International Policy Brief Series Social Science and Law Journal of Policy Review and Development Strategies p-ISSN: 2315-8387 | e-ISSN: 2354-1628

SSLJPRDS

February, 2025 Vol. 11, No. 1

The Impact of the Nature and the Character of the State on Development Planning in Contemporary Nigeria

Johnson Alalibo Sinikiem Abstract

Department of Political Science, Niger Delta University, Wilberforce Island, Bayelsa State

Article DOI: 10.48028/iiprds/ssljprds.v11.i1.03

Keywords: Nature/ Character,

State, Development Planning, Nigeria

he task of development has birthed a need for conscious and the success of emerging industrial states of East Asia through planned development has created enormous interest in the conditionalities for the success of development planning. Interestingly, the literature has attributed the failure of development plans in Nigeria and other African states to a number of factors. This paper mainly aims to examine the impact of the nature and character of the Nigerian State on Development Planning in Nigeria. This study contributes to the growing literature by arguing that the nature and character of the State is a key impacting factor on development planning in Nigeria. It extracts evidence from secondary sources, journal articles and monographs, to show how the nature and identity of the state impact development planning in the country. It concludes that Nigeria's lack of selfreliance has plunged her into issues like ethnicity, corruption, rent seeking, privatization, and economic vulnerability, lack of evaluation of as a major component of projects implementation, creating conditions and structures that hamper the success of development planning in the contemporary Nigerian state. Therefore, it was recommended that these root causes be addressed as a way forward for the planned development in Nigeria.

Corresponding Author: Johnson Alalibo Sinikiem

https://internationalpolicybrief.org/social-science-and-law-journal-of-policy-review-and-development-strategies-volume-11-number-1/

Background to the Study and Statement of the Problem

Two seemingly recurring ideas have been diffusing around the world in recent decades. Presently, they have filtered into virtually every country dominating all national discourses. This dispersion can be likened to the spread of volcanic ash that makes dawn and dusk appear rosy, or it can be likened to thermonuclear fallout between two world powers that changes the very nature of the world as it is known. The two ideas of interest here are planning and development. Interestingly, the very origin of these two ideas is traceable to the post World War 2 era when President Harry Truman's public relations birthed the idea of development that permeated all spheres of the world (Rist, 2008). The goal of development was universal and almost acquired the status of a buzzword (Rist, 2007). It denotes the idea that societies can and should be developed through improved capabilities and living standards for people, expanded production, greater control of the environment and better prospects for the future (Sen, 1999). This universal goal spawned such widespread interest that different strategies for its achievement evolved over time. Ultimately, two broad ideological perspectives emerged, the capitalist vs. socialist ideological frameworks. These ideologies over time came to be associated with cultural and geographical borders/blocs. There have therefore been such divides as the eastern and western blocks represented by the United states and the USSR, that have spiralled into such parallel divides as the market-led versus state-led dichotomy as well as the Washington consensus versus the Beijing consensus.

These divides essentially capture two distinct approaches to development in the world. One is based on a system of production and distribution led by the market; and the other is based on a system of production and distribution controlled by the state. In the post-independent era, developing states of Africa and Asia experimented with both models, and there were varying degrees of success across time and space. While countries like Singapore, Malaysia, Taiwan (now China) and others in East Asia made remarkable progress following the path of state-led development through development planning, African countries like Nigeria had abysmal results from their development planning experience. The nation remains mainly underdeveloped with a fragile economy driven by one resource, from the launch of the first national development plan to the modern era of short-term economic plans like the Economic Recovery and Growth Plans.

Due to a depressing tendency, there have been numerous academic and policy concerns about the reasons why Nigerian development planning has failed and the variables that impact it. This concern is germane as problems form the pivot of academic research. For the social scientist, understanding social problems (in this case, factors that impact development planning in Nigeria) creates a starting point for identifying their solution(s). Consequently, the literature on factors that have an impact on Nigeria's development planning has named several of them, including lack of financial resources, incorrect cost projections, corruption, inefficiency, and political instability. All the factors mentioned above are the main impacting factors on development planning in the country. However, this paper contends that treating each of these separately or conducting a general analysis of the variables affecting the nation's development planning without considering the very characteristics of the Nigerian state runs the risk of producing a poor understanding of the problem. Consequently, this paper seeks to examine the impact of the very character of the Nigerian state on development planning in contemporary Nigeria and propose an argument that the nature and character of the state are a major factor, and consequently, a fundamental impediment to the success of development planning in contemporary Nigeria. The research question that underpins this study is the following. *How does the nature and character of the state impact development planning in contemporary Nigeria*? To successfully answer this question, the following specific objectives were formulated.

