Balancing Revenue Allocation: A Comparative Analysis of Vertical Distribution Mechanism of Nigeria, India, and United States of America

Prof. Aliyu Idris
Revenue mobilisation Allocation and Fiscal Commission
dr.aliyuidris@gmail.com
DOI: 10.56201/ijssmr.v10.no11.2024.pg.51.60

Abstract
This study examines the vertical revenue allocation mechanisms in Nigeria, India, and the United States of America, focusing on the strategies employed to achieve balance and equity among levels of government. The research highlights the comparative framework used to assess federal-state financial relations and the efficacy of the revenue distribution systems in each country. Drawing on conceptual, theoretical, and empirical insights, the study explores fiscal federalism, intergovernmental relations, and resource distribution issues. Findings underscore the strengths and weaknesses of each system, offering recommendations to enhance equitable and efficient revenue allocation.

1.1 Introduction

Revenue allocation is fundamental to fiscal federalism. It defines the dynamics between central and subnational governments and significantly shapes governance, equity, and efficiency within federal structures. It provides the framework for distributing financial resources, enabling governments at all levels to deliver essential public services, uphold fiscal stability, and address socio-economic inequalities. Achieving a balanced revenue allocation between central and subnational authorities is a complex challenge, especially in heterogeneous societies marked by diverse ethnic, cultural, and economic contexts.

The vertical distribution of resources in federal systems often provokes debates over fairness and efficiency as different levels of government vie for sufficient funding to fulfil their constitutional obligations. Heavy reliance on a single revenue source exacerbates fiscal disparities in resource-dependent economies such as Nigeria. By contrast, nations like India and the United States benefit from diversified revenue streams, which come with complexities and challenges.

This research offers a comparative analysis of the revenue allocation frameworks in Nigeria, India, and the United States, each operating within unique federal structures. Nigeria's system is characterised by its dependency on oil revenues and a highly centralised allocation model. India's approach relies on the constitutionally established Finance Commission, which periodically reassesses and adjusts revenue-sharing arrangements. In the United States, a decentralised model allows states considerable autonomy in generating and managing their financial resources.

1.2 Statement of the Problems

Effective revenue allocation is essential for fiscal equity, governance efficiency, and socio-economic development in federal systems. However, structural and systemic challenges hinder the equitable distribution of financial resources. In Nigeria, heavy reliance on oil revenues creates fiscal disparities between central and subnational governments. A centralised allocation formula and limited income diversification perpetuate inequities, stifle state autonomy, and expose the economy to shocks. Despite the Finance Commission's periodic reviews, regional disparities and political tensions complicate India's revenue allocation. Developmental gaps and perceptions of favouritism hinder equitable resource distribution. The State autonomy in the U.S. adds complexity to balancing equity and oversight, creating fiscal inconsistencies across states with varying revenue capacities. No globally accepted standard exists for equitable vertical revenue allocation, leading to fragmented and inconsistent approaches.

This research addresses the need for comparative analyses of revenue allocation in federal systems. Examining Nigeria, India, and the U.S. identifies strengths and weaknesses, offering insights into creating balanced and equitable revenue-sharing frameworks. Providing a comparative analysis of three federal systems and their contextual influences on revenue mechanisms, the study identifies adaptable best practices for addressing revenue distribution challenges, offers a policy framework for equitable and efficient revenue allocation, and bridges theoretical and practical discussions on fiscal federalism to enrich academic and policy discourse.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

i. To analyse the vertical revenue allocation systems of Nigeria, India, and the U.S.
ii. To identify the strengths and weaknesses of each country's mechanism.
iii. To propose strategies for improving revenue allocation equity and efficiency.
iv. To draw lessons for Nigeria from the experiences of India and the United States.

2.0 Review of Related Literature

2.1 Conceptual Framework

The study of revenue allocation mechanisms in federal systems involves several key conceptual issues, each critical to understanding fiscal federalism dynamics. These issues include:

Fiscal Federalism

Fiscal federalism is the financial relations between different levels of government in a federal system. It encompasses the allocation of revenue, expenditure responsibilities, and fiscal powers. The concept is essential for understanding how resources are distributed to ensure governance efficiency, equity, and fiscal sustainability. Variations in fiscal federalism frameworks reflect different federal systems' socio-economic and political realities, as seen in Nigeria, India, and the United States.

