

The Effects of Abandoned Infrastructure Projects on Regional Development in Nigeria: An Empirical Investigation

Dr. Osasere Festus Imasuen

Department of Business Administration, Delta State University, Abraka, Delta State
imasuenfestus2012@yahoo.co.uk

Ubani Ajuzieogu Christian P.hD, Mnse

Mechanical Engineering department, Abia State Polytechnic, Aba, Nigeria
ajuzieogu.ubani@abiastatepolytechnic.edu.ng

Abstract: Background: Abandoned infrastructure projects have become a critical impediment to Nigeria's development agenda, affecting socio-economic progress and regional equity. Despite significant investment in public infrastructure, widespread abandonment remains prevalent across sectors and regions. This study investigates the socio-economic impacts, underlying causes, and regional variations of abandoned infrastructure projects in Nigeria, drawing insights from key stakeholders including government officials, contractors, and local communities. A mixed-methods approach was adopted. Quantitative data were collected through structured questionnaires distributed to 312 respondents across Nigeria's six geopolitical zones. Descriptive statistical analysis (mean, skewness, and kurtosis) was employed to measure perceptions and consensus levels. Complementing this, qualitative data were obtained via 30 in-depth interviews and focus group discussions, analyzed thematically. Results show that abandoned projects significantly hinder socio-economic development by disrupting transportation, limiting access to healthcare and education, and diminishing public trust. Key causes include political interference, corruption, underfunding, and weak institutional oversight. Regional disparities are driven by governance capacity, political alignment, and community involvement. The South West reported better project completion due to higher civic participation, while regions like the North East and South East suffer from poor oversight and political marginalization. Abandonment of infrastructure projects in Nigeria is both a symptom and a cause of deeper systemic failures. Strategic reforms in project planning, monitoring, and community engagement are crucial.

Key words: Abandoned projects, infrastructure, socio-economic impact, governance, regional disparity, political interference.



This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license

1. INTRODUCTION

Infrastructure development remains a vital catalyst for economic growth, social integration, and regional development, particularly in emerging economies such as Nigeria. Adequate infrastructure facilitates transportation, communication, access to markets, and the delivery of essential public services, all of which are instrumental in alleviating poverty and enhancing the quality of life (Calderón & Servén, 2010; World Bank, 2020). In Nigeria, despite significant budgetary allocations to infrastructure, there is an alarming prevalence of abandoned infrastructure projects. These abandoned projects, which range from roads, bridges, hospitals, housing schemes, to water facilities, are often scattered across various regions of the country, undermining the intended development objectives. The phenomenon raises critical questions about governance, resource allocation, and the developmental impact of such failures, especially in the context of Nigeria's persistent regional inequalities (Ezeokonkwo, 2017; Ibrahim & Ahmadu, 2020).

Studies have consistently shown that infrastructure abandonment can lead to direct economic losses, discourage investment, and perpetuate underdevelopment in affected regions (Adeniran & Ajakaiye, 2019; Omole, 2010). For instance, Olaseni and Alade (2012) argue that project abandonment in Nigeria is not just a technical or financial issue, but a deeply rooted systemic failure in planning, monitoring, and governance structures. Their research on urban infrastructure failures reveals how poor coordination among tiers of government and a lack of continuity between political regimes exacerbate the issue. Similarly, Ayodele and Alabi (2011) highlight how politically motivated project siting and a lack of feasibility studies often result in infrastructures that are misaligned with community needs, leading to non-utilization or abandonment. These findings are corroborated by Okonjo-Iweala and Osafo-Kwaako (2007), who emphasize that ineffective public procurement systems and weak institutional frameworks are significant barriers to sustained infrastructure delivery in Nigeria.

The impact of abandoned infrastructure is particularly severe in rural and semi-urban regions, where such projects are often the only potential lifeline to development. Empirical investigations by Nwankwo et al. (2016) and Oladipo and Olayemi (2020) show that incomplete road networks and healthcare centers have direct negative implications on health outcomes, access to education, agricultural productivity, and local commerce. This aligns with the argument by Adesanya (2011) that infrastructure not only provides the physical structures needed for development but also generates employment and stimulates secondary economic activities. Yet, when such projects are left incomplete, the communities suffer not only the loss of the direct benefits but also the economic opportunity costs of the unutilized capital.

A growing body of research attempts to link infrastructure failures to broader development issues, particularly regional disparities. For example, Ogun (2010) posits that regions with a high concentration of abandoned projects often exhibit higher poverty rates and lower human development indices, thereby exacerbating Nigeria's already entrenched geographical inequalities. This assertion finds support in the work of Akinola and Fakunle (2015), who examine how infrastructure development patterns correlate with regional socio-economic profiles. Their study suggests that abandonment further marginalizes already disadvantaged areas, contributing to a cycle of underdevelopment and social exclusion. Regional development, they argue, cannot be effectively pursued without a coherent and accountable approach to infrastructure delivery.

Political economy factors also play a critical role in the abandonment of infrastructure projects in Nigeria. Empirical studies by Iwuagwu (2016) and Ayoade (2019) explore the intersection between patronage politics and infrastructure deployment, revealing that many projects are initiated not based on need but as political gestures aimed at winning electoral support. Once the political utility of a project diminishes especially after a change in administration funding ceases

and work halts, often indefinitely. This political discontinuity is also noted by Okpala (2017), who finds that the non-institutionalization of development plans makes infrastructure projects vulnerable to regime changes. Such tendencies point to the systemic governance failures that lie at the heart of infrastructure abandonment.

The cost implications of project abandonment are profound, both financially and developmentally. Babalola and Ogunlade (2016) estimate that Nigeria loses billions of naira annually to abandoned federal and state projects. In their study, they highlight abandoned expressway and rail projects in the South-West as examples of public investments that failed to yield returns. Likewise, Bello and Oyekanmi (2018) argue that the costs go beyond sunk capital to include environmental degradation, loss of public trust, and community disillusionment. These authors emphasize the importance of value-for-money audits, transparency in contract awards, and post-implementation reviews as tools to mitigate abandonment and its consequences.

From a planning and policy perspective, scholars such as Abubakar and Doan (2010) argue for a holistic infrastructure governance framework that integrates community participation, inter-governmental coordination, and robust project lifecycle management. Their case studies of infrastructure implementation in Northern Nigeria reveal that when local communities are involved in the planning and monitoring stages, the likelihood of project success improves significantly. This is echoed in the work of Uchenna and Agbakwuru (2015), who find that participatory planning helps ensure that projects are contextually relevant, socially accepted, and sustainable in the long run. As such, abandonment is less likely when projects reflect real community needs and when stakeholders are invested in their completion.

While there is ample literature on infrastructure and regional development, a noticeable gap exists in the empirical linkage between abandoned infrastructure and regional development outcomes, particularly in Nigeria. Most studies, such as those by Ezeabasili et al. (2014) and Aliyu and Lawal (2019), tend to focus either on the causes of project abandonment or the economic benefits of infrastructure in general. Few adopt an integrated empirical approach to assess how the abandonment of infrastructure specifically impairs regional development indices like employment, poverty alleviation, and educational access. This lack of empirical synthesis limits both academic understanding and policy effectiveness, particularly in targeting developmental disparities between Nigeria's regions.

It is also crucial to recognize the role of regulatory and institutional capacity in addressing abandonment. Agbola and Jinadu (2016) note that in the absence of strong oversight agencies, accountability in infrastructure projects is often weak, allowing contractors and officials to divert funds or abandon sites without consequence. Their research into abandoned housing estates in Abuja shows how weak enforcement of planning regulations facilitates poor project delivery. Similar findings are echoed by Olaniyi et al. (2021), who assess the National Assembly's oversight functions and find them largely ineffective due to political interference and corruption. These structural deficiencies further deepen the crisis of abandoned infrastructure and hinder regional development efforts.

