

AYÍKÁ

ISSN: 2664-3030 (Print)
2664-3022 (Online)

JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENT AND
POLITICS IN AFRICA

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.69778/2664-3022/2026/8.2/EN>

Editorial Note

This is a brief introduction to a timely and intellectually relevant conversation in this AYIKA publication. It centres on ten articles that cover unique aspects of development challenges in Africa, with particular attention to South Africa and Nigeria. These contributions, taken together, not only identify persistent challenges in environmental protection and economic growth but also advance policy recommendations in response to Africa's changing circumstances across various fronts. To be clear, the needs of Africa are multifaceted and interconnected in several ways; the challenges are similar across the board, although the manifestations may differ geographically. These articles address the connections in the needs and choices of Africa while projecting a better future. Motswaledi's article illuminates this in this volume, concluding that equitable and inclusive energy provision should be prioritised as a fundamental social justice intervention to redress historical inequalities, promote human dignity, and advance socio-economic transformation in post-apartheid South Africa. Such insight applies to all of Africa.

Collectively, these contributions demonstrate that Africa's development challenges cannot be understood in isolated compartments. Governance affects environmental management; energy affects social justice; infrastructure affects economic growth, etc. The major strength of this collection is therefore its interdisciplinary character. It brings together governance, economics, environmental studies, development studies, public policy, agriculture and social justice. More importantly, the articles consistently return to a central question: how can African societies build institutions and development pathways that improve human welfare without undermining the environmental and social foundations of the future? This collection does not claim to offer simple answers. Instead, it provides evidence, cases and critical perspectives that can help scholars, policymakers and practitioners ask better questions. New and better research questions are a right way in the right direction.

Managing Editor

Prof. Kayode EEsuola

Institute of African and Diaspora Studies.

University of Lagos, Nigeria

oesuola@unilag.edu.ng

Editor

Dr. Bamidele Olajide

Department of Political Science

University of Lagos, Nigeria

contactdele@gmail.com

TABLE OF CONTENT

1. Critical Analysis Of Energy Provision As An Instrument For Advancing Social Justice <i>Thabang R. Motswaledi</i>	5
2. The Development Of An Emissions Inventory Of Selected Air Pollutants Within The Phalaborwa Town, South Africa <i>Phumudzo O Thivhafuni, Shadung J Moja</i>	27
3. Beyond The Climate Crisis: Protecting African Children From Rising Violence <i>Douglas Nyathi, Victor H Mlambo</i>	48
4. Transforming Rural Agricultural Marketing Through Neuromarketing: A Review Of Consumer Preferences, Brand Trust And Loyalty <i>Olaitan Ayotunde Shemfe</i>	73
5. Investigating The Nexus Of Economic Growth, Energy Consumption And Carbon Emissions In South Africa: Evidence From Cointegration And Causality Analysis <i>Badienzele Isaiah Mutombo, Strinivasan Soondrasan Pillay</i>	94
6. Building Resilient Livelihoods In Informal Settlements: Assessing Hemp-Based Strategies Through The Sustainable Livelihoods Framework And Institutional Theory In Ethekewini Municipality <i>Tshililo Ruddy Farisani</i>	113
7. Using Qualitative Meta-Analysis In The Last Decade To Affirm The Dictum That Intrinsic Development Hinges On Established Functional Local Autonomy (Using Nigeria's Realpolitik Environment As Lessons For Africa) <i>Ikemefuna Taire Paul Okudolo</i>	135
8. Political Corruption And Its Impact On Public Governance In Post-Apartheid South Africa <i>Sandiso Mahlala, Xolisile Ngumbela, Phumudzo P. Ramolai, Makhura B. Rapanyane, Mahlatse Sevhake</i>	151

9. Entrenching Sustainable Development Goal Sixteen Within A
Developmental Local Government In South Africa
Kaizer R. Makole, Kabelo B. Moeti **178**

10. Climate Change Adaptation And National Water Policies On Flooding
Risk Management: Analytical Experience From Osun State, Nigeria
Luqman Olawale Alako, Bolanle Waliu Shiyanbade, Kazeem Oyedele Lamidi
201

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.69778/2664-3022/2026/8.2/a7>

**USING QUALITATIVE META-ANALYSIS IN THE LAST DECADE TO
AFFIRM THE DICTUM THAT INTRINSIC DEVELOPMENT HINGES
ON ESTABLISHED FUNCTIONAL LOCAL AUTONOMY (USING
NIGERIA'S REALPOLITIK ENVIRONMENT AS LESSONS FOR
AFRICA)**

Ikemefuna Taire Paul Okudolo

*Extraordinary Researcher,
Afrocentric Governance of Public Affairs (Agopa) Entity
North-West University, South Africa
Tel: +2348023686576*

