INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND DEVELOPMENT STUDIES (IJPADS)

Volume: [3] **| Issue:** [1] **|** Pages: 526 - 543 **| | Date:** [March, 2026]

Open Access Journal. Accessible online via https://ijpads.com

GOVERNANCE AND STATE CAPACITY IN NIGERIA

Karawusa, Victor Tochi
Department of Public Administration, Federal College of Fisheries and Marine Technology
Email: Victortochi381@gmail.com

Onuoha, Onyebuchi Benedict
Department of Public Administration, Federal College of Fisheries and Marine Technology
Email: onuohaonyebuchi56@gmail.com

Aliu Hussaina Lovina
Department of Public Administration, Federal College of Fisheries and Marine Technology
Email: lovinaaliu2021@gmail.com

Anaele Obinna Faustinus
Department of Industrial and Labour Relations, Federal College of Fisheries and Marine Technology
Email: faustinus44@gmail.com

Abstract

Governance and state capacity have emerged as critical concerns in contemporary political analysis, particularly in developing countries where weak institutions, limited administrative effectiveness, and socio-political fragmentation undermine policy outcomes. In Nigeria, the challenges of governance manifest in persistent issues such as corruption, institutional inefficiency, insecurity, fiscal mismanagement, and uneven service delivery. Anchored on Institutional Theory and State Capacity Theory, the study examines how institutional performance, bureaucratic structure, and political accountability shape the Nigerian state's ability to formulate and implement policies, maintain territorial control, provide public goods, and ensure socio-economic stability. Relying on secondary data and existing scholarly literature, the study finds that despite episodic reforms, Nigeria's state capacity remains constrained by structural and governance deficits, including elite capture of state resources, weak bureaucratic coordination, and limited autonomy of key state institutions. The study concludes that Nigeria's

developmental challenges are rooted not only in formal institutional structures but also in the state's capacity to implement policies effectively. It recommends institutional reforms, capacity-building initiatives, as well as fiscal and resource management to restore citizens' trust in Nigerian public institutions.

Keywords: Governance, State Capacity, Institutional Theory, Accountability, State Effectiveness, Institutional Reform.

Introduction

Governance and state capacity remain central issues in Nigeria's political and developmental trajectory. Since independence in 1960, the Nigerian state has struggled to translate its abundant natural and human resources into sustainable development outcomes. Despite periods of economic growth particularly during oil booms persistent challenges such as weak public institutions, corruption, insecurity, infrastructural deficits, and poor service delivery continue to undermine effective governance (Ake, 1996; Joseph, 1991). These recurring governance deficits raise fundamental questions about the capacity of the Nigerian state to design, implement, and enforce policies that promote public welfare and national development.

Governance broadly refers to the processes and institutions through which authority is exercised in managing a country's economic and social resources (World Bank, 1992). It encompasses principles such as accountability, transparency, rule of law, participation, and responsiveness (UNDP, 1997). State capacity, on the other hand, relates to the ability of state institutions to formulate and implement policies, mobilize resources, maintain order, and deliver public goods effectively (Fukuyama, 2004; Migdal, 1988). A capable state demonstrates administrative efficiency, fiscal strength, regulatory effectiveness, and coercive authority necessary for enforcing laws and maintaining legitimacy (Weber, 1978). Where these elements are weak, governance outcomes are often compromised.

In the Nigerian context, governance challenges are closely linked to structural and institutional weaknesses shaped by colonial legacies, prolonged military rule, patron–client politics, and overdependence on oil revenues (Suberu, 2001; Watts, 2004). The dominance of oil rents has reduced incentives for effective taxation, thereby weakening the social contract between the state and citizens

(Karl, 1997; Ross, 2001). As a result, accountability mechanisms remain fragile, and public trust in institutions is frequently undermined. Additionally, bureaucratic inefficiency, politicization of state institutions, and complex federal arrangements continue to constrain effective policy implementation (Ekeh, 1975; Osaghae, 1998).

