

# Achieving Sustainable Development and Promoting Development Cooperation in Nigeria: Way Forward

IDRITH A .Y CAN<sup>1</sup>    MUNIRU HARUNA ACA, CPFA<sup>2</sup>    ABDULMUHYI M .A<sup>1</sup>  
JOHNSON AYANWUYI ACA.<sup>1</sup>

1.Department of Accountancy Federal polytechnic Bauchi. BAUCHI, NIGERIA

2.Julius Berger Nigeria PLC, Abuja, Nigeria

## Abstract

The world today witnesses emerging new challenges, aggravated by multiple financial, economic, food and energy crises, which have threatened the ability of all countries to achieve sustainable development. The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development reaffirmed the political commitments of the international community to pursue sustainable development, under the principles of Agenda 21, including the principle of common but differentiated responsibility, this is inline with the Millennium Development Goals objectives which focused attention on selected social and human development priorities. The main objective of the paper, is to evaluate the possible ways of achieving sustainable development and development cooperation in Nigeria. To achieved the above objective the researchers make use of questionnaires, Hypothesis are formulated which were analyzed using SPSS. Pearson Correlation Test were equally conducted to determine the correlation between economic development cooperation and sustainable development in Nigeria. Empirical economic modeling were established with the prior expectation to construct multiple regression. The paper recommended that, government should take steps to introduce price control on essential items to avoid persistence increase in price level, adequate measures should be put in place to cope with the effect of climate change, government as well should come up with policies that will encourage production and consumption of locally produce goods and services and discourage importation of essential items, Nigerian populace should take a drastic measure to ensure that those to be elected as policies makers are of credible character and patriot that are capable of protecting the interest of the generality of the entire populace and finally the governments at all level should come up with economic recovery plans that is capable of salvaging the financial system and entire economy at large.

**Keywords:** Economy, Cooperation, Development, Strategy, Sustainability, Transformation.

## 1. Introduction

No country has made the arduous journey from widespread rural poverty to post-industrial wealth without employing targeted and selective government policies to modify its economic structure and boost its economic dynamism. Moreover, it is difficult to see how countries at all levels of development can respond constructively to contemporary challenges – from job creation and poverty reduction to participating in the technological revolution and global value chains, from promoting efficient and clean energy to mitigating climate change and greening the economy – without using some kind of targeted industrial policy.

The process of structural transformation remains particularly challenging for developing and emerging economies. Their efforts to upgrade and diversify take place in an interdependent world economy where earlier industrializers have already accumulated both enabling capabilities (individual and enterprise level know-how and skills, along with collective knowledge and sources of creativity) and productive capacities (embodied in production factors and physical and technological infrastructure) that give their producers significant cost and productivity advantages and equip them to push out the technological frontier through research and innovation. These advances offer developing countries like Nigeria many opportunities to catch up rapidly by learning to master technologies and products already available in more developed countries. The key question is: how can such learning be accelerated? Catching up encompasses two distinct but related processes: first, the strengthening of capabilities that enable developing economies to trigger, accelerate and manage structural and technological transformation; and, second, the accumulation of productive capacities through a sustained process of investment. In both aspects, success requires active policies that provide incentives, direction and coordination.

Many of the higher value added activities and sectors that characterize successful transformation today are likely to be more capital-intensive than their counterparts in the past, in part because of readier access to the technology and capital equipment produced in the more advanced economies, but also because of the pressures of intensified global competition, which can be met on a sustained basis only by rapid rises in productivity. Mobilizing the financial resources to undertake the investments in physical and human capital and in infrastructure required to meet these demands continues to be a major policy challenge in many countries (ILO, 2011; UNIDO, 2013; ECA, 2013; World Bank, 2013; OECD, 2013).

The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to evaluate the ways of achieving sustainable development and development cooperation in Nigeria. The relevance of the different traditions in the development economics and the contributions of their various frameworks to the analysis and design of industrial policy that can lead to the sustainable development and development cooperation were equally considered. Each of those frameworks highlights different objectives of industrial policies, raises different policy issues, and therefore suggests different areas and scope for industrial policies. Moreover, the application of different analytical frameworks to current practice in government policy can contribute to a better understanding of what is needed to create and pursue successful productive transformation and sustainable development.

