INDUSTRIALIZATION, LEADERSHIP AND INDIGENOUS INNOVATION IN NIGERIA SINCE 1960: A CRITICAL REASSESSMENT OF STRUCTURAL CONSTRAINTS, POLICY FAILURE, AND THE FATE OF NIGERIAN INVENTORS

Nmeme Edoghogho
memehchristian@gmail.com/ 09038789278
Department of History and International studies
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
and
Christopher Chidiebere Uwakwe
cuwakwe@gouni.edu.ng
Department of History and International Studies,
Godfrey Okoye University Enugu

Abstract

Nigeria's attainment of independence in 1960 generated expectations of rapid economic transformation, technological advancement, and sustained industrial development. However, despite its abundant natural resources, human capital, entrepreneurial capacity, and indigenous technological creativity, Nigeria has struggled to establish a broad-based and sustainable industrial economy. This study examines the historical trajectory of Nigerian industrialization since independence, focusing on the interaction among leadership, industrial policy, indigenous innovation, ethnic politics, institutional weakness, and structural economic constraints. It argues that Nigeria's industrial difficulties cannot be explained primarily by a lack of resources or technological ingenuity, but by the weakness of the institutional and economic systems required to transform innovation into productive industrial capacity.The study examines the historical consequences of import dependence, oil dominance, the Structural Adjustment Programme, inadequate infrastructure, unreliable electricity, limited access to long-term finance, foreign-exchange vulnerability, policy inconsistency, insecurity, weak research-industry linkages, and limited technological commercialization. It further considers the influence of ethnic politics, patronage, and political competition, while emphasizing that ethnicity constitutes one factor within a broader political-economic framework rather than a sufficient explanation for industrial failure. The experiences of Ezekiel Izuogu and the Z-600 automobile project, Mudashiru Ayeni's Mudagraph, and Shamsuddeen Jibril are examined as case studies of indigenous technological creativity and the institutional difficulties encountered in moving from invention to commercialization. The study finds that Nigeria's central industrial challenge is institutional: innovative individuals and enterprises have repeatedly emerged, but their efforts have often lacked sustained financing, infrastructure, technical support, intellectual-property protection, market access, and consistent government policy. The study adopts a historical research methodology design, relying on qualitative analysis historical sources of primary, secondary, and tertiary of information. Oral testimonies were collected, and supplementary data were drawn from archival materials, official government records, and a diverse array of published works, including books, journal articles, reports, newspapers, and online repositories. The paper concludes that sustainable industrialization requires a coherent national innovation system linking government, industry, finance, research institutions, universities, and indigenous entrepreneurs. Such a system should promote merit-based support, technological development, local supply chains, infrastructure, policy continuity, and effective commercialization of indigenous inventions.

Keywords: Nigeria; industrialization; indigenous innovation; leadership; manufacturing; ethnic politics; industrial policy; deindustrialization; technological development; Structural Adjustment Programme

Introduction

The history of Nigerian industrialization since independence presents a striking contradiction. Nigeria possesses a large domestic market, abundant natural resources, a substantial pool of educated and technically skilled citizens, and a long history of entrepreneurial activity. Nevertheless, the country has not achieved the broad-based manufacturing transformation expected after independence. The central problem is therefore not an absence of resources or inventors but the weakness of the institutions and economic structures required to convert ideas into productive capacity.

At independence, Nigeria inherited a colonial economy whose productive structure was strongly connected to the export of primary commodities and the importation of manufactured goods. Subsequent governments attempted different industrial strategies, including import substitution, public-sector investment, indigenization, and later market-oriented reforms. These strategies produced some industrial capacity, but the overall system remained highly dependent on imported machinery, intermediate inputs, foreign exchange, and external technology. Research on Nigeria's industrial history identifies the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) of the 1980s as an important turning point. Bangura (1991) shows that exchange-rate adjustment, interest-rate deregulation, tariff changes, and other SAP measures raised costs for many import-dependent industries and contributed to factory closures and retrenchment.[1]

More recent scholarship similarly describes Nigeria's experience as premature deindustrialization. Itaman and Awopegba argued that the interaction of oil dependence, financial liberalization, and the allocation of credit away from manufacturing contributed to the decline in manufacturing value added. Their findings suggest that the problem cannot be reduced to one policy or one administration; it reflects a deeper structural relationship between finance, oil rents, institutions, and productive investment.[2]

Industrialization and Structural Transformation

Industrialization involves more than the establishment of individual factories. It requires a sustained process through which an economy develops productive capabilities, increases manufacturing value added, creates linkages between firms and sectors, develops technological competence, and generates productive employment. Ayodele and Falokun (2003) emphasize the structural characteristics of the Nigerian economy, while subsequent research demonstrates that the country's industrial base has remained weakly integrated and vulnerable to external shocks.[4]

Nigeria's dependence on petroleum intensified the structural imbalance. Oil revenues generated foreign exchange and public resources, but the resulting dependence also reduced the urgency of developing agriculture, manufacturing, and other tradable sectors. Itaman and Awopegba connect this resource-dependent structure to premature deindustrialization, arguing that the decline of manufacturing occurred before Nigeria had reached the income and technological levels normally associated with mature post-industrial economies.[5]

The Structural Adjustment Programme and Deindustrialization

The SAP introduced in 1986 was designed partly to correct macroeconomic distortions and encourage greater reliance on domestic production. In practice, however, the sharp devaluation of the naira, changes in tariffs, financial liberalization, and increased exposure to imported goods created severe adjustment pressures for firms that depended on imported machinery and raw materials. Bangura documents the closure and rationalization of firms during the early SAP period, especially among industries with high import content. The result was not simply a failure of entrepreneurship; it was a mismatch between the productive capabilities of domestic firms and the economic environment in which they were expected to compete.[6]

The later trajectory reinforces this interpretation. Itaman and Awopegba find that the allocation of domestic bank credit toward oil and services rather than manufacturing was associated with lower manufacturing value added, whereas development-oriented financial flows had a positive relationship with manufacturing. Thus, access to finance must be understood not only as the amount of money available in an economy but also as the sectors and enterprises to which capital is directed.[7]

Major Structural Constraints on Nigerian Industrialization

The dominance of petroleum created a production system in which foreign exchange availability became closely connected to oil prices. Manufacturing firms that needed imported equipment, spare parts, chemicals, and intermediate inputs were therefore vulnerable whenever oil revenues declined or foreign-exchange restrictions intensified. This reinforced the paradox of an economy that earned substantial foreign exchange from a primary commodity while remaining dependent on imports for many manufactured inputs.

Unreliable electricity, transport bottlenecks, inadequate industrial infrastructure, and high logistics costs increase the cost of producing goods locally. For firms operating with limited access to finance, these costs can make imported finished products appear cheaper than domestically produced alternatives. Infrastructure therefore has a direct relationship with industrial competitiveness rather than being a separate development concern.