- i) To show a trend in the performance of development plans in the Nigerian state.
- ii) Decipher the core components that can form the basis for understanding the nature and character of the Nigerian state.
- iii) Show how the components identified in objective ii above impact development planning in Nigeria.

Methodology

The paper is a qualitative study that relies on documentary evidence to show the impact of the very character of the state on the development planning in Nigeria. Such sources as related texts, journal articles, monographs, and newspaper articles formed the basis for the data. Similarly, data collected from these sources were analyzed using a mixture of qualitative content analysis and thematic analysis. First, patterns were established through thorough analysis of evidence from the aforementioned secondary sources, then appropriate themes were formulated for a clear presentation of data and conclusive remarks.

In light of the foregoing, the paper is organised as follows. The first section, the introduction, gives a broad background on the conception of development plans' origins, dissemination, and success, as well as on their mixed record of success in general and their dismal performance in modern Nigeria. The research question and the objectives are also highlighted in this section. The next section provides concise details on the methodological underpinnings of this study to ease understanding and perhaps replication. The third section contains an explanation of the main arguments in the literature on factors that impact development planning. The following section provides an overview of the performance of development plans in the Nigerian state and a panoramic synopsis of factors that sum up the very characteristics of the Nigerian state. The penultimate section contains a logical and evidence-based analysis of the impact of the highlighted traits of the Nigerian state on development planning; and the final section contains the concluding remarks and recommendations.

Review of Related Literature

The rationale for why development plans has failed in Nigeria and other states in Africa has been a major subject of inquiry in policy and academic circles. Consequently, there is no dearth of literature on the subject matter. The literature has thus identified factors that affect the development planning process in Nigeria, such as inadequate finances, erroneous estimates of costs, fraud, ineptness and lack of expertise, poor monitoring and planning, and political turbulence (Ogunmola, 2015; Nweze, 2016), along with other issues. This section presents an overview of the literature to understand existing knowledge and makes further contributions.

Poor Financial Capacity: It is widely asserted that inadequate funds constitute a major impediment to plan initiation and implementation. This is supported by a large body of empirical data showing that inadequate funding has led to problems such as delays, plan neglect, and implementation delays (Akande et al. 2018). Financial failures also result in budgetary detriments that have ultimately constituted debacles in development plans in the country. Ubani and Ononuju (2013) stated that the state's funds are being slowly disbursed towards the plan initiation and implementation due to mismanagement, diversion, bureaucratic ineptitude, and dwindling revenue owing to the volatility of oil price fluctuation in the international market, which has seen a high rate of failures in development plans and failures of energy, buildings, and road other infrastructural projects within Nigeria. In the same vein, Dim (2018) stated that many state plans and projects in Nigeria are failures. This has ultimately resulted in a case where plans that have been formulated are not only unsuccessful, but end up poorly implemented.

Inaccurate Costing and Corruption: The ability to make accurate estimates of available revenue and possible financial and resource costs for plan initiation and implementation is vital for the success of development plans (Botchkarev, 2015). Many state-led projects and initiatives of the Nigerian state face the limitation of inaccurate cost estimates that results from several factors, especially leadership ineptitude and corruption. Nweze (2015) made the following observation in support of this claim: In Nigeria, ministries, departments, parastatals and agencies charged with development planning are given this responsibility without adequate knowledge and training in best practices in planning, as well as inadequate monitoring and supervisory procedures. It is obvious that lax oversight and accountability encourage corrupt behaviour. Additionally, contractors abuse the system and create false reports that are favorable to them.