Other objectives of the study were delineated as follows:

- i. To find out whether Sustainable Development is attainable in Nigeria.
- ii. To find out whether the Development Cooperation can be attained in Nigeria.
- iii. To provide workable recommendations capable of salvaging the situation as to the sustainability of development in Nigeria.

In line with the above objectives, the following hypothesis were formulated:

**H<sub>0</sub>:** Sustainable Development is unattainable in Nigeria.

**H<sub>1</sub>:** The Development Cooperation cannot be attained in Nigeria.

## 2. Conceptual Framework

In September 2000, world leaders adopted the United Nations Millennium Declaration which provided the basis for the pursuit of the Millennium Development Goals. A global consensus was successfully discussed the importance of poverty reduction and human development. Since then, the global community has managed to uplift a large segment of the poor and vulnerable. The world reached the poverty target five years ahead of the 2015 deadline. In developing regions, the proportion of people living on less than \$1.25 a day fell from 47 per cent in 1990 to 22 per cent in 2010. About 700 million fewer people lived in conditions of extreme poverty in 2010 compared with 1990. Still, results fall short of international expectations and of the global targets set to be reached by the 2015 deadline. It remains imperative that the international community takes bold and collaborative actions to accelerate progress in achieving the Millennium Development Goals.

Continuation of current development strategies will not suffice to achieve sustainable development beyond 2015. Moreover, relying on “business as usual” scenarios presents clear risks, because evidence is mounting that:

- (a) The impact of climate change threatens to escalate in the absence of adequate safeguards and there is a need to promote the integrated and sustainable management of natural resources and ecosystems and take mitigation and adaptive action in keeping with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities;
- (b) Hunger and malnourishment, while decreasing in many developing countries, remain persistent in other countries, while food and nutrition security continues to be an elusive goal.
- (c) Income inequality within and among many countries has been rising and has reached an extremely high level, invoking the specter of heightened tension and social conflict.
- (d) Rapid urbanization, especially in developing countries, calls for major changes in the way in which urban development is designed and managed, as well as substantial increases of public and private investments in urban infrastructure and services;
- (e) Energy needs are likely to remain unmet for hundreds of millions of households, unless significant progress in ensuring access to modern energy services is achieved;
- (f) Recurrence of financial crises needs to be prevented and the financial system has to be redirected towards promoting access to long-term financing for investments required to achieve sustainable development.

Over the past years, the global challenges to sustainable development have been driven by a broad set of “megatrends”, such as changing demographic profiles, changing economic and social dynamics, advancements in technology and trends towards environmental deterioration. A better understanding of the linkages among these trends and the associated changes in economic, social and environmental conditions is needed. The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, from 20 to 22 June 2012, highlighted a range of interlinked challenges which call for priority attention, including decent jobs, energy, sustainable cities, food security and sustainable agriculture, water, oceans and disaster readiness. The present *Survey* focuses on three of these cross-sectoral issues with immediate implications for realizing sustainable development, namely: (a) sustainable cities, (b) food and nutrition security and (c) energy transformation. The other challenges are important, but a comprehensive discussion of them is beyond the scope of this research.

### 2.1 Strategies for pursuing sustainable development

Agenda 21 (United Nations, 1993) emphasized the interconnectiveness among the three dimensions of sustainable development. Its actual implementation, however, arguably did not occur in the integrated manner envisaged. While the Millennium Development Goals focused attention on selected social and human development priorities, the world today witnesses emerging new challenges, aggravated by multiple financial problems in the area of economic, food and energy crises, which have threatened the ability of all countries to achieve sustainable development. The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development reaffirmed the political commitments of the international community to pursue sustainable development, under the principles of Agenda 21, which includes the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, needs for inclusive strategies and technology innovation. The outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development provides guidance for achieving the transition to sustainable development as a means of increasing the well-being of current and future generations in all countries. Sustainable development strategies need to be inclusive and take special care of the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable. Strategies need to be ambitious, action-oriented and collaborative, taking into account different national circumstances.