Given the importance of infrastructure to regional development and the widespread nature of abandonment across Nigeria, there is a pressing need for a comprehensive, empirically grounded investigation. This study seeks to fill this gap by systematically examining the effects of abandoned infrastructure projects on regional development in Nigeria. By integrating spatial, economic, and governance dimensions, the research aims to uncover how and why certain regions are more adversely affected, and what policy interventions could reverse the trend. The significance of this investigation lies not only in addressing a critical developmental challenge but also in providing evidence-based insights for future infrastructure planning, monitoring, and accountability mechanisms.

Statement of the Problem

Despite decades of public investment in infrastructure, Nigeria is riddled with abandoned projects that undermine the nation's socio-economic progress. From uncompleted highways to deserted hospitals and housing schemes, these failures contribute significantly to regional development disparities, yet they remain inadequately addressed in both academic research and policy frameworks (Olaseni & Alade, 2012; Ezeokonkwo, 2017). The persistence of project abandonment suggests systemic issues in planning, execution, monitoring, and governance (Ayodele & Alabi, 2011). Political transitions, corruption, poor feasibility studies, and lack of community involvement further exacerbate the trend (Iwuagwu, 2016; Omole, 2010). Despite this, there is a glaring gap in empirical studies quantifying how abandoned infrastructure projects directly impact regional development indicators such as income levels, employment, education, and access to services (Aliyu & Lawal, 2019).

Furthermore, current development policies often overlook the spatial consequences of project failures, resulting in neglected rural areas and widening regional inequality (Ogun, 2010; Akinola & Fakunle, 2015). The absence of a national database or accountability mechanism makes it difficult to track or revive abandoned projects, allowing public funds to be wasted without consequence (Babalola & Ogunlade, 2016). Therefore, this study seeks to fill this empirical and policy gap by investigating the multidimensional effects of abandoned infrastructure on regional development in Nigeria, with the goal of offering data-driven insights for reform. Without urgent action, the continued abandonment of infrastructure projects will remain a significant barrier to equitable and sustainable development.

Research Objectives

The primary objective of this study was to empirically examine the effects of abandoned infrastructure projects on regional development in Nigeria, specifically, the study wants to:

1. Assess the socio-economic impacts of abandoned infrastructure projects on regional development in Nigeria.
2. Identify the major causes and challenges associated with the abandonment of infrastructure projects across different regions.
3. Examine regional disparities in the incidence and consequences of infrastructure project abandonment in Nigeria.

Research Questions

To guide the study, the following research questions were formulated:

1. What are the socio-economic consequences of abandoned infrastructure projects on regional development indicators in Nigeria?
2. What are the underlying causes and challenges associated with the abandonment of infrastructure projects, and how are these challenges experienced and interpreted by key stakeholders?
3. How does the effect of abandoned infrastructure projects vary across different regions in Nigeria, and what explains these disparities?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Abandoned Infrastructure Projects

Abandoned infrastructure projects refer to systems such as roads, bridges, hospitals, schools, water supply schemes, and housing estates that were initiated but remain incomplete, non-operational, or unused long after the planned completion date. The literature highlights how

abandonment is not merely a physical phenomenon but emblematic of deeper institutional, financial, and governance breakdowns. Olaseni and Alade (2012) describe abandoned projects as “orphaned structures” that arise due to fundamentally flawed planning, inconsistent political support, and inadequate project continuity. These projects can persist in a partially built state for years, consuming public resources with no tangible benefit.

The causes of abandonment relate to several interlinked factors. Feasibility studies, when conducted, often lack thoroughness or fail to align with community needs (Ayodele & Alabi, 2011). Omole (2010) notes that assessments of technical requirements, environmental impact, and cost-benefit ratios are frequently superficial or tailored to justify politically motivated siting. This leads to the initiation of projects that, in reality, have no functional viability. In parallel, funding constraints are a central issue either due to under-budgeting or because initial allocations are diverted or evaporate amid changing political priorities (Ezeokonkwo, 2017). The governance and institutional environment plays a critical role. Alabi and Ayodele (2011) emphasize that weak oversight mechanisms, coupled with endemic corruption, allow contractors to deliver substandard work or disappear mid-stream. Iwuagwu (2016) shows how political patronage can dictate project locations, with those tied to influential politicians being more shielded at least initially from scrutiny. However, when political winds shift, so does the project’s fate, especially when support structures disappear.

Institutional discontinuity amplifies physical abandonment. Okpala (2017) outlines how major infrastructure initiatives frequently lack embedded succession planning. Consequently, incoming administrations whether at federal, state, or local levels do not feel accountable for predecessors’ projects, leaving many to languish. This deficit is compounded by the absence of national inventories or databases tracking projects across their lifecycles, rendering abandoned projects invisible in policy discourse (Babalola & Ogunlade, 2016). Despite the multifaceted drivers of abandonment, a key outcome is the erosion of public trust. Bello and Oyekanmi (2018) document how communities become increasingly distrustful of government during repeated cycles of start-and-abandon. This trust deficit undermines future public participation, weakening community monitoring and oversight. In turn, this creates a vicious cycle in which uncompleted projects are less likely to be flagged promptly, worsening inefficiencies.

Socio-economic Impacts of Abandoned Infrastructure Projects

Infrastructure is often regarded as the backbone of socio-economic development, providing essential services, stimulating economic activities, and improving quality of life. When such projects are abandoned, the resulting socio-economic consequences can be severe and multidimensional. In Nigeria, abandoned infrastructure projects disrupt development trajectories, especially in underserved regions where infrastructure gaps are already acute. According to the World Bank (2020), poorly maintained or incomplete infrastructure contributes to underdevelopment by restricting access to markets, limiting education and health outcomes, and discouraging private investment.

One of the most direct socio-economic impacts of abandoned infrastructure projects is on employment and local livelihoods. Large-scale infrastructure projects such as roads, bridges, and irrigation schemes typically create jobs during both construction and operation phases. When these projects are prematurely halted, communities not only lose employment opportunities but also experience income shocks, particularly in rural areas where alternative sources of income may be limited (Ogunleye & Adeniyi, 2019). In regions like the Niger Delta, where abandoned projects are widespread, local populations have expressed frustration at lost opportunities and unfulfilled development promises (Akinyemi & Adebayo, 2021). Healthcare delivery and education also suffer significantly from abandoned infrastructure. For instance, uncompleted hospitals or health centres in remote areas mean communities continue to rely on substandard or far-away facilities, thus increasing morbidity and mortality (Obiegbu, 2020). Similarly,

uncompleted schools hinder access to education, especially for children in rural or low-income regions. Adefemi and Oyelade (2018) found that abandoned educational infrastructure in northern Nigeria contributed to rising dropout rates and worsening literacy outcomes.

Abandonment also introduces inefficiencies into regional economies. Incomplete roads, for example, increase transportation costs and travel times, disrupt supply chains, and discourage investment in agriculture and small-scale manufacturing (Onyema & Okafor, 2021). Moreover, unfinished or idle assets such as industrial parks or markets represent sunk costs with no productive return, thereby reducing the potential for local economic diversification (Chukwuemeka & Uche, 2017). This deprives communities of critical infrastructure that could stimulate microenterprise development and regional trade. Another consequence is the psychological and social toll on communities. Prolonged exposure to abandoned projects generates feelings of neglect and disillusionment, eroding social cohesion and trust in government institutions (Nwachukwu & Egwuonwu, 2021). Abandoned structures can also become sites for criminal activities or environmental hazards, such as stagnant water that breeds disease vectors (Aluko & Adeyemi, 2016).