Incompetence and lack of knowledge: Nigeria has a sizable population, but the vast majority of projects are unable to be completed because there are not enough qualified experts to do so (Kuroshi and Lawal, 2014; Okuntade, 2015). As one of the factors causing ineptitude problems in Nigerian projects, Nweze (2016) stated causes such as the movement of skilled workers to other countries, which increased the adoption of foreign specialists at a high cost. Without a doubt, using project management effectively and fully increases the completion percentages of projects. However, Nigerian government projects often fail as a result of poor project management practices. For example, Olateju et al. (2011) found that project professionals did not have an elementary knowledge of project management methods during their study of project management practice in the Nigerian public sector.

Poor Planning and Estimation: Due to the poor understanding of planning specialists in Nigeria, most projects experience problems with planning and monitoring. Therefore, to be able to implement successful initiatives, it is essential to design, manage and monitor projects (Adebayo et al., 2018). Insufficient preparation, estimation, and organisation during the course of a project execution has been shown to be a significant cause of project failure in Nigeria. Insufficient projections, timelines for their implementation, and cost estimates have been strongly associated with project failures in Nigeria (Dosumu & Aigbavboa, 2017).

Poorly formulated goals and detailed plans to achieve them lead to planning errors. As a result, projects in Nigeria have largely failed because they have been launched arbitrarily and without following a predetermined course (Nzekwe et al., 2015).

Political Instability: Under politically unstable conditions, no nation has ever completed a successful endeavor. Nigeria is a prime example, where numerous militaries that were installed through the use of arms have ruled the country. Due to instability in the way government operates, even a democratic system of government, such as that in Nigeria today, has seen a number of projects fail. The inability of the Nigerian government to stabilise the country has led to the failure of numerous government projects, including the Aluminium Smelting Company in Ikot-Abasi, Akwa Ibom State, and the Ajakuta Iron Company.

Poor Communication: It has been established that inadequate interaction between all parties present in public efforts is one of the main reason's projects fail in Nigeria. The federal and state governments, the government and the project's private sector consumers, the government and local residents, and the parties in charge of carrying out the project may not communicate enough with one another (Ogundelea & Somefunb, 2008; Dim, 2018). In Nigeria, lack of communication has also been linked to delays in the completion of projects, eventually resulting in the conclusion and collapse of the project.

Poor Contracting and Contractor Practices: Contractor-related factors have also been linked to the increase in project failures in Nigeria. Every state in Nigeria has experienced the neglect and collapse of public projects as a result of poor contracting practices, which have led to 'substandard' project delivery, delivery delays, and other issues (Uyo, 2019). These actions are related to inadequate contracts reached with contractors, willful nonperformance of granted contracts by contractors, and contractor budget theft. Contracting problems that lead to failures have been linked to favoritism and ethnocentrism in the awarding of allowances in a highly biased manner, which has led to an elevated rate of failures.

Frequent Design Scope Changes and Errors: On the other hand, it has been discovered that the problems and inadequate plans that are delayed for execution are solely responsible for the failure of projects in Nigeria (Dosumu & Aigbavboa, 2017). Similarly, to this, design flaws and changes increase project costs, delay implementation, and hinder the effectiveness of Nigerian construction efforts (Onungwa et al., 2017; Dosumu & Aigbavboa, 2017). Numerous government projects in Nigeria have failed as a result of these "design change-related effects." Anigbogu and Shwarka (2011) estimate that up to 50% of all projects in Nigeria fail before they even get off the ground due to design issues.

Socio-Cultural and Political Interferences: Examples of socio-cultural disruptions that have been generated to establish barriers to project completion in Nigeria include disputes and continuous obstacles to public projects. Similar to this, inconsistent project development has prevented successful governments from providing funding to finish projects started by previous governments (Nweze, 2016). Due to the insufficient commitment of the ruling class to development and the indifference to implementing campaigns, efforts have not succeeded

in Nigeria. For example, the Gelegale Seaport in Edo State and the Gas Revolution Industrial Park in Ogidigben, Delta State, both failed to get off the ground despite the preparedness of local and global governments for the projects (Yusuf, 2018; Okoromadu, 2019). This is the result of disputes and undermined assumptions that occurred throughout the two projects' lifespans.

Poor Leadership and Corruption: Governments all over Nigeria have been unable to afford projects because they have expanded in cost, racked up delays, and become unaffordable (Sonuga et al., 2002). This is the result of poor leadership and corruption in project planning, hiring, budgeting, and execution. Infrastructure project failures, project stalling, construction delays, and project disregard have been caused by corrupt public employees who steal money and enter shady contracts for their own gain. The information presented above shows that there is a large body of literature that examines obstacles to development planning in the state of Nigeria.