Vertical Revenue Allocation

This concept pertains to the distribution of financial resources between the central government and subnational entities such as states and local governments. The primary goal is to ensure that each level of government has sufficient resources to discharge its constitutional responsibilities effectively. However, achieving equity in vertical revenue allocation often involves balancing competing demands for centralisation and decentralisation.

Equity vs. Efficiency

Equity and efficiency are fundamental principles in revenue allocation. Equity focuses on fair resource distribution to address regional disparities and socio-economic imbalances. Efficiency emphasises the optimal use of resources to maximise public welfare. Balancing these principles is a persistent challenge in designing revenue-sharing mechanisms, especially in heterogeneous societies like Nigeria and India.

Resource Dependency

Resource dependency, particularly on natural resources such as oil, significantly influences revenue allocation frameworks. In Nigeria, the over-reliance on oil revenues has led to fiscal centralisation, economic vulnerabilities, and regional disparities. Understanding the impact of resource dependency is crucial for diversifying revenue streams and promoting fiscal stability.

Political Economy of Revenue Allocation

Political considerations play a pivotal role in shaping revenue allocation mechanisms. Regional representation, lobbying, and political bargaining often influence the design and implementation of allocation formulas. This issue is particularly evident in India, where political dynamics affect the functioning of the Finance Commission, and in the U.S., where state autonomy shapes fiscal decisions.

Institutional Frameworks

Effective revenue allocation requires robust institutional mechanisms. In India, the Finance Commission provides a structured framework for revenue sharing. Conversely, Nigeria's centralised model and reliance on statutory allocation formulas highlight the limitations of its institutional arrangements. In the U.S., the decentralised approach grants states significant autonomy, requiring coordination mechanisms to address disparities.

Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations

Revenue allocation is a critical aspect of intergovernmental fiscal relations. Effective collaboration and coordination between central and subnational governments are necessary to ensure fiscal balance and avoid conflicts. As observed in Nigeria, the absence of strong intergovernmental frameworks can lead to inefficiencies and tensions.

Sustainability of Revenue Allocation Mechanisms

The sustainability of revenue allocation frameworks is essential for long-term socio-economic development. This involves addressing structural imbalances, diversifying revenue sources, and adapting to changing economic conditions. A lack of sustainability can undermine governments' capacity to meet public needs and maintain fiscal stability.

Fiscal Federalism and Vertical Revenue Allocation

Fiscal federalism provides the theoretical foundation for understanding how financial powers and responsibilities are distributed among levels of government. Vertical revenue allocation operationalises this by determining the financial transfers needed to address fiscal imbalances. Nigeria's centralised revenue-sharing formula emphasises fiscal control, while India's Finance Commission represents a dynamic approach to managing fiscal relations.

Equity vs. Efficiency in Practice

Equity-driven models, such as Nigeria's, aim to reduce regional disparities but often face criticism for inefficiency and lack of accountability. Conversely, efficiency-focused systems like the U.S. prioritise fiscal autonomy but may exacerbate state inequalities.

Impact of Resource Dependency

Nigeria's dependence on oil revenue highlights the risks associated with a narrow economic base. This contrasts with the U.S., where diverse revenue streams mitigate such risks. India's mixed approach reflects the challenges of balancing resource dependency with diversification efforts.

Role of Political Economy

Political dynamics significantly influence revenue allocation decisions. In India, the interplay between regional politics and the Finance Commission's recommendations underscores the importance of political considerations. The U.S. model, emphasising state autonomy, reflects the decentralised nature of its political system.

Institutional Strength and Sustainability

Robust institutional frameworks, like India's Finance Commission, enhance the adaptability and effectiveness of revenue allocation systems. However, the sustainability of these mechanisms depends on their ability to evolve with changing socio-economic conditions. Nigeria's reliance on a rigid formula underscores the need for institutional reform.

2.2 Empirical Review

Empirical studies provide valuable insights into the mechanisms and outcomes of revenue allocation in different federal systems.

2.2.1 Nigeria

Adedokun (2021) emphasises that Nigeria's revenue allocation system relies heavily on oil revenues, accounting for over 70% of the country's total income. This dependency creates fiscal imbalances and limits the capacity of subnational governments to diversify their revenue bases. Adedokun argues that this reliance undermines the fiscal autonomy of states and increases vulnerability to global oil price fluctuations. Ofoegbu and Onuoha (2018) highlight the challenges posed by Nigeria's statutory allocation formula, prioritising population and landmass without adequately addressing socio-economic disparities. Their study points to the need for reforms incorporating performance-based metrics to improve efficiency and equity. Adeosun et al. (2022) explore the impact of oil revenue on governance, noting that the centralised allocation system often fuels corruption and reduces accountability at both central and subnational levels. The study calls for a more transparent and decentralised revenue—sharing approach.