Governance and Institutional Factors Contributing to Infrastructure Abandonment

Governance and institutional performance are widely recognized as foundational elements in the success or failure of infrastructure delivery, particularly in developing countries like Nigeria. A major theme that recurs in the literature on project abandonment is the weakness of governance structures and institutional capacity, which often fail to ensure project continuity, transparency, and accountability. In Nigeria, public infrastructure delivery is marred by administrative inefficiencies, politicization, corruption, and lack of proper legal frameworks that can safeguard projects through changes in political administration (Ilesanmi & Fadare, 2019; Ezeabasili & Mbakwe, 2021).

One core governance challenge is the frequent policy discontinuity that accompanies political transitions. When new governments assume office, they often abandon their predecessors' infrastructure projects, regardless of their importance or near-completion status, primarily to discredit opposition administrations and justify new spending (Ogunyemi, 2017). This pattern of politicization undermines long-term planning and reflects the absence of institutional mechanisms to insulate infrastructure projects from political cycles. Adebayo and Oladipo (2020) argue that the absence of legally binding frameworks to enforce continuity of strategic infrastructure projects is a major flaw in Nigeria's federal and state governance systems.

Another prominent issue is the endemic corruption in public procurement and project execution. Projects are often awarded based on patronage rather than competence, resulting in contractors with inadequate capacity receiving large contracts, which subsequently become stalled or abandoned (Ocheni & Nwankwo, 2012). Reports from the Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Commission (ICPC) and Nigeria's Bureau of Public Procurement indicate that inflated contracts, ghost projects, and diversion of funds are widespread (ICPC, 2022). Corruption also affects the monitoring and evaluation processes, as oversight agencies are either understaffed, underfunded, or compromised by political interests (Magu & Yusuf, 2019).

Institutional fragmentation further exacerbates abandonment. Many infrastructure projects involve multiple layers of government federal, state, and local with overlapping responsibilities. Without effective coordination, jurisdictional ambiguities arise, delaying approvals, payments, and conflict resolution (Ademiluyi, 2010). Similarly, the absence of a national database or centralized monitoring platform contributes to mismanagement, as there is no reliable system to track the status or progress of projects across regions (Usman & Olowu, 2018). Bureaucratic inefficiency is also a significant contributor. Delays in fund disbursement, administrative bottlenecks in procurement, and slow response times from public agencies create an environment where projects

are likely to stall (Onyemenam & Odigie, 2021). Even when projects are initiated with good intentions, a sluggish administrative structure weakens execution and encourages abandonment.

Regional Development and Spatial Disparities in Nigeria

Regional development in Nigeria is deeply shaped by historical, political, and structural inequalities, resulting in stark spatial disparities in infrastructure, economic performance, and human development. These regional imbalances are not merely incidental; they are embedded in the political economy of resource distribution, policy implementation, and socio-economic planning. Literature on Nigerian development repeatedly points to a persistent North-South divide, as well as rural-urban disparities, both of which influence the prevalence and impact of abandoned infrastructure projects (Ikeanyibe, 2013; Ezeani & Nwankwo, 2019).

The concept of regional development entails equitable distribution of economic and social benefits across geographic areas to minimize inequalities and promote inclusive growth (Rodríguez-Pose, 2013). In Nigeria, however, regional development policies have often been undermined by centralization, favoritism, and inconsistent implementation. For instance, Adeyemi and Akinyele (2020) observed that infrastructural development disproportionately favors politically connected regions, while marginalized areas particularly in the North-East and parts of the Niger Delta continue to suffer neglect, compounding historical underdevelopment.

A significant contributor to regional disparities is the uneven allocation of public investment. Empirical studies reveal that regions with greater political influence or representation at the federal level tend to attract more infrastructural projects and budgetary allocations (Olojede & Akinbode, 2016). However, the irony lies in the fact that even in politically favored regions, infrastructure projects often become abandoned due to poor planning or governance failures, leaving intended beneficiaries worse off. In contrast, neglected regions not only receive fewer projects but also experience higher abandonment rates due to weak local oversight and limited capacity for project monitoring (Olaopa & Ajayi, 2021).

Rural-urban disparities also play a central role in shaping the spatial distribution of development. Urban areas particularly state capitals and federal hubs like Lagos and Abuja receive substantial infrastructure investments, while rural communities lack roads, schools, and health centers (Ogunleye et al., 2017). Even when projects are initiated in rural areas, they are often left incomplete due to inadequate follow-up, logistical challenges, or lack of political will. According to Udeh and Umeh (2021), rural infrastructure abandonment contributes to sustained poverty, food insecurity, and migration pressures, thereby aggravating urban congestion.

Another dimension of regional disparity is environmental and topographical challenges, particularly in regions like the South-South, where swampy terrain increases construction costs and delays project execution (Effiom & Essien, 2018). Without adequate project adaptation to local geographies, abandonment becomes more likely. Furthermore, insurgency and insecurity in regions like the North-East also hinder project completion, as contractors withdraw due to threats or logistical constraints (Arowolo & Lawal, 2020). Regional development is therefore deeply intertwined with infrastructure outcomes. As highlighted by Olowu (2015), sustainable regional development cannot occur in an environment where infrastructure is haphazard, inequitable, or abandoned. The current study emphasizes this relationship by empirically linking abandoned infrastructure to patterns of regional inequality and by exploring how spatial disparities shape both the incidence and consequences of abandonment.

Infrastructure Planning and Policy Failures in Nigeria

Infrastructure planning and policy formulation are central to the success of national development strategies, yet in Nigeria, these elements have consistently fallen short of their developmental purpose. The high incidence of abandoned infrastructure projects is strongly correlated with

systemic weaknesses in project planning, policy formulation, and implementation processes. Inadequate feasibility studies, unrealistic timelines, poor stakeholder engagement, and lack of continuity mechanisms are just some of the recurring themes in the literature on Nigeria's infrastructure policy failure (Omole & Olayiwola, 2017; Bello & Fatile, 2020).

One of the primary planning-related failures is the widespread lack of rigorous project preparation. Many infrastructure projects in Nigeria are initiated without comprehensive needs assessments, environmental impact analyses, or stakeholder consultations. This often leads to misaligned projects that do not reflect the actual priorities or capacities of the host communities (Ojo & Fagbenro, 2018). As a result, such projects either stall mid-way or are abandoned outright when challenges arise. According to Salami and Adeyemo (2021), over 60% of infrastructure projects initiated between 2000 and 2020 lacked complete technical and financial feasibility studies before approval.

Another major weakness is the prevalence of fragmented planning and the absence of coherent national infrastructure policy frameworks. Unlike countries with centralized infrastructure planning authorities, Nigeria operates a dispersed system where multiple agencies independently initiate and manage projects, often leading to duplication, inconsistency, and misallocation of resources (Isah & Bamidele, 2022). This fragmented structure makes it difficult to ensure alignment between federal, state, and local projects and reduces the potential for synergistic development. For instance, road projects started by federal ministries often overlap with similar initiatives by state governments, resulting in waste and, in many cases, abandonment when funding conflicts arise (Agunbiade & Olumide, 2020).

Funding uncertainty is another manifestation of planning failure. Infrastructure budgets are frequently overestimated and poorly structured, leading to mid-project financial exhaustion. In many cases, disbursements are delayed or never materialize due to revenue shortfalls, debt burdens, or political shifts (Okoye & Achakpa, 2019). These financial instabilities are rarely accounted for in the original planning stages, pointing to a broader issue of unrealistic budgeting and lack of risk mitigation strategies. In addition, the absence of performance monitoring and feedback systems further exacerbates policy inefficiency, as there is no reliable mechanism to assess or adjust failing projects (Alemika & Jibrin, 2021).

The regulatory environment also contributes to the dysfunction. The infrastructure policy space is governed by overlapping legal instruments that are often outdated or weakly enforced. This legal ambiguity creates loopholes that contractors and officials exploit to delay, divert, or abandon projects with little consequence (Ekong & Etim, 2020). Furthermore, public procurement policies, though designed to enhance transparency and competitiveness, are frequently circumvented, leading to inflated contracts and unqualified contractors who are ill-equipped to execute complex projects.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design: This study adopted a mixed-methods research design, combining both quantitative and qualitative approaches to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the effects of abandoned infrastructure projects on regional development in Nigeria. The rationale for this design stemmed from the need to obtain statistical insights into patterns of abandonment and their socio-economic effects, while also capturing contextual narratives from stakeholders through interviews and focus group discussions.