Nigeria has repeatedly produced industrial policies and development plans, but policy formulation has often been stronger than implementation. Changes in government can alter incentives, import rules, financing arrangements, and institutional priorities. A manufacturing firm, unlike a short-term trader, requires confidence that the policy environment will remain sufficiently stable to justify investments in machinery, skills, research, and supply chains.

A functioning industrial economy requires firms at different scales: micro-enterprises, small firms, medium-sized manufacturers, and large corporations. Nigeria has often struggled to develop the medium-sized firms capable of connecting small producers to large industrial markets. Limited long-term credit, high borrowing costs, weak venture financing for hardware innovation, and insufficient development finance constrain this transition. The evidence presented by Itaman and Awopegba is particularly relevant because it demonstrates that the direction of financial resources matters for industrial development.[8]

Industrialization requires domestic capabilities to adapt, improve, and eventually develop technologies. Importing technology is not inherently harmful; indeed, technology transfer can accelerate development. The difficulty arises when imported technologies are not accompanied by local learning, supplier development, engineering capabilities, and research partnerships. The result is a production system that consumes technology without progressively increasing domestic technological capability.

Adedeji Adekunle posits that visionary leadership is essential to determining the future trajectory of any national effort or developmental objective. Visionary leadership serves as the rudder that directs the course of national development and shapes the relationship between leadership and followership within a nation. Nigeria has had several opportunities to develop and pursue a coherent national vision, particularly during the early years following independence in 1960. However, the inability to sustain a strong and inclusive developmental vision has contributed significantly to the country's persistent developmental challenges.[9]

The absence of visionary leadership, combined with ethnic divisions, tribal sentiments, and religious considerations, has negatively affected Nigeria's industrial development. These challenges have, in several instances, undermined indigenous technological initiatives and innovations that could have contributed to national industrialization. A notable example is the work of Ezekiel Izuogu and his development of the Izuogu Z-600 automobile, which represents one of the indigenous technological innovations whose potential for national development warrants closer examination. The circumstances surrounding the development, recognition, and eventual decline of such initiatives illustrate the broader consequences of weak institutional support and the absence of a sustained national industrial vision.

Tribalism has also served as a significant impediment to industrial development in Nigeria since independence. Rather than consistently prioritizing merit, technical expertise, competence, and national economic interests, ethnic considerations have frequently influenced political and economic decisions. In some circumstances, industrial projects have been affected by political patronage, resulting in the location, management, or distribution of resources being influenced by ethnic and political interests rather than economic viability and national developmental priorities. Consequently, industrial development has sometimes become intertwined with competition among ethnic groups for access to state resources and political influence.[10]

According to Adebamiwa Olugbenga Michael, accusations of tribalism, nepotism, and favoritism have remained persistent features of Nigerian public discourse since independence. Political leaders have frequently been criticized for favoring members of their ethnic or religious groups at the expense of broader national interests. Nigeria's political and socioeconomic landscape has consequently been characterized by ethnic sentiments and tribal divisions, which have contributed to challenges in achieving sustained industrial development. The influence of tribalism extends beyond political appointments to the distribution of national resources and opportunities. Adebamiwa argues that no Nigerian government has been completely free from accusations of tribalism, nepotism, or favoritism. However, he further observes that the problem cannot be attributed exclusively to political leadership. Ordinary citizens also participate, consciously or unconsciously, in sustaining ethnic and religious divisions through their everyday choices regarding whom they support, trust, recommend, and promote. Thus, tribalism and its consequences should be understood as a broader national problem rather than merely a failure of political leadership.[11]

The historical roots of these divisions can also be traced to the colonial period, during which administrative and political policies contributed to the differentiation of Nigeria's various ethnic and religious communities. Following independence, successive governments frequently proclaimed national unity while, in practice, political patronage, selective appointments, and uneven patterns of development sometimes reinforced existing divisions. Although these structural and historical factors remain important, individual choices and societal attitudes continue to influence the persistence of inequality, ethnic competition, and institutional favoritism.

The interaction between weak visionary leadership and ethnic, tribal, and religious considerations therefore provides an important framework for understanding some of Nigeria's difficulties in achieving sustained industrialization. Where national development is not guided by a consistent and inclusive vision, industrial initiatives may become vulnerable to political interests, ethnic competition, and institutional neglect. The experience of indigenous innovators such as Ezekiel Izuogu demonstrates the importance of examining not only the technological capacity of Nigerians but also the political, institutional, and social environment in which such innovations are developed and supported.

For Nigeria to realize its industrial potential, therefore, national development must be anchored in visionary and inclusive leadership, merit-based decision-making, institutional continuity, and a commitment to supporting indigenous technological innovation. Industrial development should be treated as a national project rather than an instrument for advancing sectional, ethnic, religious, or political interests. Such an approach would create an environment in which indigenous innovations can receive the institutional support, investment, recognition, and continuity necessary to contribute meaningfully to national development.

Ezekiel Izuogu and the Z-600: Ezekiel Izuogu's Z-600 provides one of the clearest examples of the opportunities and vulnerabilities surrounding indigenous automotive innovation in Nigeria. Izuogu developed a prototype vehicle that was publicly presented in 1997 and was reported to contain approximately 90% locally produced components. A government-appointed panel reportedly assessed the vehicle, after which the government promised a grant of N235 million to support mass production. Contemporary reporting later documented that the promised funding was not received and that the project failed to move into sustained mass production (Punch, 2015; Vanguard, 2019).[12]

The case illustrates the difference between invention and industrialization. Designing a functioning prototype is an engineering achievement, but mass production requires patient capital, tooling, quality control, supply-chain development, intellectual-property protection, testing, regulatory certification, market access, and managerial capacity. Without these complementary institutions, even a technically promising invention can remain a prototype.

The project suffered another major setback on March 11, 2006, when armed men raided Izuogu's factory at Naze and reportedly removed machinery, moulds, design documents, and other components. The event is documented in Nigerian press accounts, including reporting based on Izuogu's own account (Punch, 2015; Vanguard, 2019). The raid severely disrupted the project's ability to continue. However, some argued the claims that the attack was ordered by ethnic, foreign, or commercial interests should not be presented as established facts without corroborating evidence. The documented fact is the robbery and its destructive effect; the identity and motive of the perpetrators require separate evidence.[13]

However, the incident raised more questions than answers. Dr. Izuogu, together with many well-meaning Nigerians who recognized the broader significance of the project, regarded the incident as a national economic disaster. The setback generated deep frustration, represented a major blow to Nigeria's industrial development, and ultimately contributed to the demise of Dr. Izuogu's dream. More broadly, the Nigerian public suffered a significant loss, as the project never fully recovered from the incident.