Lack of Political Will and Indiscipline at the Point of Implementation: This is another very serious issue. The lack of strong political will definitely doesvetails into indiscipline at the point of implementation. Even where the plan is very good at the point of conception, monitoring and implementation are key to the success of such projects. These identified issues have undoubtedly constituted severe impediments to the success of development planning over the years in the Nigerian state. However, these issues are often treated in isolation and compartmentalized. This study fills this gap by establishing a thread through these issues as constraining factors in development planning in the contemporary Nigerian state.

The Nature and Character of the Nigerian State: Monocultural Dependence on Oil, Ethnicity, Rent Seeking, and Privatization

Extant evidence from the literature shows that the monocultural dependence on oil, ethnicity, rent-seeking, and the privatization of the Nigerian state provides a framework for the understanding of the nature and character of the Nigerian state. The State is the vehicle through which political power is exercised, making it the supreme institution in society. Establish demands systems and uses coercion to ensure compliance. Its essence and characteristics define the nature of politics in society, because it is the subject of political competition. Both the state has autonomy or it does not. An autonomous state is separate from the prevailing elites and is not subject to their manipulation or influence. It follows that the state is therefore not privatized and is not used as an instrument of primitive accumulation of wealth for those who control it, and accordingly politics promotes the interests of all members of society. However, where the state lacks autonomy, it is not detached from the ruling elites and is most likely used as an instrument of primitive accumulation of wealth (Ake, 1996:8). The lack of autonomy by a state creates a desperate and normless struggle for power. Politics at such a period is more or less a warfare, as the winners gain it all, and the loser loses it all.

Different ways in which the aforementioned circumstance impedes development exist. First, constant competition for dominance causes instability, which discourages expenditure and reduces output. Politics is highly valued by the leadership, which causes them to disregard

people-oriented growth. Thus, politics is turned into a business that profits at the price of growth. And to make matters worse, accountability and transparency are sacrificed in favor of crime, disobedience, and disregard for long-term national development goals. As a result, citizens become alienated from the State, which makes it difficult to mobilise them for growth. Development is an active process, not just a wish. In contrast, the state in Europe and America is primarily independent, and hence separate from the ruling class, which is also subordinate to the law. This gives politics some sense and gives it an identity that is focused on fulfilling the ambitions of the populace. The economy has thus remained monocultural with heavy dependence on oil rent, seeking consequent upon the privatization of the Nigerian state by the ruling class since it serves their interest. Ethnic, religious, and political divisions are strengthened all in a bid to keep the masses more impoverished. It is important to note however that colonialism gave birth to this dependent state which lacks autonomy and thus promotes the imperialist policies rather than focusing on being disciplined and patriotic development plans for the benefit of the people. This means that most of the ingredients of the plans are controlled externally. Development must be a conscious effort of, by and for the people. Until development plans are regenerated domestically with massive participation of the people, success will continue to be a mirage.

Additionally, there is the recent twist in the dimensions of oil politics. This involves the subsidy removal and its effect on the economy. The subsidy removal has since aroused and exposed sectional, regional, personal and also party interests. The impact of this removal has negatively influenced the economy in no small measures. The economy was primarily agrarian during the precolonial period, with each group relying on revenue from their agricultural products. This pattern continued until the various segments of the country were merged for administrative convenience by the British colonial powers in different phases between 1900 and 1914. This merger marked the beginning of massive socio-economic and political interaction between these disparate parts of the country. Between 1922 and 1929, the European government established a number of legislative councils, each with varying degrees of Nigerian representation. The 1945 constitution divided the country into three regions, east, west, and north, each with its own ethnic composition seeking political representation in government. But in the Northern, Western, and Eastern Regions, respectively, the Hausa, Yoruba, and Igbo major ethnic groups held sway over the nation's political landscape. As a result, there was ethnic dominance and oppression within regions, as well as fierce interethnic competition at the national level. As a result, discord between segments of the country arose, as did a conflict over the date of independence in Kano in 1953. On October 1, 1960, the country was granted independence and the stage was set for the never-ending pursuit of economic gains and political competition.