Study Area: The study was conducted across Nigeria, a country located in West Africa and comprising 36 states and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja. For analytical depth and national representativeness, the study focused on the six geopolitical zones of Nigeria: North Central, North East, North West, South East, South South, and South West. Each zone represents a unique combination of political history, ethnic composition, economic activity, and

infrastructural challenges. Two states were purposively selected from each zone based on the prevalence of abandoned infrastructure projects, levels of socio-economic development, and accessibility for data collection. In the North Central, states such as Kogi and Benue were selected. The North East, particularly Borno and Bauchi States. In the North West, Kano and Kaduna were chosen. The South East, represented by Anambra and Ebonyi, the South South, including Rivers and Delta States, and lastly, the South West, notably Lagos and Ondo States, was selected to reflect both urbanized infrastructure dynamics and the rural neglect that leads to abandonment. These states encapsulate the diversity of Nigeria's infrastructural, political, and socio-economic conditions. The study area was carefully chosen to reflect key factors influencing regional development: population density, ethnic diversity, availability of federal and state-level capital projects, urban-rural divides, and the impact of governance quality.

Population of the Study: The population of this study consisted of 2,500 stakeholders directly or indirectly involved in the planning, execution, abandonment, and management of infrastructure projects across selected regions in Nigeria. This population included key actors at the federal, state, and local government levels, alongside community stakeholders, civil society organizations, private sector contractors, and residents impacted by abandoned infrastructure projects. At the institutional level, the population included staff and officials from relevant ministries, departments, and agencies (MDAs), such as the Federal Ministry of Works and Housing, State Ministries of Infrastructure, Budget and Planning Commissions, and local government authorities. At the community level, the population encompassed traditional rulers, community development associations (CDAs), town union leaders, village heads, and affected beneficiaries of the abandoned projects. The population also included contractors and project consultants, many of whom had been directly engaged in the construction and management of the infrastructure in question. To enhance inclusiveness and contextual understanding, civil society organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were also part of the population, and lastly, journalists and media professionals who reported on public news were also considered part of the population.

Population Distribution: The distribution of the study population was strategically aligned with six geopolitical zones, North Central, North East, North West, South East, South South, and South West to ensure national representativeness and balance. Within each selected zone, two states with a high incidence of abandoned infrastructure projects were purposively chosen based on data from the Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission (ICRC) and the Bureau of Public Procurement (BPP). For each selected state, specific Local Government Areas (LGAs) were identified where significant abandoned infrastructure projects such as hospitals, roads, schools, water schemes, and housing units were located. However, the population distribution was also stratified by stakeholder roles, ensuring proportional representation from public officials, technical contractors, and affected residents. For instance, in each LGA, no fewer than: 5 – respondents were drawn from local government administrative staff; 8 – from traditional or community leadership; 10 – from households directly impacted by the abandoned projects; 4 – from relevant state-level infrastructure ministries; 2 – from contractors or construction firms; 2 – from civil society monitoring bodies. This structured distribution allowed for both vertical (across governance levels) and horizontal (across stakeholder types) representation.

Sampling Technique and Sample Size Determination:

The study employed a multi-stage sampling technique to ensure inclusivity, representativeness, and precision in capturing the complex dynamics surrounding abandoned infrastructure projects across the six geopolitical zones. The sampling process involved four key stages, combining purposive, stratified, and random sampling approaches to draw a valid and reliable sample from a diverse population. In the **first stage**, a purposive sampling technique was used to select two states from each of six geopolitical zones. The selection criteria were based on the prevalence of abandoned infrastructure projects, diversity of project types (e.g., health, education, roads), and

ease of access for data collection. Secondary data sources such as reports from the BPP, ICRC, and media coverage. In the **second stage**, specific LGAs within each selected state were identified using both purposive and convenience sampling methods. A minimum of three LGAs per state were chosen to reflect both urban and rural perspectives. The **third stage** involved stratified sampling, where the population was divided into distinct stakeholder categories based on their roles and relationships with the infrastructure projects. These included: government officials (federal, state, and local), community leaders and members, contractors and project consultants, civil society actors, media practitioners, and beneficiaries of abandoned projects. In the **final stage**, simple random sampling was applied within each stakeholder stratum to select individual participants.

The sample size for the quantitative survey was calculated using Yamane's (1967) formula for determining sample size:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where: n = sample size; N = population size (2,500); and e = level of precision (0.05).

$$n = \frac{2,500}{1 + 2,500(0.05)^2} = \frac{2,500}{1 + 6.25} = \frac{2,500}{7.25} = 345$$

For the qualitative component, 30 key informants were purposively selected across all regions. These included top-level policymakers, directors from ministries, senior engineers, project managers, traditional rulers, and NGO leaders. Their selection was based on their expertise, institutional roles, and community standing, ensuring that the interviews yielded in-depth contextual insights into the systemic challenges and consequences of abandoned projects.

Instruments for Data Collection: Two primary instruments were used for data collection: a structured questionnaire and an interview guide to capture both quantitative and qualitative data. The questionnaire captured quantitative data on perceived socio-economic impacts, institutional effectiveness, and stakeholder engagement levels. It was divided into five key sections. Items in the questionnaire were closed-ended and measured using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." Also, the questionnaire was administered in both print and digital formats (via Google Forms) to enhance accessibility and convenience across urban and rural communities. The semi-structured interview guide was used to elicit deeper qualitative insights from key informants. This instrument was used during in-depth interviews with government officials, contractors, traditional leaders, civil society actors, and subject matter experts. Interviews were conducted face-to-face where feasible and virtually (via Zoom, Skype, or telephone) where physical access was restricted due to distance or insecurity. Each session lasted between 30 and 60 minutes and was audio-recorded with the consent of the participant for later transcription and analysis.

Validity and Reliability of Instruments: To ensure content and construct validity, the instruments were reviewed by experts in development studies, public policy, and infrastructure planning. A pilot study was conducted in two non-sampled states, and necessary adjustments were made based on feedback. For reliability, the internal consistency of the questionnaire was tested using Cronbach's Alpha, which returned a coefficient of 0.81, indicating high reliability. Interview guides were also tested for clarity and responsiveness before full deployment.

Procedure for Data Collection: Data collection was conducted over a period of three months. Trained research assistants administered the questionnaires in person, ensuring proper interpretation where necessary. Interviews were conducted both face-to-face and via virtual platforms (Zoom and Skype), depending on the availability and location of respondents. Ethical

protocols, including informed consent, voluntary participation, and confidentiality, were strictly adhered to. Voice recordings of interviews were made with participants' consent and later transcribed for analysis.

Data Analysis Techniques: Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (mean, frequency, standard deviation). Qualitative data were analyzed using thematic analysis, involving open and axial coding to identify recurring patterns and emergent themes. NVivo software supported the organization and retrieval of qualitative data during coding.

Ethical Considerations: Before the administration of all instruments, participants were informed about the purpose of the study, their rights to confidentiality, and the voluntary nature of participation. Informed consent was obtained in writing or verbally, depending on literacy levels. No personally identifiable information was disclosed in any reports or analysis.

4. Data Analysis and Discussion

4.1 Descriptive Analysis of Questionnaire Administration

The table 4.1 presents the frequency and percentage of questionnaire administration outcomes for the study. A total of 345 questionnaires were distributed to selected respondents.

