

Inequality in Nigeria

An institutional analysis of the differences in prosperity between North and South Nigeria.

Naam: Sander Turenhout
Student number: S1566431
Docent: Dr. F. De Zwart
Course: Development and Underdevelopment: Testing Historical Institutional Explanation
Datum: 17 juni 2019
Aantal woorden: 8445

Intro:

On June 18, 2017, the Guardian headline read “Shameful Nigeria: a Country that does not care about inequality”. In this article, the authors discuss the outright unwillingness of the Nigerian Government to commit to reducing inequality (Akinwotu & Alukoya, 2017). This analysis is backed by the “Commitment to Reducing Inequality Index” produced by Oxfam Novib in 2018, that ranks Nigeria in the last place of the 157 countries researched (Oxfam Novib, 2018). Nigeria is Africa’s largest economy and one of the fastest growing economies on the planet. The Nigerian economy enjoyed steady growth for the last years and the GDP averaged a growth rate of 7% (Babjide, Adegboye, Omankhanlen, 2015, p.629). Additionally, Nigeria’s economy is expected to grow even further between 2020 and 2050. The CITI rapport about Global Growth Generators ranks Nigeria as potentially the fastest growing economy in the world between 2020 and 2050 (CITI Global Economics View, 2011). Nigeria has the largest reserves of natural gas and is the main oil exporter in Africa (Ogunnubi & Okeke-Uzodike, 2016 p.115). Nigeria also has an abundance of arable land and solid minerals, as well as other exportable commodities and no shortage of people with over 200 million inhabitants (Dauda, 2017, p.63). Furthermore, Nigeria is the biggest economy in Africa, with a GDP of 522 billion dollars in 2014 and a growth rate of 6.2% (Ogunnubi & Okeke-Uzodike, 2016 p.115).

Despite this, more than half of the Nigerian population is living in extreme poverty¹ (Oxfam Novib, 2018). Nigeria is associated with severe poverty, illiteracy and Islamic terrorism (Meagher, 2013, p.840). This poverty incidence² is only increasing, the percentage of the population living in extreme poverty has been rising for decades; in 1980 it was 46.3 %, in 2004 it was 54.7% and in 2010 69 % of the population lived in extreme poverty (Dauda,

¹ The World Bank defines “**extreme poverty**” as living on less than \$1.90 per person per day.

² **Incidence of poverty:** This is the share of the population whose income or consumption is below the poverty line, that is, the share of the population that cannot afford to buy a basic basket of goods (Worldbank 2019).

2017, p.63). These numbers become dreadful when they are varied among the six-geopolitical zones and 36 states in the Nigerian state.

The Chairman of the Northern State Governors Forum, Kashim Shettima; beautifully illustrates this perverse difference;

“ Unemployment in the north is extremely high. Nigeria is a country of two nations, the South is much more stable and prosperous, and the north, on the other hand, is in a poverty trap. In Nigeria, poverty wears a northern cap, if you are looking for a poor man, get somebody wearing a northern cap," (Daily Post, 2016).

The greatest disparity is the poverty incidence among states, Niger state had the lowest of 33.8 % and the Sokoto state the highest at 81.2 % (Dauda, 2017, p.63). When other factors are taken into account, the prosperity differences become even more apparent. First, there is a huge difference in literacy between the North and the South. In the Northeast, North-west, and North-central, the literacy rates are 23%, 21.6 %, and 47%. In contrast, the Southeast, South-West, South-South zones have literacy rates of 81.8 %, 79.8 %, and 77.1% respectively. Second, the unemployment rate in the North is three times greater than in the South (World Bank 2015). How did North and South Nigeria end up with such different levels of prosperity?

All these differences are not just coincidences, there are structural causes as to why this difference in prosperity is maintained and came into existence. Well-known explanations for inequality in regions and the world are formulated in the Geography hypothesis, Culture hypothesis and Ignorance hypothesis (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012 pp.45-70). The Geography hypothesis states that the great divide between rich and poor countries is created by geographical differences (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012, p.48). Most of the richer nations tend to be in more temperate climates. The theory states that tropical diseases, tropical soils, and heat affect production effectiveness adversely. However, it should be noted that this

argument is contradicted by countries such as Botswana, Puerto Rico, Taiwan, and Singapore, who thrive despite the climate.

The Culture hypothesis makes a link between prosperity and culture. This goes back to the Protestant work ethic theory formulated by Max Weber (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012, p.57). Many believe that Latin Americans are just too lazy, to ever become rich. This was also said about the Chinese Culture by many researchers in the '60s but look at the economic powerhouse China is today (Idem.). The aspects of culture, religion, or the difference between "Western" and "African" or "Latin" values are just not adequate enough to formulate why some states are prosperous and others not. The final hypothesis can be described as the "Ignorance hypothesis", poor countries are poor simply because they do not know how to make themselves rich. It is not the case that leaders of poorer nations are incapable, they have less institutional constraints to abusing their power (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012, p.68).

These theories are all inadequate to explain the huge differences in prosperity between North and South Nigeria. It is not the difference in work ethic, geography or ignorance that made Northern Nigeria poorer than South Nigeria.

Another cause for the poor economic development of some countries/regions in Africa is attributed to a weak state, which is unwilling or incapable of providing basic public goods such as education, law enforcement, infrastructure, and order. This is often attributed to the institutional persistence of the 'indirect rule' system from the colonial period (Acemoglu, et al, 2014, p.3). The legacy of the modern weak African states began under the burdening colonial governance that installed indirect rule, that lead these states down a path dependent outcome of weak states and poor prosperity.

During the colonial period, the Northern Nigerian administration had a system of indirect rule and the Southern (and Eastern) Nigerian administrations had a system of more direct rule. The administrations in the South were under more strongly direct British control, with one administration even being under the British crown itself (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.113). In

the North, the former state structure of the Caliphate of Sokoto was used to rule over the people. This meant a much more indirect ruling system than in Southern Nigeria (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.112). These seemingly small differences between direct and indirect rule are the root cause of the differences between prosperity.

In this thesis, the theory of path dependency and indirect rule on economic development is used to explain the differences in prosperity. I argue that the “institution” of indirect rule lead Northern Nigeria down a different path than Southern Nigeria; namely one of poor state capacity and extractive institutions, that consequently lead to poor development.