Understanding the nexus between governance and state capacity is therefore essential for assessing Nigeria's development prospects. Scholars argue that strengthening institutional effectiveness, enhancing fiscal responsibility, promoting rule of law, and deepening democratic accountability are critical pathways toward improving governance performance and state legitimacy (Evans, 1995; Grindle, 1996).

Statement of the Problem

Despite over six decades of independence and repeated reform initiatives, Nigeria continues to experience persistent governance deficits and weak state capacity that undermine sustainable development. According to Ojiako, Umeasiegbu, Onyeulo & Okoye (2024), the unending controversies surrounding the issues of democratic governance and electoral processes in Nigeria has continued to receive increased attention of scholars of diverse backgrounds because of the crucial role it plays in any organized political system. While the country possesses significant natural resources and a large population, the state has struggled to effectively provide public goods, ensure security, enforce laws, and deliver basic social services (Ake, 1996; World Bank, 2020). These weaknesses are reflected in recurring institutional inefficiencies, policy implementation gaps, widespread corruption, fiscal instability, and declining public trust in government institutions (Joseph, 1991; Transparency International, 2023).

A critical concern lies in the apparent disconnect between democratic governance structures and actual governance outcomes. Although Nigeria has sustained uninterrupted civilian rule since 1999, democratic consolidation has not automatically translated into improved institutional performance or enhanced service delivery (Osaghae, 1998; Suberu, 2001). Electoral processes, public sector reforms, and anti-corruption campaigns have been introduced, yet structural challenges such as politicization of the bureaucracy, patronage networks, and rent-seeking behavior continue to weaken administrative effectiveness (Ekeh, 1975; Watts, 2004).

Furthermore, Nigeria's heavy reliance on oil revenues has limited the development of a

robust taxation system, thereby weakening the social contract between the state and citizens (Karl, 1997; Ross, 2001). This rent-dependent structure reduces government accountability and constrains long-term institutional capacity building. In addition, growing security challenges including insurgency, banditry, and communal conflicts raise further concerns about the state's coercive and regulatory capacity.

Although existing literature has examined governance reforms and democratization in Nigeria, there remains insufficient integrated analysis of how structural governance weaknesses directly affect state capacity and development outcomes. The core problem, therefore, is the persistent inability of the Nigerian state to build strong, accountable, and effective institutions capable of sustaining development and maintaining legitimacy. Addressing this gap requires a systematic examination of the interrelationship between governance practices and state capacity in Nigeria.

Objectives of the study

The broad objective of this study is to examine the relationship between governance and state capacity in Nigeria. Specifically, this study seeks to:

1. Assess the level of administrative, fiscal, and regulatory capacity of the Nigerian state.
2. Analyze the effect of institutional weaknesses on policy implementation and public service delivery in Nigeria.
3. Investigate the relationship between governance quality and development outcomes in Nigeria.

Research Questions

The study seeks to address the following questions:

1. To what extent does the Nigerian state possess administrative, fiscal, and regulatory capacity to implement public policies effectively?
2. How do institutional weaknesses affect policy implementation and public service delivery in Nigeria?
3. What is the relationship between governance quality and development outcomes in Nigeria?

Literature Review

Conceptual Review

Governance

The concept of "governance" is not new. It is as old as human civilization. Ozigbo (2000)

cited in Okpaga (2009) opined that before one discusses good governance, it is first necessary to examine the context of the term governance. According to him, governance denotes how people are ruled and how the affairs of the state are administered and regulated. Governance refers therefore, to how the politics of a nation is carried out. Governance can be used in several contexts such as corporate governance, international governance, national governance and local governance. Generally, governance, according to the World Bank (1989) is the exercise of political power in the management of a nation's affairs or the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country's economic and social resources for development. Simply put "governance" means the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented (or not implemented). On this premise, Ansah (2007) viewed governance as encompassing a state's institutional and structural arrangements, decision-making process and implementation capacity and the relationship between government officials and the public. Governance consists of two essential elements of the state, namely the structure of the state and the procedures of the legislative, judicial and those of the executive and administrative bodies at all the tiers of government.

