

**DECONSTRUCTING FEDERALISM: HOW FEDERAL IS THE
FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA**

BY

**CHRISTOPHER OSAHENI
SSC1608256**

**DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN
BENIN CITY.**

JUNE, 2021

**DECONSTRUCTING FEDERALISM: HOW FEDERAL IS THE
FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA**

BY

CHRISTOPHER OSAHENI

SSC1608256

**A PROJECT REPORT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT
OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT FOR THE AWARD OF BACHELOR
OF SCIENCE (B.Sc) DEGREE IN POLITICAL SCIENCE AND
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

**JUNE, 2021.
CERTIFICATION**

This is to certify that this project was carried by Mr. Christopher Osaheni in partial fulfillment of the award of Bachelor of Science (B.Sc), at university of Benin, Benin City, Edo State.

Dr. Osaretin Idahosa
(Project Supervisor)

Date

Dr. Charles Ewere
(Head of Department)

Date

APPROVAL

This project is hereby approved by the Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Benin, in partial fulfillment for the award of Bachelor of Science (B.Sc) degree in political Science and Public Administration.

Dr. Charles Ewere

Date

(Head of Department)

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated firstly to God Almighty for His unfailing love, grace and mercy upon my life, for seeing me through my stay in this noble University of Benin.

I also dedicate this work to my parents Mr. and Mrs. Osaheni (Late), my brothers and sisters.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I give thanks and praise to God Almighty who in His infinite mercy, love and grace has seen me through this project work.

I also appreciate my project supervisor Dr. Osaretin Idahosa and Mr. Sowemino for their assistance, patience and understanding, for taking time to read through my work and making necessary correction just to ensure that this project was carried out properly and in the right order. My sincere appreciation also goes to the Head of Department Dr. Charles Ewere for his moral support, understanding and assistance on my project work and also appreciating my course adviser Miss. Daisy Igbinovia and all my lecturers for their academic impartation.

I also want to say a big thank you to the following members of my Family for their supports, advises and prayers Mr. Nosa Ehigie, Mr. Evans Osaheni, Mr. Edwin Osaheni, Miss. Sandra Osaheni and Miss. Happy Osaheni, my aunty Mrs. Fatima. I

will not forget to appreciate the following people for their advice, love and support in one way or the other: Mr. Elijah Ehikodi, Barr. (Dr.) Emmanuel Obarisiagbon, Dr. Bishop Longe, Mr. Nonso Ufuani, Pastor Austine Okungbowa, Pastor Frank Akhigbe, Living for Christ Mission Ekosodin, Ezekiel Erhahon, Gift Ebhodaghe, Gaius Okoduwa, Stephanie Uwaifo, and finally my class (CLASS ULTIMATE), you all are the best God Almighty has given to me.

Thank you all for your finances, care, love, prayers, moral concern towards me life and education.

ABSTRACT

The study investigates the effect of deconstructing federalism and how federal is the federal republic of Nigeria. The population for the study comprised of all academic and non-academic staff of the University of Benin, Benin City, Edo state. From the population, 135 respondents were sampled using random sampling technique. The samples were further stratified on the basis of gender, educational status, years in service, age distribution. Data were collected using a researcher designed questionnaire titled deconstructing federalism and how federal is the federal republic of Nigeria (DFHFFRN). Data collected were analyzed using percentages and frequency count. Based on the findings, it was observed that Federation determines the distribution of nature, manner and resources, True federalism remains theoretical and practical exclusive, the three (3) tiers of government in Nigeria do not enjoy fair play. Based on these findings, it was recommended that there should be design and working out of development plans at the federal, states and local levels of governance to guide the authorities in planning and execution of development programmes. It was also recommended that Corruption, ethnicity, religious bigotry and all other particularistic feelings and tendencies should be properly checked through functional laws and stiff penalties to minimize ethno- religious and sectional identities among Nigerians.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title page	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ii
Certification-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	iii
Approval	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	iv
Dedication	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	v
Acknowledgement-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	vi
Abstract	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	viii
Table of contents	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	x

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1	Background to the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
1.2	Statement of the Research Problem	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
1.3	Research Questions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
1.4	Objectives of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
1.5	Scope of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
1.6	Significance of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1	Introduction	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13
2.2.1	Federalism: Some Conceptual Discourse and Deconstruction									13
2.2.2	Origins and Structure of Nigerian Federalism	-	-							23
2.2.3	Factors That Necessitated the Adoption of Federalism in Nigeria	--	-	-	-	-	--	-	-	31
2.2.4	The Features of Nigerian Federalism	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33
2.2.5	Historical Antecedence of Federalism in Nigeria	-	-							34
2.2.6	Nigeria's federalism in practice	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40

2.2.7 Nation-building: An insight	-	-	-	-	-	-	45
2.2.8 Nigeria in Global Perspective: Some Contending Discourse on ‘True Federalism’	-	-	-	-	-	-	48
2.2.9 Toward a Definition of ‘True Federalism in Nigeria’:							
Understanding Fallacy of Context	-	-	-	-	-	-	52
2.3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK-	-	-	-	-	-	-	61
Structural-functionalism							

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction	-	-	-	-	-	-	66
3.2 Research Design	-	-	-	-	-	-	66
3.3 Population of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	67
3.4 Sample Size and Sampling Technique	-	-	-	-	-	-	67
3.5 Validity of the Research Instrument	-	-	-	-	-	-	67
3.6 Research Instrument	-	-	-	-	-	-	68
3.5 Method of Data Collection	-	-	-	-	-	-	68
3.8 Method of Data Analysis	-	-	-	-	-	-	69

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

4.1 Introduction	-	-	-	-	-	-	70
4.2 Data presentation and Analyses	-	-	-	-	-	-	70
4.3 Discussion of Findings	-	-	-	-	-	-	80

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction	-	-	-	-	-	-	82
------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

5.2	Summary of Findings	-	-	-	-	-	-	82
5.3	Conclusion	-	-	-	-	-	-	83
5.4	Recommendations	-	-	-	-	-	-	84
	References	-	-	-	-	-	-	86

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Federalism is a constitutional mechanism that allocates powers among different levels of government which traditionally comprises federal, state, and local government. It constitutionally guarantees autonomy over certain policy areas while sharing power under agreed rules over other areas (Adeyi, 2013). Thus, federalism combines partial self-government with partial shared government (Elazar 2007). Federal systems of government are usually associated with culturally diverse or territorially large countries. Examples of countries practicing federalism (Countries with federal-like characteristics, sometimes referred to as ‘quasi-federations’) include Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Germany, India, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Spain, South Africa, and the United States (Elazar 2009).

A federal state is more than a loose alliance of independent states. It defines a sovereign state characterized by the union of partially self-governing constituent units subordinate to a central government. The self-governing status of the component states is constitutionally entrenched and may not be altered by a unilateral decision of the central government (Odetunde, 2004). The component

states of a federation usually possess no powers concerning foreign policy and by implication, they enjoy no independent status under international law (Odetunde, 2004). Federations may be multi-ethnic, or cover a large area of territory, although neither is necessarily the case. They are often founded on agreements among sovereign states based on mutual concerns or interests. The purpose can be the desire to solve mutual problems or to provide for mutual defense. The initial agreements create a stability that encourages other common interests, brings the disparate territories closer together, and gives them all a more common ground without necessarily losing their identities. In a federation, the constituent units are considered in some sense as sovereign, insofar as certain powers are reserved to them that may not be exercised by the central government (Adeyi, 2013).