Table 4.1: Questionnaire Administration Summary

Items	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Total Questionnaires Distributed	345	100%
Returned and Valid (Completed)	312	90.4%
Returned but Incomplete	18	5.2%
Not Returned	15	4.4%

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Out of the 345 questionnaires distributed for the study, 312 were returned and valid, accounting for 90.4% of the total, which indicates a very high response rate and enhances the reliability of the data. Another 18 questionnaires (5.2%) were returned but found incomplete or unusable due to missing data or invalid responses. Only 15 questionnaires (4.4%) were not returned, showing minimal attrition. The high return rate reflects effective fieldwork coordination, proper follow-up, and respondent engagement strategies during data collection.

4.2 Demographic Analysis of Respondents Characteristics

The demographic characteristics of the respondents were analyzed to understand the composition of the sample in terms respondents. The table 4.2 below presents the descriptive statistics.

Table 4.2: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents (n = 312)

Item	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	176	56.41%
	Female	136	43.59%
Age Group	18–30 years	84	26.92%
	31–40 years	102	32.69%
	41–50 years	70	22.44%
	51 years and above	56	17.95%
Marital Status	Single	98	31.41%
	Married	172	55.13%
	Divorced/Widowed	42	13.46%
Educational Level	Primary	24	7.69%
	Secondary	78	25.00%

	Tertiary	168	53.85%
	Postgraduate	42	13.46%
Occupation	Civil Servant	96	30.77%
	Self-employed	72	23.08%
	Private sector worker	54	17.31%
	Unemployed	54	17.31%
	Artisan/Farmer	36	11.54%
Zone of Residence	North Central	50	16.03%
	North East	48	15.38%
	North West	50	16.03%
	South East	54	17.31%
	South South	58	18.59%
	South West	52	16.67%
Key Informants Profile (n = 30)			
Category		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Government Officials		10	33.33%
Contractors/Project Consultants		6	20.00%
Traditional Leaders		5	16.67%
Civil Society Representatives		5	16.67%
Subject Experts/Academics		4	13.33%

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 4.2 data shows that the gender ratio shows moderate male dominance (56.41%), though female representation is relatively strong at 43.59%, supporting gender-inclusive insights. Most respondents are within the economically active age range (18–50 years), with a peak concentration in the 31–40 age bracket (32.69%). A significant number are married (55.13%), which could influence their concern about long-term regional development issues. Educationally, a strong majority (67.31%) possess tertiary or postgraduate qualifications, suggesting a relatively informed sample. Occupationally, civil servants (30.77%) and self-employed individuals (23.08%) dominate the sample, which is ideal for exploring both policy and grassroots perspectives. The distribution across Nigeria's six geopolitical zones is also well-balanced, allowing for comparative regional analysis. The 30 key informants included a strategic mix of policymakers, contractors, civil society actors, and traditional leaders, ensuring rich qualitative insight into the causes, effects, and governance implications of abandoned projects.

4.3 Answering Research Questions

Research Question 1: How do abandoned infrastructure projects affect socio-economic development in Nigeria, and how do stakeholders perceive these impacts? In order to answer the research question, descriptive analysis was performed on the data collected (Table 4.3.1).

Table 4.3.1: Effect of abandoned infrastructure projects on socio-economic development

Item	Mean	Std.Dev.	Skewness	Kurtosis
Abandoned projects reduce access to healthcare services	4.236	0.842	-1.121	2.305
Incomplete roads hinder local transportation and logistics	4.385	0.793	-1.306	2.764
Job creation is negatively impacted by project abandonment	4.103	0.881	-0.974	2.020
Community morale and social cohesion decline as a result	3.846	1.005	-0.654	1.368

Educational infrastructure abandonment disrupts school access	4.167	0.871	-1.084	2.441
Local businesses suffer due to incomplete market/utility projects	4.231	0.821	-1.091	2.516
Abandonment leads to mistrust in government and civic institutions	4.295	0.797	-1.252	2.843

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The findings in table 4.3.1 reveal a consistently high mean score across all seven items (all above 3.80), indicating strong agreement among respondents that abandoned infrastructure projects significantly hinder socio-economic development. The highest mean (4.385) is linked to disruptions in transportation, while the lowest (3.846) reflects declining social cohesion. The negative skewness values across all items suggest responses are concentrated toward the higher end of the scale (strong agreement). Kurtosis values above 2.0 on most items indicate that responses were tightly clustered, reflecting strong consensus on the negative impacts. These patterns confirm that project abandonment is widely perceived as a serious barrier to economic mobility, social services access, and trust in governance.

To complement the quantitative analysis, the qualitative thematic analysis of interviews and focus group discussions uncovered several dominant themes related to Research Question 1:

Economic Stagnation: Participants across all zones emphasized that abandoned projects disrupt job creation, especially those involving roads, markets, etc. One civil society leader from South East remarked,

“We were promised that this agro-processing center would employ our youths, but since the project was abandoned, many have left the community.”

Public Service Breakdown: Key informants from North Central and South West pointed out that the abandonment of schools, hospitals, and water schemes has directly led to reduced quality of life and overburdened existing facilities.

Social Disillusionment and Distrust: Several FGD participants expressed deep frustration and civic apathy, stating that repeated abandonment of projects has made people doubt future government initiatives. A traditional ruler from North East stated,

“People no longer believe in the government. They say, ‘why bother voting when the projects never get finished?’”

Loss of Investment Confidence: Contractors and consultants noted that infrastructure gaps caused by abandonment make communities less attractive to private investors and NGOs, worsening unemployment and poverty.

Regional Inequality: Some respondents perceived a political bias in project abandonment, noting that regions aligned with opposition parties often suffered more neglected infrastructure, deepening regional disparity.

Research Question 2: What are the underlying causes and challenges associated with the abandonment of infrastructure projects, and how are these challenges experienced and interpreted by key stakeholders? In order to answer the research question, descriptive analysis was performed on the data collected (Table 4.3.2).

Table 4.3.2: Causes and challenges associated with infrastructure projects abandonment

Item	Mean	Std.Dev.	Skewness	Kurtosis
Poor project funding and delayed payments lead to abandonment	4.356	0.754	-1.276	2.732

Political interference and changes in government derail projects	4.423	0.718	-1.398	3.104
Corruption and misappropriation of funds are key causes	4.397	0.775	-1.211	2.524
Lack of continuity during political transitions affects completion	4.231	0.834	-1.138	2.138
Weak monitoring and evaluation mechanisms contribute significantly	4.013	0.907	-0.823	1.842
Inadequate feasibility studies cause technical execution failures	3.865	0.939	-0.654	1.675
Bureaucratic bottlenecks and institutional inefficiencies hinder progress	4.244	0.819	-1.016	2.318

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The findings in table 4.3.2 shows that respondents strongly perceive political interference (Mean = 4.423) and corruption (Mean = 4.397) as the most critical underlying causes of project abandonment, closely followed by funding delays (Mean = 4.356) and institutional inefficiencies. All items demonstrate negative skewness (skewed left), indicating respondents predominantly agreed with the statements. Kurtosis values over 2.0 for most items suggest strong consensus. Items related to technical and bureaucratic challenges (like feasibility issues and monitoring) had slightly lower means but still reflected considerable concern.

To complement the quantitative analysis, the qualitative thematic analysis of interviews and focus group discussions revealed several themes related to Research Question 2:

Political Discontinuity and Patronage Systems: Government officials, especially from South West and North Central, emphasized that projects are often abandoned when new administrations take office, especially those initiated by opponents. A former commissioner noted:

“New governors often cancel ongoing projects to initiate their own for credit and political relevance.”

Chronic Underfunding and Late Budget Releases: Contractors cited irregular and delayed payments from government ministries. Some confirmed that mobilization fees are often paid late, while certificates of completion remain unpaid for months:

“We stopped work when payment delays made it impossible to pay our workers and suppliers,” said a contractor from North East.”