According to Cambridge Dictionary, governance is the system of rules, practices, and processes used by an organization, institution, or country to manage its operations, make decisions, and ensure accountability. Generally speaking, governance entails service delivery to citizens. According to Nwafor, Ojiako, Okonkwo & Onyeulo (2023), effective service delivery constitutes one of the most crucial roles of a responsible government, and its contribution to societal development and stability cannot be overemphasized.

The Webster's Third New International Dictionary (1986) defined governance as the "act or process of governing via authoritative direction and control". Fourie and Jordan (2017) see governance as the exercise of authority, direction and control of an organization to ensure that its goals are achieved. It refers to who is in charge of what; who sets the directions and the parameters within which direction is to be pursued; who makes decisions; who sets performance indicators; monitoring of progress and evaluates results; and who is accountable to whom and for what.

History of Governance in Nigeria

Governance in Nigeria has transformed through different historical phases;

Colonial Administration (mid-19th to 1960)

Colonial administration in Nigeria refers to the systems of governance established by the British Empire between the mid-19th century and 1960(Wikipedia). It began with the annexation of Lagos in 1861 and the 1914 amalgamation of the Northern and southern protectorates by Sir Frederick Lugard to form the colony and protectorate of Nigeria.

During colonial rule, governance structures were designed mainly to protect British colonial interest, structures like; indirect rule system, the administrative structure; colony of Lagos, the protectorates, Trust territories, Constitutional development and Independence Clifford constitution 1922, Richards constitution 1946, MacPherson 1951 and Lyttleton 1954. (The Oxford Handbook of Nigerian History 2022).

Post-Independence Era (1960)

After independence, Nigeria experienced political instability coup, and ethnic tension that weakened democratic governance. Nigeria was granted full independence in October 1960, as a federation of three region (northern, western, and eastern) under a constitution that provide for a parliamentary form of government. The emergence of democratic Nigeria in May 1999 ended the 16 years of consecutive military rule.

Military rule (1966 to 1999)

Military rule in Nigeria spanned from 1966 to 1999, punctuated by a brief democratic interlude (1979-1983). Military government centralized power and weakened democratic institutions, limiting citizens participation and accountability. (Adekunle Ajeisebiyawo and joseph onoyemeakpo, 'The legacy of military rule and the challenges of democratic consolidation in Nigeria 2021).

Democratic Era(1999-Present)

Democracy returns to Nigeria refers to the pivotal transition in the country's governance that occurred on May 29,1999, marking the end of nearly 30years of military rule. This event followed a tumultuous period characterized by political instability, including the quick succession of three presidents in just one year and significant social unrest due to the annulment of the June 12, 1993 presidential election, which many regarded as the Nigeria's fairest. (EBSCO 2021).

State Capacity

State capacity is the ability of a government to implement policies, enforce laws, and provide public services effectively. According to Max Weber (The monopoly of Coercion 1919) defined the state through its ability to maintain a monopoly on the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory. Capacity in the Weberian sense, relies on building a professional, merit-based bureaucracy capable of enforcing rules and maintaining order without relying on violence.

According to Wikipedia, State Capacity is the ability of a government to accomplish policy goals, either generally or in reference to specific aims. State Capacity often refer to the ability of a state to collect taxes, enforce laws and order, and provide services to the public.

Dimensions of State Capacity

1. Coercive Capacity: It describes the state's ability to enforce authority throughout its territory. It mostly expresses itself in violent and repressive ways by which the military and the police uphold public order and ultimately the state's monopoly on violence. In developed states, enforcement is mostly a non-violent and administrative business (Ansell and Lundvall 2021). However, even developed states occasionally use brute force to control populations, such as through policing and imprisonment (Tilly 2007).