In contrast, Southern Nigeria experienced more direct rule, which sends them down a path of stronger state capacity with inclusive institutions and significant economic development during colonial times. Evidence for these differences in the colonial state of Nigeria is presented, then the consequences of this in the postcolonial state of Nigeria are analyzed and finally evidence of the lasting effect in modern day Nigeria is presented.

Nigeria is a particularly interesting case because it is the biggest economy in Africa, with more than 200 different ethnic groups. Besides being the biggest economy in Africa it ranks as the lowest country on the ‘willingness to address inequality’ index by Oxfam Novib.

Nigeria has experienced economic growth since its existence and is expected to grow even further. However, this growth seems to be only for the Southern part of Nigeria.

This thesis will be structured in different chapters. The first chapter is about the theoretical background of historical institutionalism, path dependency and the effects of the indirect rule on economic development. The second chapter will be covering the method and operationalization used in this essay. The third chapter will explain the history and causes of the regional differences between North and South Nigeria. The fourth chapter will discuss the consequences of these differences during the postcolonial state of Nigeria until 1998.

The fifth chapter compares the current level of prosperity in North Nigeria to the current level of prosperity in South Nigeria, therefore proving that the differences made in the colonial times still influence the modern day state of Nigeria.

Chapter 1: Theoretical Frame.

In 1348 the bubonic black Plague spread across the whole continent and isles of Europe, wiping out half the population of any area it hit (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012, p.96). This plague created a scarcity of labor across England, which strengthened the bargaining position to demand more rights. Consequently, the old feudal system began to crumble, the institutions began to change. An inclusive market began to emerge in England, where the workers had sufficient power over their own wares and labor (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012, p.100). This same event had massively different consequences in other parts of Europe. In Eastern Europe this scarcity of labor caused the feudal lords to restrain the freedom of their population even more (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012, p.100). They increased the plots of land in their possession and began to limit the freedom of the citizens even more.

The almost similar societies in the early 14th century responded differently to a major event (critical juncture) and began to develop differently. Small differences such as that towns were slightly weaker and lords were a little better organized in the East, eventually lead to major differences. Two different worlds arose from these small differences. In the West, workers had no more feudal duties and became a part of a “free” market economy. In the East, almost half of the labor was unpaid, and almost every country the number of feudal duty days increased (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012, p.101).

Acemoglu & Robinson (2012) use the example of the Black Death to illustrate that critical junctures can have long-lasting impacts on institutions and prosperity. Small differences can lead to very different outcomes. The choices a state makes are path dependent and continue to influence the future and present. These impacts have lasting consequences, showcased by the fact that Eastern Europe was very similar but took such a different path after the critical juncture.

This example is from the book "Why Nations Fail; the origins of power, prosperity, and poverty, in this book, Acemoglu and Robinson (2012) use institutional path dependency to explain differences in prosperity and why some states fail while others prosper. To understand the theoretical backgrounds of path dependency, I will first discuss the background of historical institutionalism.

According to Pierson & Skocpol (2002), three important features characterize historical institutional theory in political science. Historical institutionalists address grand puzzles that are related to the interest of broad publics (Pierson & Skocpol, 2002, p.3). Historical institutionalists tend to take time seriously, focusing on sequences and tracing transformations to develop an explanatory argument about these puzzles or outcomes.

One of the distinctive features of historical institutionalism which is important for this essay is the notion that timing and sequence of events shape the political process (Fioretos, 2011, p.371). This timing and sequence also affect the flexibility, the longer an event is, the more difficult it is to reverse course. Furthermore, events in the past have lasting effects on the current situation. This notion of events in the past having lasting effects on current situations is one of the central propositions to Acemoglu & Robinson's (2012) argument in their book on why some nations fail and others succeed.

Path dependence theory means that the path of institutions within a system determines the nature of the institution in the future and present, this is based on previous choices or "paths" taken by the institution (Fadiran & Sarr, 2016, p.1). Current and past institutional frameworks will have a varying degree of influence on the direction of that institution.

Acemoglu & Robinson (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012, p.110) describe this as the contingent path of history.

These paths of history can be altered through critical junctures. Critical junctures are major events or factors disrupting the existing economic or political balance in society (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012, p.101). A critical juncture can open the way for inclusive institutions (free

market access and no more feudal duties in Western Europe) or break them down and facilitate extractive institutions (massive feudal duties in Eastern Europe). One path may lead to heaven and the other to hell.

Acemoglu & Robinson make a distinction between states with inclusive and exclusive political institutions, and extractive or inclusive economical institutions (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012, p.431). Inclusive economic institutions tend to enforce property rights, create an equal playing field and stimulate investments in innovative technologies and skills. In comparison, extractive economic institutions are molded to extract resources from the many by the few and neglect to safeguard property rights or stimulate incentives for economic activity (Idem.).

Inclusive political institutions are centralized and pluralistic in which power is distributed broadly and subjected to constraints (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012, p.81). When one of these conditions fail, the institutions are classified as an exclusive political institution by Acemoglu & Robinson (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012, p.81). Extractive economic institutions often accompany extractive political institutions. Because extractive political institutions concentrate power in the few, they often structure the economic institutions to extract resources from the rest of the population, what results in extractive economic institutions (Idem.). The elites who benefit from extractive institutions gain the resources required to build armies, buy mercenaries, bribe judges and rig elections to maintain power (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012, p.343). They also have every reason to maintain the status quo, because they are the ones benefiting from the system.

Besides the nature of the political institutions, the amount of capacity and presence of the state is also vital. Acemoglu, Garcia & Robinson (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2015, p.2405) argue that state capacity is important for economic development. Because central and local states with the capability to foster public goods, enforce the law and- order, regulate economic activity are vital for economic development (Idem.). This proposition originated in

the works of Hobbes and Weber and gained more recognition after the rise of “East Asian Tigers” (Acemoglu, Garcia & Robinson, 2015, p.2405).