Corruption and Procurement Fraud: Many respondents linked abandonment to kickbacks, inflated contracts, and ghost projects. Civil society actors reported that multiple layers of intermediaries inflate costs, leaving little for actual execution:

“There’s a chain of compromise from the planning to the contract award stage,” said a CSO leader in South South.”

Institutional Weakness and Lack of Oversight: Technical officers and local government staff pointed to the absence of project monitoring units, poor inter-agency collaboration, and lack of real-time audits as key weaknesses:

“Some projects don’t even have baseline data or proper documentation,” noted a project engineer.”

Lack of Community Inclusion and Ownership: In FGDs, many communities said they were not consulted in project planning. As a result, projects are abandoned because they do not serve actual community needs or face local resistance:

“They built a health center here with no road, no staff. We told them from the start it wouldn’t work,” said a traditional leader in South East.”

Research Question 3: How does the effect of abandoned infrastructure projects vary across different regions in Nigeria, and what explains these disparities? In order to answer the research question, descriptive analysis was performed on the data collected (Table 4.3.3).

Table 4.3.3: Effect of abandoned infrastructure projects vary across different regions

Item	Mean	Std.Dev.	Skewness	Kurtosis
Project abandonment is more frequent in regions with weaker governance structures	4.256	0.814	-1.093	2.531
Some regions experience neglects due to political misalignment with the central government	4.218	0.836	-1.167	2.716
Geography and terrain contribute to project abandonment	3.872	0.942	-0.654	1.603
Community involvement affects the sustainability of infrastructure projects	4.090	0.889	-0.892	2.208
States with more autonomous budgetary control manage projects more effectively	3.833	0.978	-0.724	1.754
Projects are more likely to be completed in regions with strong traditional institutions	3.756	0.993	-0.512	1.486
Local political will influences project monitoring and accountability	4.167	0.846	-1.011	2.464

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The findings in table 4.3.3 suggests that respondents widely agree that governance structure, political alignment, and community involvement significantly influence both the incidence and impact of project abandonment. The highest mean scores (4.256 and 4.218) indicate strong agreement that abandonment is more frequent in regions with weaker institutions and political marginalization. While geographical and environmental factors are also seen as relevant (Mean = 3.872), they rank slightly lower in perceived importance. Responses show a negative skew (leaning toward agreement) and moderate-to-high kurtosis, reflecting strong consensus among respondents.

To complement the quantitative analysis, the qualitative thematic analysis of interviews and focus group discussions revealed several themes related to Research Question 3:

Governance Capacity and Oversight Gaps: Respondents in the North East and South East emphasized that weak project oversight and bureaucratic fragmentation at the state level were significant drivers of abandonment. A government official in Gombe noted:

“There’s no single database of ongoing projects. Ministries work in silos.”

Political Marginalization: Participants in opposition-aligned states, particularly in the South East and North Central, reported a perceived bias in federal resource allocation. A civil society actor in Enugu stated:

“Projects started by the previous administration are left uncompleted because of party politics.”

Geography and Physical Terrain: In riverine South South and hilly North Central communities, infrastructure projects—especially roads and bridges were often abandoned due to engineering complexity and inaccessibility during rainy seasons:

“Contractors abandon projects during floods and never return,” said a community leader in Bayelsa.”

Community Participation and Ownership: In the South West, especially Lagos and Ogun, respondents highlighted higher community engagement and local project co-funding as reasons for better completion rates:

“We don’t wait for government alone we support schools and water projects,” said a traditional ruler in Ogun.”

Traditional Leadership and Informal Institutions: In the North West, strong emirate systems were reported to enforce community accountability and oversight, contributing to project continuity:

“When the Emir supports a project, everyone ensures it is done,” noted a contractor in Kano.”

Local Political Will and Media Scrutiny: Stakeholders in urban areas like Abuja and Lagos reported that media pressure and public activism forced governments to complete projects. Conversely, rural communities without such visibility suffered prolonged neglect.

4.4 Discussion of Findings

Effect of abandoned Infrastructure Projects on Socio-Economic Development in Nigeria

The findings of the descriptive and qualitative analyses strongly affirm that abandoned infrastructure projects have far-reaching negative implications for socio-economic development in Nigeria. The consistently high mean values across all items (above 3.80), with the highest being 4.385 for transport disruption, demonstrate the perceived criticality of these impacts. The negative skewness and high kurtosis scores further reflect broad consensus among stakeholders on the severity of the issue. This aligns with earlier assertions by Calderón & Servén (2010) and World Bank (2020) that infrastructure is foundational to development, and its absence or failure significantly restricts access to essential services and economic mobility. The qualitative narratives reinforce the quantitative findings. Stakeholders from civil society, local government, and traditional institutions emphasized themes of economic stagnation, decline in public services, loss of trust, and disillusionment. These lived experiences echo the work of Olaseni and Alade (2012) and Ezeokonkwo (2017), who describe abandoned projects as symptomatic of systemic planning and governance failures. Notably, uncompleted roads and transport systems disrupt mobility and market access, confirming Onyema & Okafor (2021) and Adesanya (2011), who argue that such failures inflate logistics costs and weaken regional economies. Furthermore, the deterioration in healthcare and educational services due to abandoned facilities corroborates findings by Obiegbu (2020) and Adefemi & Oyelade (2018), who identify infrastructure gaps as major drivers of poor literacy and health outcomes. The result also affirms that infrastructure abandonment erodes public trust and community cohesion, mirroring Nwachukwu & Egwuonwu (2021) on the psychological toll of development betrayal. This social disillusionment is particularly harmful in regions with longstanding development grievances, thus amplifying Ogun (2010) and Akinola & Fakunle (2015)’s arguments about abandonment as a reinforcing agent of regional inequality. Lastly, the findings validate Bello & Oyekanmi (2018) who highlight the broader investment consequences where communities with poor infrastructure profiles struggle to attract private and public investments, thereby perpetuating cycles of poverty and exclusion.

Causes and Challenges Associated with the abandoned Infrastructure Projects

Descriptive analysis shows overwhelming agreement among respondents that political interference, corruption, and funding delays are the most critical drivers of infrastructure abandonment. This is consistent with studies by Okonjo-Iweala & Osafo-Kwaako (2007) and Olaseni & Alade (2012) who identify a broken governance architecture, political discontinuity,

and compromised procurement systems as major barriers to infrastructure continuity. The highest mean scores in this category (above 4.3.2) suggest a systemic pattern of governance breakdown, where projects are abandoned not for technical reasons but due to political or financial mismanagement. Stakeholder testimonies from government officials, contractors, and civil society actors provide compelling confirmation. Multiple respondents indicated that projects are frequently discontinued with regime changes reflecting Okpala (2017)'s argument that Nigeria's infrastructure delivery is vulnerable to political transitions due to the absence of institutionalized development frameworks. This phenomenon is further compounded by procurement fraud and inflated contracts, validating Iwuagwu (2016) and Ayodele & Alabi (2011)'s position on political patronage and corruption driving poor project performance. Moreover, delays in budget release and underfunding, as cited by several contractors, align with findings from Ezeokonkwo (2017) and Babalola & Ogunlade (2016), who note that weak fiscal planning and inconsistent funding cycles are a hallmark of Nigerian infrastructure delivery. Institutional inefficiencies such as weak monitoring and poor inter-agency collaboration as described by respondents support Agbola & Jinadu (2016) and Olaniyi et al. (2021), who critique the ineffectiveness of Nigeria's oversight frameworks and regulatory mechanisms. Significantly, the lack of community involvement in planning and implementation, reported by grassroots stakeholders, also supports the call by Abubakar & Doan (2010) and Uchenna & Agbakwuru (2015) for participatory infrastructure governance. When communities are excluded, projects are often ill-suited to local realities, increasing the likelihood of resistance, abandonment, or underutilization.