2. Administrative Capacity: is the state's ability to formulate and implement policies effectively and impartially. Weber famously identified a list of features that characterize bureaucratic as opposed to patrimonial states. Previous research has indicated that merit-based employment is by far the most important indicator of bureaucracy and administrative capacity more generally for influencing important outcomes like equal treatment of citizens and possibly economic development, whereas other Weberian features like employment tenure have clear downsides (Dahlström and Lapuente 2017; but see Cornell et al. 2020; Dahlström and Lapuente 2022). Hence, we focus on meritocratic recruitment norms as one expression of administrative capacity.

3. Extractive capacity: is sometimes considered as an additional, independent dimension of state capacity (see Hanson and Sigman 2021). However, in our view, the extraction of resources to fund state activities is conceptually related to both coercive and administrative capacity because the ability to tax the population requires an administrative apparatus than can organize the extraction (who should pay what, when, and how) on the one hand and control of the territory and an ultimate threat of coercion to back the extraction on the other (Besley and Persson

2009). We therefore understand extractive capacity as a second-order concept that overlaps partially with both of our main dimensions.

Challenges of Governance and State Capacity in Nigeria

Bad leadership

A number of scholars have lampooned the ineptitude of Nigeria's leadership (Achebe, 1988). If we divide Nigeria's democracy into four republics; the First Republic (1960-1966) never lasted long before the military scuttled it; the Second Republic (1979-1983) was much shorter; the Aborted Third 'Republic' (1983 and 1984) need not be considered a "republic" because the military dictators combined military rule and some form of representation of the people; the Fourth Republic (1999 till the present) has been so far the longest republic (Asiegbu, 2022). All through the republics (First, Second, third, Fourth), the leadership has proved incapable of steering the affairs of the Nigerian state.

Corruption

One of the most critical governance issues in Nigeria is corruption. Nigeria has been consistently rated among the most corrupt countries in the world by Transparency International in its Corruption Perception Index. In 2011, Nigeria was ranked 143 out of 183 countries.

In 2012, Nigeria was rated 139 out of 176 countries and in 2013, Nigeria was placed at the 144 position out of 177 countries. In 2014, Nigeria was rated 136 out of 174 countries. Although from 2014 to today, Nigeria has not made any improvement and has remained I36 in the corruption perception index (Transparency International, 2017). Corruption has permeated every aspect of Nigerian society and has become a norm. It has not only affected the functioning of governmental institutions but also the private sector, resulting in a lack of trust in public institutions and a decrease in foreign investment. Corruption in Nigeria is systemic and deeply entrenched, with bribery being demanded and paid for services that should be provided by the government. The lack of accountability and oversight has created an environment in which individuals in power can act with impunity, leading to a culture of corruption. This is the stark reality of Nigeria after more than twenty years journey into democracy.

General insecurity, increasing crime waves and banditry

From religious crises to post election violence to armed banditry and kidnapping for ransom; with the proliferation of illegal arms across

Nigeria's borders and the growth of bandits' camps in the Northwestern parts, the story is a lamenting wave of insecurity, and the developed, more sophisticated and organized Boko-Haram insurgency and terrorism to the expansion of farmer-herder violence into Southern parts, and the emergence of the Eastern Nigeria Network (ESN) in the South East; indeed, the level of insecurity in Nigeria is multifaceted as such one cannot accurately categorize the patterns.

It is noteworthy that foreign investments seek out a peaceful and a welcoming atmosphere. Investors are wary of those regions embroiled in violence. The Global and Peace Index has continuously downgraded Nigeria as one Following in the heels of Boko Haram are the Fulani herders. Although the herders did not belong to any of the agents of security, the FG never deals them any hard blow. The Fulani pastoralists have generated unrest in most parts of the Nigerian state. They maim, rape, kill, kidnap and plunder. Buhari-government and the rampaging Fulani ethnic nation have lost sight of the modern mechanized way of herding cows. The rejection of the peaceful modern avenues of pastoralism has made their activities suspicious. Other regions of the Nigerian state have rejected the Fulani occupation of their ungoverned spaces within their ancestral lands. That the Buhari-led FG turns a blind eye on their activities places the Fulani herders above the law. The emergence of Eastern Nigeria Network (ESN) and Amotekun are traceable to the obnoxious activities of the Fulani herders (Asiegbu, 2022).