&

*Dennis Osadebay University,
Asaba, Nigeria*

Email: Ikemefunapaul@yahoo.com

Orcid ID: <https://Orcid.Org/0000-0002-5910-5080>

ABSTRACT

The article contends that meta-data analysis in the last decade from Nigerian realpolitik context demonstrates a nexus between qualitative national development and the establishment of functional local autonomy. Therefore, the article's intent is to utilize qualitative meta-analysis from the Nigerian realpolitik environment to substantiate the dictum that intrinsic development hinges on the persistence of functional local autonomy, which can be generalized to African statehoods. Although research studies prove the link between established functional local autonomy and integral development, some African political systems are pushing backwards to operating centralizing tenets more than decentralization creeds. The article argues that by relegating decentralist tenets today, such African statehoods invariably negate the value that efficacious local autonomy schemes naturally contribute to entrenching intrinsic development. Therefore, the article's overwhelming emphasis is that qualitative development in Africa is best realized where established decentralization practices and functional local autonomy mechanisms are promoted. To ground our central arguments, the bottom-up development theory serves as the article's theoretical framework, based on data insights from Nigeria's realpolitik environment.

Keywords: *Dictum; centralizing tenets; decentralization model; local autonomy schemes; Nigeria's realpolitik environment; African statehoods*

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND COMMENTARY

It is important to state from the outset that intrinsic development also mean the same thing as qualitative development in the paper. The concept of intrinsic development implies an organic kind of growth of society rooted in an all-round modernization of the internal dynamics or sectors of society, including in the economic, political, social, educational, technological spheres (Okudolo & Mekoa, 2019). Qualitative development is a good measure of how society is functionally advancing (Chigwata, de Visser & Ayele, 2021).

The degree of centralization or decentralization in realpolitik can be measured using inter-governmental exchanges at the political, institutional, economic, and financial relations among other parameters, particularly between the higher tiers and the local government units (Ferrazzi & Rohdewohld, 2017). In recent times, works of literature have tended to explain centralization to denote the dominance of the higher tiers (i.e., federal and state governments) over the local government administrations in those aforementioned policy arenas that are even perceived as local affairs. Invariably, this may be interpreted to mean that most African countries are yet to fully embrace the value of the decentralization trends to realize intrinsic development. This is in spite of the fact that Enemu (1999, p. 312) long ago declared regarding African statehoods that "... the centralised state system has neither

promoted development nor has it enhanced national integration."

Given the abysmal outcomes of the centralization mode of inter-governmental relations vis-a-vis African development, it was expected that the political leaders would have more recourse to apply decentralization approaches more. This can be evidenced from the upsurge of research works focusing on local government functionality and its imperative in the intrinsic development process across African states before the commencement of the present millennium (Rodríguez-Pose & Tijmstra, 2007; Olowu & Wunsch, 2004; Harrison, 2001; Wekwete, 2007; *et al*). These studies and various other political maneuvers were all in tandem with the paradigmatic shift away from the centralized state governance system of African political leaders that had been demystified.

However, with time, recentralizing tenets started to rear its head in African governance schemes after the first ten years of this millennium. This could be attributed to scholarly debates over what the concept of devolution or decentralization should actually imply for Africa's intrinsic development. It is to be noted that devolution and decentralization share basic features in principle as they both denote transfer, delegation, or shift in power and responsibilities from the central government to lower sub-national tiers, indicating the state/intermediate and local governments (Ricart-Huguet & Sellars, 2023; Schakel, 2021; Behnke, 2018). Hence, the debate that ensued is between the two-sided

dichotomous belief of the form of functional devolution or decentralization that can better the delivery of qualitative African development.

In a synopsis, the foregoing analysis indicates that a re-centralization mindset is gaining more ground from sub-national state governmental political authorities across Africa. Many African states/intermediate governments desire to exercise *de facto* authority to be overlords of their local political governance mechanisms. This mindset is in tandem with the emphasis that devolution or decentralization should imply transfer or delegation of power or responsibilities to the state/intermediate governments rather than local governments. One plausible reason for this re-centralization tendency is that Africa's neocolonial governance practices still exhibit the inherited governance mentality of their colonial masters, which was built around the centralized state system.

LITERATURE REVIEW

By *realpolitik* is meant the actual factors and circumstances that underpin practical circumstances and considerations of the state of affairs of a social system (Blagden, 2021). This section of the paper aims to address how its key terms connect in the political trajectory and environment of Nigeria's local autonomy-development nexus.

The earlier noted disappointment of the centralized state system to deliver quality development and the imperative of adopting federalist tenets by formalizing tiers of

governments to manage the modern state now makes local autonomy and decentralization issues a topic of currency for advancing African development. Furthermore, the situation called for African statehoods to prioritize institutionalized and formalized local government administration, as well as promotion of local autonomy so as to fast-track the entrenchment of intrinsic development (Atisa, Zemrani & Weiss, 2021; Okudolo, 2022 & 2012; Rugeiyamu & Msendo, 2025). In other words, scholarships that associate achieving intrinsic development of Africa with increased emphasis on devolution and decentralization to local governments are now losing grounds to the contrary school in *realpolitik* and political praxis. The question arises why re-centralizing tenets are returning in a number of African statehoods? To provide answers to the query of why re-centralization tendencies are becoming evident and operational in Africa is the crux of the article.

