transitioned to middle- and high-income status have generally combined sound macroeconomic management with competitive subnational governance, strong institutions, industrial policy, and sustained investments in human capital and infrastructure. Nigeria's federal structure provides a unique opportunity to replicate these dynamics by empowering states to compete on productivity rather than dependence. Accordingly, the evidence supports the article's central thesis: productive federalism should become a cornerstone of Nigeria's long-term development strategy. By creating incentives for states to leverage their comparative advantages, improve governance, and invest in productive sectors, Nigeria can foster more balanced regional development, diversify its economy, and build greater resilience to external shocks.

13. COMPARATIVE INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCES IN PRODUCTIVE FEDERALISM

One of the central arguments of this article is that Nigeria's development strategy should move beyond macroeconomic stabilization toward a governance model that promotes productive competition among its constituent states. International experience demonstrates that countries with diverse political systems and levels of economic development have successfully utilized decentralized governance to stimulate regional competitiveness, attract investment, and accelerate structural transformation. While institutional contexts differ, valuable lessons can be drawn from China, India, Germany, Brazil, and Ethiopia.

13.1 China: Provincial Competition as an Engine of Industrialization

China's remarkable economic transformation since the late 1970s has often been attributed to market reforms. Equally important, however, has been the country's system of decentralized economic governance. Following the reforms initiated by Deng Xiaoping in 1978, provincial and municipal governments were granted substantial autonomy in attracting foreign direct investment (FDI), developing industrial zones, and implementing localized development strategies (Qian & Weingast, 1997).

Competition among provinces became a powerful incentive for improving infrastructure, reducing bureaucratic barriers, investing in education, and supporting export-oriented manufacturing. Local governments established Special Economic Zones (SEZs), technology parks, and industrial clusters that significantly enhanced productivity and employment. Performance-based evaluation of provincial leaders further strengthened incentives for economic growth. Officials were frequently assessed based on measurable indicators such as investment attraction, industrial output, employment creation, and fiscal performance (Xu, 2011). This institutional arrangement encouraged innovation and policy experimentation while maintaining national macroeconomic coordination. Although China's political system differs fundamentally from Nigeria's democratic federation, its experience illustrates the developmental benefits of empowering subnational governments to compete in productive economic activities.

13.2 India: Competitive Federalism and Economic Liberalization

India provides one of the closest institutional parallels to Nigeria due to its federal structure, ethnic diversity, large population, and regional economic disparities. Following economic liberalization in 1991, state governments assumed increasingly important roles in attracting investment, improving infrastructure, and facilitating industrial development (Ahluwalia, 2002). States such as Gujarat, Maharashtra, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, and Telangana emerged as leading investment destinations through proactive governance and business-friendly reforms.

Competition among Indian states has focused on:

- Ease of doing business reforms;
- Industrial corridor development;
- Digital governance;
- Skills development;
- Logistics infrastructure;
- Innovation ecosystems;
- Agricultural modernization.

The Government of India reinforced these incentives through periodic state rankings measuring investment climate, governance quality, digital services, and infrastructure development. Today, many investment decisions in India are influenced more by state-level governance than by national policies alone. This experience demonstrates how healthy inter-state competition can strengthen national economic performance. For Nigeria, similar benchmarking systems could encourage states to improve governance while attracting greater domestic and foreign investment.

13.3 Germany: Cooperative and Productive Federalism

Germany represents one of the world's most successful federal systems. Unlike competitive models emphasizing rivalry, German federalism combines cooperation with productive specialization.

The Länder (states) possess substantial authority over:

- education;
- vocational training;
- innovation policy;
- infrastructure;
- environmental regulation;
- regional economic planning.

Germany's internationally recognized vocational education system illustrates the importance of state-level coordination among government, industry, and educational institutions (Scharpf, 2009).

Industrial clusters further reinforce regional specialization:

- Bavaria—automobiles and aerospace;
- Baden-Württemberg—advanced manufacturing;
- North Rhine-Westphalia—engineering;
- Hamburg—logistics and maritime industries.

Rather than competing solely through tax incentives, German states compete by developing specialized industrial ecosystems. Nigeria could similarly encourage specialization based on comparative advantages.

Examples include:

State	Potential Competitive Advantage
Kano	Textile manufacturing, leather processing, commerce
Kaduna	Defence industries, ICT, manufacturing
Benue	Agro-processing
Nasarawa	Mining and mineral processing
Plateau	Horticulture and tourism
Cross River	Tourism and blue economy
Ogun	Industrial manufacturing
Lagos	Financial services and technology
Rivers	Petrochemicals and maritime logistics
Ekiti	Knowledge economy and education

13.4 Brazil: Fiscal Decentralization and Regional Development

Brazil's federal system demonstrates both the opportunities and challenges of fiscal decentralization. States possess significant taxation authority while competing to attract industrial investment.

- Competition has encouraged:
- industrial diversification;
- agricultural modernization;
- infrastructure investment;
- export-oriented production.