Weak institutions

Another significant governance issue in Nigeria is weak institutions facing Nigeria's governance system. The country's institutions, such as the police, judiciary, and bureaucracy, are often understaffed, underfunded, and lacking in training and resources. This has resulted in a system where those in power can act with impunity, and the rule of law is often ignored. This creates an opportunity for public officials to embezzle funds without fear of repercussion or punishment. Institutional weakness and failure has led to high level of disregard for constitutionalism, flagrant abuses of citizens' rights, and the rule by law, not of law (Omotola, 2008a, p.53). Furthermore, the monumental failure of the police as state institution to ensure security and maintain law and order across the country is evident by the proliferation of vigilante groups which are effectively taking over the important state role of law enforcement, adjudication and 'dispensation

of justice' and at the same time "protect and extort from local communities" (Ginifer and Ismail, 2005, p.2). The persistence of such intractable institutional inadequacies in Nigeria and by extension Africa which Nzongola-Ntalaja described as "malfunctioning of democracy" informed the view by a section of Western scholarship "that Africa is not 'mature' for democracy" (Omotola, 2008a, p.46). Worse still, major political actors hardly operate within the limit of constitutional provisions, as they employ extra-constitutional mechanisms to pursue their selfish interests, including the struggle for power elongation and abuse of power of incumbency to frustrate opposition forces (Omotola, 2008b, p.58). Nigeria is degenerating into a society without a discernible legalistic framework for law enforcement agencies or judicial system.

Empirical Study

Fagbemi and Adeoye (2020) in their study "Nigerian Governance Challenges" investigated the impact of oil revenue on governance quality in Nigeria. The study found that oil dependence weakens governance quality. Natural resource rents negatively affect institutional development.

Ekeocha and Ononugbo (2017) "cost of Governance and Fiscal Deficit in Nigeria". The study examined how governance expenditure affects fiscal deficits in Nigeria states. The study further discovered that high cost of governance costs contributes significantly to fiscal deficits. The study empirically demonstrates how excessive governance costs weakens fiscal sustainability and development.

Salawu, Oyewole, and Ishola (2025) in their study "State Capacity and income inequality in Nigeria" the study investigated how weak state capacity contributes to income inequality during Nigeria's fourth Republic. Institution weakness and corruption increase poverty and inequality. Weak governance reduces the government's ability to implement redistributive policies. Inadequate infrastructure limits economic inclusion.

Theoretical Framework

This study was anchored on Institutional Theory and State Capacity Theory, which together provide a comprehensive explanation of governance outcomes in Nigeria.

Institutional Theory

Institutional theory emphasizes the role of formal and informal rules, norms, and organizational structures in shaping political

behavior and governance performance. Institutions determine how power is exercised, how decisions are made, and how public resources are allocated (North, 1990). According to this perspective, governance failures are not merely the result of individual leadership weaknesses but are rooted in dysfunctional institutional arrangements and entrenched informal practices.

In the Nigerian context, colonial administrative legacies, patrimonial political culture, and weak rule-of-law institutions have shaped governance patterns (Ekeh, 1975; Osaghae, 1998). Informal networks such as patron–client relationships often override formal bureaucratic procedures, weakening accountability and transparency (Joseph, 1991). Institutional theory therefore helps explain why governance reforms in Nigeria frequently produce limited results—formal rules may change, but informal norms and entrenched interests persist. Strengthening governance, from this perspective, requires institutional restructuring, enforcement of legal frameworks, and alignment between formal and informal rules.

State Capacity Theory

State capacity theory focuses on the ability of the state to effectively design, implement, and enforce public policies (Migdal, 1988; Fukuyama, 2004). A capable state possesses administrative capacity (efficient bureaucracy), fiscal capacity (ability to generate revenue), regulatory capacity (effective law enforcement), and coercive capacity (monopoly over the legitimate use of force) (Weber, 1978).