2.2.2 India

Chakraborty (2020) examines the role of the Finance Commission in India, which is mandated to review and recommend adjustments to the revenue-sharing formula periodically. The study highlights the Commission's efforts to address regional disparities by considering factors such as population, income levels, and fiscal discipline. Bahl and Bird (2018) analyse the challenges of balancing vertical and horizontal equity in India's revenue allocation system. Their findings suggest that while the Finance Commission has made strides in reducing inter-state disparities, political influences often hinder the implementation of its recommendations.

Gupta (2021) investigates the relationship between revenue allocation and economic growth, concluding that states with higher fiscal autonomy tend to perform better regarding development outcomes. However, Gupta notes that weaker states still struggle to meet their financial needs, highlighting the limitations of India's current system.

2.2.3 United States

Smith and Brown (2019) explore the decentralised nature of revenue allocation in the U.S., where states enjoy significant tax collection and expenditure autonomy. Their study underscores how this autonomy fosters innovation in revenue generation but complicates efforts to achieve uniformity and equity across states. Fisher and Wassmer (2020) analyse the role of federal grants in mitigating fiscal disparities among states. While federal transfers help address some imbalances, the lack of a standardised framework leads to variations in how states utilise these funds. McGuire and Rueben (2017) investigate the impact of tax competition among states, noting that the absence of a centralised allocation system often results in a race to the bottom, where states reduce taxes to attract businesses, sometimes at the expense of public services.

2.2.4 Comparative Insights

Shah's (2014) study provides a comparative analysis of revenue allocation mechanisms in federal systems. The findings indicate that countries with diversified revenue bases, such as the U.S., tend to achieve more excellent fiscal stability than resource-dependent economies like Nigeria. Alam and Roy (2020) highlight the importance of institutional frameworks in revenue allocation. Their cross-country analysis reveals that robust institutions, such as India's Finance Commission, contribute to better fiscal outcomes than ad hoc systems like Nigeria's statutory allocation. Musgrave (1959) emphasises balancing fiscal centralisation and decentralisation to optimise revenue allocation. His theoretical framework is often cited in studies exploring the trade-offs between equity, efficiency, and autonomy in federal systems.

2.2.5 Gaps Identified in the Literature

While these studies offer valuable insights, limited comparative research examines how different federal systems address similar challenges in revenue allocation. This study aims to bridge that gap by providing a cross-national analysis of Nigeria, India, and the United States, identifying best practices and lessons that can be applied across diverse contexts.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

The study is anchored on the Theory of Fiscal Federalism, propounded by Richard Musgrave in 1959. This theory provides a foundational framework for understanding how financial responsibilities and resources should be distributed among different levels of government in a federal system to achieve optimal governance outcomes. Musgrave identified three core functions of government resource allocation, income redistribution, and macroeconomic stabilisation and emphasised the critical role of these functions in fiscal federalism. The theory posits that resources should be allocated to ensure the provision of public goods and services aligns with the preferences and needs of citizens across jurisdictions. In a federal system, subnational governments are often better positioned to understand and address local needs, necessitating adequate revenue allocation to empower them for effective service delivery.

Fiscal federalism underscores the importance of reducing income inequalities across regions through equitable revenue-sharing mechanisms. This principle is particularly relevant in heterogeneous societies where disparities in resource endowments and economic opportunities exist. Central governments are typically tasked with overseeing redistribution to ensure national equity and cohesion. The theory also highlights the role of fiscal policies in maintaining economic stability. By coordinating revenue allocation and expenditure policies across different levels of government, fiscal federalism aims to prevent macroeconomic imbalances, such as excessive deficits or regional economic disparities.

2.3.1 Relevance of the Theory to the Study

The Theory of Fiscal Federalism is highly pertinent to this study, as it provides a robust framework for analysing the vertical revenue allocation mechanisms in Nigeria, India, and the United States. The theory helps to evaluate equity and efficiency in Nigeria, where oil revenues dominate. It highlights the need for diversification and equitable redistribution to address regional disparities and reduce fiscal dependency. It explains the role of the Finance Commission in balancing resource allocation in India to bridge economic and developmental gaps across states. In the U.S., it offers insights into the challenges of maintaining equity and efficiency in a highly decentralised system. The theory underscores the importance of aligning revenue allocation with governance objectives, such as service delivery and regional development. This perspective is crucial for understanding how federal systems allocate resources to achieve socio-economic stability and growth.