In Africa, a weak state is often attributed to the persistence of ‘indirect’ rule from the colonial period (Acemoglu et al, 2014, p.1). A weak state is one which does not possess a monopoly of violence, does not have modern bureaucracy and is unable to raise taxes (Acemoglu et al, 2014, p.5). In a various research, it is proven that indirect rule leads to a weak state (Lange, 2004; Lange, 2009; Iyer, 2010; Acemoglu et al, 2014). Overall this research provides three main arguments how the indirect rule affects economic development in a state.

The indirect rule makes it difficult for a state to establish a monopoly of violence, this is made difficult by the traditional rulers. Often they are against constructing a national identity so that politics and loyalty stay local (Acemoglu et al, 2014, pp.3-4). Second, traditional rulers are problematically unaccountably, and therefore able to extract major resources from the state and under-provide public goods. Third, the indirect rule encourages bureaucracies based on patrimony and lineage, ruling families dominate whole bureaucracies (idem.). These factors interact with others to create huge negative economic consequences from the indirect rule. Another reason is that colonial rulers probably set up poorer institutions in places where they do not intend to settle for a longer period of time (Iyer, 2010, 697). Property rights or investments in schooling, benefit the local population more than the colonial powers.

All these theories lead to a couple of assumptions. North Nigeria took a different institutional path than South Nigeria, this can be explained by looking at the different institution of an indirect rule imposed by the British in Northern Nigeria. This indirect rule resulted in a weak state and extractive institutions in Northern Nigeria, which consequently leads to less prosperity.

Chapter 2: Method

To investigate how these regional differences came into existence, I will be using a comparative analysis with a most similar systems design. In a Most Similar Systems Design (MMSD), the objects of research must be as similar as possible, except on the phenomenon that you want to research (Anckar, 2008, pp.390-391). This design is chosen for this thesis is to keep constant as many extraneous variables as possible. Despite being theoretically firm, the MMSD has one fundamental shortcoming, it is impossible to discuss all explanatory variables in a state (idem.). Therefore, in this thesis a looser application of MMSD is maintained, we study two regions that appear to be similar on many variables, while never completely matching on all the variables (idem.). North and South Nigeria share the same history, state system, judicial system, cultural diversity.

In this thesis, the legislative, judicial and executive institutions will be analyzed and compared to make an assessment of the extractive grade of these institutions. The institutions in North Nigeria are expected to be more extractive and therefore produce less prosperity. In his work, North gives a good description of what institutions exactly are. North (1991) describes institutions as;

'Humanly devised constraints that structure political, economic and social interaction. They consist of both informal constraints (sanctions, taboos, customs, traditions and codes of conduct), and formal rules (constitutions, laws and property rights) (North, 1991, p.97).'

The level of prosperity between North and South Nigeria will be compared. Prosperity will be measured using variables such as education, GDP, literacy, health employment, and institutions. These variables are taken from the Prosperity Index by the Legatum Institute (Bate, 2009, p.3).

Furthermore, state capacity is analyzed. Economic development and weak states are closely linked together. State capacity is not a directly observable phenomenon (Gomide, Pereira,

Machado, 2019, p.10). To operationalize state capacity and therefore analyze the prosperity, it must be taken into account that state capacity can be defined by looking at what it produces in terms of success, for example by looking at health education, security and taxes (Gomide, Pereira, Machado, 2019, p.10). In this thesis, the results of state capacity will be analyzed by looking at health (maternal death rates), education (literacy rates, number of universities), and GDP per capita.

Finally, indirect rule is an important part of this thesis, it explains the different institutional paths taken by North and South Nigeria. Indirect rule can be defined as a system where colonial powers (such as the British) use native rulers as the (regional) government (Acemoglu, Chaves & Kwaako, 2014, p.3). Giving them the power to tax, dispense law, maintain order and care for the population.

In the next chapters, North Nigeria and South Nigeria are compared and the cause of the difference in prosperity is analyzed.

Chapter 3: History of the Regional differences

In this chapter the history and consequences of the different institutions that shaped North and South Nigeria are analyzed. Especially the differences between the institutions of direct and indirect rule are analyzed. It will describe how the British established extractive political and economic institutions in Northern Nigeria. Furthermore, how a system of indirect rule was established in Northern Nigeria and how this system differs from the one in South Nigeria. This chapter shows the beginning of the differences between North and South Nigeria.

The modern state of Nigeria was founded with the arrival of the British, although creating new nations was not their intention (Afigbo, 1991, p.16). Colonization of Nigeria by the British is a critical juncture, an important event that kick started the lasting differences between North and South Nigeria. It took over 40 years for the British to fully occupy current-day

Nigeria. Because it was a process that took place over multiple years, different tactics were used for these different regions, which led to different administrations and levels of development (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.85). It began with the colonization of Lagos in 1861 and ended with the occupation of the Sokoto Caliphate in 1903.

The British had two guiding rules for colonizing Nigeria, one was the "Dual mandate" system (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.112). This system entails that the native populations of Nigeria and Great Britain should simultaneously benefit from the colonial rule. British rulers saw it as their duty to bring civilization to the otherwise backward African societies (idem.). The other guiding principle was indirect rule; this meant that the traditional kings and chiefs were used by the British to govern the native population.

However, in practice abiding by these two principles was not as easy as thought. In Southeastern Nigeria, British colonial officers were often not capable of defining who the kings and chiefs of the region were (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.113). Instead of finding autocratic heads, the village-group councils were more like representative democracies (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.116). The Chiefs in these areas were more ritual figures than actual autocratic political heads of society, the villages or village groups had the power (idem.).

The British tried to find the local leaders, but they usually failed because of mistrust of the population. Often, the native population thought the leaders would be killed, so they handed over social outcasts or slaves. Furthermore, the jurisdiction the British gave to these leaders regularly did not correspond with the actual ethnic and tribal lands of these leaders. This meant that there was no actual recognition of the leaders (if they even had a single leader) by the native population (Falola & Heaton, 2008, pp.113-114). In practice, this leads to the British appointing unimportant people (that were basically British puppets) and founding native courts with British governor generals as presidents (idem.).

On the other side in the south, in the Colony of Lagos, British colonial officers ruled even more directly than in any other part of Nigeria. This led to significant development of

institutions in South (western) Nigeria. It has been a crown colony since 1861, this gave the inhabitants all the rights of British citizens (Falola & Heaton, 2008, pp.115-116). This meant that in practice, the colonial officials took control of the daily administration in Lagos, not indirectly through native rulers (*idem.*). In Lagos the British Crown had established, public buildings, roads, electric lighting, telegraphs and public transport (*idem.*). There even was a medical department and police department that had a handful of African doctors and policemen. Furthermore, in the whole of Southern Nigeria, education was extensively promoted by the colonial government.