Federalism originated from the intergovernmental relations in ancient Greece when attempts were made to describe the legal relationships between the leagues and the city-states. The leagues represented the union of several city-states under a single administration while the city-state, like the states in Nigeria today, existed to oversee individual affairs. The leagues then were different from the current structure of modern federalism in that while the various governments freely interacted, no direct contact between the citizens of the various governments was permitted (Alli, 2003). Nigeria is not yet a nation. It is a country created by our erstwhile colonial master, the United Kingdom; made up of many ethnic

nationalities, but a nation is waiting to be born (Moghalu, 2018). Search for a viable government and political system have characterized the affairs of men and states across the world for political and socio-economic development. Nigeria is one of the states that adopted federalism from the colonial era, through independence and post-colonial/independence periods of its political history and experience (Moghalu, 2018). Although many argue that Nigeria's federalism originally emerged as an imposition by the British colonial masters, it has despite its shortcomings, remained the unique and viable political solution to the Nigerian state as a united political entity. The various areas around the River Niger that before January 1914 existed as empires, caliphate, kingdoms, republics, and small independent and or stateless societies became formally united and so areas of the North and South of River Niger became amalgamated by His then Majesty's Government thereby sealing the formation of a new country (Nigeria) with large and heterogeneous population, geographical, political and religious settings and organizations (Afigbo, 2003). Thus there were first, independent nationalities brought together as colonies by the British, then British Protectorates, and finally one united country - Nigeria. Nigeria went through periods of constitutional enactments and changes (1922-1954). From October 1954, Nigeria under the institutional framework of the Lyttleton's constitution and in recognition and official acceptance of the diverse nature of its people, land, and resources began to

operate a federal system of government in which powers were constitutionally shared among the federal (central), three Regions (East, North, and West) and later in August 1963, the Mid Western Region (carved out of the former Western Region of Nigeria). There was a federal Prime Minister and an Executive Council for the federation, Regional Premiers as government leaders and Executive Heads, their Executive Councils, and Ceremonial Governors who were above politics for each of the regions. Under that federal arrangement, there were divisions of constitutional powers between the federal (center) and regional governments. That federal arrangement lasted till January 15, 1966, when the constitution was abrogated in the country's first military coup. The earlier, immediately preceding and subsequent events (bitter politics, excessive regional identities, and divisive tendencies, military coup et cetera) led to the suspension of the constitution and later abrogation of the federalism and its replacement with the unitary system via (Decree No. 24 of May 1966). Subsequent events including disaffection among Nigerians, perceived marginalization especially by the Northerners, near fictionalization of the military, and dissatisfaction with the earlier abrogation of the federal system led to the second military coup.

Statement of the Problem

The nature of the articulation of the problem of diversity, in particular, made federalism an appropriate contemplation. Beginning from its prominence in the

earlier transition moment in Nigeria, the federal ideology has been valorized by weak, marginalized, and excluded ethnic claimants for the emancipatory powers its constituent elements of guaranteed power-sharing, local autonomy, and fiscal decentralization are believed to possess (Mohammed, 2001). Separatist agitation for the creation of new states remains the exception rather than the rule. In other words, notwithstanding the intense and sometimes uncompromising nature of anti-state demands and mobilization, most agitations are for state reconfiguration rather than dissolution, although that remains a distinct possibility where it proves impossible to reconcile differences. If separation or dissolution is the goal of agitation, then, of course, federalism cannot be a viable solution. The demands for power-sharing, equity, resource control, fiscal decentralization, and group rights have territorial and non-territorial dimensions that are amenable to the federal solution. However, although the amenability argument would seem to justify the clamor for federalism in Africa, it is not oblivious of the mixed records of federal solutions and in particular the growing number of ‘failed federations’, the huge costs and complexities of running federal systems, and the unresolved question of whether federalism is a means to an end or an end in itself. But even so, the point made by several authors and supported by the experience of successful federal states is that on balance federal solutions and arrangements have a fairly good

record as systems of political accommodation for the management of diversity and conflict, including problems of minorities (Rothchild 1999).

Consequently, every nation encounters challenges that attract attention to its mode of governance and provide the pedestal for dissecting its socio-economic and political wellbeing. In almost the emergent colonial states in the world, more so in Africa, many countries therein contend with problems relating to incontrovertible identity slogan, eternal connection to ethnicity, and fragile nationality. Although “every nation has her peculiarities, it is such peculiarities that determine the way the nation is governed” (Bright, 2018). The peculiarity of Nigeria consists in its heterogeneity and the deep-seated disintegrating forces that contradict the idea of transforming it into an egalitarian society. The evasive political contour emanates from the inability to adopt a generally accepted system of government and constitution or balanced political structure that provides for an equal number of administrative centers and federating units. It denies equity in representation, equal benefits from the government, and breeds mystifying problems, which show that most autonomous pre-colonial communities, forcibly fused by alien powers to form an incompatible political union without rigorous efforts to glue the distinct groups together, scarcely nurtures itself into a viable nation. As a result of the shared belief that most colonial states lack the quintessence of nation status. Hence,

the study investigates deconstructing federalism and how federal is the federal republic of Nigeria.

Research Questions

In this study the following research questions will be addressed;

- i. What is the formula for the distribution of the federation account resources across the three tiers of government in Nigeria?
- ii. To what extent does the federal system of government affect nation-building and national development in Nigeria?
- iii. What are the rational principles of federalism in Nigeria?

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the study is to deconstructing federalism and determine how federal the federal republic of Nigeria is.

In this study the following research questions will be addressed;

- i. Determine the formula for the distribution of the federation account resources across the three tiers of government in Nigeria;
- ii. Examine how the federal system of government affect nation-building and national development in Nigeria;
- iii. Determine the rational principles of federalism in Nigeria.

Scope of the Study

This study attempts to deconstruct federalism and determining how federal the federal republic of Nigeria is.

The study covers both academic and non-academic staff of the University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State.

Significance of the Study

The study will be a huge contribution to the body of literature in the area of deconstructing federalism and determining how federal is the federal republic of Nigeria is, thereby constituting the empirical literature for future research in the subject area. This study will inform the general public on the activities of true federalism and national development in Nigeria.

There are five chapters in this study. Chapter one, is the introduction, the background to the study, the statement of the problem, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, the scope of the study, limitations of the study, and definition of the terms.

Chapter two presents a literature review; introduction, conceptual framework on the study under review, the concept of federalism, deconstructing federalism, the origin of federalism in Nigeria, federalism and constitutional provisions,

federalism, nation-building and national development, challenges of true federalism in Nigeria, and its theoretical underpinning.

Chapter three presents of methodology; introduction, research design, the population of the study, sample and sampling technique, method of data collection, research instrument, and method data analysis.

Chapter four data presentation, analysis and interpretation of results; introduction, data presentation, data analysis and interpretation and discussion of findings. This chapter tries to show the relationship between variables under review.

Chapter five presents a summary of the findings, conclusion, recommendations, and suggestions for further studies, bibliography, and appendix.