There is need to systemically change consumption and production patterns, and might entail, inter alia, significant price corrections; encourage the preservation of natural endowments; reduce inequality; and strengthen economic governance. Such a process will need to minimize the types of consumption and production that have negative externalities, while simultaneously seeking to maximize the types of consumption and production that create positive externalities. Examples of minimizing negative externalities include reduction of environmental pollution, while examples of positive externalities include, for example, technology adaptation, reduction of food waste and enhanced energy efficiency. Technology certainly play a major role in this transformation. Changes in consumption patterns can drive the creation of new technologies necessary for sustainability and their adoption and diffusion at the desired pace. Success in bringing about these changes will require substantial reorganization of the economy and society and changes in lifestyles. Economic and financial incentives for the creation and adoption of new technologies will be needed which may include innovative policy reforms. Poverty eradication, changing unsustainable and promoting sustainable patterns of consumption and production, and protecting and managing the natural resource base of economic and social development is the major objectives of and essential requirements for sustainable development. In this large context, protection of climate and environment will need to be pursued as a universally shared goal. The global relocation of manufacturing and services sectors will also mean that

appropriate technical regulation and social standards need to be adopted by developing and developed countries, with technical and financial support for developing countries.

### 2.1.1 Ensuring food and nutrition security

It is essential to ensure that everyone in the world has access to enough nutritious food. The research, highlights the challenges in this regard and the changes to the food system that are needed to ensure food and nutrition security by 2050.

### 2.1.2 Export sophistication, growth and the middle-income trap

To sustain the development process, however, inside-the-frontier innovations are not enough. An emerging literature highlights the importance of capabilities and the need for Nigeria to progressively increase its capability to develop and diffuse new products (and processes) in order to achieve sustainable development (Nübler 2013). Hence, it is the ability of a society and of firms to accumulate skills and knowledge, to combine the productive knowledge of its individuals and to develop collective competencies that determines its ability to diversify and increase internal value added and so to produce goods that are progressively more sophisticated and competitive in international markets, challenging the advanced competitors on the technological frontier.

Structural change and the development of capabilities are nevertheless challenging endeavours. Changing the economic structure of the economy requires the acquisition and refinement of productive knowledge. A country cannot produce goods of which it has no knowledge, and it does not accumulate knowledge of products that it does not produce. Hausmann et al. (2011) acknowledge this, pointing out that countries move from the products that they already produce to others that are similar in terms of the knowledge required to produce them. Industrial development is assumed to be a gradual and path-dependent process, and countries are unable to jump into distant products.

### 2.1.3 Trade and industrial policies

One of the most difficult policy areas in economic debate on effective and balanced productive transformation is international trade. The literature on the links between trade openness, structural transformation and economic growth is vast. Very broadly, the evidence shows that most successful economies have used smart combinations of trade opening, export promotion, and support and protection for infant industries as part of a wider set of policies to stimulate structural transformation. Consequently, trade reforms should not be pursued as stand-alone goals and need to be accompanied by other policies: infrastructure, education and training, enterprise development, entrepreneurship, innovation, finance and indeed social policies (Jansen, Peters and Salazar-Xirinachs, 2011).

In a situation where trading advantages are created rather than given, and both economies of scale and learning are key to sustained growth and structural transformation, gaining market entry is a challenging exercise that depends not only, or even principally, on flows of foreign direct investment (FDI) but mostly on local firms emerging successfully from an expanding domestic market and connecting with regional and global value chains. Historical legacies can have long-run economic consequences, and “market forces do not select a single, predetermined outcome, instead they tend to preserve the established pattern, whatever that pattern may be” (Gomory and Baumol, 2000). This would suggest that a “win-win” outcome is just one among a range of possibilities in a more open trading system and that international market forces, in conjunction with varying national capabilities, can produce results that are beneficial for some but detrimental to others. Certainly, posing the policy issue as a contest between import substitution and export-led industrialization models is misleading.