Several important questions surrounding the incident has been raised by this paper and has remained unanswered. Who were the armed men who carried out the attack, and who, if anyone, sent them to undertake such an act of national economic sabotage? Why were the components and moulds associated with the Z-600 prototype stolen? Could there have been external interests behind the incident? One possibility that has been raised concerns the South African government, particularly because the incident occurred shortly after the South African government had reportedly expressed interest in the Z-600. However, this possibility would require credible evidence before any conclusion could be reached.

Another question concerns whether internal interests opposed the emergence of an indigenous automobile industry from the Igbo community. Could individuals or groups within Nigeria have had reasons to prevent the project from succeeding? Similarly, questions have been raised about the possible involvement of foreign economic interests. The successful mass production of the Z-600 could potentially have reduced Nigeria's dependence on imported automobiles and challenged existing patterns of dependence on foreign automobile

products. Such a development could have affected established commercial interests associated with automobile imports.

Equally significant is the question of why the Federal Government did not release the promised grant of ₦235 million for the mass production of the Z-600 for more than five years after the commitment was reportedly made. Was the delay simply a consequence of administrative and financial difficulties or whether other interests that contributed to the failure to release the promised funds? It is also reasonable to ask whether individuals involved in automobile importation in Nigeria at the time might have perceived the successful mass production of an indigenous vehicle as a threat to their businesses. These questions deserve historical investigation by authority rather than being left only in the memories of public assumption.

Another unresolved issue is the failure of Nigeria's security agencies to recover the stolen components or identify and apprehend those responsible. The fact that the stolen equipment was reportedly not recovered for many years raises serious questions about the effectiveness of the security response. Whether this was the result of institutional failure, inadequate investigation, negligence, or possible complicity remains a matter of assumption.

The Federal Government therefore cannot be completely separated from the broader circumstances surrounding the collapse of the project. The prolonged delay in providing the financial support reportedly promised for industrial-scale production, together with the apparent failure to provide adequate protection for such strategically important technological assets, contributed to the difficulties confronting the project. At the same time, the activities and interests of automobile importers during the period may also warrant further investigation to determine whether any commercial interests played a role in undermining the project.

The broader question of foreign influence on African industrial development also deserves careful scholarly examination. Historically, African economies have experienced significant dependence on imported technologies, manufactured goods, and foreign capital. However, any claim that Western governments or foreign interests were directly responsible for the sabotage of the Z-600 would require documentary and empirical evidence. Such claims are therefore presented on this paper, as questions for further research rather than established facts.

More troubling, perhaps, is the inability of the relevant Nigerian security institutions to publicly establish what happened to the stolen equipment and identify those responsible after many years. This unresolved aspect of the incident continues to raise questions about institutional accountability and the protection of indigenous technological innovation. The attack and subsequent theft of the moulds and other critical components, which had reportedly taken approximately ten years to design and develop, effectively brought the production ambitions of the Z-600 to a halt.[14]

The Z-600 represented far more than an automobile. It symbolized confidence in Nigeria's technological capacity, indigenous creativity, and the possibility of developing a locally owned automobile industry. Its celebrated unveiling in 1998 represented a moment of considerable national optimism, while the devastating setback that followed in 2006 illustrated the vulnerabilities faced by indigenous technological initiatives.[15]

The story of the Z-600 therefore embodies both the promise and the challenges of innovation and industrial development in Nigeria. It raises fundamental questions about government commitment, institutional protection, economic interests, technological sovereignty, and the treatment of indigenous innovators. Most importantly, it leaves a question that remains relevant to Nigerian policymakers and citizens alike: What could Nigeria have achieved if its innovators had received sustained institutional support, adequate financing, and effective protection for their technological achievements?. The Z-600 case nevertheless supports the broader argument of this paper: Nigeria's challenge has often been the inability to build an institutional bridge between invention and commercialization. The failure to provide predictable financing and adequate protection for industrial assets can transform a potentially important innovation into a historical footnote.

Mudashiru Ayeni: **A Forgotten Pioneer of Nigerian Technological Innovation**

Another remarkable inventor whose story reflects the challenges faced by indigenous innovators in Nigeria was Mudashiru Ayeni, popularly known as "Muda." In 1971, at the age of 20, Ayeni, a Nigerian student with a strong interest in electronics and mechanical invention, reportedly developed a pioneering battery-powered robotic office assistant. He called the invention the Mudagraph, also referred to as the Receptograph. The device was essentially an early form of automated receptionist designed to perform routine office functions. With the press of a button, it could indicate whether a manager or supervisor was "busy," "available," or "out of the office."

The significance of Ayeni's invention becomes clearer when considered within the technological context of early 1970s Nigeria. At a time when automated office technologies were still uncommon in the country, Ayeni reportedly constructed his device using basic electrical components, wires, and batteries in the limited space available to him. His objective was remarkably forward-looking: he imagined machines capable of performing repetitive tasks that were ordinarily undertaken by human beings.[16]

The Mudagraph was not an artificial-intelligence system in the modern sense. It could not think, learn, reason, or communicate autonomously. Rather, it operated according to predetermined instructions. Nevertheless, the conceptual significance of the invention was considerable. In an era when most Nigerian offices relied almost entirely on human personnel for routine administrative functions, the idea of a machine capable of assisting with reception and communication tasks demonstrated an unusual degree of technological imagination.[17]

Unfortunately, Ayeni's ingenuity was reportedly met not with the institutional support, laboratory facilities, scholarship, or technical mentorship that could have helped him develop his ideas, but with suspicion. According to accounts of his life, his unconventional technological activities led some people to question his mental state, and he was reportedly taken to the Yaba Psychiatric Hospital for assessment. Accounts further state that he underwent psychiatric evaluations on several occasions before eventually being certified as mentally sound.

The experience reportedly had serious consequences for his education. After writing to his school principal to advocate for greater recognition of the role that young Africans could play in technological development, Ayeni was allegedly prohibited from attending classes and eventually had to leave the school environment. Instead of being given the opportunity to develop his invention within an educational or scientific institution, he was effectively pushed outside the system that should have provided him with mentorship and technical resources.

The tragedy of Ayeni's story lies not merely in the difficulties he encountered but in what those difficulties represented. A young Nigerian who demonstrated an unusual capacity for technological creativity was reportedly treated as a problem to be contained rather than a talent to be cultivated. His experience raises an important question about the institutional environment for innovation in Nigeria during that period: How many potentially transformative ideas were lost because society lacked the mechanisms to recognize, evaluate, and support unconventional young inventors?