Following independence, the country was plunged into a dangerous level of interethnic and intraethnic competitions and conflicts, culminating in the 1967 civil war. Agriculture was gradually replaced as the mainstay of the country's economy by oil beginning in 1958. Oil was discovered in the Oloibiri province in 1957 and has since grown to become the country's mainstay. Indeed, the Yum-Kippur war of the 1970s, which caused Middle Eastern countries to impose an oil embargo on the United States, resulted in such a massive increase in revenue

that the country entered an era of oil boom. As oil generated massive revenues for the country, other sectors were gradually phased out, and the country formally became a rent-dependent entity, relying solely on oil for foreign exchange and revenue.

During the precolonial, colonial and immediately postcolonial periods, non-oil exports like cotton, groundnuts, palm kernels, and others produced income. Exportation of this product helps to boost the gross domestic product by at least 80% and to lower the unemployment rate. When oil was discovered in the middle of the 1970s, this industry saw a collapse as the country's non-oil economy was gradually supplanted by the oil industry. Since then, Nigeria has relied heavily on oil as its main energy source and now plays a significant role in both the political and economic landscape of the country (Ogunbiyi & Abina, 2019).

Similar statements are made by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA): "The largest economy in Sub-Saharan Africa depends strongly on oil as its main source of revenue; efforts to broaden into agriculture, telecommunications, and services are hindered by poverty and corruption" (Central Intelligence Agency, 2020). The country's rich oil reserves led to a flourishing public sector. There were a huge number of federal and state public sector companies around the country. However, as a result of the 1980s oil glut and declining earnings, the nation eventually gave up control over some state businesses through its privatisation programme. Due to poor management and lack of finance, many government agencies had become outdated and ineffective.

Oil, the economy's mainstay, could no longer provide adequate revenue to service the country's budget, and all other productive sectors of the economy had been sacrificed on the altar of oil wealth. This compelled the country to seek loans from multilateral bodies such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. These bodies were neoliberal in nature, advocating for an open market through liberalization, deregulation, and privatization as a means for developing countries to improve their economies and industrialize. The positions of Jerome (2008) and Nwali (2019) clearly summarize the points raised above. Jerome states that "public corporations have taken on more various and strategic roles in the Nigerian economy." This was made worse during the oil boom of the 1970s and 1980s, when succeeding military governments built up a sizable state business sector that included a broad variety of economic operations, fuelled by economic nationalism and enormous oil windfalls.

Before the privatisation wave, there were approximately 600 federal public enterprises (PEs) and around 900 smaller PEs at the state and local scales (Jerome, 2008, p. 4). These comprised major fundamental sectors (manufacturing, agriculture, services, public utilities, and infrastructure), including telecommunications, power, steel, petrochemicals, fertiliser, vehicle assembly, banks, insurance, and hotels. Nwali contends that Nigeria's public sector enterprises performed poorly as a result of the falling oil market and prices and the global economic downturn because the country's public enterprises and agencies could no longer meet the demands of the economy under such pressure. The sustainability of these public enterprises became nearly unattainable due to high international debt commitments, unemployment, an absence of foreign exchange, and an international drop in oil prices,

Nigeria's primary source of income (Nwali et al., 2019, p. 138). Because of its reliance on oil, the country has become a hotbed of intergroup competition for access to the country's wealth. Politics became the only way to attain certain levels of wealth, and ethnic groups competed fiercely for political positions.

Intergroup competition for power became a question of who would control and benefit from the country's wealth, rather than who would ensure good governance. Citizens became disillusioned, believing that only with 'their person', someone from their ethnic group in power, could they achieve their aspirations for development and economic improvement. This was reflected in the voting patterns across the country in various elections. While ethnic groups have been at odds over access to power and control over state resources, individuals have also been at odds over state resources. In reality, the majority of ethnic and religious sentiments reflected in political choices are the direct result of individual ambitions carefully executed through patrimonial networks and structures.

Impact of the Nature and Character of the Nigerian State on Development Planning in Nigeria

The nature and character of the Nigerian state discussed above have had far-reaching impacts on development planning in the country. It has resulted in political distortions, political instability, a lack of political and technocratic commitment, and widespread corruption that has been a constraint to development planning in the country. In the following, we show how the nature and character of the Nigerian state has resulted in these factors that have ultimately limited the practical benefits derivable from development planning in the country.