The disparate experiences described in this paper reinforce the need for a strategic approach to trade policy and a close link between trade and competitiveness policies. In a number of the cases discussed, countries have followed the kind of shock therapy that was part of the Washington Consensus without concomitant attention to their dynamic competitiveness and have, as a result, discovered that the combination of rapid trade liberalization with limited public investment leads to serious bottlenecks in infrastructure and human capital and a deficient investment climate, and that, even when this policy approach generates static gains, it can also destroy existing industrial capacity and undermine prospects for future industrial development. The lesson seems to be that policy-makers need to develop balanced packages of trade and competitiveness measures, and that sequencing and timing issues are fundamental to successful outcomes, as are relationships with complementary structural policies, the development of education and skills, and the maintenance of competitive exchange rates.

## 3.0 Methodology

The paper is an empirical research work that make use of questionnaire. Hypothesis are formulated which were analyzed using SPSS. Pearson Correlation Test were equally conducted to determine the correlation between economic development cooperation among Nigerians and the level of sustainable development in Nigeria. Empirical economic modeling were established with the prior expectation to construct multiple regression.

### 3.1 Empirical Model

The research attempt to quantify the ways of achieving sustainable development and development cooperation in Nigeria, and therefore the researchers relied on empirical economic modeling with prior expectations to construct a multiple regression aimed at undertaken analysis by the use of Ordinary Least Square Procedure. The aim of this economic modeling is to offer quantitative measurements of the impacts of various variables on the development of Nigerian economy.

The Empirical Model takes the form:

Sustainable Development (SD) = Prices (P) + Economic Order (EO) + Tax Laws (TL) + Financial Crisis (FC) + Consumers real Income (CR) + Quality Job (QJ)+ Error).

Therefore,  $SD = \beta_0 + \beta_1EO + \beta_2TL + \beta_3FC + \beta_4CR + \beta_4QJ + \varepsilon$  ..... (1)

Sustainable Development adjustments result in adjustments in the following: adjustments in Food Prices, Economic Order, Tax Laws, Financial Crisis, consumers' real income, Quality Job.

Therefore, two equations are necessary but the direct equation which we are seeking is:

Development (**D**) = f (Cooperation (**C**)) and the Indirect equation is the one above.

Therefore,  $D = \beta_0 + \beta_1C + \epsilon$ ..... (2)

From the first model (1), we expect the independent variables to have a positive relationship with

Development in Nigeria with the exception of consumer's real income which has a negative relationship with Development.

The Pearson Correlation statistic used in this research tests the null hypothesis that samples in two or more groups are drawn from the same population.

The null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) will be that all sample means are equal ( $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3$ ).

The alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) is that at least one mean is different (Not  $H_0$ ).

Decision rules: If  $F_{obs}$  is greater or equal to  $F_{crit}$ , reject  $H_0$ , otherwise do not reject  $H_0$ .

If the decision is to reject the null, then at least one of the means is different. However, the omnibus Pearson Correlation does not tell you where the difference lies. For this, you need post-hoc tests.

#### 4 Results and Discussions

**Table 1: Responses on Attainment of Sustainable Development in Nigeria**

H1	Sustainable Development is attainable in Nigeria	1	2	3	4	5	Total
1	Rising food and energy prices are hitting hard on the livelihoods of poor and vulnerable people.	150	57	30	73	190	500
2	Our developmental goals could easily be reversed if we do not find workable solutions to the twin crises in the food and energy markets.	120	177	12	71	120	500
3	The profound threat of climate change and the deterioration of our natural environment.	80	27	5	177	211	500
4	No social or economic order is secure if it fails to benefit the majority of those who live under it.	99	85	11	105	200	500
5	The fact that Nigeria import almost everything including fuel	70	175	35	70	150	500
6	Non Patriotic attitude of the policy makers in Nigeria	200	230	10	33	27	500
7	Income inequality has been rising and has reached an extremely high level, invoking the specter of heightened tension and social conflict;	90	233	5	77	95	500
8	Recurrence of financial crises in the Nigerian financial system	25	100	15	171	189	500
9	The frequent changes in the tax laws makes Nigeria not a friendly Business environment	34	100	50	106	210	500
10	Lack of quality job among many Nigerians	56	120	24	70	230	500
	<b>Total Response</b>	<b>924</b>	<b>1304</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>953</b>	<b>1622</b>	<b>5000</b>
	<b>Percentage (%)</b>	<b>18.48</b>	<b>26.08</b>	<b>3.94</b>	<b>19.06</b>	<b>32.44</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Field Survey 2017