Regarding the Nigerian *realpolitik*, the period of full-blown colonial administration and governance of Nigeria, the local governments operated under a unitary system. In light of this, Olowu (1988) conceives Nigeria's local administrations as non-sovereign community governments that, although they possess legal personalities, are essentially incorporated as administrative agents or units of the three regional governments. Therefore, the definition of Nigeria's colonial local governments reflects the character of a unitary political system in which centralization of power structure is

coterminous with a principal-agent form of intergovernmental power relations, with local governments not enjoying local autonomy (Olowu, 1989).

Even when Nigeria formally adopted a federal system of government under the Lyttleton Constitution of 1954, local governments were still treated as in the sense of a unitary system, which was clearly the norm delimited by the Richards Constitution of 1946. Ordinarily, centralization of power is mutually exclusive to the federal system of government that emphasizes decentralization. But the kind of decentralization practices that shaped the realpolitik of local autonomy-development linkage of Nigeria from 1954 that held sway retained centralism mentality.

Meaning that, by 1954, Nigerian local governments ought to begin to enjoy some measures of local autonomy driven by decentralization policies and programmes by devolution. But this was not the case as decentralization by deconcentration was more adopted and applied by the regional governments in their intergovernmental relations with local governments. It is to be noted that deconcentration is a type of decentralization model, but it is often accused of exhibiting much of centralism tenets. (Hipp, Lee, Kim & Forthun, 2022). Deconcentration involves redistributing administrative functions and responsibilities to lower-tiers by the central government but retains concrete decision-making powers to higher tier. The implication of emphasizing deconcentration in the

regional government-local government relations during the operation of Nigeria's 1954 Constitution meant that unitary principles still defined local autonomy stature of the country (Okudolo, 2024 & 2021; Okudolo, Breakfast & Mekoa, 2021).

Yahaya (1989, p. 233-239) provides evidence of this inevitable contradiction of decentralization application via deconcentration in Nigeria under a 1954 federal constitutional stipulation by positing that self-determination of the local tiers was never in the consideration of the regional governments. He noted that whatever reforms were executed to the Native Authority System and the popular political representative system practiced in the Northern and Eastern/Western regions respectively, requisite local autonomy was never the goal to be attained. The implication of Yahaya's (1989) supposition is that the requisite local autonomy necessary for intrinsic development to be realizable in Nigeria cannot come about through decentralization by decentralization.

What the above analysis underscores is that even under a federal constitutional framework, Nigerian local governments were yet to live up to the definition of the local government institution as proffered by the United Nations Office for Public Administration (UN-OPD). The UN-OPD defines local government as such:

A political subdivision of a nation which is constituted by law and has substantial control over local affairs, including the

power to impose tax or to exert labour for prescribed purposes... of which the governing body of such an entity is elected or otherwise locally selected. [Okudolo & Onah, 2019, p 12]

Incidentally, the military overthrow of the First Republic's civilian elected political administration in 1966 did not help to address the contradiction of the local autonomy-decentralization necessity in a federal Nigerian constitutional framework. In fact, the truth is that the Nigerian military was not expected to actually transform the persistent unitary intergovernmental relations with local governments of the country upon its entry into active political governance (Amujo, 2012; Okudolo, 2021 & 2022). This thinking is due to the reality world over that the military's command structure and system, dictated by a top-down hierarchical authority flow, is simply the embodiment of the unitary arrangement (Hilde, 2025). However, to the surprise of many local government scholars, including this author, the Nigerian military performed better to entrench decentralization by devolution to strengthen local autonomy functionality for achieving qualitative development in Nigeria's realpolitik.

Most significant policies that empowered the decentralization model and galvanized a functional local autonomy to advance Nigerian development were products of military regimes. For example, the refinement of what a local government should be in a federal

system that Nigeria has now fully embraced is one aspect of the outcome of the 1976 local government reform organized and formalized during the military regime of the Murtala/Obasanjo government. The Guideline for Local Government Reform (FGN, 1976) sees local government as:

Government at local level exercised through representative Councils established by law to exercise specific powers in defined areas. These powers should give the council substantial control over local affairs as well as staff and institutional and financial power to initiate and direct the provision of services and to determine and implement projects so as to complement the activities of the state and federal government in their areas and to ensure through devolution of functions to these councils and through the active participation of the people and their traditional institutions that local initiatives and responses to local needs and conditions are maximized.

From the above definition, the 1976 local government reforms equivocally declare that Nigeria is now to promote decentralization by devolution that is commensurate with a federal system of government. Unlike deconcentration, devolution entails the transfer of responsibilities to lower-tier governments with the requisite power, authority, and right to make and take binding decisions. While Nigeria's version of

decentralization by deconcentration entailed state/regional government's formalization of such local dynamics, decentralization by devolution entailed constitutional stipulation of those local powers (Deacon, 2021).