Effect of Abandoned Infrastructure Projects Vary Across Regions

The regional analysis in Table 4.3.3 reveals significant variation in the incidence and impacts of infrastructure abandonment across Nigeria's geopolitical zones. The highest mean scores relate to governance weaknesses and political marginalization, indicating that institutional quality and political alignment are pivotal in explaining regional disparities. These findings provide empirical support for Ogun (2010) and Akinola & Fakunle (2015), who argue that regions with weaker governance or opposition alignment face disproportionate developmental neglect. Qualitative data further illustrate these patterns. Respondents in opposition-controlled or remote regions consistently reported higher instances of project discontinuity and neglect, echoing Ayoade (2019) and Iwuagwu (2016) who link infrastructure deployment to political patronage and vote-maximization strategies. As one civil society actor in the South East noted, many projects from previous administrations are deliberately left unfinished due to party differences, a practice that institutionalizes underdevelopment and entrenches inequality. Geographical constraints such as flooding and terrain complexity, particularly in the South South and North Central, were also cited as technical barriers to completion. These findings resonate with Omole (2010) and Aliyu & Lawal (2019), who argue that without adequate geotechnical studies and adaptive engineering, infrastructure delivery in challenging environments often stalls. In contrast, more positive outcomes were reported in urban and better-governed regions such as Lagos and parts of the South West. Here, high levels of community participation, traditional institutional support, and media scrutiny were credited with keeping projects on track. These observations reinforce Abubakar & Doan (2010) and Uchenna & Agbakwuru (2015)'s assertions that inclusive governance and civic oversight significantly improve project completion rates. Furthermore, the role of informal institutions, such as emirate councils in the North West, shows how cultural legitimacy can enhance project accountability highlighting the nuanced and locally-specific dynamics of infrastructure delivery. The impact of media pressure in urban centers also demonstrates the influence of visibility and advocacy on development outcomes, aligning with Olaseni & Alade (2012)'s view on the importance of civil monitoring mechanisms.

5. Conclusion

This study has explored the multifaceted impacts, causes, and regional disparities associated with abandoned infrastructure projects in Nigeria. Through an integrated analysis of quantitative survey data and qualitative interviews, it is evident that the abandonment of public infrastructure projects significantly undermines socio-economic development across the country. The findings underscore that such projects lead to economic stagnation, loss of employment opportunities, poor access to social services, and growing public disillusionment. Particularly alarming is the strong consensus among stakeholders that political interference, corruption, funding irregularities, and institutional weaknesses are at the heart of this recurring phenomenon. Moreover, regional disparities were found to be driven by governance capacity, political alignment, and community engagement, with marginalized zones suffering disproportionately. The abandonment of infrastructure projects not only represents a massive waste of public resources but also reinforces regional inequalities and erodes trust in government. As supported by the literature, infrastructure is a vital enabler of national development. Yet in Nigeria, the lack of continuity in governance, weak institutional frameworks, and insufficient community participation have resulted in a systemic pattern of failure. Addressing this crisis is not merely a technical challenge but a political and institutional imperative.

6. Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following actionable recommendations are proposed:

1. To the Federal Government of Nigeria, it is recommended that a National Infrastructure Continuity Framework be legislated to protect projects from political discontinuity and regime changes.
2. To the Ministry of Works and Housing, improved project planning, timely funding, and mandatory feasibility studies should be enforced before any project is approved.
3. To the National Assembly, stronger oversight and anti-corruption enforcement mechanisms must be instituted, with sanctions for defaulting contractors and public officers.
4. To State Governments, building inclusive community engagement frameworks will ensure that infrastructure projects reflect actual needs and encourage local ownership.
5. To civil society and media organizations, sustained advocacy and public monitoring will be crucial to ensure accountability and visibility of ongoing and abandoned projects.

Limitations, Validity, and Credibility

This study is limited by its reliance on mostly self-reported data, which may be subject to bias or exaggeration. Additionally, while the sample covered all six geopolitical zones, logistical constraints limited deeper coverage in remote areas. However, the study ensured validity through triangulation of quantitative and qualitative methods, enhancing the depth and reliability of findings. Credibility was reinforced by using diverse respondent groups government officials, contractors, civil society, and community members ensuring a balanced perspective and minimizing single-source bias in the interpretation of results.

Funding

The research had no external means of fund

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Abubakar, I. R., & Doan, P. L. (2010). Institutional framework for managing urban infrastructure in Nigeria. *Habitat International*, 34(1), 100–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2009.07.003>
2. Adebayo, K. A., & Oladipo, T. S. (2020). Political transition and public project discontinuity in Nigeria: Implications for sustainable development. *African Journal of Governance and Development*, 9(1), 57–70.
3. Adefemi, O. J., & Oyelade, M. T. (2018). Infrastructural abandonment and the education sector in Northern Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 9(30), 1–9.
4. Ademiluyi, I. A. (2010). Public infrastructure delivery in Nigeria: Evidence from housing and road projects. *Journal of African Studies and Development*, 2(2), 33–40.
5. Adeniran, A., & Ajakaiye, O. (2019). Infrastructure investment and inclusive growth in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Economic and Social Studies*, 61(1), 93–120.
6. Adesanya, A. (2011). The impact of transportation infrastructure on the Nigerian economy. *Journal of Infrastructure Development*, 3(2), 135–152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/097493061100300204>
7. Adeyemi, A. O., & Akinyele, B. T. (2020). Regional disparities in infrastructural development in Nigeria: Evidence from public capital allocation. *African Journal of Economic Policy*, 27(2), 103–118.
8. Agbola, T., & Jinadu, A. M. (2016). Institutional failings and the collapse of public housing projects in Nigeria: A study of Festac Town, Lagos. *Urban Studies*, 53(12), 2631–2648. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098015608560>
9. Agunbiade, M. E., & Olumide, O. J. (2020). Infrastructure policy fragmentation and its developmental consequences in Nigeria. *Public Policy and Administration Research*, 10(3), 47–60.
10. Akinola, S. R., & Fakunle, O. (2015). Regional disparities in infrastructure and socio-economic development in Nigeria. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 33(2), 214–235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02589001.2015.1012917>
11. Akinyemi, B., & Adebayo, O. (2021). Abandoned projects in the Niger Delta: Causes, effects and implications for sustainable development. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, 10(2), 103–115.
12. Alemika, E. E. O., & Jibrin, I. (2021). Monitoring and evaluation deficiencies and project failure in Nigeria's public sector. *Journal of Policy Analysis in Africa*, 8(1), 25–42.
13. Aliyu, A., & Lawal, A. (2019). Public infrastructure abandonment and development planning in Nigeria. *Public Administration Research*, 8(2), 30–42. <https://doi.org/10.5539/par.v8n2p30>
14. Aluko, O. E., & Adeyemi, O. (2016). Urban decay and abandoned public structures: A study of Ibadan, Nigeria. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 59(8), 1463–1480.
15. Arowolo, D., & Lawal, T. (2020). Insecurity and infrastructural decay in Northern Nigeria: A policy crisis. *Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies*, 11(1), 45–61.