Despite these setbacks, Ayeni's story did not end entirely in obscurity. Accounts indicate that he later received encouragement from the Federal Commissioner for Communications, Aminu Kano, and attracted interest from some local businessmen. Such recognition suggests that his abilities were eventually noticed by individuals who understood the potential significance of his work. However, the support appears not to have developed into the sustained institutional investment that might have enabled his invention to reach a wider technological and commercial stage.

Modern commentators have sometimes described Ayeni as a "forgotten AI pioneer" or a technological genius who was ahead of his time. Although describing the Mudagraph as "AI" requires qualification because the device was based on programmed or predetermined functions rather than artificial intelligence as understood today, the description captures an important aspect of his story: Ayeni was thinking about the automation of human tasks decades before intelligent automation became a dominant feature of contemporary technology.[18]

According to Adeshola Sulaimon Adeshina, Ayeni's experience represents a particularly painful example of how unconventional genius can be misunderstood when institutions lack the capacity to recognize emerging technological talent. Rather than being provided with a laboratory, scholarship, mentorship, or research environment, he was reportedly subjected to suspicion and psychiatric evaluation. His experience therefore raises broader questions about the relationship between society and innovation, particularly when an inventor challenges conventional assumptions about what is technologically possible.[19]

Ayeni's story should not simply be remembered as an account of an individual who experienced institutional rejection. It should also be understood as a warning about the consequences of failing to develop systems capable of identifying and nurturing indigenous talent. Innovation often begins with ideas that appear unusual, impractical, or even impossible to those who encounter them for the first time. When such ideas are dismissed without proper technical assessment, society risks losing opportunities that may never return.

In this sense, Mudashiru Ayeni became a symbol of Nigeria's untapped technological potential. His experience demonstrates the importance of creating an environment in which young inventors are encouraged to experiment, question existing systems, and develop unconventional solutions. Instead of being punished for intellectual curiosity or technological ambition, promising innovators should have access to laboratories,

funding, mentorship, educational opportunities, intellectual-property protection, and institutions capable of helping transform prototypes into viable technologies.

The story of the Mudagraph therefore leaves us with a profound question: What might have become of Ayeni's invention if he had received sustained institutional support, technical mentorship, financial investment, and the opportunity to develop his ideas within a properly equipped research environment? It is impossible to know whether the Mudagraph could have evolved into a globally competitive technology. However, the lost possibility itself is significant.

Ayeni was more than a student experimenting with electronics. His story represents the aspirations of a generation of African innovators who imagined technological possibilities despite operating in environments with limited resources. His experience also demonstrates that the failure to recognize and support innovation can be as consequential as the absence of innovation itself.

The lesson for contemporary Nigeria is therefore clear: society must learn to distinguish unconventional thinking from incompetence and technological originality from eccentricity. Young inventors should not have to fight the very institutions that are supposed to nurture them. The challenge is not merely to celebrate forgotten inventors after their contributions have been overlooked, but to build institutions capable of recognizing talent while it is still developing. The next Mudashiru Ayeni should encounter a laboratory, not a psychiatric ward; a mentor, not ridicule; and an opportunity to build, rather than an institution that silences his imagination.

Ultimately, Ayeni's story forces us to confront a difficult question about Nigeria's technological history: How many inventions, ideas, and potentially transformative innovators were lost because they were not recognized, supported, or protected at the moment when they needed it most?

Shamsuddeen Jibril and Contemporary Indigenous Innovation: The experience of Shamsuddeen Jibril demonstrates that the environment for Nigerian innovation is not entirely static. Jibril began experimenting with model aircraft as a student, reportedly using low-cost materials such as cartons, plastic bottles, wires, and small motors. He later developed drone technologies oriented toward agriculture and surveillance and became associated with Vora Robotics. Voice of America reported in 2024 that Jibril had developed a drone capable of detecting crop diseases, while his public professional profile identifies him with Vora Robotics and locally developed agricultural drone technology.[20]

Jibril's trajectory is important because it illustrates a movement from informal experimentation to higher education, specialized engineering, entrepreneurship, and commercialization. It also demonstrates the importance of mentorship and institutional access. His experience suggests that Nigeria can produce globally relevant technological solutions when young innovators receive opportunities to acquire technical knowledge and connect their inventions to real economic problems. At the same time, Jibril's story should not be interpreted as evidence that Nigeria has solved its innovation-financing problem. The persistence of funding, research infrastructure, regulatory, market, and scaling constraints means that individual success stories remain exceptional unless they are supported by institutions capable of reproducing them across thousands of innovators.

External Factors and the International Political Economy

Nigeria's industrial experience cannot be separated from the international economic system. Colonial economic structures emphasized primary commodity production and external markets, while post-independence industrialization frequently relied on foreign capital, imported machinery, and multinational firms. External dependence made industrialization impossible, it also increased the importance of domestic technological learning and industrial policy making.[21]

Trade liberalization generates efficiency and consumer benefits, but premature exposure of weak domestic industries to international competition can also accelerate industrial decline. Bangura (1991) documents how tariff and exchange-rate changes during SAP affected import-dependent industries. The central policy issue is therefore not whether Nigeria should isolate itself from global markets, but whether integration is accompanied by measures that build domestic productive capability.[22]

Foreign investment should similarly be evaluated according to its contribution to local capabilities. Investment that creates domestic suppliers, trains workers, transfers technology, supports research, and expands exports can strengthen industrialization. Investment that simply imports inputs, repatriates profits, and operates with limited local linkages contributes less to structural transformation.

The development of a viable industrial sector has historically been central to the economic transformation of nations. Industrialization provides opportunities for employment creation, technological advancement, value

addition, diversification of production, expansion of domestic markets and reduction of excessive dependence on imported manufactured goods. For Nigeria, the aspiration to establish a strong industrial economy has existed since the colonial period and became particularly important after independence in 1960. Successive governments have introduced industrial policies, development plans, import-substitution programme, export-promotion measures, structural adjustment initiatives and various incentives intended to encourage domestic production. Nevertheless, the Nigerian industrial sector has continued to operate below its potential because of a combination of structural, infrastructural, financial, institutional and human-capital constraints.[23]

Contemporary Constraints on Industrial Development in Nigeria

The contemporary challenges confronting Nigerian industries cannot therefore be understood simply as isolated economic problems. They are interconnected manifestations of long-standing weaknesses in the country's productive structure. The World Bank has identified infrastructure gaps, especially in electricity, transport and logistics, alongside insecurity, weak institutional capacity and limited access to finance, as important constraints on productivity and private-sector development in Nigeria. These problems interact with one another: unreliable electricity raises production costs; high production costs reduce competitiveness; weak infrastructure increases the cost of moving goods and raw materials; insecurity disrupts production and distribution; limited access to affordable finance restricts investment; and deficiencies in technical skills limit the capacity of firms to adopt new technologies.[24]

One of the most persistent obstacles to industrial development in Nigeria is the unreliability of electricity supply. Electricity is not merely an auxiliary requirement of modern manufacturing; it is a fundamental factor of production. Virtually every stage of industrial activity, from the operation of machinery and refrigeration systems to information technology, welding, fabrication, packaging and storage, depends on a dependable energy supply. Where electricity is unreliable, firms are compelled to provide alternative sources of power, thereby increasing their operating expenses.