In 1922, the colonial Government in Southwest Nigeria even created a Legislative council of forty-six members, three of these members were males of the population in Lagos and Calabar. The Governor himself was the president of the legislative council. This was the first elected African representation on a legislative position (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.113).

While there were problems with establishing systems of indirect rule in Southern Nigeria, in Northern Nigeria, there was no problem identifying the traditional chiefs and Sultans. In 1903 the British seized control of the Sokoto caliphate. The British colonial officer blessed with the task of establishing British rule in Northern Nigeria was High commissioner Lugard (Afigbo, 1991, p.18). Lugard is famously known for his book "Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa", what is basically the canonical book for British colonial administrators enforcing indirect rule (Cooke, 2003, p.49). Essential to Lugard's indirect rule was that natives are integrated into the machinery of the bureaucratic administration, while they understand that they have no power without proper service to the state (Cooke, 2003, p.49). Most of the developments in Southern Nigeria did not happen in Northern Nigeria. The Islamic emirs and colonial officials explicitly forbade to build public services such as roads, electric lighting, and telegraphs (Falola & Heaton, 2008, pp.115-116). Everything that did make Lagos and other parts of Southern Nigeria an attractive center was forbidden in Northern Nigeria. According to Lugard, the development of modern social services was to be undertaken by the native administrations themselves, at their own expense and on their own terms (*idem.*). Not

abiding by this principle was a direct violation of the “Dual mandate” principle of Lugard. It constitutes unnecessary colonial expenditure and erodes the traditional social structures. This was for the sake of parsimony and cultural preservation (idem.). Even the access of Christian missionaries and schools was prohibited, for the sake of preserving the traditional culture (idem.). The most damaging aspect that still lingers today is the exclusion of the mission –Catholic-sponsored schools in the mainly Muslim North (Osaghae & Suberu, 2005, p.12). For example in 1921, there were 2200 schools in Southern Nigeria. North Nigeria only had about 50 of non-Qur’anic schools (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.115). An effect we still witness today, the literacy rates between North and South Nigeria differ by 30/40 percent.

Lugard took control by simply replacing the seat of power the Sultan of Sokoto in had filled and directed his control through the Fulani Emirs and non-Muslim chiefs that still held control over their regions (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.114). The British High commissioner Lugard and his replacements now gifted authority and power that was previously gifted by the Sultan of Sokoto to the rulers. In the South, this was not the case; there were no centralized previous elite structures to overtake. That is why it was more difficult to install centralized indirect control there.

In Northern Nigeria, all the power rested in the hands of a single Emir, in South Nigeria there were more people deciding over the fate of their tribe. For example, the Emirs continued to lift taxes and judge over court cases, under sharia law (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.150). In the South, the legal system was based on British law. For the reasons mentioned above, the Northern part of Nigeria was developed remarkable different from the South (Afigbo, 1991, p.17).

Because the North and South were so different, the economic activities also developed differently. The commercial enterprise in Southern Nigeria started with the activities of the British chartered Royal Niger Company (Raheem et al. 2014, p.167). The Royal Niger Company had gained the power to control the political administration and commerce policies in Nigerian territories in name of the British Crown. With these commercial activities, the first

economic differences between North and South Nigeria began to develop (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.99).

The advantages South Nigeria gained from these commercial activities was the promotion of economic, political and intergroup relations. This was realized by new roads, rails, and ports (Olusegun & Kehinde, 2012, p.8). Also, the introduction of the British Pound in Nigeria facilitated trade among the Nigerians. All of these things led to the expansion of urban centers and commerce in the South.

Wherever the Royal Niger Company had an administrative headquarters, an economic center developed. The Royal Niger Company switched the location of the administrative headquarters constantly between cities in Southern Nigeria (Calabar, Asaba, Lokoja and later Lagos), this laid the foundation for the economic inequalities between North and South Nigeria (Raheem et al. 2014, p.167) (Osaghae & Suberu, 2005, p.12). Because the headquarters were located only in Southern Nigeria, this created an imbalance in commercial growth nodes. This was only enforced by the limited financial and human resources of the British that focused on these commercial growth nodes.

These centers can be the cause of enormous economic inequality because resources and people were drawn to these hubs of commercial activity. Over the course of time, the inequality between the cores and the region expanded. Another effect of the headquarters was that the areas directly linked to it began to modernize, for example, the availability of public services grew (Raheem et al. 2014, p.168). This was not the case in the periphery that was mainly situated in the North. In the South, there were investments in public services such as education and healthcare.

The British colonial officers in the south wielded far too much power and influence over the indigenous courts and councils according to Lugard. Falola & Heaton (2008) describe this process as “ making emirs out of southern kings and chiefs” (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.117). This did not go too well, because the Southern population did not recognize these newly

found chiefs and kings, and they did not wield the same amount of power as in the North.

Southern Nigeria had a very different social make-up of communities, this meant in practice that the rift created by colonialism between indigenous rulers and their subjects widened in Southern Nigeria (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.117). Afigbo even states that it is common knowledge that indirect rule failed in Southeastern Nigeria (Afigbo, 1985, p.1)

To summarize, the North already had extractive political institutions that the British used to control the distribution of power. In the South, this was more difficult, the British had to adapt to a lesser form of indirect rule that also listened to the traditional councils that look similar to representative democracies. This form of direct rule resulted in more state capacity in Southern Nigeria than in Northern Nigeria. For Lagos, there even was a form of representative legislation for the population. Because there was no tradition of the centralized rule in the South, the political institutions developed more inclusively than in the North, where Lugard ruled through his emirs also the economic institutions in South Nigeria were relatively more inclusive than in North Nigeria. The public roads, services, and education made sure that the level playing field was more even than in North Nigeria. There even were African doctors in Lagos.

In the next chapter consequences of Northern domination on Nigeria's economy is analyzed. Here leads the weak state capacity of Northern Nigeria to poor economic growth and the strong state capacity of Southern Nigeria to economic growth.