However, Brazil also illustrates the risks of excessive tax competition, where states may engage in fiscal incentives that reduce public revenues without generating sustainable productivity gains. Nigeria can learn from this experience by ensuring that state competition is guided through transparent national standards and coordinated industrial policy.

13.5 Ethiopia: Regional Industrial Parks

Although Ethiopia is not a classical federation comparable to Nigeria, its regional industrial development strategy offers useful lessons.

The Ethiopian government deliberately located industrial parks across multiple regions rather than concentrating manufacturing in the capital city.

Regional specialization promoted:

- textile production;
- leather processing;
- agro-processing;
- export manufacturing.

This spatial distribution reduced regional inequality while stimulating employment outside Addis Ababa.

Nigeria could adopt similar strategies through state-level industrial parks linked to comparative advantages.

14. TOWARDS A FRAMEWORK OF PRODUCTIVE FEDERALISM FOR NIGERIA

Building on the foregoing analysis, this article proposes a Productive Federalism Framework (PFF) comprising six mutually reinforcing pillars.

Pillar 1: Fiscal Incentives for Productivity

The current revenue allocation system should gradually reward productive economic performance.

Potential performance indicators include:

- Internally Generated Revenue growth;
- Manufacturing expansion;
- Agricultural value addition;
- Export performance;
- Employment generation;
- Ease of Doing Business improvements.

Rather than encouraging dependence, fiscal transfers should increasingly reward productivity.

Pillar 2: State Competitiveness Index

The Federal Government, National Bureau of Statistics, Nigerian Governors' Forum, and private sector organizations should jointly publish an annual Nigeria State Competitiveness Report**.**

Possible ranking indicators include:

- investment attraction;
- infrastructure;
- governance;
- innovation;
- education;
- healthcare;
- environmental sustainability;
- industrial development.

Such rankings would encourage healthy policy competition among states.

Pillar 3: Comparative Advantage-Based Industrialization

Every state should prepare a long-term industrial strategy based upon its comparative advantages.

Illustrative examples include:

Sector	Potential States
Rice processing	Kebbi, Niger, Ebonyi
Cotton-textile	Kano, Kaduna, Katsina
Livestock	Adamawa, Taraba
Cocoa	Ondo, Cross River
Mining	Nasarawa, Plateau

Sector	Potential States
ICT	Lagos, Abuja, Kaduna
Renewable energy	Sokoto, Jigawa
Tourism	Plateau, Cross River, Ogun

Pillar 4: Innovation Ecosystems

Each geopolitical zone should establish integrated innovation ecosystems comprising:

- universities;
- technology hubs;
- research institutes;
- startup accelerators;
- venture capital funds;
- industrial laboratories.

Knowledge-intensive industries will increasingly determine future competitiveness.

Pillar 5: Infrastructure Corridors

Rather than isolated infrastructure projects, Nigeria should prioritize regional economic corridors linking:

- farms;
- processing industries;
- logistics hubs;
- railways;
- ports;
- export terminals.

Integrated infrastructure substantially reduces production costs.

Pillar 6: Governance and Institutional Reforms

Competitive states require:

- transparent procurement;
- digital land administration;
- efficient taxation;
- commercial courts;
- investment promotion agencies;
- anti-corruption systems;
- evidence-based planning.

Institutional quality ultimately determines investment confidence.

15. CONCLUSION

Nigeria's development trajectory over the past four decades demonstrates that macroeconomic reforms are necessary but insufficient conditions for sustainable development**.** While successive administrations have implemented reforms in exchange-rate management, fiscal policy, public financial management, banking regulation, and petroleum governance, these initiatives have not consistently translated into broad-based structural transformation. Persistent poverty, unemployment, weak industrialization, infrastructure deficits, and widening regional disparities underscore the limitations of a reform agenda centered primarily on macroeconomic stabilization. This article has argued that Nigeria's future prosperity depends on complementing national reforms with a deliberate strategy to enhance state-level competitiveness within a framework of productive federalism**.** Drawing on insights from New Institutional Economics, Competitive Federalism Theory, Endogenous Growth Theory, and Developmental State Theory, the analysis demonstrates that institutions, innovation, human capital, and decentralized economic governance are central drivers of long-term development. Comparative experiences from China, India, Germany, Brazil, and Ethiopia reinforce the proposition that empowered and competitive subnational governments can become engines of national growth.

The proposed Productive Federalism Framework offers a practical pathway for repositioning Nigerian states as productive economic actors rather than passive recipients of federal transfers. By linking fiscal incentives to measurable performance, strengthening state institutions, fostering innovation ecosystems, promoting industrial specialization, and investing in human capital and infrastructure, Nigeria can unlock the diverse comparative advantages of its 36 states and the Federal Capital Territory. Ultimately, sustainable national development will require a transition from a resource-allocation federation to a production-oriented federation**.** Such a shift would not only diversify the economy beyond oil but also promote inclusive growth, reduce regional inequalities, enhance resilience to external shocks, and strengthen Nigeria's competitiveness within Africa and the global economy. The future of Nigeria's development therefore lies not solely in pursuing additional economic reforms, but in reimagining federalism as a catalyst for productivity, innovation, and shared prosperity**.**

16. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The study proposes the following policy recommendations:

Constitutional and Fiscal Reforms

- Review aspects of fiscal federalism to strengthen state fiscal autonomy while preserving national equity.
- Expand states' authority over selected taxes and economic development functions.
- Introduce performance-based federal grants linked to measurable development outcomes.