References

- Adeyi, E. M. (2013). Politics of emancipation: The struggles of Solomon DaushepLar. Jos: *Global Emancipation multi-services*. 14
- Afigbo, A. E. (2003). Federal character: its meaning and history. Federalism and Cite as: *An Evaluation of the Origins, Structure and Features of Nigerian Federalism*, 1(5), 314-325
- Alli, W. O. (2003). The development of federalism in Nigeria: Contending issues and perspectives in Aaron Gana and Samuel G. Egwu federalism in Africa. Eritrea: Africa World Press, Inc.
- Bright, E. (2018). The Restructuring Debate. *The Sun Newspaper online*, accessed in 18th December 2018, <https://www.sunnewsonline.com/the-restructuring-debate-2/>
- Elazar, D. (2009). Introduction: Why Federalism? *Federalism and Political Integration* (Tel Aviv: Turtledove).
- Elazar, D. (2007). *Exploring Federalism* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press).
- Mohammed, M.A.(2001). *African Democracies and African Politics* (London: Pluto Press).
- Rothchild, D.(1999). *Ethnic Insecurity, Peace Agreements and State Building, Conflict and Democracy in Africa* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner).

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Introduction

This chapter critically reviews relevant literature on the subject matter and the theoretical framework of analysis underpinning the study.

2.2 Federalism: Some Conceptual Discourse and Deconstruction

Federalism is a system of government, which scholars have examined from different perspectives. Federalism is not a straightjacket system of government, as many people would perceive, especially in developing countries. Federalism differs in conception and practice across many countries of the world, even though benchmarks for federalism are universal. The differences in the conception of federalism are informed by the fact that its adoption and domestication usually reflect the internal dynamics and material conditions of the different countries practicing federalism as a political framework to manage the dynamics associated with multiculturalism.

Several scholars across the world have written about federalism. They also differ in opinions, both theoretically and empirically on the application and contextualization of federalism, without necessarily abusing the core values of the system. Some of these scholars include the father of the classical theory of modern

federalism, Professor K.C. Wheare whose literature on Federal Government published in 1964, laid the foundation of the discourse on modern federalism. On his theoretical breakthrough, other federal thinkers like Levingston 1956; Riker 1964; Friedrich 1968; Elazar 1987; Oyovbaire 1985; Awa 1976; Watts 1999 among others, from different viewpoints contributed to the study of or expanded the discourse on federalism. In their separate studies and theorizations on federalism though interlocking, form the different molds on the practice of federalism. The context from which these scholars have engaged the debates on federalism has been shaped largely by their environments, experiences, perceptions, and scholarships drawn from the poll of studies of the nature and practice of federalism in many countries across the world.

One of the most profound Nigerian federal scholars, Oyovbaire (1979) has extensively studied and analyzed the dynamics of federalism in several countries across the world. Specifically, his close study of the sentiments of various scholars on American federalism concluded that the problem with the attempt to study federalism relates to the problem of empiricism. He posited that ‘empiricism in political science is an exercise in observation, analysis and explanation of social phenomena at one time in one place, or at one time in several places, or at different times in one place’ (Oyovbaire, 1979). It, therefore, implies that there is no generalization, whether in theory or practice, about federalism.

It also implies that understanding the working of federalism in any country requires the understanding of the nature and character of the relationship therein. This relationship within a state system depends on the place, time, and political and economic atmosphere of the country. Federalism, as a political and economic framework, is widely practiced in many countries, such as Nigeria, Australia, Canada, United States, Germany, and India among others. In practical terms, the practice of federalism differs in the countries identified. This indicates that federalism is not a static concept, its application changes depending on the change in conditions that warrants it, not exogenously but endogenously construed.

From the above context, what then is federalism? Arowolo (2011) offered the etymological conception of the word 'federalism', that it is a concept derived from the Latin word *foedus*, meaning 'covenant'. Simply put, federalism is therefore a treaty or agreement over the distribution of the spheres of operation, both vertically and horizontally, in a political community. In this instance, federalism determines the nature and manner power and resources are distributed. Therefore, federalism is at one point about the distribution of power and resources between the government for all and the government for the constituent units, and at some other point, it is between the organs of government, such as the executive, legislature, and the judiciary.

Notwithstanding, Arowolo (2011) cited Ajayi (1997) to define federalism as ‘a political system where there are at least two levels of government. In such a case, there is the juxtaposition of two levels of power as the central government, otherwise, the federal government and other component units, labeled variously as states, regions, republics, cantons, or unions’. To Wheare (1964), federalism is ‘the method of dividing powers such that the general and regional governments are each, within a sphere, co-ordinate and independent’.

Also, Sagay (2008) argued that in a federal arrangement, ‘the central authority exists as a government separately and independently from others, operating directly on persons and properties within its territorial area and with a will of its apparatus for the conduct of affairs and with an authority in some matters exclusive of others’. These definitions of federalism from the legal and/or constitutional standpoint are narrow conceptions about federalism. This leads to exploring other definitions of federalism. Elazar (1987) cited in Aalen (2002), defined ‘federalism as “a political remedy for political diseases”, designed to prevent tyranny without preventing governance’. This means that the role of the federal system as a political framework to remedy political diseases by promoting a way of checking power and creating balances cannot be undermined (Burgess, 1993).

However, other perspectives also exist about federalism. One of these perspectives is sociological, which sees federalism as that link between the state and society aiming at the attainment of national integration. In this context, Oyovbaire (1979), contends that there exist at least two patterns of communities, one all-inclusive and the other composed of several exclusive communities in any federal system. In the federal practicing countries, the federal system is reduced to having the central and regional government respectively, with some considerable level of autonomy to enable federating units to enjoy constitutional protection from at least two levels of government (Elazar, 1987; Vernon, 1988). Put differently, federalism must reflect the distinct characteristics of the principal and minor ethnolinguistic groups. The objective of this principle is to accommodate diversities of ethnicities, cultures, and traditions as evidence of ‘unity in diversity’ (Awolowo, 1966).

The second perspective is that federalism is about the pluralistic inter-relationship that goes on not just among the institutions of government or between different level’s governments, but also about the practical socio-economic, political and cultural relationship, which exist in the society (Livingstone, 1956). This means that federalism as a political framework has the capacity of managing conflict in diverse settings (Horowitz, 1997). However, the capacity for mitigating conflicts is not absolute, it rather depends greatly on the institutional structures of

the state and certain prevailing conditions. Nevertheless, irrespective of the lacunas in federalism, its impacts by managing diversity in divided societies go beyond other political frameworks (Bird & Ebel, 2005). The third perspective is about the procedures and functionality of federalism. Riker (1964) associated federalism with the political dynamics of the party and intergovernmental relations in divided societies.

Accordingly, the adoption of federalism is significant for two reasons, which include first, the constant desire and quest among politicians at all level to expand their territorial control and relevance, and, the second is about the governed being willing to submit themselves and their rights to self-government in exchange for peaceful coexistence and wellbeing. On the part of intergovernmental relations, federalism permits autonomous fields of operation to the extent that no one part is worse-off to decide to quit the federation (Riker, 1964). In this context, federalism is, therefore, an outcome of a rational bargain among various constituencies for a better life, socially, economically, and politically. The essence of the rationale bargain in federalism is the need to achieve greater economies and political freedom to protect and promote constituents' valued identities in a multi-ethnic state formation.

Moreover, federalism is a non-equilibrium political process, as such federal arrangements are bound to be unstable, and over time may change to the advantage

or disadvantage of other federating units. Federalism could be peripheral (where the sub-national body is more powerful than the central body) or centralized (where power gravitates to the national government) (Riker, 1964). Either way, the nature of federalism has a direct implication on the state. When power gravitates to the subordinating units, it will undermine and negate the essence of federalism. When power gravitates more to the central units, the coordinate bodies lose a certain level of independence, thereby making the power at the center to be twice the power at the circumference. Put differently, power-sharing between the central government (government for all citizens) and co-ordinate government (government for specific groups of ethnic enclaves) in most circumstances disproportionately favors the central government. This situation begs for federal bargaining to adjust the interplay within the federal pluralist societies like Nigeria (Riker, 1964).