Specifically, these recommendations of the 1976 LG reform of Nigeria specifically spoke to the galvanization of decentralization by devolution trends for improvement of local autonomy functionality in the country, henceforward:

1. Local government is to be a third tier of government in the Nigerian federation by constitutional declaration.
2. It provided for fiscal federalism as the local governments were now to enjoy a constitutional percentage share of federal and state governments' revenues allocated to them.
3. The constitution was to provide for a set of exclusive internally generated revenue (IGR) sources for the local government administration. And,
4. The constitution was to recognize the democratic credentials of local government. That is, elections and voting are the only legitimacy of local leaders.that take/make public policies.

Emerging from the 1976 Reform is the proper notion of local autonomy in a federal state that Nigeria has now assumed by her inauguration and commencement of the country's Second Republic (1979 - 1983). All

things considered, autonomy as a vocabulary denotes a right to self-government (Ladner, Keuffer & Bastianen, 2025). Hence, Al-Fatih (2025) concedes that local autonomy in realpolitik is usually more a function of formal constitutional determination than informal rules reflecting deconcentrating conveyance.

Therefore, the 1979 Constitution that midwifed Nigeria's Second Republic required decentralization by devolution, and the character of local autonomy in realpolitik was not that local governments were denied *de facto* powers to govern their jurisdictions independently. Wright (1980 & 1983) captures in analysis the import of the 1976 Reforms for the Second Republic local autonomy realpolitik. Wright notes that a denial of requisite local autonomy by sub-national state governmental political authorities to only exercise discretion and not autonomy in the use of political power that has been granted both *de jure* and *de facto* to local government is incompatible with the federal system. Unfortunately, Wright's supposition is what played out mostly during Nigeria's Second Republic in terms of decentralization trends and local autonomy schemes. Wright's studies (1980 & 1983) have persuasively posited the imperative of local autonomy in federalism because to him the federal paradigm is understood to be a matrix of decision-making among established levels of government (federal-state-local government) to achieve intrinsic development.

Gboyega (1987: 175) captures the absurdities of the character of

decentralization by devolution trends and local autonomy as a summation of its realpolitik in Nigeria's Second Republic built on a civilian democratic federal system of governance:

The Second Republic of Nigeria (1979-1983), far from making improvements to the system of local government which was bequeathed by the military regime, exploited, compounded, and dramatised the shortcomings and loopholes in the system. The politicians of the Second Republic quite clearly did not share the values of the soldiers, and therefore had no commitment whatsoever to maintain the structure erected by the soldiers. Although the military leadership identified the values and commitment shared by it and the incoming civilian administration and, as far as local government is concerned, took steps to secure, through the constitution, the essence of the 1976 reforms, the Constitution was blatantly and flagrantly abused and subverted.

Nigeria's Third Republic never operated; hence, we shall not exhaust any analysis of the era in relation to our theoretical and thematic focus. Incidentally, the language and letters of the 1999

Constitution that is midwifing the present Fourth Republic of Nigeria that commenced in 1999 share very little or no difference from that of the 1979 Constitution. An implication of this overt similarity of the constitutional language and letters of the Second and Fourth Republics of Nigeria is that the same absurdities that caused havoc to the realpolitik of decentralization and effective local autonomy of the Second Republic was likely to rare its presence in this present ongoing Fourth Republic (Okudolo, 2019, 2021, 2022, 2024, & 2025; Eleje, 2023; Nwogwugwu & Olusesi, 2015).

The foregoing analysis suggests that the abject poverty of intrinsic development of Nigeria (i.e. a generalization for Africa by extension) relates to the trajectory of promotion of decentralization and the status of local autonomy of the country over time. Generally, tendencies towards centralization or usurpation of decentralization by devolution in Nigeria's present Republic is no longer the blame of colonial legacy but that of attitudinal mindset of neo-colonial political actors across Africa (Othuke, 2024; Olowu, 2012). Indeed, one of the legacies of African colonialism is the penchant for a centralist mindset and an overt disdain for decentralization. Ordinarily, with paradigm shifts dictated by an avid desire to fast-track African states' intrinsic development, decentralization, and addressing local autonomy schemes became necessary. However, from the above analysis of Nigeria's realpolitik trajectory, it is like African neo-colonial political gladiators at the state/regional sub-

national tier levels are championing the retention of this colonial mindset of centralism. Therefore, the paper aims to generate a middle-level theory on the truism that intrinsic development cannot materialize without a functional local autonomy mechanism in place.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

According to Gargano, (2021), centralism is synonymous to top-down development stratagem, while decentralism is substitutable to bottom-up development model. Invariably, failures of top-down development approaches naturally instigates the necessity to emphasize the bottom-up development theory (West, Saunders & Willet, 2021). Hence, this paper utilizes the bottom-up development theory as its theoretical framework of analysis. The proponents of the theory include Keuffer and Horber-Papazian (2020), Arkhipov and Yeletsky (2020), and Dellavalle (2017). According to these proponents, intrinsic social, economic, political and other dimensions of societal development is best actualized *society-qua-society* when the formative principles of national policies is constructed from more of ingredients of the bottom spheres of society.