Chapter 4: Northern dominance and growing disparity.

This chapter provides evidence that the weak state capacity of Northern Nigeria, caused negative economic consequences in the whole of Nigeria. Despite these negative consequences, the South still developed, because of their stronger state capacity in the South. First I present the three negative economic consequences of Northern Nigerian rule that are a consequence of weak state capacity, then I give a few examples which showcase

the Southern Nigerian stronger state capacity and then evidence that Southern Nigeria actually grew economically while being under Northern oppression.

In 1951, the plans were made for the very first general election in Nigerian history (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.136). The Southerners had massive advantages in entrepreneurship, administrative experience and education (Lewis, 2006, p.97). In the South, infrastructure services and education made sure that the economy was more developed than in the North. Despite these advantages for the Southerners, this did not lead to political power over the government. The Northern region that lagged behind in educational and economic resources proved most capable of organizing themselves on behalf of Northern interests. Northern Nigeria became dominant in the first government and dominated Nigerian politics for decades to come, with most military junta's being of a Northern ethnicity (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.136).

One reason for the Northern dominance in the first election is the system of indirect rule in the North that maintained the influence of the traditional Emirs (Lewis, 2006, p.97). Emirates that retained their influence in the system of indirect rule in Northern Nigeria built upon their cultural and religious identities to create an effective political network during the nationalist year (Lewis, 2006, p.97). Every region had its own political party, but the Northern party had achieved dominance over the state structure in the first elections of Nigeria. This Northern dominance didn't result in economic prosperity for the region, on the contrary, it leads to poor government bureaucracy and reliance on the South.

Namely; first, the Northern elites gave preferential treatment to Northerners, this led to a bureaucratic system based on patrimony. Despite proportionality invested in the constitution by the British, Northerners, particularly the Hausa-Fulani, dominated all the federal civil service, public agencies, and institutions (Jinadu, 1985, p.81). Preferential treatment was normal for Northerners, and promotions frequent. For example, in the Nigerian army, the entry qualifications were reduced for Northerners (Jinadu, 1985, p.81). In addition, the schooling system favored Northerners; compensatory quotas for Northern students were

extended to federal secondary schools (Jinadu, 1985, p.81). This system of preferential treatment led to many incapable bureaucratic employees, and incited corruption in Nigeria. The patronage network of almost every government was corrupt to the core. All this leads to poor economic development for the Nigerians.

Second, the Northern dominance leads to the North extorting resources from the South, this meant that the Northern economy did not develop an economic foundation of its own. The extraction of goods from Southern Nigeria was not something new for them, in the colonial times this was also frequent (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.117). Lugard relocated funds from Southern Nigeria to Northern Nigeria, because of the failing economy. The finances of Northern Nigeria always had been a flop; by 1914, the economy has declined under the indirect rule and was not able to finance itself (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.117).

One example of the federal government's intention to use the apparatus to boost a northern agenda is the FNDP (Federal Nigerian Development Plan) (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.166). Almost all the budget that was reserved for health, education and infrastructure projects went to the North. The Niger dam project (in Northern Nigeria), costing a staggering 88 million pounds, was 10 percent of all federal spending in Nigeria (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.166).

Third, this caused communal competition and later a civil war, which is bad for the whole economy of Nigeria. Regional tensions were already very high at the end of the British rule, which made it difficult to find a constitutional arrangement for independent Nigeria (Bevan, Collier & Gunning, 1999, p.16). As is mentioned above, the preferential treatment of Northerners did not help this. This led to communal competition between North, South and East Nigeria. Communal competition between North and South Nigeria led to three consequences for the ethnic groups in the South. First, they had less access to the state, which was essential for opportunities and claims on resources (Lewis, 2006, p.96). Political and economic power gives the Northerner's dominance over the Southerners, state positions are used to direct resources towards their clique. In addition, those elites in power do desire to prevent other groups from building an economic base, for example; preventing the

Southerners to economically liberalize (Lewis, 2006, p.96). These political stalemates are bad for economic development, if there is no government that has a coalition across communal lines, it is impossible to organize a unitary state policy that seeks economic growth on behalf of Nigeria.

An illustration of these “political stalemates” that plagued Nigeria, is the civil war in the '70s. The Southeastern region tried to secede from the rest of Nigeria. After a failed coup and because of ongoing mistreatment of Igbo's in the North, the military government declared the independence of the Republic of Biafra (Heerten & Moses, 2014, p.174). This induced civil war from 1967 until 1970, where between 1 and 3 million people were killed and the nation of Nigeria almost destroyed. Ultimately the federal government was able to recapture the Eastern region, but this civil war did illustrate the ethnic problems that persisted in this country (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.180).

These three consequences of weak state capacity halted the economy of Nigeria. Despite these three consequences, the Southern economy still developed. The Southern regions still had some political power to influence their own states; the power of the federal government was not absolute. A good illustration of the different mindsets between the Southerners and the Northerners is their view on inequality. In the North, inequality is justified by a legitimate hierarchy and in the South as a consequence of fair competition (Bevan, Collier & Gunning, 1999, p.187).

Even during the years of Northern dominance, the North/South divide in wealth began to widen during the 1960s and 1970s. This indicates that the economy of the North was falling behind even more, strangely during their political years of dominance (Bevan, Collier & Gunning, 1999, p.107). Economic inadequacy is probably the main reason the Northern elite did not want to rely upon market mechanism or abandon control of the federal government's power to redistribute oil revenue (Bevan, Collier & Gunning, 1999, p.107). This divide kept on growing; in 1992, the expenditure of the significantly richer South had increased by 30

percent, while there had been no change in the poorer North (Bevan, Collier & Gunning, 1999, p.108).

One reason for the growing disparity in the late 1980s is the liberalization of the market. These years from 1980s and onward were characterized by liberalization (due to international pressure by the IMF), a political notion the Southern political groups were advocating for a long time (Lewis, 2006, p.97). Northern interest groups tried to prevent this for a long period of time, this because of the simple fact that the North still was educationally backward and would lose the commercial race on a level playing field (Bevan, Collier & Gunning, 1999, p.99). Exactly this happened, the liberalization leads to a significant redistribution of income from Northern to Southern households (Bevan, Collier & Gunning, 1999, p.99).