Table 1 above shows that 150, 57, 30, 73, and 190 of the respondents strongly disagree, disagree, not decided, agree and strongly agree respectively that sustainable development is attainable with Rising food and energy prices are hitting hard on the livelihoods of poor and vulnerable people. 120, 177, 12, 71 and 1200 of the respondents strongly disagree, disagree, not decided, agree and strongly agree respectively that Our developmental goals could easily be reversed if we do not find workable solutions to the twin crises in the food and energy markets. 80, 27, 5, 177 and 211 of the respondents strongly disagree, disagree, not decided, agree and strongly agree respectively that the profound threat of climate change and the deterioration of our natural environment affect sustainable development in Nigeria. 99, 85, 11, 105 and 200 of the respondents strongly disagree, disagree, not decided, agree and strongly agree respectively that No social or economic order is secure if it fails to benefit the majority of those who live under it. 70, 175, 35, 70 and 150 of the respondents strongly disagree, disagree, not decided, agree and strongly agree respectively that sustainability is attainable even with the fact that Nigeria import almost everything including fuel. 200, 230, 10, 33 and 27 of the respondents strongly disagree, disagree, not decided, agree and strongly agree respectively that Non Patriotic attitude of the policy makers in Nigeria affect sustainable development. 90, 233, 5, 77 and 95 of the respondents strongly disagree, disagree, not decided, agree and strongly agree respectively that Income inequality has been rising and has reached an extremely high level, invoking the specter of heightened tension and social conflict in Nigeria. 25, 100, 15, 171 and 189 of the respondents strongly disagree, disagree, not decided, agree and strongly agree respectively that sustainable development cannot be attained due to Recurrence of financial crises in the Nigerian financial system. 34, 100, 50, 106 and 210 of the respondents strongly disagree, disagree, not decided, agree and strongly agree respectively that the frequent changes in the tax laws makes Nigeria not a friendly Business environment. 56, 120, 24, 70 and 230 of the respondents strongly disagree, disagree, not decided, agree and strongly agree respectively that sustainable development is unattainable due to Lack of quality job among many Nigerians. In summary, 924 of the response representing 18.48% Strongly Disagree that sustainable development is attainable in Nigeria, 1304 of the response representing 26.08% Disagree that sustainable development is attainable in Nigeria, 197 of the response representing 3.94% didn't decided as to whether sustainable development is attainable in Nigeria or not, 953 of the response representing 19.06% agrees that sustainable development is attainable in Nigeria, while 1622 32.44% were in strong support that sustainable development is attainable in Nigeria.

**Table 2: Responses on Developmental Cooperation in Nigeria**

H2	The Development Cooperation cannot be Attained in Nigera	1	2	3	4	5	
1	The architecture of development cooperation is becoming more complex	100	77	30	103	190	500
2	Increase in food prices, climate change and the current economic slowdown	99	137	25	93	146	500
3	Procrastination will not make our problems go away.	80	27	5	177	211	500
4	Poverty is the ultimate systemic risk in Nigeria	99	85	11	105	200	500
5	The breeding ground for the proliferation of terrorism, armed conflict, environmental degradation, cross border diseases and organized crime	70	175	35	70	150	500
6	Reaching remote and deprived populations	130	150	10	150	60	500
7	Challenges in working together as one Nigeria	90	133	5	107	165	500
8	The private sector to support development either through core business activities, generating employment and wealth	25	100	15	171	189	500
9	A change in mindsets is needed in order for the business community to increasingly view the low income segment as real economic actors and desirable participants in the business process.	34	100	50	106	210	500
10	Weak correlation between strength and use of national systems	56	120	24	70	230	500
	<b>Total Response</b>	<b>783</b>	<b>1104</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>1152</b>	<b>1751</b>	<b>5000</b>
	<b>Percentage (%)</b>	<b>15.66</b>	<b>22.08</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>23.04</b>	<b>35.02</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Field Survey 2017