In addition, federalism is a process for generating development. For example, the plural nature of the state can effectively be harness and channeled towards achieving national collective goals. Friedrich (1968) and Deutsch (1973) in their respective studies understood the efficacy of federalism towards the development of multicultural societies. All over the world, federalism depends on the social, economic, and political conditions of the state. The stronger is the economy, the better the political condition of the state and its citizens (Watts, 1999). Federalism, therefore, is not only a political ideology as others may conceive, rather a political

framework designed to solve the problems associated with multiculturalism through collective processes of constitutional, sociological, and functional means of the federal system (Odofin, 2003). There are two points to deduce from the above assertions. First, is the manner ‘power’, which also symbolizes ‘resources’ that are generated and distributed at all levels of government in the state. Lastly, is the procedural relations, which exist at the level of inter-governmental relations and informal institutional relations in the state. These constitute central concern about the working of federalism because it hinges on ‘unity in diversity’ as well as ‘shared rule and self-rule’, which sustains the hard-won compromises that no federating unit has an absolute victory (Elazar, 1987). In a federal system, all federating units collectively work for the survival of the state, and no federating unit can quit the federation, except upon the consent of all the federating units.

2.2.1 Origins and Structure of Nigerian Federalism

When the colonialist came to colonize what later becomes Nigeria, the colonization was by force and suppression of peoples’ rights. According to Osadolor cited in Amuwo (2003) “the decision of Lugard to create a unified Nigeria on 1st January 1914 did not result from the pressure (consent) of local political groups; it derived from considerations of administrative convenience as interpreted by a colonial power”. This suggests that the formation, evolutionary process, and unification of Nigerian political and administrative systems did not

represent the interest and aspirations of the natives or political groups. The early pre-independence constitutional development is an example of this misrepresentation of the native consent on what type of system Nigeria will run—whether a federation, a confederation, unitary, or not. According to Okadigbo (1987) “after the amalgamation of the Northern and Southern protectorates of Nigeria in 1914, the country was more or less run as a unitary colony with twenty-four provinces (12 in the North and 12 in the South) until the establishment of the federal order via the Richards constitution of 1946.

Thereafter, ethnic politics (otherwise known as tribalism) and regionalism became definitive features of Nigeria federalism”. Okadigbo (1987) further observed that “to contain regionalism as well as secession, General Gowon created twelve states out of the pre-existing four regions (6 in the North and 6 in the South) and General Murtala Mohammed created seven more (10 in the North and 9 in the South) in 1976. From 1967 through 1976 till date, regionalism gave way to statism, which in effect engendered a greater sense of loyalty to one’s state of origin than to the Nigerian nation. Accordingly, statism assumed the form of sub regionalism and sub-ethnic irredentism at the state levels”. Finally, Okadigbo (1987) observed that: After the major’s coup of January 1966, which ironically brought General Aguiyi Ironsi to power, there was an attempt to impose a unitary state structure through

the infamous Decree N0.34 of 30th, May 1966 which purportedly abolished the regions and unified the public services.

This fatal decree became the last straw that broke the back of the federal camel. Responses thereto varied from appalling massacre (as revenge) of Nigerians from the Southern regions, especially the Igbos, the repatriation or flight- en masse- of persons to their places of origin in Southern Nigeria, and the declaration of independence by Eastern Nigeria in the name of the Republic of Biafra, to the return of federalism, this time with a stronger center. Thenceforth, the general agreement of Nigerians seemed to be that Nigeria should remain a federal Republic. The question has been what type of federal Republic”? In 1987, General Ibrahim Babangida created nine additional states thereby bringing the total number of states in the country to thirty (Oyediran, 2008). Thereafter, in 1996 General Sani Abacha created six new states, and 183 new Local Government areas throughout the country, thereby bringing it to thirty-six states and 774 local government areas, and Federal Capital Abuja (Ibid). These were all aimed at restructuring and consolidating Nigerian federalism. However, the earliest colonial constitutions in Nigeria from 1922-1951 namely Clifford, Richards, McPherson all did not voluntarily or involuntarily agreed to give considerable room for a federal –state. They refused to allow Nigerians (natives) to be fully part of the constitutional making process. Their participation was constitutionally limited in scope until a

united struggle and resistance by Nigerian nationalists irrespective of regional and ethnic affiliations from within and outside the country for a new constitution. Sequel to the resistance, Lyttleton's constitution of 1954 was reviewed to allow the emergence of a formal federation.

According to Oyeneye (2001) "however, it was the Lyttleton constitution which came into effect on 1st October 1954 that introduced real federalism in Nigeria. The constitution shared powers between the central and regional governments, giving out details on issues that were exclusive to only one level and those on which both could legislate. Regional premiers were also provided for in the constitution". Other pre-colonial constitutions that were made before Lyttleton, with exception of Richard's constitution of 1947 to some extent, all others were repugnant to a purposeful federal constitution. However, certain measures were put in place to curb resistance and struggle by the nationalists against colonialism. For instance, as a mechanism to curb African nationalism, the National Congress of British West Africa in 1920, organized and demanded reforms in the British West African colonies, Sir, Hugh Clifford, the then Governor of Nigeria, immediately sought to divide the nationalist and frustrate their course by arguing that "*The people of West Africa do not belong to same stock and are not common descent*" (Cited in Nnoli, 1980).

Sir, Hugh Clifford further made it clear that his administration will seek “to secure and separate people the right to maintain its identity, its individuality, and its nationality, its chosen form of government, and peculiar political and social institutions which have been evolved for it by the wisdom and the accumulated experiences of generations of its forebears” (Cited in Okorie, 2003:15). This was in line with the provision of the Clifford constitution. The Clifford constitution sought to divide the country along a communal line (Nnoli, 1980:112). It was purely a colonial policy to encourage regionalism. This further the division of the country into three regions; Eastern; Northern; and Western; along ethnic and communal lines dominated by the three major ethnic groups; Igbo, Hausa-Fulani, and Yoruba respectively. According to Okorie:-The three regions created in the 1930s were to toe the ethnic line, as a result, there was distrust, lack of cooperation, and rivalry among the three dominant ethnic groups that dominated the political scene. The Igbo, Hausa-Fulani, and Yoruba led its geographical area as a basis for political support and nationalistic activism (2003:16). This division was made by Bernard Bourdillon, the then Governor of Nigeria, and the division was made precisely in 1939. The constitutional arrangement which came into effect in 1947 was the first time the North and the South were brought into the same legislative authority to discuss some issues of common interest (Anifowose and Enomou, 1999).