In the agricultural area, liberalization hit the North the hardest. Evidence for this is the fact that the South began producing more "nonfood" crops that are made for the world market and food production increased in the North (Bevan, Collier & Gunning, 1999, p.113).

Indicating that the market in the South was much more entwined with the world market and produced for the competitive market.

That the state capacity and economic institutions were more inclusive in Southern Nigeria than in Northern Nigeria is beautifully illustrated by the difference credit can be loaned for farms (Bevan, Collier & Gunning, 1999, p.99). In the North, 55 percent of the farmers borrowed money from the informal market, more than 80 % of the loans were in cash, with an annual interest rate of 11.4 % (Bevan, Collier & Gunning, 1999, p.270). The collateral would be based on land, trees or reputation acquired through the regular contact (Bevan, Collier & Gunning, 1999, p.270). When the land is returned, the loaner has to pay a bond. Furthermore, it is of utmost importance to be of the same kin when a loan is to be secured.

In contrast, in Southern Nigeria, the process is much more formal, when a loan is initiated both parties hire a letter writer or a lawyer to draw up a legal document (Bevan, Collier &

Gunning, 1999, p.270). Additionally, five people have to witness the transaction and attach their postage stamp to it (Bevan, Collier & Gunning, 1999, p.270). In this case, kinship or residence networks play no part in achieving a loan (Bevan, Collier & Gunning, 1999, p.270).

One common explanation for the deepening divide between North and South Nigeria is the fact that all the oil was based in South (eastern) lands. However, this argument does not hold, the allocation of oil revenue was made fully federal in 1979 (Falola & Heaton, 2008, p.186). The North was in control of the federal allocation, so they benefitted the most from the oil revenue. Growing inferiority of the Northern economy has been the core of the reluctance of the Northern elite to abandon control over the distribution of it (Bevan, Collier & Gunning, 1999, p.107).

Concluding, the traditional power structures in North Nigeria that kept intact through the indirect rule of Lugard, made sure that the North could politically unite and dominate the postcolonial state of Nigeria. Although this did not lead to significant economic development in Northern Nigeria, because of the extractive nature and weak state capacity of the Northern elite and state. Namely, that the government structure was based on patrimony (which instigated corruption), ethnic conflict was frequent (with even civil war) and the extraction of resources from the Southern economy to the Northern economy (which lead to unsustainable economic growth). On the short term, this was beneficial for the Northerners, but in the long run, it damaged their economy more because they didn't develop their own economic foundations. The political elite in Northern Nigeria has been extracting economic goods from the populace since the colonial times, this may be the root cause of poor economic development. In contrast, the South was able to develop even in these bare conditions. While being used as a source of extraction, they still grew more than their Northern counterparts. This can be attributed to the strong state capacity and more inclusive institutions of Southern Nigeria as a consequence of more direct rule.

Chapter 5: Lasting effects on modern-day Northern Nigeria.

One of the central arguments to the Path dependency theory is that events in the past have lasting consequences on a modern day. This chapter illustrates that the inequality created by the difference in direct and indirect rule is path dependent and still exist in modern-day Nigeria. This will be done by comparing the levels of prosperity in Northern Nigeria with Southern Nigeria.

As mentioned above, an explanation for the difference in education, GDP and many more factors can be attributed to the difference in direct and indirect rule (Lange, 2004, 2009)(Iyer, 2010) (Acemoglu et al, 2014, p.5). Indirect rule resulted in a weaker state compared to a stronger state under direct rule. The results of state capacity will be analyzed by looking at health (maternal and child death rates), education (literacy rates, number of universities) and GDP (per citizen).

Northern Nigeria has some of the worst HDI (Human development indicators) in the world (Hoffman, 2014, p.2). To begin with education, the North has a long history of Islamic schooling. These schools do not include “Western” subjects such as English, Mathematics, Social studies and basic science courses (Aghedo & Eke, 2013, p.101). This lack of basic subjects negatively affects the job opportunities of these students. As can be seen in the table below, the literacy rates in North Nigeria are shockingly lower compared to the literacy rates in South Nigeria. On first sight, this may seem odd, because North Nigeria has a higher number of schools. However, the quality of education is undeniably lower. This also can be attributed to the high number of Islamic Schools in Northern Nigeria (Aghedo & Eke, 2013, p.101). If these numbers are varied across sex, it becomes even more dreadful for Northern Nigeria (National Literacy Survey, 2010). The high amount of Islamic schools is a direct consequence of the system of indirect rule. British colonial administrators did not allow western styled education in Northern Nigeria.

Not only are the number of schools and literacy rates lower in North Nigeria, but also the number of universities. In Northern Nigeria, there are 58 universities of different quality. In southern Nigeria, in 2017 this number is up to 102 universities (Dapel, 2018).

Table 1 Number of public primary schools/Literacy rates in the zones and regions	No. of schools	Percentage Distribution	Literacy Rates
Zones/Region			
North West	9,786	16%	29.71%
North East	19,436	31%	30.43%
North Central	12,691	21%	42.31%
North	41,913	68%	34.15%
South West	5,453	9%	64.60%
South South	8,701	14%	73.16%
South East	5,824	9%	63.16%
South	19,978	32%	66.97%

Source: UNESCO (2012), NBS (2015) (From Suleyman)

Examining health statistics, we find that with an average life expectancy of 52 years, Nigeria has one of the lowest life expectancies in Africa. There are also major differences between the North and the South. Take for instance Adamawa in North Nigeria, with an average life expectancy of 43 and Cross Rivers state in the South, which has an average life expectancy of 52 (Statistical Rapport on Men and Women in Nigeria, 2017).

Child mortality rate below five years is 15 percent in the North of Nigeria and 10 percent in the South of Nigeria (Demographic and Health Survey, 2013). This means that 150 out of 1000 children born in North Nigeria will not grow beyond the age of five. The lowest child mortality rate can be found in the South-west region with 9 percent the worst in the North-

central region (19%). Furthermore, women in Northern Nigeria have a higher chance of maternal death compared to South Nigeria. In the Northeast 1549 women die per 100.000 live births. Compared to 165 deaths per 100.000 live births in the Southwest. The leading cause of death among women between the ages of fifteen and nineteen in Northern Nigeria is pregnancy-associated complications. Over a third of pregnancies of fifteen and nineteen-year-olds are carried out without the help of an education professional, traditional pregnancy help, or even a non-educated friend or relative (Maternal Health in Nigeria: Facts and Figures, APHRC, 2017).