Table 2 shows that 100, 77, 30, 103, and 190 of the respondents strongly disagree, disagree, not decided, agree and strongly agree respectively that development cooperation cannot be attained in Nigeria. 99, 85, 11, 105 and 200 of the respondents strongly disagree, disagree, not decided, agree and strongly agree respectively that No social or economic order is secure if it fails to benefit the majority of those who live under it. 70, 175, 35, 70 and 150 of the respondents strongly disagree, disagree, not decided, agree and strongly agree respectively that sustainability is attainable even with the fact that Nigeria import almost everything including fuel. 200, 230, 10, 33 and 27 of the respondents strongly disagree, disagree, not decided, agree and strongly agree respectively that Non Patriotic attitude of the policy makers in Nigeria affect sustainable development. 90, 233, 5, 77 and 95 of the respondents strongly disagree, disagree, not decided, agree and strongly agree respectively that Income inequality has been rising and has reached an extremely high level, invoking the specter of heightened tension and social conflict in Nigeria. 25, 100, 15, 171 and 189 of the respondents strongly disagree, disagree, not decided, agree and strongly agree respectively that sustainable development cannot be attained due to Recurrence of financial crises in the Nigerian financial system. 34, 100, 50, 106 and 210 of the respondents strongly disagree, disagree, not decided, agree and strongly agree respectively that the frequent changes in the tax laws makes Nigeria not a friendly Business environment. 56, 120, 24, 70 and 230 of the respondents strongly disagree, disagree, not decided, agree and strongly agree respectively that sustainable development is unattainable due to Lack of quality job among many Nigerians. In summary, 924 of the response representing 18.48% Strongly Disagree that sustainable development is attainable in Nigeria, 1304 of the response representing 26.08% Disagree that sustainable development is attainable in Nigeria, 197 of the response representing 3.94% didn't decided as to whether sustainable development is attainable in Nigeria or not, 953 of the response representing 19.06% agrees that sustainable development is attainable in Nigeria, while 1622 32.44% were in strong support that sustainable development is attainable in Nigeria.



**Table 3: Correlations Matrix of Hypothesis 1**

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
Q1 Pearson Correlation	1	.892**	.826**	.959**	.926**	.727**	.821**	.896**	.940**	.967**
Q1 Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Q1 N	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Q2 Pearson Correlation	.892**	1	.799**	.865**	.938**	.753**	.946**	.861**	.859**	.821**
Q2 Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Q2 N	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Q3 Pearson Correlation	.826**	.799**	1	.893**	.820**	.580**	.753**	.926**	.906**	.840**
Q3 Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Q3 N	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Q4 Pearson Correlation	.959**	.865**	.893**	1	.890**	.706**	.800**	.917**	.967**	.970**
Q4 Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Q4 N	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Q5 Pearson Correlation	.926**	.938**	.820**	.890**	1	.730**	.904**	.846**	.886**	.869**
Q5 Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Q5 N	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Q6 Pearson Correlation	.727**	.753**	.580**	.706**	.730**	1	.773**	.639**	.678**	.697**
Q6 Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
Q6 N	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Q7 Pearson Correlation	.821**	.946**	.753**	.800**	.904**	.773**	1	.798**	.788**	.743**
Q7 Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
Q7 N	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Q8 Pearson Correlation	.896**	.861**	.926**	.917**	.846**	.639**	.798**	1	.957**	.897**
Q8 Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
Q8 N	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Q9 Pearson Correlation	.940**	.859**	.906**	.967**	.886**	.678**	.788**	.957**	1	.956**
Q9 Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
Q9 N	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Q10 Pearson Correlation	.967**	.821**	.840**	.970**	.869**	.697**	.743**	.897**	.956**	1
Q10 Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
Q10 N	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Extracted from IBM SPSS v20 Output, 2017.