Therefore, what became evident in the debate was about the degree of autonomy that local governmental political authorities ought to enjoy over their jurisdictional zones in terms of their functional, financial, political, and administrative self-reliance. Clearly were these two dichotomous believe: On the one

hand are scholars that believe that the emphasis of devolution or decentralization should be greater transfer or delegation of power and responsibilities to the state or intermediate governments whom are to own and control the local government units within their jurisdictions (e.g. Wunsch [2001] emphasized this view as a major challenge to reap bountifully from devolution/decentralization practices in Africa).

On the other hand, some argue that entrenching intrinsic African development hinges on greater devolution or decentralization to local governments than the state/intermediate tier, which is to promote and support requisite local autonomy to subsist. (The likes of Dickovick [2011]; Kasim & Agbola [2017]; Okudolo [2018 & 2019]; Okudolo & Mekoa [2019]; *et al* concur with the position that Africa's better route to realize qualitative development is to promote functional local autonomy to persist). In short, the debates resonated the best possible measure of local self-government from a glocalization perspective necessary to realize African intrinsic development logically and speedily (Chigwata, de Visser & Ayele, 2021).

That is, policy benefits are likely not to be widespread if most of its considered feature targets are mostly specific to issues related to top spheres of society. In short, citizens benefit more from a policy if its formative inputs emanate mostly from the considerations of the grassroots conditions than from the upwards spheres of the

federal/national and state/regional levels. A bottom-up development approach regards true development as evolving from accepting that the aggregate of the local grassroots areas' development needs reflects that of the national outlook (Keuffer & Horber-Papazian, 2020)

Arkhipov and Yeletsky (2020) note that a bottom-up development mindset is promoted by greater emphasis on glocalization for the rapid development of multicultural societies. Such thinking engenders a system whereby every policy programme of the higher tier-governments prioritize the needs of local communities in the most pivotal sense. The theory, therefore, has as a prospect to ensure that national development plans take cognizance of local communities' developmental priorities more willfully (Dellavalle, 2017). Scholars such as Dellavalle (2017) notes that the application of the bottom-up development strategy is known to stimulate increased degrees of participatory governance in national development plan formulation, policy implementation, and even policy evaluation. Local grassroots development priorities reflecting local financial, administrative, political-democratic, and functional autonomy is most considered in policies of the higher tiers, wherein adopting the bottom-up development approach.

METHODOLOGICAL CONCERNS

Methodological Orientation:- The article is anchored on the qualitative methodology, utilizing meta-data to analyze the data and generalize

middle-level theories in line with our central thesis. Qualitative methodology involves analyzing textual, visual or oral data already published to explain social phenomena such as affirming the dictum that qualitative development hinges on persistence of a functional local autonomy spectrum (Heinrich, 2024). **Data Collection:-** The study utilized meta-data to analyze the research focus of the article. Meta-data are information sourced from computer that relates with specific descriptive purpose (Riley, 2017). **Data Segmentation:-** The collected meta-data were intellectual works of literature that interrogate the Nigerian local autonomy dynamics to the extent that it shapes intrinsic development process of the country. Only works appearing online between 2015 and 2025 met the requirement to be analyzed. It is also important to stress that only works that dwell on the Nigerian realpolitik environment within the aforesaid period were gathered and analyzed. **Data Analysis Technique:-** The collected meta-data for this study were analyzed using phenomenological analysis technique. According to Finlay (2014), phenomenological analysis technique involves a kind of hermeneutic reasoning whereby the researcher makes valid deductions and interpretations from the collected data. The goal is for the researcher to derive valid and reliable generalizations from the analyzed data so as to properly formulate valid middle-level theories from interpretations and deductions reflecting the focus of the article. In the context, phenomenological analysis is

expected to confirm that qualitative development hinges on functional local autonomy in place.

FINDINGS, ANALYSIS, AND DISCUSSION

Ample evidence suggests that research works from 2015 to date demonstrate our assumed assertion that the absence of intrinsic development in Africa correlates with the receding levels of local autonomy schemes permitted by higher tiers, as well as the intrusion of more centralist tenets in African realpolitik. As earlier said, we use qualitative metadata from Nigerian realpolitik to generalize for the African continent.

For instance, the research of Ata-Agboni, Aliyu, Usman, Ibrahim, Hamza, Wahab, Obaka, and Abdulkerim (2023) noted that Nigeria's operating 1999 Constitution in the country's Fourth Republic fails to clearly entrench bottom-up development theory. The research argues that the letters and language of this operating constitution instead inadvertently empower the state governments to exercise centralist powers to frustrate local autonomy efficacy in Nigeria. Accordingly, this aforementioned 2023 study recommends that lawmakers amend Nigeria's 1999 Constitution to entrench clear and unambiguous letters and language to strengthen Nigeria's decentralization policy application backed with a strong local autonomy mechanism.