This represented the first step towards federalism in Nigeria. This happened as a result of the struggle, resistance, yearning, and agitations of the nationalists as earlier mentioned, irrespective of region and ethnic affiliation (Anifowose and Enomou, 1999). Nationalism, therefore, as Rodney (1972) defined is “a certain form of unity which grows out of a historical experience. It is a sense of oneness that emerges from social groups trying to control their environment and to defend their groups”. Nevertheless, the amalgamation of 1914 of the Northern and Southern protectorates generated a sense of inward-looking and antagonistic tendencies within the union. This is because the British colonialist failed to, first of all, create a common forum to bring the two different entities together to understand each other (Takaya in Elaigwu and Akindele 1996). The differences at the micro and macro levels created a social, political, administrative, and economic imbalance. According to Nnoli (1980), “these differences in the systems of education not only created an educational imbalance between the North and the South but as far as the emergence of ethnicity was concerned, it widened the social distance between the peoples of the two parts of the country”. So also, at the political and administrative levels, as Nnoli further observed:- The various parts of the country did not share a common experience for a long time. The North was excluded from the area of the legislative competence of the council set up by the 1922 constitution. In fact, from the time of the amalgamation of the South and

North in 1914 to 1946 the two parts of the country maintained only a tenuous linkage in law through the person of the Governor. They retained their distinctive political identities and maintained separate administrations (1980).

The contention brought by this colonial arrangement created a situation where the southern protectorate became qualitatively developed by man-power (educated) and (physical) infrastructure as well as economically; while the Northern protectorate was quantitatively developed by geographical might and large population. This distinctive variation generated tension between the Northern and Southern nationalists who earlier on were united in the struggle for the liberation of Nigeria. For instance, on 31st March 1953, Anthony Enahoro moved a motion in the House of Representatives for Nigeria's independence in 1956, a move which the Northern representatives resisted. The excuse given by the Northern representatives was that the North was far behind the South in development "*that it would be a junior partner to it in an independent Nigeria*" (Nnoli, 1980). The extent to which as Ayoade (1996) noted "the Northern delegates advocated a confederal arrangement to guarantee separate development which had then become conventional wisdom". The Western delegates, who ever before are advocates of confederation, advocated a confederal arrangement too. The Eastern Region remained neutral. Hence, the "general trend of thought was that of bias for a federal system which becomes an interesting theme of debate"

(Amuwo, 2003:37). Sir, Abubakar Tafawa Balewa in his words maintained that “I am beginning to think that Nigeria’s political future may only lie in a federation because so far as the rate of regional progress is concerned, some of the regions appear to be more developed than others” (Cited Amuwo, 2003).

2.2.2 Factors That Necessitated the Adoption of Federalism in Nigeria.

Oyediran (2008) and Oneyeye (2001) summarized the factors that necessitated the adoption of federalism in Nigeria as follows:-

Heterogeneity/cultural differences: Nigeria is made up of diverse ethnic groups, religions, customs, traditions, and languages. These diversities are a problem to the operation of a unitary system. The peoples, therefore, opted for federalism to retain as much as possible identity.

Size and Population: The country is too large both territorially (size) and in population for a unitary system of government, and federalism became inevitable for administrative convenience.

Historical /Colonial factor: The different ethnic groups in Nigeria had developed different administrative structures. The colonial principle of indirect rule allowed each region to preserve its cultural and traditional practices different from those of other regions.

Economic factor: In Nigeria, natural resources are scattered, therefore component units must unite as a federation to harness the resources for their overall benefit in addition to even and rapid economic development.

Fear of Domination: There has been suspicion among the various ethnic groups, particularly the major ones like the Yoruba, the Igbo, and the Hausa-Fulani. There was also fear by the minority groups that they would be dominated by the majority ones. Federalism, therefore, offers the opportunity for self-preservation by different groups.

Divide and Rule Policy of the British Colonial Administration: The British policy of divide and rule was a deliberate attempt to keep Nigeria weak and decentralized. The British considered unity among the various ethnic groups as a threat to their imperialistic interest.

2.2.3 The Features of Nigerian Federalism

Oyediran, Nwosu, Takaya, Anifowose, Badejo, Ogboghodo, and Abgaje (2008) gave the general features of Nigerian federalism in summary as follows:-

1. Division and sharing of governmental powers between the federal and the regional or state governments;
2. The derivation of the powers of the different levels of government from the constitution.

3. Adoption of a written and rigid constitution.
4. The supremacy of the federal government.
5. The existence of a supreme court for judicial interpretation and review.
6. Unified police force
7. Decentralization of the public service and the judiciary.
8. The existence of a bicameral legislature at the federal level.
9. The principle of the federal character; and
10. A three-tier system of government.

2.2.4 Historical Antecedence of Federalism in Nigeria

The evolution and development of Nigerian federalism could be dated back to the period of the pre-colonial era. According to some political scientists, sociologists, and historians, the available literature shows that there were other reasons as pointed out by Erim, O E. (1996) that “the logic of British interest in colonial Nigeria favored a strategy of divide and rule. A strategy, which, he observed, in which the British officers stationed in different parts of Nigeria corroborated and the Nigerian’s primordial features of the indigenous society which the British conquered each kingdom, state, empire, republic, separately and negotiated separate treaties with each made a federal or confederal arrangement inevitable. While each of these has shaped the political history and future of Nigeria as a federal state. This means that those that were sympathetic to the cause

of Nigerian nationalism maintained that it was for administrative convenience that the British colonial administration attempted to administer Nigeria based on the federal structure to protect their interest and save cost and problems of personnel. The other reason was to ensure that, if there was any emergence and advocacy for new states, such would forever remain weak, unstable, unrealizable, or unachievable.

Furthermore, Erim, O.E. (1996) concluded that it was revealed that the British had no long-term political program, and therefore matters were attended based on ad-hoc manner. Because of this, the British had never faced up the problems of political unification of the country they had created rather they assumed it somehow would solve itself with time by a process of natural evolution. The emergence of Nigeria as a federal system of government came after independence as pointed out by Samuel (2009) that the debate on the source of authority of how Nigeria arrived at a different view of the constitution and federation. In the analysis, the separated protectorates such as Lagos, defunct southern and northern protectorates became one and independent polity thereafter was agreed to have a general government for certain limited purpose where justification have been deduced for succession, interpositions, and state rights.

According to Samuel (2009), men who conceived the original design of American federalism worked from the premises of the national theory. American

federalism presupposes their nationalism. The constituent power was one people (the nation). The idea by which a nation would act not only the constituent power but also as to continue controlling and directing the influence in the political life of its citizenry through representation. This postulation had preoccupied the energies of the long struggle and continued to be central to the shaping of the federal structure.

Tella, Doho&Bapeto It was against this development that Humphrey N. (1977) posits that: It is neither false nor an exaggeration to postulate that the critical problem of political development in Nigeria lies not in the absence of political authority, but in the existence of several legitimated authorities in the wider society which inhibits the exercise of national political authority. The situation remained like this until 1914 when Lord Lugard succeeded in effecting the unification of the southern and northern protectorates now called Nigeria. Some of the reasons that informed the amalgamation were, among others, not only the needed financial assistance from the south and the British to the North but also the intention of granting the south the administrative features that were lacking but were so much perfected in the North. However, beyond the reasons for the unification was the intention of granting southern Nigeria the administrative features that had since been perfected by the North. According to Okafor (1981), Lugard only had very little experience limited to the north from 1900-1912;

Nigeria-south and North drastically changed administrative style and purpose. Furthermore, he also stated and observed disapprovingly that the educated Elite observed since the arrival of Lugard in Nigeria in 1912; Lugard made it categorically clear that the social and political situation in Nigeria must be made to conform to northern Nigeria interest. Nigeria was divided into three areas, which were the colony and the northern and southern provinces. This would have been an excellent arrangement if the principle was also laid down that each division shall be autonomous (free). Furthermore, each area shall have within it a perfect machine for effective government, subject nevertheless to central control. Therefore, this central authority should have the power of dealing with matters peculiar to each. This would have thereby become a federate state. After the unification in 1914, the new Nigerian state and the issue of its continued survival dominated the constitutional evaluation of Nigeria beginning with Clifford's attempt to change the system he inherited, which made administrative and political departments remain separate. As a result, there were growing conflicts due to differences in tradition, character, and orientation.