North Nigeria is comprised of 19 states and has 79.07 percent of the landmass with 53.6 percent of the national population (Ndanusa, 2017, p.15). The whole of Northern Nigeria contributes 33 percent of the country's GDP, in comparison, solely the South-west zone of South Nigeria contributes 28 percent of the national GDP. GDP can explain why the poverty rate in North Nigeria is tremendously higher than in South Nigeria. Each native Northerner earns around 990 dollars each year, whereas in the South an average citizen earns around 2400 dollars each year (Ndanusa, 2017, p.16). GDP is an important yardstick used to measure the health of an economy.

The diversification of the Northern economy is also very poor, in the North East and North West about 70 percent of all employment is Agricultural based. In the South, almost one in four jobs is a wage job and over half of the workforce is self-employed (Poverty Work Program, FRN, 2016). Unemployment data gathered in 2010 ranks nine of the nineteen northern states as the highest states in unemployment in Nigeria. Some states had unemployment percentages as high as forty percent, affecting younger than 25 (Hoffman, 2013, p.16).

The nationwide poverty rate is 45.9 percent, when this is varied across the North/South divide this becomes 24 percent for the South of Nigeria and 67.8 percent average for the North (Ndanusa, 2017, p.16). About 75 percent of the chronically poor households are in the North (Poverty Work Program, FRN, 2016). This divide is expected to grow even further due

in part to an increasing population as Nigeria expected to be the third most populous state in 2050.

Concluding, on every indicator that portrays the results of good state capacity Northern Nigeria scores lower than South Nigeria. This proves that the decisions made in the past still influence Northern Nigeria today. The colonial heritage of indirect rule under the High Commissioner Lugard seems to be one path to hell instead of heaven.

Conclusion

What can explain the difference in development between North and South Nigeria? The origins of the difference started during the colonial times, where the difference between direct or indirect rule leads the two regions down two very different paths.

The indirect rule in Northern Nigeria caused the region to not develop any state capacity, economic capabilities or inclusive institutions. Existing elites in the North benefitted from extracting the populace and were not interested in investing in education, infrastructure, public services and more.

In Southern Nigeria, it was very difficult to impose a system of indirect rule, because of the lack of powerful traditional chiefs or kings. This leads to a system of more direct rule that resulted in more state capacity. Because there was no tradition of a centralized rule in the South, the political institutions developed more inclusively than in the North, where Lugard through his emirs had the power. As a result, the South was much more prosperous and educated.

These differences made sure that the two regions developed very differently in the postcolonial year. The traditional power structures in North Nigeria that kept intact through the indirect rule of Lugard, made sure that the North could politically unite and dominate the postcolonial state of Nigeria. Although this did not lead to significant economic development in Northern Nigeria, because of the extractive nature and weak state capacity of the Northern elite and state. In contrast, the South was able to develop even in these bare conditions.

While being used as a source of extracting, they still grew more than their Northern counterparts. This can be attributed to the strong state capacity and more inclusive institutions of Southern Nigeria as a consequence of more direct rule.

These differences still influence Nigeria today, as is seen in the last chapter. This proves that the decisions made in the past still influence Northern Nigeria today. The colonial heritage of indirect rule under the High Commissioner Lugard seems to be one path to hell instead of heaven.

Policy Implications

With these conclusions lead to the following policy implications for the Nigerian Government and Northern state specifically. In North Nigeria, the lack of prosperity can be attributed to a lack of state capacity. If North Nigeria wants to reduce the ill effects of state capacity and increase its prosperity it is important for the Northern states to invest in education, literacy rates, and security. Besides investing in state capacity, Northern Nigeria must try to make their institutions more inclusive. This can be done by guaranteeing property rights, create an equal playing field and stimulating investment in innovative technologies and skills. In Northern Nigeria, almost 70 % of all employment is in the agriculture sector, which is not innovative jobs that require a high education. Diversification of labor sectors is also a requirement due to the increase in desertification and floods.

To do this, Northern Nigeria must have a good implementation of regional planning policies (Mayowa.2014, p.170). For regional inequality to be reduced, regional planning between the Southern hubs of economic activity and the Northern agricultural producing areas should be more connected. This can be done by appointing a special Regional Development Planning Coordinating Agency. The agency would be responsible for cross-state administrative and economic integration and projects (Ndanusa, 2017, p.17).

To further improve state capacity in Northern Nigeria, Nigeria could shift the capital cities of states and maybe the Federal capital to the North. When the Nigerian Federal capital went

from Lagos to Abuja, there was a milestone development in Abuja while retaining the development in Lagos (Mayowa, 2014, p.176).

Finally, it is important after many years of Northern military dictators to improve the transparency of the administration, as this continues to slow economic development in the whole of Nigeria when the use of public resources is transparent, public trust in government will improve (Ndanusa, 2017, p.86).

References:

- Acemoglu, D. & Robinson, J. (2012). *Why Nations fail: the origins of power, prosperity and poverty*, Crown Business, 2012.
- Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S. & Robinson, J. (2004). Institutions as the fundamental cause of long-run Growth. Working paper 10481. National Bureau of Economic Research Cambridge.
- Acemoglu, D., Chaves, I. & Osafo-Kwaako, P. (2014). Indirect rule and State weakness in Africa: Sierra Leone in Comparative Perspective. *Working Paper*
- Acemoglu, D., Garcia-Jimeno, C. & Robinson, J. (2015). State Capacity and Economic Development: A Network Approach. *American Economic Review*, 105(8): 2364-2409.
- Afifgo, A. (1991). Background to Nigerian Federalism: Federal Features in the Colonial State. *Publius* 1(21): 13-29.
- African Population and Health Research Centre. (2017). *Maternal Health in Nigeria: Facts and Figures*.
- Aghedo, I., & Eke, J. (2013). From Alms to Arms: The Almajiri Phenomenon and Internal Security in Northern Nigeria. *The Korean Journal of Policy Studies*, 28(3): 97-123.
- Akinwotu, E. & Olukoya, S. (2017, 18 Jul) "Shameful" Nigeria: a country that doesn't care about inequality. *The Guardian* Retrieved from: <https://www.theguardian.com/inequality/2017/jul/18/shameful-nigeria-doesnt-care-about-inequality-corruption>
- Archibong, B. (2018). Historical origins of persistent inequality in Nigeria, *Oxford Development Studies* 46 (3): 325-347.