Chidiebere and Ndaguba (2018) agree with the above assertion that local autonomy in Nigeria has

suffered from the deliberate politicization of constitutionalism. The realpolitik of intergovernmental relations with Nigerian local autonomy is that state governors apply more of the centralist tenets to benefit political godfathers, ruling state parties, and not for advancing even grassroots development.

Abdulkareem, Abdulhakeem, and Ajadi (2018), Emmanuel, Markanthony, and Oloruntoba (2025), and Okene and Nicholine (2026) all agree that Nigeria's underdevelopment is connected to the willful subordination of local autonomy in realpolitik. These studies concur that grassroots underdevelopment results from poor application of the bottom-up development theory in Nigeria, and as such, national qualitative development cannot transpire.

The studies of Isa (2016), Anyebe, A. A. (2017), Salako and Ajibade (2022), and Othuke (2024) all assert that bottom-up development is nonexistent in Nigeria in spite of public policies ensuring requisite local autonomy exists, such as the Supreme Court's July 11, 2024, ruling enforcing fiscal local autonomy. Consequently, top-down centralization principles still dominate the practice towards pursuing the intrinsic national development of the country. These studies establish that there persists a powerful correlation between functional decentralization, local autonomy, and entrenched national development. Conversely, therefore, in the Nigerian realpolitik, intrinsic development may likely not happen and not be transpiring due to the non-functional bottom-up development policies derived from constitutionally formalized letters and language for local autonomy.

The imperative of deepening qualitative development in Nigeria as a result of the entrenched functionality of local

autonomy due to well-formulated decentralization programmes operating in the country's realpolitik has been demonstrated by a number of researched works in the last decade. Such works include Izokpu (2023), Doho, Ahmed and Umar (2018), Osho and Adams (2025), Ketebu-Orubebe, Egobueze and Osai (2021), Dance, Ibrahim and Dalyop (2024), and *et al.* These aforementioned works underscore one fact: Nigeria's vivid underdevelopment results from the politics of the state-tiers to deliberately undermine local autonomy and implement centralism mindsets in their intergovernmental relations with their local government administrations.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The foregoing analysis indicates that the role of functional local autonomy and decentralization tenets that promote bottom-up development are *sine qua non* to actualize intrinsic development. Entrenching decentralized governance with a broad level of functional local autonomy in Africa is a *desideratum* for qualitative overall development to exist and persist on the continent. Little doubt why works of literature continue to accentuate the aforesaid dictum. The article, therefore, posits that African statehood needs to give priority to secure local autonomy and decentralization measures in realpolitik to realize their qualitative development.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS FOR AFRICAN STATEHOODS

Our foregoing analysis reveals these lessons for African statehoods in terms of realizing their intrinsic development. A good starting point relates to addressing bad political culture, practices, and behaviour regarding entrenching functional local autonomy and formalizing workable

decentralization policies to strengthen bottom-up development theory stratagem in the development process. This calls for formalizing clear and unambiguous language and letters for local autonomy and decentralization in constitutions. It also implies adherence to constitutionalism and the rule of law for realizing functional local autonomy to be able to achieve qualitative development.

Another important lesson for Africa is that, regarding ensuring higher-tier political elites improve on their patriotic politics to promote functional decentralization and local autonomy, realpolitik persists. This calls for African political systems to somehow punish political elites who disregard the importance of promoting functional local autonomy and respect for decentralization policy prescriptions to exist. This may require political parties to only field politicians who understand the importance of autonomous local governments to operate with state-based jurisdictions.

Hence, only higher-tier political leaders with the requisite knowledge of the connection between local governance and intrinsic national development, as exhibited in their campaign manifestos, should eventually be inaugurated. African national development plans must also have enshrined in the formalized documents, punishment mechanisms to be meted out to any elite that implement unpatriotic political culture, practice, and behavior that contradict the entrenchment of functional local autonomy and espouse dysfunctional decentralization policies.