**Table 4: Correlations Matrix of Hypothesis 2**

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
Q1 Pearson Correlation	1	.933**	.894**	.989**	.900**	.894**	.821**	.927**	.963**	.969**
Q1 Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Q1 N	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Q2 Pearson Correlation	.933**	1	.847**	.922**	.974**	.933**	.885**	.869**	.903**	.904**
Q2 Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Q2 N	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Q3 Pearson Correlation	.894**	.847**	1	.893**	.820**	.823**	.753**	.926**	.906**	.840**
Q3 Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Q3 N	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Q4 Pearson Correlation	.989**	.922**	.893**	1	.890**	.889**	.800**	.917**	.967**	.970**
Q4 Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Q4 N	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Q5 Pearson Correlation	.900**	.974**	.820**	.890**	1	.945**	.904**	.846**	.886**	.869**
Q5 Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Q5 N	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Q6 Pearson Correlation	.894**	.933**	.823**	.889**	.945**	1	.891**	.870**	.900**	.874**
Q6 Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
Q6 N	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Q7 Pearson Correlation	.821**	.885**	.753**	.800**	.904**	.891**	1	.798**	.788**	.743**
Q7 Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
Q7 N	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Q8 Pearson Correlation	.927**	.869**	.926**	.917**	.846**	.870**	.798**	1	.957**	.897**
Q8 Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
Q8 N	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Q9 Pearson Correlation	.963**	.903**	.906**	.967**	.886**	.900**	.788**	.957**	1	.956**
Q9 Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
Q9 N	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
Q10 Pearson Correlation	.969**	.904**	.840**	.970**	.869**	.874**	.743**	.897**	.956**	1
Q10 Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
Q10 N	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Extracted from IBM SPSS v20 Output, 2017.

#### 4.1 Descriptive Analysis

Based on the output of 2-Tailed Pearson Correlation Test carried out in the table 3 above, Q1 had a significant linear relationship of 0.892, 0.826, 0.959, 0.926, 0.727, 0.821, 0.896, 0.940 and 0.967 with Q2, Q3, Q4, Q5, Q6, Q7, Q8, Q9 and Q10 respectively. Q2 had a linear relationship of 0.892, 0.799, 0.865, 0.938, 0.753, 0.946, 0.861, 0.859 and 0.821 with Q1, Q3, Q4, Q5, Q6, Q7, Q8, Q9 and Q10 respectively.

#### 4.2 Test of Hypothesis

In accordance with the basic decision-making in the Pearson Correlation test carried out above, there is statistically significant linear relationship for all study variables being > 0.05, and also the direction of the relationship is positive. We can therefore, conclude that there is a positive correlation between the economic developmental and cooperation among Nigerians and Sustainable Development in Nigeria.

#### 5.0 Summary of Major Findings

From the analysis of data collected the following were found:

- i. Prices of food and energy in Nigeria is increasing, which is hitting hard on the livelihoods of the poor and vulnerable people.
- ii. That profound threat of climate change and deterioration of our natural environments affect sustainable development in Nigeria.
- iii. That sustainable development is unattainable with the fact that Nigeria depends on importation of essential commodities including fuel.
- iv. That non patriotic attitude of the policy makers in Nigeria affect sustainable development.
- v. It was equally found that income inequality has been rising and has reached an extreme level, invoking the specter of heightened tension and social conflict in Nigeria.
- vi. That sustainable development cannot be attained due to recurrence of financial crises in the Nigeria financial system.
- vii. That frequent changes in tax laws make Nigeria not to be a suitable business environment.

## 5.1 Conclusions and Recommendations

Successful developing countries progressively change their production structure, replacing low value added goods with more sophisticated activities and a wider array of products. As countries undergo this transformation, three important changes are seen. First, production diversification increases in line with rising income levels, but subsequently it slows down and then even reverses as countries become more specialized as they enter a post-industrial stage. Second, while investment becomes less important at high levels of income and the importance of innovation grows, for most developing countries operating inside the production frontier, the links between a rapid pace of investment and technological adaptation are crucial to successful diversification. Third, educational systems shift their focus along with structural changes in the economy, from developing workers' skills to adopt and adapt technology to preparing and enabling workers to develop new processes and products. These changes do not occur automatically, and, thus, many middle-income countries fail to increase the sophistication of their production and export structures. This in turn adversely affects growth performance.