The Nigerian experience demonstrates the seriousness of this problem. Evidence from the World Bank's survey of Nigerian firms showed that 85.3 percent of firms reported experiencing power outages in 2020, while 22 percent reported using generators. Manufacturing firms recorded particularly high exposure to electricity interruptions. Although the exact pattern of electricity availability has changed over time, the underlying problem remains significant: industrial enterprises cannot plan production efficiently when electricity supply is uncertain.[25]

The economic consequence of unreliable electricity extends beyond the immediate cost of purchasing diesel or petrol. Firms must acquire generators, maintain them, purchase fuel, employ technicians and absorb the cost of machinery deterioration caused by unstable power supplies. A business that could ordinarily allocate capital toward technological upgrading, employee training, research and development or expansion may instead devote a substantial proportion of its resources to energy self-generation. Earlier World Bank evidence estimated that self-generated electricity could cost Nigerian firms several times more than electricity obtained from the public grid. This illustrates how an infrastructure deficiency can become a direct industrial-policy problem.[26]

For large manufacturers, the consequences may include reduced capacity utilization and increased production costs. For small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), the consequences can be even more severe because smaller firms have less capital with which to purchase and maintain generating equipment. An enterprise operating on narrow profit margins may find it difficult to remain competitive when energy expenditure rises substantially. The situation becomes particularly problematic when Nigerian manufacturers compete with imported products produced in countries where electricity is more reliable and less expensive.

The electricity problem also has a historical dimension. Nigeria possesses substantial energy resources, including natural gas, oil, hydroelectric potential and renewable-energy resources. Yet the availability of natural resources has not automatically translated into reliable electricity for industrial production. This distinction between resource endowment and productive capacity is important to understanding Nigeria's industrial experience. Industrialization requires not merely resources but also institutions, infrastructure, investment and effective systems for converting resources into productive economic capacity.[27]

Consequently, the electricity crisis should be viewed not only as an energy-sector problem but also as a constraint on national industrial competitiveness. Unless electricity becomes more reliable and predictable, Nigerian industries will continue to carry an additional cost burden that reduces their ability to expand production, compete in regional markets and invest in technological innovation.

A second major obstacle is the difficulty of obtaining affordable capital for industrial investment. Industrial production is inherently capital intensive. Manufacturing enterprises require funds for land acquisition, factory construction, machinery, raw materials, transportation, storage, maintenance, research and development, employee training and technological upgrading. When the cost of borrowing becomes excessively high, firms may postpone expansion or limit their operations to activities requiring relatively little capital.[28]

The problem is particularly serious for SMEs, which often lack the collateral, credit history and financial strength required to secure long-term financing at favourable rates. The result is a financing structure in which many enterprises depend heavily on retained earnings, informal credit arrangements or short-term borrowing rather than long-term industrial finance. Such a situation is incompatible with sustained industrial transformation because major manufacturing investments generally require patient capital and relatively long repayment periods.

The problem became more complicated with foreign-exchange pressures. Nigeria's industrial sector has historically depended on imported machinery, spare parts, industrial chemicals, components and, in some cases, raw materials. Consequently, disruptions in the foreign-exchange market can affect industrial production even when the firms themselves are domestically owned.

The foreign-exchange difficulties experienced in the Nigerian economy in the early 2020s illustrate this relationship. The International Monetary Fund reported persistent foreign-exchange shortages, substantial exchange-rate depreciation and difficulties faced by the private sector in obtaining foreign currency. The naira's depreciation also increased the domestic-currency cost of imported inputs. Where manufacturers could not obtain foreign exchange at predictable rates, production planning became more difficult because the cost of imported machinery and raw materials could change substantially within relatively short periods.[29]

The interaction between high interest rates and foreign-exchange instability produces a particularly difficult environment for industrial enterprises. A manufacturer may need to borrow money at a high cost to purchase machinery or inputs whose naira price is simultaneously rising because of exchange-rate depreciation. The firm is therefore confronted with two separate cost pressures: the cost of financing and the cost of imported inputs.

This problem also demonstrates the importance of macroeconomic stability to industrial development. Industrial policy cannot operate effectively in isolation from monetary, fiscal and foreign-exchange policy. Where inflation is high, interest rates are elevated and exchange rates are volatile, long-term investment decisions become considerably more difficult. The World Bank has similarly emphasized the importance of improving access to finance, strengthening infrastructure and creating a predictable business environment to support private investment and the expansion of productive firms.[30]

It is therefore important to distinguish between merely providing credit and creating an effective industrial-financing system. Industrial development requires financing mechanisms capable of supporting long-term investment, technological upgrading and productive expansion. Development banks, commercial banks, private equity, pension funds and other financial institutions can contribute to this process when appropriate institutional arrangements encourage investment in productive sectors.

Foreign-exchange policy is equally important. A manufacturing economy that depends excessively on imported machinery and inputs remains vulnerable to currency instability. In the long term, Nigeria's industrial strategy must therefore seek to increase domestic production of intermediate goods, machinery components and industrial inputs. Such a process would reduce the vulnerability of manufacturers to external exchange-rate shocks while simultaneously strengthening domestic industrial linkages.

Industrialization cannot be sustained without an efficient infrastructure network. Factories require roads through which raw materials can reach production centers and finished products can reach markets. They require ports through which machinery and imported inputs can enter the country. They require warehouses, railways, telecommunications systems, water supply and other forms of economic infrastructure.

Nigeria's infrastructural deficits therefore constitute a major constraint on industrial productivity. The World Bank has repeatedly identified infrastructure gaps in electricity, transportation and logistics as significant impediments to productivity and market integration. Poor infrastructure increases what may be described as the "hidden cost" of production. These costs may not appear directly on the factory floor, but they influence the final price of goods.[31]

For example, a manufacturer may purchase raw materials at a competitive price but incur substantial expenses transporting those materials over poorly maintained roads. Vehicles may experience frequent mechanical

breakdowns, travel times may increase, and firms may require larger inventories because transportation is unpredictable. These costs eventually become part of the price of manufactured goods.

Port infrastructure presents another important dimension. Nigeria's geographical position gives it considerable potential for maritime trade, yet inefficiencies in port operations have historically increased the cost and duration of importing and exporting goods. Delays in clearing industrial machinery and raw materials can interrupt production schedules. Where manufacturers are unable to obtain essential components on time, factories may operate below capacity or temporarily suspend production.