- 1. **Plans Inconsistency**: the rent seeking characteristics of the Nigerian state reflected in the dependence of the state on oil rents and the attitudinal tendency of relying on entitlements and benefits without production and meaningful engagements by citizens. This has resulted in the consistent distortion of plans for private benefits by those in power. It has been noted that every development plan that was introduced was altered at some point. The 1966 coup and countercoup disrupted the initial development plan. The first development plan in Nigeria was completely disorganised after the outbreak of the Nigerian Civil War in 1967. The war later destroyed even some of the things that had been put in place. According to Dean (1972), one major oversight that was often tolerated was the ease with which completely new and unconnected endeavors were substituted for the original programmes. Plan skewing affected all of the development plans that were introduced in the post-independence era and was not just unique to the first national development plan. This situation further resulted in the Indiscipline plan at the level of implementation.
- 2. **Political Upheavals and the Interruption of Programmes**: the underlying factors characterizing the Nigerian state ethnicity, rent seeking, privatization, etc. has created a trend of violence and stiff competition for political power that has led to the occurrence and recurrence of violence in the Nigerian state. The 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s were characterized by military coups and change of governments in Nigeria. These were the periods during which these national development plans were

launched. The political atmosphere was unstable and successive administrations were not interested in continuing or implementing projects that were initiated by their predecessors. The period in question witnessed the following military coups: January 15th, 1966; July 29th, 1966, 1975; February 13th, 1976, return to civilian administration on 1st October, 1979, military coup of 31st December, 1983 and military coup in 1985. It is pertinent to note that these military coups and countercoups, as well as change of government to civilian administration, truncated the implementation of all the development plans in Nigeria (Okoli and Onah, 2002). The Nigerian government makes many promises, but cannot fulfill them. They are not committed enough to continue and complete the plans put in place already by their predecessors. This ultimately limits the prospects of achieving set goals.

- 3. Absence of Political and Technocratic Commitment: A careful examination and analysis of the development plans indicated that the political actors who were at the helm of the affairs at one time or the other did not have the political will and commitment to implement the development plans. Every successive administrative introduces some form of long-term, medium-term, or short-term development plan; however, the major preoccupation of political leadership in the country has been the occupation and retention of political power at the detriment of development (Ake, 1996). The reason for this is not far from the very nature and character of the Nigerian state. The penchant for seeking rents form the state and the privatization of the state for private interest has usurped the desire for leadership and followership to prioritize the overall development of the state. According to Luke (2008), implementing a strategic plan for a nation is like going to war. He further was supported by saying that you are like someone who has a plan at hand. A national strategic plan and war have something in common. Both have the capacity to change the face of the nation positively or negatively. A nation which declares war without the political will to prosecute it will lose. Similarly, you cannot set the full benefits of a strategic plan for a country without political will to implement it. The Nigerian leaders did not show commitment and enthusiasm for the implementation of the various development plans. They were all governed by selfish interests and how to accumulate the wealth of the nation to the detriment of the poor masses.
- 4. Corruption: The most difficult issue that has deeply affected Nigeria's leaders is corruption. The money that was supposed to be used to carry out the development plans was misappropriated and turned into private collections and bank accounts. Nigeria is among the most corrupt nations in the world right now, according to The Guardian (December 25, 2009). According to Deekor and Kia (2015), the country is ranked 157th out of 170, while Ghana is ranked number 70 among the most corrupt nations in the world (in upward order). At the launch of the "Fix Nigeria" initiative in Abuja in 2008, Nahu revealed that approximately 65 trillion (£220 billion) had been stolen over the previous 40 years of independence. He regrettably mentioned that the revenue could have reconstructed the attractiveness and glory of western Europe six times over (Guardian, September 22, 2008).

5. Lack of Evaluation: This is a crucial component in project implementation, serving as a vital tool to assess the effectiveness, efficiency, and impact of a project. Through evaluation, project stakeholders can systematically collect and analyze data to determine whether the project is meeting its intended objectives, identify areas of strength and weakness, and inform decision-making for future improvements. Effective evaluation enables project managers to adjust their strategies, allocate resources more efficiently, and ultimately, achieve better outcomes. Moreover, evaluation promotes accountability, transparency, and learning, allowing organizations to refine their practices, build on successes, and avoid repeating mistakes. By integrating evaluation into project implementation, organizations can ensure that their projects are delivering the desired results, achieving their goals, and making a meaningful impact (Okowa, 1991).