16. Ayoade, J. O. (2019). Politics of infrastructure development and abandonment in Nigeria. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 13(3), 24–34. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJPSIR2018.11110>
17. Ayodele, T. D., & Alabi, E. O. (2011). The menace of abandoned projects in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 13(1), 123–133.
18. Babalola, A. & Ogunlade, A. (2016). Fiscal implications of abandoned infrastructure in Nigeria. *African Development Review*, 28(3), 278–290. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8268.12204>
19. Bello, A., & Oyekanmi, R. (2018). The socio-economic cost of abandoned public projects in Nigeria. *International Journal of Economics and Management Studies*, 5(2), 10–18.
20. Bello, K. A., & Fatile, J. O. (2020). Policy implementation challenges in Nigeria's public infrastructure sector. *African Journal of Public Administration*, 12(2), 59–73.
21. Calderón, C., & Servén, L. (2010). Infrastructure and economic development in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of African Economies*, 19(suppl_1), i13–i87. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jae/ejp022>
22. Chukwuemeka, E., & Uche, E. O. (2017). Effects of abandoned projects on national development in Nigeria. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Public Policy and Social Development*, 5(1), 27–40.
23. Effiom, L., & Essien, I. (2018). Environmental factors and project abandonment in Nigeria's Niger Delta. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, 7(2), 678–689.
24. Ekong, C., & Etim, A. (2020). Legal frameworks and public infrastructure governance in Nigeria: A critical appraisal. *Nigerian Journal of Law and Development*, 7(1), 18–33.
25. Ezeabasili, A. C. C., Mojekwu, J. N., & Herbert, W. E. (2014). Infrastructure development in Nigeria: A panacea for transformation. *International Journal of Economics, Finance and Management Sciences*, 2(5), 347–356. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijefm.20140205.13>
26. Ezeabasili, A. C., & Mbakwe, C. C. (2021). Governance and public project abandonment in Nigeria: A critical review. *International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research*, 6(4), 45–58.
27. Ezeani, E. O., & Nwankwo, B. C. (2019). Governance, marginalization and regional development in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Public Administration and Local Government*, 22(2), 34–49.
28. Ezeokonkwo, J. U. (2017). Causes and consequences of abandoned projects in Nigeria. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 143(9), 04017068. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)CO.1943-7862.0001359](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0001359)
29. Ibrahim, J., & Ahmadu, U. (2020). An evaluation of abandoned infrastructure projects in Northern Nigeria. *Journal of African Studies and Development*, 12(1), 1–11.
30. ICPC. (2022). *System Study and Review Report on Abandoned Projects in Nigeria*. Abuja: Independent Corrupt Practices Commission.
31. Ikeanyibe, O. M. (2013). Federalism and the quest for equitable development in Nigeria. *African Journal of Public Affairs*, 6(2), 1–17.
32. Ilesanmi, A. O., & Fadare, S. O. (2019). Institutional mechanisms and infrastructure project failures in Nigeria. *Journal of Management and Development Studies*, 7(2), 110–123.

33. Isah, A. O., & Bamidele, S. (2022). Coordination challenges in infrastructure policy implementation in Nigeria. *International Journal of Development Studies*, 6(1), 91–105.
34. Iwuagwu, O. (2016). The political economy of abandoned projects in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(3), 104–119.
35. Magu, I., & Yusuf, H. M. (2019). Procurement fraud and the dilemma of infrastructure in Nigeria. *International Journal of Law and Governance*, 6(1), 89–103.
36. Nwachukwu, M. A., & Egwuonwu, C. C. (2021). Abandoned infrastructure and community disillusionment in Southeast Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, 19(1), 74–89.
37. Nwankwo, A. U., Ugochukwu, B. C., & Okoye, C. O. (2016). Impact of abandoned road projects on rural development in Southeast Nigeria. *Journal of Rural Infrastructure and Development*, 7(1), 65–77.
38. Obiegbu, C. J. (2020). Health infrastructure abandonment and rural health outcomes in Nigeria. *African Journal of Health Economics*, 9(1), 33–45.
39. Ocheni, S. I., & Nwankwo, B. C. (2012). Analysis of corruption in the public sector and its impact on development in Nigeria. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research*, 4(3), 47–53.
40. Ogun, T. P. (2010). Infrastructure and poverty reduction: Implications for urban development in Nigeria. *Urban Forum*, 21(3), 249–266. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12132-010-9094-0>
41. Ogunleye, E. O., & Adeniyi, O. B. (2019). Infrastructure, employment, and poverty in Nigeria. *African Development Review*, 31(2), 145–160.
42. Ogunleye, E., Oladipo, O., & Akinola, R. (2017). Infrastructure and inclusive growth in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Economic and Social Studies*, 59(1), 29–50.
43. Ogunyemi, B. (2017). Political interference and infrastructure abandonment in Nigeria's public sector. *African Policy Review*, 3(1), 66–82.
44. Ojo, B., & Fagbenro, D. A. (2018). Participatory planning and infrastructure sustainability in Nigeria. *Journal of Urban and Regional Planning*, 5(2), 85–98.
45. Okonjo-Iweala, N., & Osafo-Kwaako, P. (2007). Nigeria's economic reforms: Progress and challenges. *Brookings Global Economy and Development Working Paper*, (6), 1–27.
46. Okoye, P. U., & Achakpa, P. M. (2019). Public sector financing gaps and abandonment of capital projects in Nigeria. *International Journal of Project Finance & Investment*, 4(1), 31–44.
47. Okpala, D. (2017). Infrastructure delivery and discontinuity in Nigeria's federal system. *Commonwealth Journal of Local Governance*, 20, 41–55. <https://doi.org/10.5130/cjlg.v0i20.6020>
48. Oladipo, T., & Olayemi, A. (2020). Abandoned healthcare infrastructure and regional health outcomes in Nigeria. *African Health Sciences*, 20(4), 1947–1956. <https://doi.org/10.4314/ahs.v20i4.39>
49. Olaniyi, O., Akinbobola, A., & Ajayi, R. (2021). Oversight and accountability in Nigerian public project delivery: Role of the National Assembly. *Journal of African Governance*, 8(2), 89–104.
50. Olaopa, T. & Ajayi, A. (2021). Infrastructure and regional imbalances in Nigeria: A diagnostic analysis. *Journal of Development Planning and Administration*, 8(1), 55–70.

51. Olaseni, M., & Alade, W. (2012). Vision 20:2020 and the challenges of infrastructural development in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 5(2), 63–77. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jsd.v5n2p63>
52. Olojede, I., & Akinbode, T. (2016). Politics of budget allocation and regional inequality in Nigeria. *Journal of African Political Economy & Development*, 2(2), 90–108.
53. Olowu, D. (2015). Enhancing regional development through local governance in Nigeria. *Commonwealth Journal of Local Governance*, 18(1), 22–36.
54. Omole, F. K. (2010). Project abandonment in Nigeria: Causes and solutions. *The Built & Human Environment Review*, 3(1), 44–51.
55. Omole, F. K., & Olayiwola, L. M. (2017). Planning challenges and infrastructural failure in Nigeria: A planning perspective. *Nigerian Journal of Urban Studies*, 13(1), 44–59.
56. Onyema, M., & Okafor, J. (2021). The economic impact of uncompleted road projects on regional markets in Nigeria. *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 10, 100395.
57. Onyemenam, C. N., & Odigie, P. O. (2021). Bureaucratic bottlenecks and stalled infrastructure development in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Public Sector Management*, 5(2), 23–39.
58. Rodríguez-Pose, A. (2013). Do institutions matter for regional development? *Regional Studies*, 47(7), 1034–1047.
59. Salami, A., & Adeyemo, T. (2021). Infrastructure financing and feasibility studies in Nigeria: Bridging the gap. *Journal of Infrastructure Development*, 10(2), 109–128.
60. Uchenna, E. E., & Agbakwuru, C. (2015). Participatory project planning and development: A panacea for curbing project abandonment in Nigeria. *Journal of Environmental Design and Management*, 7(1), 17–28.
61. Udeh, C., & Umeh, N. (2021). Rural infrastructure abandonment and migration in Nigeria: An exploratory study. *African Journal of Migration and Development*, 3(1), 67–82.
62. Ugochukwu, O. E., & Onyekachi, U. J. (2022). Reinventing governance to tackle infrastructure abandonment in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 24(1), 90–106.
63. Usman, A. M., & Olowu, T. M. (2018). Institutional responses to infrastructure governance challenges in Nigeria. *African Infrastructure Monitor*, 4(1), 14–28.
64. World Bank. (2020). *World Development Report 2020: Trading for Development in the Age of Global Value Chains*. Washington, DC: World Bank. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/wdr2020>