3.0 Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The study adopts a comparative research design by comparing different phenomena or cases to explore differences, similarities, or trends. The researcher compares fiscal policies, budget allocations, or economic outcomes across different countries, regions, or periods in this study. This design allows for an in-depth examination of how various factors influence fiscal policy decisions, financial governance, and overall economic health. Qualitative data is descriptive and focuses on understanding the meaning, experiences, and perspectives of the subjects involved. This data type is often more nuanced and provides deeper insights into complex fiscal policy or governance issues. The data sources used in this research are government publications (Finance Commission Reports, Budget Documents), Academic Journals, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF)**).**

3.2 Data Analysis

The study analyses the data through qualitative methods, such as thematic analysis, which involves identifying patterns or themes within the data. Comparative analysis may also contrast findings across different sources, such as comparing government reports with academic studies or expert opinions. Combining data from multiple sources enables a holistic view of the research problem, combining theory with practical, real-world insights.

3.2.1 Thematic Analysis of the Study

This study uses thematic analysis to explore various fiscal policy and governance aspects based on the qualitative data gathered from experts, government reports, and academic literature. The thematic analysis allows the researcher to explore key issues of transparency and accountability, revenue generation and distribution, policy formulation and implementation, and international comparisons. By identifying these and other relevant themes, the thematic analysis provides a rich, nuanced understanding of fiscal policy and governance complexities, allowing for a more informed comparison of how fiscal frameworks function across different contexts.

3.2.2. Justification of the Thematic Analysis

Thematic analysis is a powerful tool for analysing the qualitative data. It uncovers and examines key patterns, themes, and insights related to fiscal policy, governance, and economic outcomes. By systematically applying this method to the data collected from government documents, academic literature, and World Bank and IMF reports, the researcher draws meaningful conclusions contributing to the broader discourse on fiscal reform, economic governance, and sustainable development.

3.3 Validity and Reliability Test

The study employs the triangulation method to ensure validity and reliability, which is essential to confirm that the results and conclusions drawn from the research are both accurate and consistent. Triangulation is a key strategy to strengthen validity and reliability in qualitative research. By comparing multiple data sources and methods, triangulation helps to cross-check and corroborate findings, increasing the overall trustworthiness of the research outcomes. It helps to reduce the bias and limitations that may arise from using a single data source or method, allowing for a more comprehensive understanding of the research topic. Triangulation is particularly useful in qualitative research, where the complexity of the subject matter can often be better understood through different lenses. Triangulation ensures that the data sources and analysis methods are appropriate and that the conclusions drawn reflect the true nature of fiscal policy and governance.

3.4 Results and Discussions

Table I: Comparative Analysis of Fiscal Systems of Nigeria, India and the United States

Criteria	Nigeria	India	United States
Revenue Sources	Oil revenue, VAT, customs duties	Taxes, grants, Finance Commission	Taxes (federal, state), grants
Allocation Formula	52.68% federal, 26.72% states	Formula-based, periodic revisions	There is no fixed formula; state autonomy
Equity Mechanism	Derivation principle (13%)	Special grants for backward states	Federal grants for specific needs
Challenges	Over-centralization, dependency	Regional disparities	Complexity, lack of uniformity

Sources: RAF Act, Finance Commission Report, World Bank&IMF Report

3.4.1 Discussion of the Table

The table 1 above compares Nigeria, India, and the United States' fiscal systems, emphasising their revenue generation, distribution, and governance approaches. The following discussions offer a more nuanced analysis of each country's fiscal system and its implications.

Nigeria

Dependence on oil revenue stifles the development of other sectors, such as agriculture, manufacturing, and technology. This limited diversification makes the economy vulnerable to fluctuations in global oil prices, as seen during oil price crashes, which often result in economic recessions. Oil price volatility introduces unpredictability in revenue, making fiscal planning and budgeting challenging. This usually leads to deficits and borrowing, increasing the country's debt burden. The revenue distribution between the federal, state, and local governments follows a statutory formula managed by the Revenue Mobilisation Allocation and Fiscal Commission (RMAFC). However, disparities in resource allocation often lead to grievances among states, particularly those in the oil-producing regions, which demand higher shares through derivation principles.