Conclusions and Recommendation

This article has established that the nature and character of the Nigerian state are significant factors influencing the development of the country and, as a result, a barrier to the development planning of Nigeria. Ideology is what drives change. By ideology, we mean the presumption of a goal to be achieved in the future, supported by plans and guidelines for how to get there (Deekor and Kia, 2015). It was noted that the majority of civilian and military administrators lacked the political will to change the course of the country, and this was attributed to ambivalent approaches to the country's development process. Therefore, Nigerians should disregard their political, ethnic, and religious affiliations and look for someone who is honest, reliable, and capable of managing both the nation's material and human resources. Another crucial aspect to consider is the appointment of more qualified individuals to perform the tasks for which they are the most qualified. It is proper to insert a round peg into a round hole. It is regrettable that in Nigeria, the majority of employment decisions are made based on a person's ethnicity, religious beliefs, and political affiliation. Because it contributes significantly to our stagnancy and lack of execution of development plans, this should be prevented. Most national development initiatives in Nigeria have tended to focus on economic and/or material development, almost entirely to the exclusion of development of attitudes, which is a crucial aspect of national development (Mesiobi, 2013). Similarly, Kamonideen (2008) asserts that "attitudinal change, change to do the right thing and ignore the wrong thing, is the best solution to the many problems working against the development of Nigeria and its proposed change to the top 20 economies."

Another step forward is for Nigerian leaders to place less emphasis on corruption and more on the country's development by effectively utilising the country's rich human and material assets to create goods that will benefit the whole. Nigeria suffered greatly as a result of the high level of corruption displayed by its leaders, but developed countries profited from the loot because the money was used for investment in the creation of jobs in their countries. The Nigerian leaders only provide lip service to fighting corruption and only target political rivals. Political rivals' transgressions and unethical behaviour are quickly forgotten once they join the ruling party. If we want to advance, this must end. A development plan or a rolling plan should not be considered the possession of a political leader or party. A development plan must be

viewed as the guide for the country that will lead us to the promised land. Therefore, succeeding governments should work to implement it; projects should be adequately and properly monitored and evaluated in order to increase transparency and accountability. This will undoubtedly improve project completion to a great extent. Additionally, funds should be released for project implementation as soon as they are due, and experts should evaluate the completed milestone based on the amount that was released. It is important to depoliticize the fight against corruption, putting party and religious differences aside. Politics should be purposefully devalued above all else.

References

Abdulwahab, I. (2018). *Customs net N58.8bn into federation account in January*, accessed on October 23th 2018 from https://newtelegraphonline.com/2018/03/customs-net-n58-8bn-federation-account-jan/.

Akinrinade, S. (1987). Structural adjustment: Is SAP the magic Wanch, Newswatch (5), 61-64

- Ale, C. (1996). *Is Africa democratizing*? Malthouse Press Ltd, Lagos.
- Amucheazi, E. C. (1980). *Readings in social sciences: Issues in national development,* Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.
- Amo, G. (1977). *Modem Nigeria*, London: Longman Supply Ltd.
- Bukola, I. & Mbakaan, K. (2018). *Nigeria's GDP grows by 1.92 % In Q4 2017.,* Accessed on October 25th 2018 from https://leadership.ng/2018/02/28/nigerias-gdp-grows-l-92-q4-2017/.
- Daggash, M. S. (2008). Why Nigeria needs a National development master plan, *Vanguard* (14), 35-36.
- Dibie, R. (2000). Understanding public policy in Nigeria: A twenty-first century approach (Nigerian edition) Lagos: Mbeyi & Associates (Nig.) Ltd.
- Dipeolu, A. (2018). Nigerian economy on course for 3.5% growth in 2018. Accessed on October 25th 2018 from https://economicconfidential.com/business/nigerian-economy-course-3-5-growth-2018/.
- Economic Confidential, (2011). Central bank of Nigeria communique No. 76 of the Monetary Policy Committee Meeting, May 23 - 24. Accessed on October, 24th 2018 fromhttps://economicconfidential.com/business/central-bank-of-nigeriacommunique-no-77/.
- Egonmwan, J. A. & Ibodje, S. W. E. (2001). *Development administration: Theory and practice,* Benin City: Resyin (Nig.) Company Ltd.