The relationship between transport infrastructure and industrialization is therefore circular. Efficient infrastructure facilitates industrial growth by reducing production and distribution costs. Industrial growth, in turn, generates demand for better infrastructure and creates additional revenue and employment that can support infrastructure development.

Historically, this relationship has been insufficiently exploited in Nigeria. Infrastructure projects have sometimes been approached as isolated public works rather than as components of an integrated industrial strategy. A road connecting agricultural communities to an industrial processing centre, for instance, has a different economic significance from a road constructed without reference to productive clusters, markets or supply chains.[32]

The development of industrial corridors, specialized economic zones and integrated transport networks could therefore strengthen the relationship between infrastructure and industrial production. Such initiatives would be more effective when roads, electricity, water, telecommunications, storage facilities, customs systems and security are planned together rather than separately.

Insecurity represents another major challenge to Nigeria's industrial development. Manufacturing requires an environment in which entrepreneurs can move people and goods, protect physical assets, maintain supply chains and make long-term investment decisions. Where insecurity becomes widespread, these conditions are weakened.

The World Bank has noted that insecurity has affected millions of Nigerians and discouraged private investment and economic growth. The effects on industry occur through several channels. First, insecurity may directly affect factories and industrial locations. Second, it can disrupt transportation routes used for the movement of raw materials and finished products. Third, firms may face higher security expenditure as they employ private guards, install surveillance systems or undertake other protective measures. Fourth, insecurity can discourage investors who might otherwise consider establishing new production facilities.[33]

The problem is especially significant for industries dependent on extensive supply networks. A manufacturer may obtain raw materials from one region, process them in another and distribute the finished product across several states. Any disruption along this chain can increase costs or interrupt production. Insecurity also influences the location of investment. Industrial enterprises generally require substantial fixed capital. Once a factory has been established, the investor cannot easily move the machinery and physical infrastructure to another location. Consequently, uncertainty about the security of an industrial site can discourage investment before the factory is even constructed.

The relationship between insecurity and industrial development is therefore mutually reinforcing. Weak industrialization contributes to unemployment and limited economic opportunities, while insecurity further undermines investment and productive activity. Addressing the security challenge should consequently form part of a broader economic-development strategy rather than being treated solely as a policing or military matter.

The World Bank's assessment of Nigeria's development challenges has similarly connected insecurity with broader weaknesses in infrastructure, governance and the investment environment. This suggests that sustainable industrial development requires both physical security and institutional confidence. Entrepreneurs need to believe that contracts will be respected, property will be protected and economic rules will remain sufficiently predictable to justify long-term investment.[34]

Another obstacle confronting Nigerian enterprises is the complexity of taxation and business regulation. Taxation is necessary for financing public services and infrastructure, but an inefficient or overlapping tax system can impose disproportionate burdens on productive enterprises, particularly SMEs.

The problem is not simply the existence of taxes. It is also the possibility of overlapping demands from different levels and agencies of government, administrative uncertainty and the time required to comply with multiple

regulatory requirements. The World Bank has identified overlapping mandates across tax jurisdictions and concerns about tax administration as important elements of Nigeria's business environment.[35] Evidence from the World Bank's Nigeria Enterprise Survey illustrates that taxation and tax administration have long been identified by firms as business obstacles. In the 2014–2015 Enterprise Survey, 25.6 percent of surveyed establishments classified tax rates as a moderate obstacle, while 15.8 percent regarded them as a major obstacle and 3.4 percent as a very severe obstacle. Tax administration produced a similar pattern, with 25.6 percent describing it as a moderate obstacle and 13.6 percent as a major obstacle. Although these data are historical rather than a direct measurement of conditions in 2026, they demonstrate the persistence of regulatory concerns within the Nigerian business environment.[36]

For SMEs, regulatory complexity can have especially serious consequences. Large companies may possess accountants, lawyers and administrative departments capable of managing regulatory requirements. Small firms frequently lack such specialised personnel. Consequently, administrative complexity can absorb time and financial resources that could otherwise be directed toward production and expansion.

Bureaucratic delays can also affect industrial investment. An entrepreneur may require approvals relating to land, environmental standards, company registration, taxation, imports, construction and utilities. When these processes are slow or unpredictable, the time between investment decisions and actual production can become unnecessarily long.

The solution is not necessarily to reduce regulation indiscriminately. Effective industrial development requires appropriate standards relating to labour, environment, safety, taxation and consumer protection. Rather, the objective should be to make regulation transparent, coordinated, predictable and proportionate. Digitization of government services, harmonization of taxes and licenses, reduction of unnecessary administrative duplication and greater coordination between federal, state and local institutions could reduce the burden on productive enterprises.

A predictable regulatory environment is particularly important because industrial investment is generally long term. Investors can tolerate regulation when its requirements are known and consistently applied. Uncertainty, rather than regulation itself, can become a major deterrent to investment.[37]

The final major constraint is the mismatch between educational output and the practical skills demanded by modern industry. Industrialization depends not only on machines and capital but also on people capable of designing, operating, maintaining and improving those machines.

Nigeria has a large and increasingly educated population, but formal educational attainment does not automatically translate into industrially relevant skills. The World Bank has documented significant gaps between the skills possessed by workers and those required by employers. Its research also noted that the demand for skilled workers and technicians was already substantial and likely to increase as the industrial sector expanded, while technical and vocational education faced resource and institutional limitations.[38]

Evidence from the Nigeria Enterprise Survey also illustrates the problem. Among firms reporting difficulty filling a skilled production-worker vacancy, 16.9 percent identified applicants' lack of technical and operational skills as the principal problem, while 7.8 percent cited inadequate basic skills. Although this survey is not a contemporary measure of every industrial sector, it provides historical evidence of the structural nature of the skills problem.[39]

The consequences are substantial. When firms cannot find adequately trained technicians, engineers, machine operators, welders, electricians, fabricators, mechanics and other specialists, they may be forced to spend additional resources training employees themselves. In some cases, companies may import technical expertise, thereby increasing production costs and reducing opportunities for domestic skill development.

The skills problem is also connected to technological innovation. Modern manufacturing increasingly depends on automation, digital systems, computer-aided design, robotics, data analysis, advanced machinery and quality-control systems. Without a workforce capable of operating and adapting to these technologies, investment in sophisticated equipment may fail to generate its full potential.

The appropriate response therefore requires a closer relationship between educational institutions and industry. Universities, polytechnics, technical colleges and vocational institutions should not operate entirely independently of the productive sector. Curricula need to reflect changing industrial requirements, while students need opportunities for internships, apprenticeships, industrial attachments and practical training.