It was in response to this that The late sir Ahmadu Bello, the Sark of Sokoto in his book entitled "My Life" opined that the 1914 amalgamation of Southern and Northern Nigeria was a mistake and that the north could have been allowed to go on their way. Despite this, Clifford still attempted to unify the

country by destroying the myth of separate development of the North and South which was resisted by the British colonial officers. After a new change of leadership in 1943, Sir Arthur Richard took over the leadership of Nigeria as Governor-General and divided the country into three regions in a federation without necessarily calling it a federation. However, it was in response to this arrangement that Chief Obafemi Awolowo observed and stated that: Nigeria is not a nation; it is a mere geographical expression. There are no Nigerians in the same sense as there English, Portuguese or French; the word Nigeria is merely a descriptive appellation to distinguish those who live within the boundaries of Nigeria from those who do not According to Awolowo, for the sake of smooth and speedy progress, steps must be taken then to develop the various ethnical groups in the country along this line. He, therefore, subscribed to the creation of as many provinces as there are ethnic groups, with each being independent and autonomous regarding its internal affairs and each must have its own regional house of assembly.

In line with what Obafemi Awolowo said, AbubakarTafawaBalewa concluded that Nigeria existed as a country only on paper as it was still far away from being united. Nigeria was only a British intention for the country. Similarly, NamdiAzikiwe also advocated for the same form of federalism. To this end, from 1947 to 1955, a federal constitution was adopted in Nigeria and took over the

mantle of leadership from the colonial masters, thus continuing the struggle between North/South for separate development as well as control of resources in the center. Given this, the political battle between such till today is yet to be resolved and currently costing the country political instability as directly responsible for the setting up of the present National Constitutional Conference which has been agitated for in some quotas.

2.2.5 Nigeria's federalism in practice

Nigeria's federalism started on a premise of incongruence borne out of a high degree of heterogeneity and multiculturalism evidenced by the presence of about four hundred (400) diverse ethnolinguistic groups occupying her vast territory but subsumed under three (3) major ethnic groups - Ibo, Hausa, and Yoruba. These diverse groups were brought together by a 'holding together' process (Stepan, 1999) which did not result from an agreement or the consent of the federating parties. The nations existed separately and independently under different political authorities for centuries until they were forcefully brought together, by the British, into the state called Nigeria (Awa, 1964). Federalism in Nigeria is unique in certain respects due to the departure from the classical federal theory which canvasses government based on constitutionalism and the constitutional sharing of political and revenue powers between the federal and state governments and sometimes, the local governments using the principle of

decentralization of powers. It is marked by party politics, which determines the nature of the federation, the configuration of powers, and the prevalence of the rule of law (US Country studies). Besides from these characteristics, federal structures are also expected to uphold a degree of self-rule for the constituent units concerning some of the sectors of the economy e.g. health, education, etc. However, the varying historical backgrounds and experiences have contributed to the departures of federations from the norm (Ndu, 2003).

Between 1954 and 1966, Nigerian federalism under the colonial and civilian regimes functioned fully despite imperfections. Ironically, under a civilian regime between 1979 and 1983, a weak federal system was practiced as a result of the influence of the preceding military governments and the fact that the constitution in place was a child of the military government leading to the operation of a unitary-federal system (Elaigwu, 1996). Military rule in Nigeria spanned about thirty years beginning from the early years immediately following her independence and gradually metamorphosing into ‘military’ federalism. The present structure of the federation whereby the creation of all the states and local governments was done by successive military governments further ingrained the excessive federal dominance in Nigeria’s political landscape (Okediji, 2003).

Even the delineation of the country into six geo-political zones – the North-Central, North-East, North-West, South-East, South-West, and the South-South

(Eze, 2014) was done during the seemingly unending transition program of General Sani Abacha which began on April 22, 1994, but was truncated with his demise on June 8, 1998, Idachaba E (2001). Reasons for this included easier representation of the states within the zones, enhanced and effective governance, and the smoothing over of topical political issues including the rotational presidency, resource control, and so forth, arising from the multicultural and ethnic diversity within the country.

In Nigeria, there are three levels of government and the constitution prescribes a clear distribution of powers between the state and federal governments. The exclusive list in the Nigerian constitution belongs to the Federal Government (FG) and contains 68 items. The concurrent list contains 12 items for legislation by the FG and state governments (SGs) with the FG having absolute veto power in areas of conflict. However, the items on the states' legislative list are almost inconsequential when compared to those on the exclusive list (constitution, 2016) thereby still upholding the age-long over-centralization of power. The local governments on the other hand are largely administrative agencies of the federal and state governments. Fiscal federalism in Nigeria is determined by the Federal Government. It implies a process of dividing tax income and functional responsibilities across the various tiers of government in a federation (Nkwede, 2013). In Nigeria, this process is heavily dependent on crude oil as the mainstay of

the economy. Crude oil was first discovered in 1958 in the area now described as the South-South geo-political zone but better known as the Niger Delta region. Before the discovery of oil, which placed Nigeria on the world scene as the sixth highest producer of the commodity (Lapegna, 2016), agriculture was the mainstay of the economy and the regions fared well in the production of their staple crops. With the oil boom and the instituted sharing formula for the oil wealth, agriculture and other revenue-generating sources like solid minerals were relegated, further threatening the stability of Nigeria's fiscal federalism.

Unlike most developed federations, the states in Nigeria depend on the allocations from the FG as prescribed in the power-sharing formula which also vests authority over the key sources of revenue in the FG (Onuigbo, 2015). This position was decried by the states and especially the main revenue-producing states which felt short-changed by the population, need minimum government responsibility, and equality formulas on which allocations to states were based. Currently, the oil-producing states get higher allocations based on the derivation formula to enable them to meet their responsibilities and the demands of their communities (Phillips, 1991). From 1999 to date, Nigeria has been under civilian rule with a very strong federal system. All tiers have functioned effectively particularly since the second tenure of the Obasanjo administration that ran between 2003 and 2007. The first tenure was dotted with influence by the out-gone

military administration but with much adjustment to democratic practice, more signs of a future for federalism in Nigeria have appeared (Elaigwu, 1996).

2.2.6 Nation-building: An insight

Globalization, with advantages like westernization and free trade among countries, still has a few downsides such as brain drain, nonunionized workforces, Americanization, and so forth, reflective of the cultural hegemony of the richer nations. Liberals coming from a stance of cultural pluralism argue that nation-building is wrong in principle and is an unjust attempt at cultural imperialism. The ‘options’ and ‘opportunities’ that come with globalization are taken because of the desires for better conditions and the failures of leadership to provide good governance. Originally, nation-building referred to the efforts of newly independent nations, notably the nations of Africa but also in the Balkans, to reshape territories that had been carved out by colonial powers or empires without regard to ethnic, religious, or other boundaries (Deutsch, 1963). It is also the process of establishing civic order and governmental functions in countries that are emerging from a period of war or other types of upheaval (Pan, 2005). In foreign policy, it defines the relationship between countries, especially between the developed and less developed countries in a bid to avert state failure by ensuring that states develop democratic structures deemed imperative to the survival of any state.