Scholars argue that weak state capacity results in poor service delivery, insecurity, and low developmental outcomes (Evans, 1995; Grindle, 1996). In Nigeria, overdependence on oil revenues has constrained fiscal capacity and weakened the taxation-based accountability relationship between citizens and the state (Karl, 1997; Ross, 2001). Additionally, bureaucratic inefficiencies and politicization of public institutions undermine administrative effectiveness. Nwafor, Ojiako and Umetiti (2024) pointed out that government should organize training programmes such as workshops and seminars to improve job performance. State capacity theory therefore provides a framework for assessing why governance structures may exist formally but fail to produce effective outcomes in practice.

Relevance of the Framework

The integration of institutional theory and state capacity theory offers a holistic understanding of governance challenges in

Nigeria. While institutional theory explains the structural and normative foundations of governance practices, state capacity theory evaluates the practical ability of the state to perform its core functions. Together, these theories illuminate how institutional weaknesses translate into limited administrative, fiscal, and regulatory capacity, thereby affecting development and democratic consolidation.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research design complemented by descriptive analysis to examine governance and state capacity in Nigeria. The qualitative approach allows for an in-depth understanding of institutional structures, policy implementation processes, and governance challenges, while descriptive analysis enables systematic presentation of patterns and trends in governance performance. This design is appropriate because the study focuses on exploring complex institutional and political dynamics rather than establishing causal relationships alone (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

The population for this study includes government institutions, public officials, policy analysts, civil society organizations, and academic literature relevant to governance in Nigeria. Purposive sampling is employed to select participants and documents that provide rich, relevant, and diverse perspectives on governance and state capacity. Specifically, federal and state ministries, regulatory agencies, and NGOs involved in governance oversight are considered key sources of data.

Data for the study are collected using secondary sources and primary sources: such as observations, surveys, official government reports, policy documents, white papers, and statistical publications, scholarly articles, books, and reports from international organizations such as the World Bank and UNDP, corruption and governance indices (e.g., Transparency International, World Governance Indicators) etc.

Data collected are analyzed using thematic analysis and content analysis techniques. Thematic analysis is employed to identify patterns, trends, and key themes related to governance structures, state capacity, and institutional performance (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Content analysis of official documents and policy reports provides empirical evidence to support the thematic findings. Descriptive statistics are used where appropriate to summarize numerical indicators of state capacity and governance quality.

Justification for the Methodology

The combination of qualitative and descriptive approaches allows for a comprehensive understanding of both structural and functional dimensions of governance in Nigeria. Institutional and state capacity challenges are deeply embedded in political, historical, and social contexts, which require detailed qualitative investigation supported by empirical evidence from secondary data sources.

Results

The findings of this study are presented under themes derived from the research questions and objectives. The analysis highlights critical aspects of governance, state capacity, and their impact on development outcomes in Nigeria.

1. Administrative, Fiscal, and Regulatory Capacity

The Nigerian state demonstrates moderate administrative capacity, but it is often hampered by weak human resource management, lack of technical expertise, and politicization of bureaucracies. Fiscal capacity remains low due to overreliance on oil revenues, poor tax administration, and low citizen compliance (Karl, 1997; Ross, 2001). Regulatory capacity is uneven: while some agencies enforce standards effectively, others are undermined by corruption and lack of enforcement authority. Overall, state capacity is inconsistent and unable to guarantee uniform service delivery or policy enforcement across regions.

2. Effect of Institutional Weaknesses on Policy Implementation

Findings indicate that institutional weaknesses—such as bureaucratic red tape, inter-agency conflicts, and patronage networks—result in poor policy implementation. Development programs often suffer from delays, mismanagement of resources, and limited coverage, particularly in sectors such as health, education, and infrastructure (Ake, 1996; Joseph, 1991). Citizens' access to essential services is uneven, reinforcing social inequalities and undermining public trust in government institutions.