REFERENCES

- AbdulKareem, A. K., Abdulhakeem, A., & Ajadi, I. A. (2018). Local Government Internally Generated Revenue And Administrative Costs: A Question Of Efficiency. *Journal of Techno-Social*, 10(2).
- Al-Fatih, S. (2025). Does the village community have autonomy? between constitutional recognition and international law. *Jurnal Hukum Novelty* (1412-6834), 16(2).
- Amujo, C. (2012). Military intervention in the Nigerian politics and its impact on the development of managerial elite: 1966-1979. *Canadian Social Science*.
- Anyebe, A. A. (2017). An overview of local government autonomy and its functions in Nigeria. *Greener Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(4), 041-044.
- Arkhipov, A. Y. & Yeletsky, A. N. (2020). Modern globalization: Development of glocalization and fragmentation of the world economy” in *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, online: <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJSSP-03-2020-0076/full/pdf>
- Ata-Agboni, J. U., Aliyu, A., Usman, Y. I., Ibrahim, Y., Hamza, N., Wahab, O. T., Obaka, A. & Abdulkerim, Y. (2023). Local government autonomy and democratic dividend in Nigeria: An assessment. *International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research*, 8(5), 112-122.
- Atisa, G., Zemrani, A., & Weiss, M. (2021). Decentralized governments: local empowerment and sustainable development challenges in Africa: G. Atisa. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 23(3), 3349-3367.
- Behnke, N. (2018). Federal, devolved or decentralized state: On the territorial architecture of power. In *Handbook of territorial politics* (pp. 30-44). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Blagden, D. (2021). Roleplay, realpolitik and ‘great powerness’: the logical distinction between survival and social performance in grand strategy. *European Journal of International Relations*, 27(4), 1162-1192.
- Chidiebere, O. A., & Ndaguba, E. A. (2018). Selected difficulties towards effective service provision in the Nigerian local Government. *Journal of Social Sciences, Special Issue*, 1-9.
- Chigwata, T., de Visser, J., & Ayele, Z. (2021). Real or imagined local autonomy: Experiences from local government in Ethiopia, South Africa and Zimbabwe. In T. B. Fenwick, & A. C. Banfield (Eds.) *Beyond autonomy: Practical and theoretical challenges to 21st-century federalism*. Chapter 11, Pp. 189 - 216. Brill Nijhoff Publisher.

Dance, A. M., Ibrahim, A. M., & Dalyop, C. F. (2024). Local government autonomy and rural development in Kaduna state, Nigeria. *International Journal of Intellectual Discourse*, 7(1), 371-386.

Deacon, R. (2021). Devolution. In *Politics UK* (pp. 316-341). Routledge.

Dellavalle, S. (2017). Top-down' vs. 'bottom-up: A dichotomy of paradigms for the legitimization of public power in the EU. in *Perspective on Federalism*, 9(2), pp. 18-46.

Dickovick, J. T. (2011). *Decentralization and recentralization in the developing world: Comparative studies from Africa and Latin America*. Penn State Press.

Doho, A. W., Ahmed, A., & Umar, A. (2018). Local government autonomy in Nigeria: Struggles and challenges. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 5(5).

Eleje, J. N. (2023). Local Government System Failure in Nigeria's Fourth Republic: An Exploration of Key Constitutional Challenges and the Exigency of a Paradigm Shift. *Caritas Journal of Management, Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2(2).

Emmanuel, A. S., Markanthony, I. O., & Oloruntoba, E. O. (2025). Local government autonomy: A deep analysis of management and community leadership in grassroots development in the local government area of Lagos, Nigeria. *Journal of Institutional Research, Big Data Analytics and Innovation*, 1(2), 40-54.

Enemuo, F. C. (1999) "Decentralisation and local government: Models, principles and purpose" in R. Anifowose & F. Enemuo (Eds.) *Elements of politics*. Sam Iroanusi Publications, Lagos.

Ferrazzi, G., & Rohdewohld, R. (2017). *Emerging practices in intergovernmental functional assignment*. Routledge.

Finlay, L. (2014). Engaging phenomenological analysis. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 11(2), 121-141.

Gargano, G. (2021). The bottom-up development model as a governance instrument for the rural areas. The cases of four local action groups (LAGs) in the United Kingdom and in Italy. *Sustainability*, 13(16), 9123.

Harrison, P. (2001). The genealogy of South Africa's integrated development plan. *Third World Planning Review*, 23(2), 175-193.

Heinrich, E. (2024). Revolutionising educational technology: The imperative for authentic qualitative research. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 10, 101073.

Hilde, P. S. (2025). Military and Command Structures. *The Oxford Handbook of NATO*, 311.

Hipp, J. R., Lee, S., Kim, J. H., & Forthun, B. (2022). Employment deconcentration and spatial dispersion in metropolitan areas: Consequences for commuting patterns. *Cities*, 131, 103947.

Isa, M. K. (2016). Nigerian local government system and governance: Lessons, prospects and challenges. In Schoburgh, E. D., Martin, J. & Gatchair S. (Eds.) *Developmental local governance: A critical discourse in alternative development*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Izokpu, O. G. (2023). Effects of Local Government Autonomy on Sustainable Development in Nigeria. *Dynamics of Public Administration*, 40(1), 34-57.

Kasim, O. F., & Agbola, T. (2017). Decentralisation and local government reforms in Africa: Challenges, opportunities and the way forward. *Eastern Africa Social Science Research Review*, 33(1), 89-113.

Keuffer, N. & Horber-Papazian, K. (2020). The bottom-up approach: Essential to an apprehension of local autonomy and local governance in the case of Switzerland. *Local Government Studies*, 46(2), pp. 306-325.

Ketebu-Orubebe, E., Egobueze, A., & Osai, O. J. (2021). Local government autonomy and development of local areas. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation (IJRSI)*, 8(5), 208-216.

Ladner, A., Keuffer, N., & Bastianen, A. (2025). Local autonomy around the world: The updated and extended Local Autonomy Index (LAI 2.0). *Regional & Federal Studies*, 35(2), 163-185.