Nation-building entails regional, political, social, and economic activities that are directed towards national development. It is a complex undertaking because of the task of fitting the basic interconnected structures of any country (political, economic, taxation, and judicial systems, infrastructure, cultural, educational, and medical institutions, and more) into a unified, organic whole. It involves the policies and programs put in place to ensure that a nation does not become a failed state (CABE) 2010.. (Pan, 2005) noted that nation-building as described by the United Nations (UN) entails essential steps such as:

- Security which guarantees citizens a safe environment;
- Political reform that involves building a civil society, developing strong local and provincial governments, and ensuring freedom of the press and other civil liberties;
- Economic reconstruction implying the restoration of economic infrastructure by establishing lines of credit for business, restarting industry, creating jobs especially in the agricultural sector, which accounts for most of the Gross Domestic Product (GDPs) of developing countries; and
- Strengthening legal institutions by ensuring functional and independent judiciaries. Based on the successful nation-building examples by the UN in countries like Kosovo, Sierra Leone, and East Timor, these steps can be likened to foundational responses achievable by the eagerness to unite and cooperate (Pan,

2005). Osaghae (1998) and Falola (1988) give credence to nation-building processes that engender less ethnic fragmentations as in Kosovo, the presence of a clear command and structure for rebuilding, the institution of democracy and democratic structures, the integration of civil society into government's schemes and programs, and the need for innovative leadership and governance that works.

2.2.7 Nigeria in Global Perspective: Some Contending Discourse on 'True Federalism'

Globally, federalism is associated with the Athenian League of Greek City-state in the 3rd Century B.C, and the Swiss state of the 16th Century. Switzerland has been recognized and celebrated as the largest country with the tradition of federalism. However, after the resolve and ratification of the American Constitution of 1787 by thirteen British Colonies of the United States to adopt for themselves federal model, through several moderations to reflect their internal peculiarities, have since made American federalism the most coveted throughout the world as an archetype, ideal or true federalism (Odofin, 2003).

Several factors were responsible for the adoption of federalism in the United States. These factors were the desire for union, the need for military strength (security), expanded economic opportunities, geographical proximity, the size of

the federating units, and the need for strong-willed leadership. Despite other factors, central to all was strong-willed leadership. They needed a leader that can harness human and material resources to meet the need of the federating units, inspire a sense of belonging as an entity, and the need to create an environment for interaction among the people of varied backgrounds in the United States (Odofin, 2003).

As these collective but differing factors, prompted the need for federalism in the United States, they were also responsible for the adoption of federalism in other countries around the world. Federalism in Nigeria has come of age. Nevertheless, it is still a contested phenomenon. The problems with Nigerian federalism are many. Some of the problems fundamentally are associated with the history of evolution into statehood and federation, and the size and population of the regions, zones, and states constituting Nigeria. Other factors include the nature and mode of representation, power-sharing and power shift; resource generation, control and distribution, the method of political recruitment, the majority-minority question; and the question of group identity. Furthermore, the nature and processes of social policies; the problem of distribution and allocation of both tangible and intangible resources; the problem of excess liberty which democracy offer to claim rights and belonging; and double loyalties

which federalism promote simultaneously also constitute a serious challenge to consolidating federalism in Nigeria (Odofin, 2003).

It is these problems put together that account for the demand for ‘true federalism’. This demand has generated serious contentious debates among scholars, policy makers, political and social activists, as well as ethnic and religious groups among others in Nigeria.

The concept of ‘true federalism’, theoretically and practically has remained elusive, as there is no specified characteristic to appropriate a federal system as ‘true’ or ‘false’. This further instigates the question, between symmetric or asymmetric federalism, which is ‘true’ or ‘false’. Evidence across the world reveals that there is neither true nor false federalism because the nature and manner federal states are organized depends on the cultural and communal characters, as well as the interests of the various ethnic and religious groups that constitute the federation. Most Nigerians have come to associate American federalism with the concept of ‘true federalism’. Many of these people clamoring for the adoption of the American federal model tend to forget that Nigeria and America, though multi-ethnic and multi-religious in nature, differ by all standards. They also tend not to reflect the differences in historical trajectories of their evolutions, as well as the political cultures of citizens of the two countries.

They have also forgotten to consider closely the differential political trends and dynamics that motivated the making of the American and Nigerian federation respectively. What is pertinent to ask is what factors make American federalism a ‘true federalism’? No matter how intriguing the factors are, do they account for naming American federalism a ‘true federalism’ and Nigerian federalism a ‘false federalism’? Suffice it to note that different countries practicing federalism as a political mechanism for managing diversity do so by reflecting their respective socio-economic and political realities and peculiarities. This explains why federalism differs in terms of institutional structures and practical contents.

Federalism is what the people perceive and define as federalism. This further demonstrates that federalism is not static but dynamic. It oscillates to symmetry and asymmetry, depending on the prevailing condition necessitating back and forth movement within the geographical terrain of a country.

2.2.8 Toward a Definition of ‘True Federalism in Nigeria’: Understanding Fallacy of Context

The concept of ‘true federalism’ has remained contentious, especially in Nigeria. Toyo (2001) has questioned ‘Have the different constitutions of Nigeria since 1960 ever given the country ‘true federalism?’ ‘Does the 1999 constitution

do so?’ The answer to both questions is ‘yes.’ He further stated that the constitution-making constituents gathered by both Babangida and Abacha confessed after close consideration of the 1979 constitution, that there was nothing wrong with the constitution. From this perspective, it is worthwhile to state that there is also nothing wrong with the 1999 constitution (As Amended). If the answer is ‘yes’, as Professor Eskor Toyo stated, it is pertinent to question, why then the contention over ‘true federalism’? What is this ‘true federalism’? How different is it from what obtains in Nigeria? Examining these questions in the context of the submissions made by scholars will offer a better understanding of the discourse about the ‘true federalism’ debate in Nigeria.

A reputable federal scholar, Oyovbaire (1985) situates the concept of ‘true federalism’ in democracy and contends that the extent to which federalism can be ‘true’, depends on how much the democratic system of government permits citizens to participate and exercise their rights within the ambit of the rule of law. This implies that no matter what terminology is given to the concept of federalism, whether ‘asymmetry or symmetry’ or the way some quarters in Nigeria call it ‘true federalism’, it hinges on democracy as a foundation to the sustenance of any federal union. Stephanie Dion, then President of the Canadian Privy Council and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, cited in Sagay (2004) puts it inter-alia that:

Without democracy, genuine federalism is impossible. To be sure, there have been dictatorships or totalitarian regimes that have claimed to be federations. Some still exist today.

However, genuine federalism presupposes the respect of a division of constitutional powers between a minimum of two orders of government. If all the political powers in the country are in fact under the control of a single-tier, it is difficult for the federative form of the state to be anything more than a façade. It is within a democracy that federalism finds its true meaning. In the same vein, Toyo (2001) posited that no federalism is false rather all are true. Therefore, the concept of ‘true federalism’ undermines the theories underpinning federalism. This context creates the contention about what constitutes ‘true federalism’. It also creates a dilemma of locating the criteria for ascertaining how the ‘true’ federal system in one country is from another.