An emerging literature identifies productive capabilities as the determinants and drivers of productive transformation dynamics and increasing export sophistication. Capabilities are not distributed exogenously, but they can be actively built up over time. Industrial policies in particular may play an important instrumental role, facilitating evolution of a knowledge structure that provides the options for moving along trajectories of progressive sophistication in the product space. Education and training policies are central to expanding the options for jumping into products and technologies that are more distant from the existing export structure (Nübler, 2013). Developing the right set of capabilities enables middle-income countries to move up the value chain and break into fast-growing markets for knowledge- and innovation-based products and services. The followings are some of the recommendations to the problems identified.

- i. Government should put in place price control on essential commodities to avoid persistence increase in price level.
- ii. Adequate measures should be put in place to cope with the effect of climate change.
- iii. Government should come up with policies that will encourage production and consumption of locally produce goods and services and discourage importation of essential items.
- iv. Nigerian populace should take a drastic measure to ensure that those to be elected as policies makers are of credible character and patriot that are capable of protecting the interest of the entire populace.
- v. That government at all level should come up with economic recovery plans that is capable of salvaging the financial system and entire economy at large.
- vi. Their should be consistency in the provision of tax laws to avoid the issue of multiple taxations, which In turns will pave way for foreign direct investments.

## References

- AfDB (2012), *Annual Development Effectiveness Review 2012, Growing African economies inclusively* (Tunis).
- Baldwin, R.E. (2012). *Global supply chains: Why they emerged, why they matter, and where they are going*, Discussion Paper No. 9103 (London, Centre for Economic Policy Research).
- ECA (2013), *Economic Report on Africa 2013 – Making the most of Africa's commodities: Industrializing for growth, jobs and economic transformation* (Addis Ababa).
- Gomory, R.E.; Baumol, W.J. (2000), *Global trade and conflicting national interest* (Cambridge, MA, MIT Press).
- Hausmann, R. et al. (2011). *The atlas of economic complexity: Mapping paths to prosperity* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University, Center for International Development, Harvard Kennedy School, and Macro Connections, Massachusetts Institute of Technology).
- ILO (2011), *Growth, employment and decent work in the least developed countries*, Report of the ILO for the Fourth UN Conference on the Least Developed Countries, May (Geneva).
- Jansen, M.; Peters, R.; Salazar-Xirinachs, J.M. (2011), *Trade and employment: From myths to facts* (Geneva, ILO).
- Lamy, P. (2012), *Report by the chairman of the trade negotiations committee* (Geneva, World Trade Organization). Available at: [http://www.wto.org/english/news\\_e/news12\\_e/gc\\_rpt\\_01may12\\_e.htm](http://www.wto.org/english/news_e/news12_e/gc_rpt_01may12_e.htm) [accessed 10 Oct. 2013].
- Nübler, I. (2013), *Education structures and industrial development: Lessons for education policies in African countries*, paper presented at the UNU-WIDER Conference on Learning to Compete: Industrial Development and Policy in Africa, Helsinki, Finland, 24–25 June.
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). (2013), *Is informal normal? Towards more and better jobs in developing countries* (Paris).
- OECD. (2012) *OECD employment outlook.*, Retrieved from <http://www.upf.edu/materials/bib/docs/3334/employ/employ12.pdf>
- UNCTAD (United Nations Commission on Trade and Development) (2013), *Strengthening linkages between domestic and foreign direct investment in Africa*, Note by the UNCTAD Secretariat, 17 Apr. (Geneva).
- World Bank (2013). *Africa's pulse*, Vol. 7, Apr. (Washington, DC).
- World Trade Organisation. World Trade Report (2010): *Trade in natural resources. 2010*, Retrieved from [http://www.wto.org/english/res\\_e/publications\\_e/wtr10\\_e.htm](http://www.wto.org/english/res_e/publications_e/wtr10_e.htm)