Nwogwugwu, N., & Olusesi, T. A. (2015). Operation of state-local governments joint account and financial autonomy of local governments in Nigeria's fourth republic. *International Journal of Innovative Research & Development*, 4(11), 85-91.

Okene Nelson, V. C., & Nicholine, U. (2026). Governance and Economic Development in Africa: The Nigerian Experience. *Saudi J. Humanities Soc Sci*, 11(3), 117-128.

Okudolo, I. T. P. (2024). Historicizing Nigeria's constitutional provision for local autonomy and grassroots development in democratic dispensations, 1979-1999. *Ajayi Crowther University Journal of History and International Studies*, 1(1).

Okudolo, P. T. I. (2018). Local government autonomy and revenue generation in Nigeria: A critical review of the Kaduna State Tax (Codification and Consolidation) Law 2016. *Ilorin Journal of Administration and Development*, 4(2), 12-19.

Okudolo, P. T. I. (2019). Local autonomy as imperative for the sustainable diversification of Nigeria's economy (1999-2014): The missing link. *Ekpoma Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3), 178-186.

Okudolo, I. T. P. (2021). Political economy essentialness of local autonomy for Nigeria's optimal development beyond COVID-19: Sacrosanctity of the bottom-up approach. *University of Nigeria Journal of Political Economy*, 11(3).

Okudolo, I. T. P. (2022). Beyond Mere Narrating" African Renaissance": Expediency of Local Autonomy to Entrenching Sustainable Developmental Renaissance in Africa. *African Renaissance (1744-2532)*, 19(1).

Okudolo, I. T. P., & Mekoa, I. (2019). Recurring thread in local administration and its impact on human security in Africa: experience from Nigeria. *African Renaissance*, 16(Special Issue 3), 57-74.

Okudolo, I. T. P., Breakfast, N. B., & Mekoa, I. (2021). Can national development thrive without local government's constructive input? Outlook of Nigeria, with lessons for Africa. *African Journal of Governance and Development*, 10(2), 336-355.

Okudolo, I. P. T., & Onah, E. I. (2019). Efficient local governments and the stability of federalism in Nigeria. *African Renaissance*, 16(3), 11-25.

Olowu, D. (2012). The Constitutionalization of local government in developing Countries-Analysis of African experiences in global perspective. *Beijing L. Rev.*, 3, 42.

Olowu, D., & Wunsch, J. S. (2004). *Local governance in Africa: The challenges of democratic decentralization*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Osho, G. S., & Adams, M. O. (2025). Nigeria Local Government Autonomy and Economic Growth: The Path to Stable and Sustainable Federalism. *Journal of Public Policy and Local Government (JPPLG)*, 81-98.

Othuke, A. A. (2024). Local government autonomy and federalism in Nigeria: Resolving the tripartite power-sharing conundrum through the judiciary. *Nnamdi Azikiwe University Journal of International Law and Jurisprudence*, 15(2), 190-202.

Ricart-Huguet, J., & Sellars, E. A. (2023). The politics of decentralization level: Local and regional devolution as substitutes. *World Politics*, 75(2), 353-389.

Riley, J. (2017). Understanding metadata. *Washington DC, United States: National Information Standards Organization* (<http://www.niso.org/publications/press/UnderstandingMetadata.pdf>), 23(2017), 7-10.

Rodríguez-Pose, A., & Tijmstra, S. A. (2007). Local economic development in sub-Saharan Africa. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 25(4), 516-536.

Rugeiyamu, R., & Msendo, A. (2025). Success, challenges and prospects of decentralization in Africa: a systematic review. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 11(1), 2458700.

Salako, O. A., & Ajibade, O. E. (2022). Local government autonomy and democratic slavery of Nigerian local governments: A case of Ifo Local Government Area of

Ogun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Management and Technology (JORMATECH)*, 7(2), 114-126.

Schakel, A. H. (2021). Exploring and explaining trends in decentralization. In *Handbook on Decentralization, Devolution and the State* (pp. 27-51). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Wekwete, K. (2007). "Strengthening state performance through decentralised governance" in *African Governance Forum (AGF VII): Building the capable state in Africa*. Regional Bureau for Africa, New York: U.N. Development Programme Publication, June 2007.

West, J., Saunders, C., & Willet, J. (2021). A bottom up approach to slowing fashion: Tailored solutions for consumers. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 296, 126387.

Wright, D. S. (1980) "Intergovernmental Games: An Approach to Understanding Intergovernmental Relations" in *Southern Review of Public Administration*, 3(4), pp. 388-403.

Wright, D. S. (1983) "Managing the Intergovernmental Scene: The Changing Dramas of Federalism, Intergovernmental Relations and Intergovernmental Management" in W. E. Eddy (ed) *Handbook of Organizational Management*. New York: Marcel Dekker.

Wunsch, J. S. (2001). Decentralization, local governance and 'recentralization' in Africa. *Public Administration and Development: The International Journal of Management Research and Practice*, 21(4), 277-288.