- Anckar, C. (2008). On the Applicability of the Most Similar Systems Design and the Most Different Systems Design in Comparative Research, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 11(5): 389-401.
- Babjide, A., Adegboye, F. & Omankhanlen, A. (2015). Financial Inclusion and Economic Growth in Nigeria. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 5(3): 629-639.
- Bate, R. (2009). What is Prosperity and How do We Measure it? *American Enterprise Institute* 1(1): 1-7.
- Bevan, D., Collier, P., & Gunning, J. (1999). *The political economy of poverty, equity and growth: Nigeria and Indonesia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Citi (2011). Global Growth Generators: Moving beyond "emerging markets" and 'BRIC'. Daily Post (16 January 2016) South is prosperous, North in poverty by Wale Odunsi.
- Dapel (2018). Poverty in Nigeria: Understanding an bridging the divide between north and S South. *Centre for Global development*
- Dauda, R. S. (2017). Poverty and Economic Growth in Nigeria: Issues and Policies, *Journal of Poverty*, 21(1): 61-79.
- Fadiran, D. & Sarr, M. (2016). Path Dependence and Interdependence between Institutions and Development. *Economic Research South Africa*, Working Paper 637.
- Falola & Heaton (2008). *A History of Nigeria*. Cambridge University Press.
Retrieved from: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/history-of-nigeria>
- Federal Government of Nigeria, National Bureau of Statistics. (2010). *National Literacy Survey*.
- Federal Government of Nigeria, National Bureau of Statistics. (2017). *Statistical Rapport on Men and Women in Nigeria*.

- Fioretos, O. (2011). Historical institutionalism in International Relations. *International Organization*. 65 (2): 367-399.
- Gomide, A. & Pereira, A. (2019). The concept of State capacity and its Operationalization om Empirical research. *International Public Policy Association*.
- Heerten, L. & Moses, D. (2014). The Nigeria–Biafra war: postcolonial conflict and the question of genocide. *Journal of Genocide Research*. 16(2-3): 169-203.
- Hoffmann, K. (2013). Power and Democracy in Northern Nigeria: Understanding political change. *Poverty and Public Policy Studies*. 1(1): 101-127.
- Hoffmann, K. (2014). Who Speaks for the North? Politics and Influence in Northern Nigeria. *Journal of Genocide Research*. 16(2-3): 169-203.
- Iyer, L (2010). Direct Versus Indirect Colonial Rule in India: Long-Term Con- Sequences. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 92(4): 693-713.
- Lange, M. (2004). British Colonial Legacy and Political Development. *World Development*, 32(6): 905-922.
- Lange, M. (2009). *Lineages of Despotism and Development: British Colonialism and State Power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lewis, P. (2006). The Dysfunctional State of Nigeria in Nancy Birdsall, Milan Vaishnav and Robert L. Ayres, eds., *Short of the Goal: U.S. Policy and Poorly Performing States*, Washington DC: Center for Global Development: 83-116.
- Marsh, D. Stoker, D. G. (2010). *Theory and Methods in Political Science*. Palgrave: New York.
- Mbah, P. (2007). “Democracy and Rule of Law in Nigeria: A Study of the Fourth Republic (2003-2007)”. *Nigerian Journal of Public Administration*, 14(1): 149-171.

- Mbah, P. (2007). "Executive-Legislative Relations in Nigeria: The Presidency and the National Assembly, 1999 -2006." *Nigeria Journal of Social Sciences*. 1(1): 187 – 210.
- Meagher, K. (2013). Informality, Religious Conflict, and Governance in Northern Nigeria: Economic Inclusion Divided Societies, *African Studies Review* 56(3): 209-234
- National Population Commission, Federal Republic of Nigeria. (2013). *Demographic and health survey*
- Ndanusa, A. S. (2017). Northern Nigeria in Perspective: Rethinking the Development Agenda. *Global Mandate Consulting*.
- North, C. D. (1991). Institutions. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 5(1): 97-112.
- Raheem, M. Oyeleye, O. & Aladekoyi, O. (2014). Regional Imbalances and Inequalities in Nigeria: Causes, Consequences and Remedies. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(18): 163-174.
- Olusola, O & Okeke-Uzodike, U. (2016). Can Nigeria be Africa's hegemon?, *African Security Review*, 25(2): 110-128.
- Ogunnubi, O. & Okeke-Uzodike, U. (2016). Can Nigeria be Africa's hegemon?, *African Security Review*, 25(2): 110-128.
- Oxfam Novib. (2018). The Commitment to reducing inequality index 2018.
- Oxfam Novib. (2018). Inequality in Nigeria; exploring the drivers
- Olaniyan, O. & Lawanson, A. (2010). Health Expenditure and Health Status in Northern and Southern Nigeria: A Comparative Analysis Using NHA Framework. Paper presented at the 2010 CSAE conference held at St Catherine College, University of Oxford.
- Osaghae, E., & Suberu, T. (2005). A history of identities, violence and stability in Nigeria. Oxford: Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity, University of Oxford.

Raheem, M. (2014). Regional imbalances and Inequalities in Nigeria: Causes, Consequences and Remedies. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences* 4(18): 163-174.

Skocpol, T. & Pierson, P. (2002). Historical Institutionalism in Contemporary Political Science. In: *Political Science: State of Discipline*. New York: W.W. Norton: 693-721.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2013). *National healthcare quality report 2012* (Report No. 13- 0002). Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

Wasiu, M. R. (2014). Regional Imbalances and Inequalities in Nigeria: Causes, Consequences and Remedies. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*. 4(18): 163-174.

World Bank. (2015). More and More Productive Jobs for Nigeria. Retrieved from: www.worldbank.org/en/country/nigeria/brief/more-and-more-productive-jobs-for-nigeria