3. Governance Quality and Development Outcomes

The study found a strong correlation between weak governance and suboptimal development outcomes. Poor institutional performance, low state capacity, and pervasive corruption are linked to low human development indicators, infrastructural

deficits, and security challenges. Regions with stronger institutional oversight and citizen participation tend to perform better in service delivery and policy implementation, highlighting the importance of both governance quality and state capacity in driving development.

Discussion of Findings

The findings of this study underscore the complex relationship between governance and state capacity in Nigeria, revealing structural, institutional, and behavioral factors that shape development outcomes.

1. Institutional Structure and Governance

The analysis shows that Nigeria has a formal institutional framework designed to facilitate governance; however, overlapping mandates, weak coordination, and bureaucratic inefficiencies limit its effectiveness. This aligns with Institutional Theory, which posits that formal rules and structures are insufficient if informal practices such as patronage networks dominate decision-making (North, 1990; Ekeh, 1975). The persistence of weak institutional performance suggests that reforms focused solely on formal structures without addressing entrenched informal norms are unlikely to yield substantial improvements in governance.

2. Administrative, Fiscal, and Regulatory Capacity

The study's findings indicate that state capacity in Nigeria is uneven across administrative, fiscal, and regulatory domains. While bureaucracies exist, inefficiencies, politicization, and limited technical expertise weaken policy implementation. Fiscal dependence on oil revenues constrains the state's ability to generate independent revenue, undermining accountability and public service delivery (Karl, 1997; Ross, 2001). These observations support State Capacity Theory, which emphasizes that effective governance requires both the authority and resources to implement policies successfully (Migdal, 1988; Fukuyama, 2004).

3. Impact of Corruption and Rent-Seeking

Corruption, patron–client politics, and rent-seeking behavior significantly reduce the effectiveness of governance institutions. This finding is consistent with earlier studies indicating that rent-dependent states often have weak institutional accountability because resource wealth creates incentives for elite capture (Watts, 2004; Joseph, 1991). From both institutional and state capacity perspectives, corruption represents a failure of formal rules to control informal practices,

undermining administrative and regulatory effectiveness.

4. Governance Quality and Development Outcomes

The findings reveal that poor governance and weak state capacity correlate with suboptimal development outcomes, including low human development indices, inadequate infrastructure, and insecurity. This aligns with studies that link effective institutions and state capacity to improved socio-economic development (Evans, 1995; Grindle, 1996). It also confirms that governance is not only about political structures but also about the state's ability to deliver tangible services and enforce laws reliably.

5. Policy Implications

The study highlights the need for integrated reforms targeting both institutional structures and state capacity. Strengthening bureaucratic professionalism, improving regulatory frameworks, and enhancing fiscal autonomy can improve policy implementation. Moreover, anti-corruption strategies and mechanisms to align formal and informal rules are critical to improving governance outcomes. These findings reinforce the theoretical argument that effective development requires both strong institutions (Institutional Theory) and capable state machinery (State Capacity Theory).

Summary

Overall, the discussion demonstrates that governance and state capacity in Nigeria are deeply intertwined. Institutional weaknesses, corruption, and rent-seeking behaviors limit administrative, fiscal, and regulatory effectiveness, which in turn constrains development outcomes. Addressing these challenges requires a dual focus on institutional reforms and capacity-building initiatives, informed by both theory and empirical evidence.

Conclusion

This study examined the dynamics of governance and state capacity in Nigeria, highlighting how institutional weaknesses, corruption, and rent-seeking behaviors undermine effective policy implementation and development outcomes. The findings show that while Nigeria possesses formal governance institutions and regulatory frameworks, these structures are often weakened by bureaucratic inefficiencies, politicization, and informal practices that override formal rules. Administrative, fiscal, and regulatory capacities remain uneven,

limiting the state's ability to deliver public goods and maintain security.