This is particularly important in Nigeria because industrial development must create not merely employment but productive employment. The expansion of factories without the development of appropriate human capital may result in a situation where enterprises exist physically but depend heavily on imported technical expertise or operate below their technological potential.

Although the six challenges discussed above may be presented separately, they are deeply interconnected. Unreliable electricity increases production costs; high production costs reduce competitiveness; high interest rates restrict the ability of firms to invest in alternative energy and modern machinery; foreign-exchange shortages make imported equipment more expensive; poor roads and port systems delay the arrival of those inputs; insecurity increases transportation and security costs; bureaucratic complexity delays investment; and skills shortages limit the ability of enterprises to adopt new technologies.

This interconnectedness explains why isolated interventions frequently produce limited results. Providing credit to a manufacturer, for example, may not substantially improve productivity if the factory continues to face unreliable electricity, poor transportation networks and insecurity. Similarly, establishing an industrial park without reliable power, efficient logistics, skilled workers and predictable regulation may not produce the anticipated industrial transformation.

The challenge is therefore fundamentally systemic. Nigeria requires an industrial-development framework in which infrastructure, finance, human capital, security, regulation and macroeconomic stability reinforce one another. The World Bank's broader assessment of Nigeria's economy similarly identifies infrastructure gaps, insecurity, governance weaknesses, human-capital limitations and barriers to private investment as mutually reinforcing constraints on long-term growth.[40]

Conclusion

The cases discussed in this paper point to a common conclusion: invention is only the first stage of industrial development. Izuogu demonstrates the difficulty of moving from prototype to mass production; Ayeni illustrates the consequences of weak mechanisms for identifying and nurturing unconventional talent; and Jibril shows how mentorship, education, entrepreneurship, and technology ecosystems can improve the prospects of commercialization.

These cases also challenge the assumption that Nigeria's industrial problem is simply a shortage of visionary leaders. Leadership matters, but leaders operate through institutions. A visionary industrial policy without reliable electricity, development finance, technical education, procurement systems, standards, intellectual-property enforcement, and stable macroeconomic conditions cannot generate sustained industrial transformation. Conversely, strong institutions can reduce the extent to which individual political preferences determine the survival of industrial projects.

The appropriate objective is therefore to construct a national innovation and industrial system. Such a system should reward competence regardless of ethnicity or region, make industrial financing accessible on transparent criteria, protect intellectual property, establish research-industry partnerships, and use public procurement to create markets for qualified domestic technologies. The goal should not be to reject foreign technology but to use global technology and capital as instruments for domestic capability building.

• Establish predictable, long-term industrial financing. Development finance should prioritize commercially credible manufacturing, engineering, and technology projects with clear milestones rather than politically connected beneficiaries.

• Strengthen electricity and industrial infrastructure. Reliable power, transport, industrial parks, broadband, water, and logistics are essential inputs into manufacturing competitiveness.

• Create a stronger research-to-market pipeline. Universities, polytechnics, research institutes, and industry should collaborate through grants, technology-transfer offices, laboratories, incubation programmes, and joint research projects.

• Improve access to intellectual-property protection. Inventors need affordable patent, design-registration, licensing, and legal-support mechanisms so that technical knowledge is protected and monetized.

• Adopt transparent merit-based public support. Grants, appointments, procurement contracts, and industrial incentives should be awarded through published criteria, independent evaluation, and auditable processes.

• Develop local supply chains and industrial clusters. Policies should encourage domestic production of components, tools, packaging, machinery, and intermediate goods rather than concentrating only on final assembly.

• Use government procurement strategically. Where domestic products meet safety and quality standards, public institutions can create early markets for Nigerian technologies, helping firms achieve scale.

• Protect innovators and industrial assets. Security agencies and legal institutions must treat theft of industrial equipment, designs, prototypes, and intellectual property as threats to national productive capacity.

• Maintain policy continuity across administrations. Major industrial programmes should be based on measurable national objectives and institutionalized so that they are not abandoned whenever political leadership changes.

• Address ethnic and regional exclusion through institutions rather than rhetoric. National industrial policy should use transparent criteria that allow talent and investment to move across regions while ensuring balanced development.

• Expand technical education and mentorship. Young inventors need access to engineering laboratories, fabrication facilities, professional mentors, scholarships, and entrepreneurship training.

• Build a rigorous evidence culture. Claims about industrial success, failure, discrimination, sabotage, and government support should be documented through official records, credible journalism, interviews, patents, and peer-reviewed research.

Nigeria's industrial history since 1960 cannot be explained by a single failure or by the absence of talented citizens. The evidence points instead to an interaction of structural and institutional constraints: dependence on oil and imported inputs, inadequate infrastructure, unstable macroeconomic conditions, limited industrial finance, weak research-industry linkages, policy inconsistency, insecurity, and forms of political patronage that can undermine merit-based development. The Structural Adjustment Programme intensified some of these pressures, particularly for import-dependent manufacturers, while the subsequent financial and political environment continued to favor short-term and extractive economic activities over long-term industrial investment.

The experiences of Ezekiel Izuogu and Mudashiru Ayeni demonstrate the cost of failing to build institutions around indigenous talent. The experience of Shamsuddeen Jibril offers a more hopeful contemporary example, showing that Nigerian innovators can move from informal experimentation to sophisticated technological entrepreneurship when education, mentorship, and markets become available. These cases collectively demonstrate that Nigeria does not lack ideas; it lacks a sufficiently strong and consistent system for converting ideas into scalable productive enterprises.

A credible industrial future therefore requires a shift from celebrating exceptional inventors after their struggles have become public stories to systematically supporting innovation before it becomes a crisis. Nigeria must create institutions in which competence matters more than identity, long-term production matters more than short-term rent seeking, and public support is allocated transparently. If the country can combine reliable infrastructure, patient finance, technical education, research capacity, intellectual-property protection, market access, and stable industrial policy, indigenous innovation can become a source of employment, technological learning, export diversification, and national self-reliance. The central lesson of the cases examined here is clear: Nigeria's industrial challenge is not a shortage of ingenuity; it is the failure to build and sustain the institutional conditions under which ingenuity can become industry.

The contemporary difficulties facing Nigeria's industrial sector are rooted in a combination of historical structural weaknesses and present economic pressures. Unreliable electricity increases the cost of production; expensive finance restricts investment; foreign-exchange constraints raise the cost of imported machinery and inputs; inadequate infrastructure weakens supply chains; insecurity increases investment risks; multiple taxation and bureaucratic complexity impose additional burdens on enterprises; and skills mismatches limit technological development.

These challenges should not, however, be interpreted as evidence that industrialization is impossible in Nigeria. Rather, they demonstrate the scale and complexity of the institutional and structural reforms required to establish a competitive productive economy. Nigeria possesses a large domestic market, substantial natural resources, entrepreneurial capacity and a significant labour force. The challenge is to convert these potential advantages into sustained productive capacity.