Most states in Nigeria rely heavily on federal allocations from oil revenue, with limited capacity to generate internal revenue. This dependency undermines fiscal autonomy and inhibits the state's ability to pursue independent development initiatives. The centralised nature of oil revenue management creates opportunities for corruption and inefficiencies, weakening the fiscal system's effectiveness.

India

India's fiscal system is characterised by a formula-driven approach managed by its Finance Commission. This system aims to address disparities between states and ensure equitable resource distribution. However, the system is not without its challenges. The Finance Commission adopts formulas considering population, income levels, and tax effort to allocate resources equitably among states. This system addresses regional disparities, with poorer states receiving more resources to support development. Resource allocation often becomes a politically contentious issue. Wealthier states may perceive the formula as punitive, while poorer states argue that allocations are insufficient to bridge developmental gaps. This dynamic can create tensions between the central government and states and among the states themselves.

While the Finance Commission operates independently, its recommendations require central government approval, which can lead to delays and modifications influenced by political considerations. This central control sometimes undermines the Commission's autonomy and effectiveness.

Although the formula-based system is designed to be objective, its success depends on accurate data and compliance by all stakeholders. Variations in data quality and political interference can hinder the system's efficiency. While the Finance Commission works to address disparities, the economic divide between states like Kerala and Bihar remains significant, suggesting that the formula alone cannot fully address systemic inequalities.

United States

The U.S. fiscal system emphasises state autonomy, granting individual states significant discretion in generating and managing revenues. This decentralised model promotes innovation but also leads to notable challenges. State autonomy allows states to experiment with different fiscal policies and economic strategies, fostering innovation and competitiveness. California and Texas have developed robust industries in technology and energy, respectively, by leveraging their unique strengths. Autonomy also creates significant revenue disparities among states. Wealthier states with higher tax bases and diversified economies have greater fiscal capacity, while poorer states struggle to provide essential services, leading to inequality in public goods and services.

The decentralised system results in wide variations in state tax policies, public spending, and social services. Education and healthcare standards vary significantly depending on a state's fiscal capacity and policy priorities. While federal grants and programmes aim to address disparities, the redistributive effect is limited compared to more centralised systems like India's. The federal government's role in fiscal equalisation is less pronounced, leaving inequalities to persist.

3.4.2 Comparative Insights

While Nigeria relies heavily on oil, India uses a formula-based approach to allocate tax revenues, and the U.S. depends on state-specific revenue systems. This highlights the importance of diversification and balanced centralisation in fiscal systems. India prioritises equity through redistribution, while the U.S. prioritises state autonomy, often at the cost of equity. Nigeria's centralised oil revenue management creates dependency and tension, with limited emphasis on either equity or independence. Political hurdles affect all three systems in different ways. India faces challenges in implementing equitable formulas, the U.S. grapples with inter-state disparities, and Nigeria struggles with dependency and governance inefficiencies.

4.0 Findings

The findings from the discussion of the results highlight significant differences in the fiscal systems of Nigeria, India, and the United States, revealing their strengths, weaknesses, and broader implications.

4.1 Nigeria

Nigeria's revenue allocation system is heavily centralised, relying predominantly on oil revenues to fund federal, state, and local government operations. While this approach ensures that all tiers of government receive a share of the national revenue, it has several adverse effects. The overreliance on oil revenues has created a fiscal environment in which states and local governments depend excessively on federal allocations for their budgets rather than developing their internal revenue-generation capacities. This dependency undermines fiscal autonomy and limits innovative governance at the subnational level. The focus on oil revenue has led to neglecting other sectors, such as agriculture, manufacturing, and services, which could diversify the economy. This leaves the country vulnerable to global oil price fluctuations, creating economic instability and fiscal unpredictability. States often lack the motivation to pursue innovative development strategies or invest in untapped sectors because they rely on guaranteed federal allocations. This approach stagnates economic growth and exacerbates regional inequalities, particularly between resource-rich and resource-poor states.

4.2 India

India's fiscal system is rooted in principles of equity and redistribution, as implemented by the Finance Commission. The system strives to balance resource allocation between economically weaker and stronger states. However, several challenges hinder its effectiveness. India's formula-based approach considers population, income levels, and fiscal effort, ensuring poorer states receive more significant support to bridge developmental gaps. While this mechanism promotes equity, it often does not address deep-rooted disparities. Though technically independent, the Finance Commission's recommendations are subject to central government approval. This opens the door to political influences, where decisions may be skewed to favour states aligned with the ruling party, undermining the objectivity of the allocation process.