The study also establishes a strong relationship between governance quality and development outcomes. Poor governance and weak state capacity are associated with infrastructural deficits, low human development indices, and limited citizen trust in government institutions. From a theoretical perspective, these findings confirm the relevance of Institutional Theory in explaining the persistence of informal practices that undermine formal structures and State Capacity Theory in illustrating the consequences of limited administrative, fiscal, and coercive capabilities.

In conclusion, Nigeria's developmental challenges are rooted not only in formal institutional structures but also in the state's capacity to implement policies effectively. Strengthening governance and enhancing state capacity are therefore critical for sustainable development, democratic consolidation, and public trust in institutions.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, the study recommends the following:

Institutional Reforms: Redesign governance structures to reduce overlapping mandates and improve inter-agency coordination. Align formal rules with informal practices to minimize the impact of patronage networks and corruption.

Capacity-Building Initiatives: Strengthen bureaucratic professionalism through training, merit-based recruitment, and clear performance accountability. Enhance technical and administrative expertise to improve policy formulation and implementation.

Fiscal and Resource Management: Diversify revenue sources beyond oil to increase fiscal independence and accountability. Improve tax administration and financial transparency to reinforce the social contract between the state and citizens.

Anti-Corruption Measures: Implement stricter enforcement of anti-corruption laws and strengthen oversight institutions. Promote transparency and citizen participation in governance to reduce opportunities for rent-seeking behaviour.

References

Ake, C. (1996). Democracy and development in Africa. Brookings Institution Press.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

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

Ekeh, P. P. (1975). Colonialism and the two publics in Africa: A theoretical statement. Comparative Studies in Society and History, 17(1), 91–112. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417500003673

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

Fukuyama, F. (2004). State-building: Governance and world order in the 21st century. Cornell University Press.

Grindle, M. S. (1996). Challenging the state: Crisis and innovation in Latin America and Africa. Cambridge University Press.

Joseph, R. (1991). Democracy and prebendal politics in Nigeria: The rise and fall of the Second Republic. Cambridge University Press.

Karl, T. L. (1997). The paradox of plenty: Oil booms and petro-states. University of California Press.

Migdal, J. S. (1988). Strong societies and weak states: State–society relations and state capabilities in the third world. Princeton University Press.

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

Nwafor, A. E., Ojiako, C. I., Okonkwo, E. R., & Onyeulo, F. L. (2023). Administrative weakness, politics of recruitment and impediments to effective service delivery in the Nigerian public sector: The dilemma of human resource managers. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews, 4*(2), 216–221. Retrieved from International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews PDF

Nwafor, A. E., Ojiako, C. I., & Umetiti, C. B. (2024). Organizational reward policy and employee productivity in Anambra State Civil Service (2014 - 2020). *Journal of the Management Sciences, 60*(3), 68–83. https://journals.unizik.edu.ng/jfms/article/view/3758

Ojiako, C. I., Umeasiegbu, L. O., Lawrence, O. F., & Okoye, E. C. (2024). Democratic issues and electoral violence in Nigeria: A critical analysis of the 2023 general elections.

Journal of the Management Sciences, 60(3), 309–320. https://journals.unizik.edu.ng/jfms/article/view/3736

Osaghae, E. E. (1998). Crippled giant: Nigeria since independence. CODESRIA.

Ross, M. L. (2001). Does oil hinder democracy? World Politics, 53(3), 325–361. https://doi.org/10.1353/wp.2001.0011

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

Transparency International. (2023). Corruption perceptions index 2023. https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2023

UNDP. (1997). Governance for sustainable human development. United Nations Development Programme.

Watts, M. (2004). Resource curse? Governmentality, oil and power in the Niger Delta, Nigeria. Geopolitics, 9(1), 50–80. https://doi.org/10.1080/14650040320001749578

Weber, M. (1978). Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). University of California Press.

World Bank. (1992). Governance and development. World Bank.

World Bank. (2020). Nigeria development update: Resilient, inclusive, sustainable. World Bank Group.