- Experience", in Usman, A. L. & Ijaiya, G. T. (eds.). Selected essays on the contradictions of economic development theories in Nigeria. Ilorin: Haytee Press & Publishing Company Ltd.
- Ezekiel, M. E. (1987). Indigenization: Nigeria for Nigerians, Newswatch 39, 41.
- FGN (2017). *Economic recovery and growth plan*, Ministry of Budget and National Planning, Abuja: Nigeria
- Kyarem, R. N. & Ogwuche, D. D. (2017). Nigeria's economic recovery and growth plan: Tackling the Macro-economic Downside Risk. *International Journal of Advanced Studies in Economics and Public Sector Management*. 5(3), 1-10.
- Ijaiya, G. T. & Usman, A. L. (2000). Development in disarray: An overview of the Nigerian
- Jhingan, M. L. (2007). *The economics of development and planning*, Delhi: Vrinda Publications (P) Ltd.
- Munroe, M. (1992). *In Pursuit of purpose*, USA: Destiny Image Publishers Inc.
- National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) (2017). *Nigeria out of recession*, Retrieved on 26 October, 2018 from https://www.vanguardngr.com > News.
- Obikeze, O. S. & Obi, E. A. (2004). *Public administration in Nigeria: A developmental approach,* Onitsha: BookPoint Ltd.
- Okoli, F. C. (2004). *Theory and practice of public organizations: A book of readings*, Enugu: John Jacob's Classic Publishers Ltd.
- Okoli, F. C. & Onah, F. O. (2002). Public administration in Nigeria: Nature: Principles and application. Enugu: John Jacob's Classic Publishers Ltd.
- Okowa, W. J. (1991). *The political economy of development planning in Nigeria*, Pan Unique Publishing Company Ltd.
- Omonubi, R. (1987). Oil: Oil, Oil, Where Is Naira?" Newswatch (October 5), 55-56
- Onah, F. O. (2006). *Managing public programmes and projects,* Nsukka: Great AP Express Publishers Ltd.
- Onah, R. C. & Ibietan, O. I. (2009). Democratic stability and regional economic integration: The economic community of West African States (ECOWAS) Experience, *Nigerian Journal of Public Administration and Local Government, UNN*. XIV, (1,)17-32.

- Opeoluwani, A. (2018). Q4 2017: OPEC puts Nigeria's oil output at 1.751m bpd, Accessed on October, 15th 2018 from http://sweetcrudereports.eom/2018/01/ll/q4-2017-opec-puts-nigerias-oil-output-1-751m-bpd/.
- Osifo- Whiskey, O. (1987). Economic planning/management: Top Speed in the Slow Lane, *Newswatch* (October 5) 32-33.
- Osifo-Whiskey, O. (1993). The economy: A headache fit for a King, Tell (June 21) 14 H16'
- Otinche, S. I. (2018). *Economic recovery and growth plan and nation building in Nigeria: Matters arising*, Accessed on January, 31st 2020 from www.paper.ssrm.com
- Poulopoulos, S. & Inglezakis, V. (2016). *Environment and development: Basic principles, human activities and environmental implications*. Netherlands, Elsevier
- Rist, G. (2007). Development as a buzzword, development in practice, 17, 4-5
- Rist, G. (2008). The history of development: From Western Origins to global faith (third edition), London, Zed Books Ltd
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*, New York: Anchor Books.
- Solomon, B. A & Fidelis, M. A. (2018). An appraisal of the Nigeria economic recovery and growth plan, 2017 2020, *African Research Review* 25-37.
- Ugwu, C. E. (2009). The imperatives of National development programmes harmonization in Nigeria: Vision 2020, millennium development goals and Seven Point Agenda, *Nigerian Journal of Public Administration and Local Government (UNN) XIV*(2), 200-216.
- Uwaleke, U. (2017). *Major threat to the economic recovery and growth plan,* Accessed on October 15th 2018 from https://guardian.ng/business-services/major-threat-to-the-economic-recovery-and-growth-plan/