Institutional Strengthening

- Establish state-level economic planning commissions with statutory independence.
- Strengthen investment promotion agencies through technical capacity building.
- Digitize land administration, procurement, and business registration systems.

Industrial Policy

- Develop state-specific industrial master plans aligned with comparative advantages.
- Promote industrial clusters and special economic zones.
- Encourage local content and export-oriented manufacturing.

Human Capital Development

- Increase investment in technical and vocational education.
- Strengthen university–industry partnerships.
- Expand digital literacy and entrepreneurship programmes.

Innovation

- Create regional innovation funds.

- Support research commercialization.
- Expand broadband infrastructure and technology hubs.

Agriculture

- Shift from subsistence farming to integrated value-chain development.
- Invest in irrigation, storage, mechanization, and agro-processing.
- Promote agricultural exports through quality certification.

Infrastructure

- Prioritize electricity reliability for industrial zones.
- Expand multimodal transport networks.
- Encourage public-private partnerships in logistics and infrastructure financing.

Governance

- Publish annual state competitiveness rankings.
- Institutionalize performance-based budgeting.
- Strengthen monitoring and evaluation systems using digital dashboards.

References

Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity and poverty*. Crown.

African Development Bank. (2024). *African Economic Outlook 2024*. AfDB.

Ahluwalia, M. S. (2002). Economic reforms in India since 1991: Has gradualism worked? *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 16*(3), 67–88.

Arowolo, D. (2011). Fiscal federalism in Nigeria: Theory and dimensions. *Afro Asian Journal of Social Sciences, 2*(2), 1–22.

Barca, F., McCann, P., & Rodríguez-Pose, A. (2012). The case for regional development intervention. *Journal of Regional Science, 52*(1), 134–152.

Central Bank of Nigeria. (2021). *Annual Report 2021*.

Central Bank of Nigeria. (2022). *Annual Report 2022*.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage.

Evans, P. (1995). *Embedded autonomy: States and industrial transformation*. Princeton University Press.

Frank, A. G. (1967). *Capitalism and underdevelopment in Latin America*. Monthly Review Press.

International Monetary Fund. (2024). *Nigeria: Article IV Consultation*.

Johnson, C. (1982). *MITI and the Japanese miracle*. Stanford University Press.

Lewis, P. (2007). *Growing apart: Oil, politics and economic change in Indonesia and Nigeria*. University of Michigan Press.

Lin, J. Y. (2012). *New structural economics*. World Bank.

Lucas, R. E. (1988). On the mechanics of economic development. *Journal of Monetary Economics, 22*(1), 3–42.

Mkandawire, T., & Soludo, C. C. (1999). *Our continent, our future*. Africa World Press.

National Bureau of Statistics. (2023). *Nigeria Multidimensional Poverty Report*.

North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.

Oates, W. E. (1972). *Fiscal federalism*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Porter, M. E. (1990). *The competitive advantage of nations*. Free Press.

Qian, Y., & Weingast, B. R. (1997). Federalism as a commitment to preserving market incentives. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 11*(4), 83–92.

Rodrik, D. (2008). Second-best institutions. *American Economic Review, 98*(2), 100–104.

Romer, P. M. (1986). Increasing returns and long-run growth. *Journal of Political Economy, 94*(5), 1002–1037.

Scharpf, F. W. (2009). *Federalism reform in Germany*. Max Planck Institute.

Soludo, C. C. (2007). *Strategic agenda for the Nigerian economy*. CBN.

Suberu, R. T. (2001). *Federalism and ethnic conflict in Nigeria*. United States Institute of Peace Press.

Todaro, M. P., & Smith, S. C. (2021). *Economic development* (13th ed.). Pearson.

United Nations. (2024). *World Population Prospects 2024*. United Nations.

Watts, R. L. (2008). *Comparing federal systems* (3rd ed.). McGill-Queen's University Press.

Weingast, B. R. (1995). The economic role of political institutions. *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization, 11*(1), 1–31.

Williamson, J. (1990). What Washington means by policy reform. In J. Williamson (Ed.), *Latin American adjustment: How much has happened?* Institute for International Economics.

World Bank. (1994). *Adjustment in Africa: Reforms, results and the road ahead*. World Bank.

World Bank. (2023). *Nigeria Development Update*. World Bank.

World Bank. (2024). *Nigeria Development Update: Building Momentum for Inclusive Growth*. World Bank.

World Economic Forum. (2020). *The Global Competitiveness Report 2020*.

Xu, C. (2011). The fundamental institutions of China's reforms and development. *Journal of Economic Literature, 49*(4), 1076–1151.