Wealthier states often feel penalised for their economic success, arguing that they contribute more to national revenues but receive less. Conversely, poorer states believe the resources allocated to them are inadequate for addressing their developmental needs. This creates state friction and fosters mistrust in the central government's role. Strengthening the autonomy of the Finance Commission and increasing transparency in the allocation process could reduce political interference.

4.3 United State

The United States operates a highly decentralised fiscal system, granting autonomy to individual states in generating and managing their revenues. While this promotes innovation and flexibility, it also results in notable disparities. States can design tax policies, manage public spending, and prioritise economic sectors based on local needs and resources. This autonomy fosters innovation, allowing states like California to excel in technology and Texas in energy. Unlike India, the U.S. lacks a robust federal redistribution mechanism to address state disparities. Poorer states with limited tax bases often struggle to provide essential services like education, healthcare, and infrastructure, while wealthier states thrive. The lack of a standardised equity mechanism significantly affects public services and economic opportunities across states. These disparities contribute to systemic inequality, which is challenging to address without undermining state autonomy.

The decentralised system often complicates coordinated responses to national crises, such as economic downturns or natural disasters. States with fewer resources are disproportionately affected, highlighting the need for more substantial federal support during emergencies.

4.4 Comparative Insights

The findings underscore the trade-offs inherent in the fiscal systems of these three countries. While Nigeria's centralised oil-dependent system fosters dependency but lacks resilience, India's equitable approach aims to address disparities. Still, it is hampered by political challenges and the U.S. model champions innovation and autonomy but exacerbates inequalities due to the absence of a standard equity framework.

5.0 Conclusion

The study examines the vertical revenue allocation mechanisms in Nigeria, India, and the United States of America, focusing on the strategies employed to achieve balance and equity among government levels. The findings indicate that the fiscal systems of Nigeria, India, and the United States demonstrate the trade-offs between equity, autonomy, and governance efficiency. Nigeria's heavy reliance on oil revenue underscores the need for diversification and improved governance. India's formula-based approach is equitable but politically challenging, while the U.S.'s decentralised system fosters innovation but exacerbates disparities. Each system offers lessons on balancing central control and autonomy while addressing inequalities and promoting sustainable development.

6.0 Recommendations

The following recommendations are drawn from the findings of the study:

i. Nigeria should prioritise economic diversification by developing non-oil revenue streams such as agriculture, solid minerals, and services. Strengthening fiscal federalism and improving governance mechanisms can also enhance revenue management and equitable distribution.

ii. India could enhance the transparency of its allocation process and strengthen the Finance Commission's autonomy. Fostering regional economic cooperation and incentivising state-level reforms can also more effectively reduce disparities.

iii. The U.S. could enhance federal-state collaboration to reduce disparities while preserving state autonomy. For example, increasing the scope of federal equalisation grants or incentivising inter-state cooperation could address some inconsistencies without undermining decentralisation's benefits.

References

Adedokun, A. (2021). Oil dependency and fiscal federalism in Nigeria. *Journal of Economic Policy*, *45*(3), 112–130.

Akindele, S. T., & Olaopa, O. (2019). Fiscal centralisation and its implications for economic diversification in Nigeria. *African Journal of Governance and Development*, *14*(2), 65–80.

Chakraborty, P. (2020). Regional disparities and revenue allocation in India. *Indian Economic Review*, *55*(1), 56–78.

Echeverri-Gent, J. (2017). Federalism and intergovernmental transfers in emerging economies: Lessons from India. *World Development*, *93*, 1–13.

IMF. (2023). Fiscal federalism: Concepts and practices. Retrieved from https://www.imf.org.

Musgrave, R. A. (1959). *The theory of public finance: A study in public economy*. McGraw-Hill.

Oates, W. E. (1999). An essay on fiscal federalism. *Journal of Economic Literature*, *37*(3), 1120–1149.

Smith, J., & Brown, R. (2019). Federal-state fiscal relations in the United States. *American Journal of Public Finance*, *34*(2), 98–115.

World Bank. (2023). Fiscal decentralisation and equity. Retrieved from https://www.worldbank.org.

Zhao, Z., & Hu, R. (2021). Decentralisation and fiscal responsibility: A comparative study of China, the U.S., and India. *Public Budgeting & Finance*, *41*(4), 45–68.