A successful industrial strategy must therefore move beyond isolated incentives and temporary interventions. Reliable electricity, efficient transportation, accessible long-term finance, stable foreign-exchange arrangements, improved security, coordinated taxation and regulation, and industry-responsive technical education should be treated as complementary components of a single industrial-development framework.

The historical experience of Nigerian industrialization demonstrates that the existence of industrial policies alone does not guarantee industrial transformation. Policies must be supported by institutions capable of implementation and by infrastructure capable of sustaining productive activity. The central issue is consequently not merely whether Nigeria possesses an industrial policy, but whether the broader economic environment enables manufacturers to produce competitively, invest confidently and innovate continuously.

In this regard, the future of Nigerian industrial development will depend significantly on the country's capacity to transform these persistent constraints into opportunities for structural reform. Reducing the cost of production, strengthening domestic supply chains, improving technical skills and creating a predictable investment environment would enable Nigerian enterprises to move beyond survival-oriented production toward higher productivity, technological innovation and greater participation in regional and international markets.

References

1. A. S. Ayodele and G. O. Falokun, The Nigerian Economy: Structure and Pattern of Development (JODAD Publishers, 2003).
2. Y. Bangura, “Structural Adjustment and De-industrialization in Nigeria: 1986–1988,” Africa Development 16, no. 2 (1991): 5–32, https://doi.org/10.57054/ad.v16i2.2718.
3. R. E. Itaman and O. E. Awopegba, “Finance, Oil Rent and Premature Deindustrialization in Nigeria,” Structural Change and Economic Dynamics 59 (2021): 149–161, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.strueco.2021.06.006.
4. Bangura, “Structural Adjustment and De-industrialization in Nigeria.”
5. Itaman and Awopegba, “Finance, Oil Rent and Premature Deindustrialization in Nigeria.”
6. Punch Newspapers, “Need for Research-Industry Linkages,” Punch Newspapers, 2015, https://punchng.com/need-for-research-industry-linkages/.
7. Vanguard News, “Hatred in Nigeria Today Worse Than in 1966 — Izuogu,” July 19, 2019, https://www.vanguardngr.com/2019/07/hatred-in-nigeria-today-worse-than-in-1966-izuogu/.
8. Pulse Nigeria, “How a Nigerian Student Built a Robot Receptionist in 1971 and Was Called Mad,” May 21, 2026, https://www.pulse.ng/story/how-a-nigerian-student-built-a-robot-receptionist-in-1971-and-was-called-mad-2026052114454503149.
9. A. Bala, “Nigerian Invents Crop Disease Detection Drone,” Voice of America, August 13, 2024, https://www.voanews.com/a/nigerian-invents-crop-disease-detection-drone/7740579.html.
10. Shamsuddeen Jibril, “Professional Profile and Public Posts on Locally Developed Agricultural Drone Technology,” LinkedIn, n.d.
11. World Bank, Nigeria Country Overview, World Bank Group, accessed September 27, 2026.
12. World Bank, Nigeria Development Update: Resilience through Reforms, evidence from the 2021/2022 IFC survey of Nigerian micro, small, and medium enterprises.
13. World Bank, Improving Nigeria’s Business Environment.
14. International Monetary Fund, Nigeria: 2024 Article IV Consultation—Press Release; Staff Report; and Statement by the Executive Director for Nigeria, IMF Country Report no. 24/102 (2024).
15. World Bank, Nigeria Economic Update: Accelerating Economic Expansion, Creating New Job Opportunities.
16. World Bank, Nigeria Country Overview.

17. World Bank, Nigeria Country Economic Memorandum (December 2022).

18. World Bank, Nigeria Development Update.

19. World Bank, Nigeria Enterprise Survey 2014–2015, variable concerning tax rates as an obstacle to business operations.

20. World Bank, Nigeria Enterprise Survey 2014–2015, variable concerning tax administration as an obstacle to business operations.

21. World Bank, Nigeria: Skills and Employability.

22. Ibid., discussion of the demand for skilled workers and technicians and the limitations of Nigeria's technical and vocational education system.

23. World Bank, Nigeria Enterprise Survey 2014–2015, variable concerning difficulties in filling skilled production-worker vacancies.

24. World Bank, Nigeria Development Update, discussion of infrastructure, insecurity, governance, human development, and investment constraints as interconnected challenges to long-term economic growth.

25. Adeshina, Adeshola Sulaimon. Source details not supplied in the manuscript; cited in the discussion of Mudashiru Ayeni.

26. Adedeji, Adekunle. Source details not supplied in the manuscript; cited in the discussion of visionary leadership.

27. Ayodele, A. S., and G. O. Falokun. The Nigerian Economy: Structure and Pattern of Development. JODAD Publishers, 2003.

28. Bala, A. "Nigerian Invents Crop Disease Detection Drone." Voice of America, August 13, 2024. https://www.voanews.com/a/nigerian-invents-crop-disease-detection-drone/7740579.html.

29. Bangura, Y. "Structural Adjustment and De-industrialisation in Nigeria: 1986–1988." Africa Development 16, no. 2 (1991): 5–32. https://doi.org/10.57054/ad.v16i2.2718.

30. Itaman, R. E., and O. E. Awopegba. "Finance, Oil Rent and Premature Deindustrialisation in Nigeria." Structural Change and Economic Dynamics 59 (2021): 149–161. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.strueco.2021.06.006.

31. Jibril, Shamsuddeen. "Professional Profile and Public Posts on Locally Developed Agricultural Drone Technology." LinkedIn. n.d.

32. Punch Newspapers. "Need for Research-Industry Linkages." Punch Newspapers, 2015. https://punchng.com/need-for-research-industry-linkages/.

33. Pulse Nigeria. "How a Nigerian Student Built a Robot Receptionist in 1971 and Was Called Mad." May 21, 2026. https://www.pulse.ng/story/how-a-nigerian-student-built-a-robot-receptionist-in-1971-and-was-called-mad-2026052114454503149.

34. Vanguard News. "Hatred in Nigeria Today Worse Than in 1966 — Izuogu." July 19, 2019. https://www.vanguardngr.com/2019/07/hatred-in-nigeria-today-worse-than-in-1966-izuogu/.

35. World Bank. Improving Nigeria's Business Environment.

36. World Bank. Nigeria Country Economic Memorandum. December 2022.

37. World Bank. Nigeria Country Overview. World Bank Group. Accessed September 27, 2026.

38. World Bank. Nigeria Development Update.

39. World Bank. Nigeria Economic Update: Accelerating Economic Expansion, Creating New Job Opportunities.