This contention relates to Oyovbaire’s (1985) assertion that, federalism in a democracy is ‘true federalism’, because of the interrelatedness and complementariness of democracy and federalism. Democracy is a system that provides the springboard on which federalism can be strengthened and excel. Democracy and federalism are like ‘Siamese twins’ designed to meet the expediencies or exigencies in plural societies like Nigeria. In the classical sense,

Abraham Lincoln defined democracy as a ‘government of the people, by the people and for the people’ (Chatuverdi, 1996, Agbo & Lenshie, 2010). In the modern sense, federalism is a system of government that guarantees the freedom of citizens based on the equal right of every person to participate in the governing process, whether directly or indirectly. Central to democracy of whatever kind of model is the ‘people’. Democracy approximates human nature, which essentially is liberty. Nevertheless, the exercise of liberty requires regulation to avoid anarchy. This informs the reason for the presence of the rule of law to control the animalistic tendencies of human beings. Since the rule of law is central to the practice of democracy and federalism, it offers the basis for the distribution of rights and privileges according to the pacts entered into by the people belonging to the federation.

Therefore, it is adequate to state that federalism compliments democracy. On the one hand, it permits the non-centralization of government by ensuring juridical division of governmental powers among different levels of government. The division of spheres of operation prevents arbitrary use of power against the people constituting the federation. On the other hand, it is concerned with bringing the government closer to the people by ensuring inclusive participation, respect for, and tolerance for diversity.

This means that federalism provides a productive forum for effective interaction among various groups in democratic states. Federalism, therefore, is a cardinal component of a democratic society, because the yearnings and aspirations of the people are cardinal to the affairs of government. Linking ‘true federalism’ to democracy, Oyovbaire (1985) revealed the ‘positive values’ of democracy, which enables public actions that are people’s oriented in a federal system of government. These positive values can adequately be situated within Twomey and Withers’s (2007) identification of the benefits associated with the adoption of federalism which equals democratic principles, namely:

- Checks on power – Federalism divides and limits power, protecting the individual overtly from a powerful government. It ensures that there is greater scrutiny of government action and helps to reduce the incidence of corruption.
- Choice and diversity – Federalism gives citizens a greater range of choices. People can vote for one party at the national level and another at the state level. They can move from one state to another if they prefer the policies of the subsequent state, or they can seek to have policies of another government implemented by their home state. If one level of government lets them down, they can seek redress from the other.

- Customization of policies – Federalism permits the tailoring of policies and services to meet the needs of people and communities directly affected. Differences in climate, geography, demography, culture, resources, and industry across the country, mean the requirement for the adoption of different approaches to meet the needs of local people constituting the federation. Put differently, federalism accommodates these differences and brings the government closer to the people, allowing them to influence the decisions that affect them the most.

- Competition – Federalism permits comparison among states and territories across the country.

Comparison becomes the source of competition, which also gives the incentive for states to improve their performance. In other words, competition increases efficiency and prevents complacency. The comparison shows that federations have proportionately fewer public servants and lower public spending than unitary states.

- Creativity – This is the master of invention. States and territories need to be innovative and experiment to compete with other jurisdictions. When a particular state is successful by becoming innovative, other states in the federation also adopt the strategy to put themselves in the comity of innovative states. Put differently, innovative states lead the country in proposing reforms in a federation or across federations.

- Co-operation – The need to co-operate to achieve some type of reform means that proposals tend to become more measurable and better scrutinized. The agreement of all jurisdictions to implement difficult reforms brings together all parts of the country in a common endeavor and gives the reforms greater insight, legitimacy, and support. Any federal state without the above characteristics in practice, such a state is questionable, because no variable identified can be latent or manifest in isolation. The shortfall of these benefits throws up the federal system into chaos. The ability to manage effectively the federal system is to provide for the divergent needs of the various quarters in the country. This depends on the scale of the country's economy. Evidence across the world proves that, because of the costly nature of constituting a federal system, poor countries with multicultural character find it difficult to manage and sustain effectively the federal arrangement. The outcome of such a venture has led to unprecedented violence, especially in Africa. It is important for federalism to be rooted in the rule of law, sustained over time, and with the people (both governing and the governed) possessing high democratic culture. In a situation where citizens' democratic culture is poor, there is a need for citizens-government engagements through communication, interaction, and argumentation on policies and actions of the government. This is important because it assists in informing and building the consciousness of the citizens about their rights and obligations, which are prerequisites for fostering federal democracy.

Some federal scholars would argue that the identified characteristics are far from what is obtainable in Nigeria. However, this does not mean that Nigerian federalism is a ‘false federalism’. Several factors mutually but also exclusively explains the variations in the practice of federalism and democracy indifferent countries. The consideration of American federalism as an ‘archetype’ by most Nigerians creates serious contention, which amounts to referring to Nigerian federalism as ‘false federalism’. This situation necessitates the need for the comparison of Nigeria and American federalism in terms of evolution, continuity, and change in the practice of federalism.

2.3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Structural-functionalism

To have a better grasp of the “federal” in the federal republic of Nigeria, we need to search for at least an appropriate theory to analyze federalism in the Nigerian context. For this research, structural-functionalism will suffice.

Structural-Functional analysis originated in the biological and mechanical sciences. In the social sciences, it was first used in Anthropology. Later on, it was developed and refined as a mode of sociological analysis, predominantly by Talcott Parsons and Marion Levy. It has been under the influence of the sociologists, particularly these two, that the Structural-Functional Approach has

come to be developed by political scientists, particularly by Gabriel A. Almond and his associates. In 1960, Almond and Coleman, in their work 'The Politics of Developing Areas', used this approach for the study of non-Western political systems. Six years later, Almond and Bingham Powell published their work 'Comparative Politics: A Development Approach'. In this, they came out with the Structural-Functional Approach designed to study and classify political systems in terms of the levels of their political development.

The Structural-functional approach revolves mainly around two concepts: Structure and Functions. This approach 'is a means of explaining which political structures perform which basic functions in the political system and it is a tool of investigation'. In the words of Samuel H. Beer and Adam B. Ulam, "The survival and maintenance of a social system require that society must be having a well-functioning economic system, a legal system, a system of values and so on. The Structural-Functional Approach seeks to study politics as a system of interactions, i.e., a Political System. It analyses Political System as a set of structures performing functions. It seeks to identify and analyze the structures which constitute the political system and perform several functions both internally and vis-a-vis other societies. Charles Worth explains the crux of this approach in a very simple way. He writes, "The structural part of the approach refers to any human organization that can do things and have an effect on human beings and other

human organizations, viz., a family, a public corporation, a court, a bureau, or a legislative body. The structural-functionalism theory can be likened to the systems theory propounded by David Easton (1965) which in a way mimics the functioning of the human body. For instance, if you take the human body as a complex whole, you have various parts which include the brain, kidney, liver, heart, etc. The functioning of all these parts keeps the human body alive. The parts are interdependent. When one part is affected, all other parts would be affected as well as the human body as a whole.

Factoring the above into our research work on how party politics have influence political campaigns in Nigeria, Consequently, United Human Rights Council (2015) had severally discussed the power of political language during campaigns and debates/interviews, the way it results in particular social cognition. You can find his discussions of how language, the media, and politics interact to create a particular way of thinking within society. Daniel (2008) opined that social cognition can be so insidious that it could make people act in particular ways as designed by the power holders in the society while the populace assumes they are the ones thinking in such a particular manner. In short, nineteen years into Nigeria's current political dispensation, women are still cheering men as the women's wings of political parties. However, the concern here is the way political influencers use language to dominate the thinking of the people and make them do

what they want them (the populace) to do. Recently, political parties and their candidates are becoming increasingly aware of the effectiveness of advertising and its role in getting the electorates to choose a particular candidate or party over the other by way of informing them. The use of political campaigns has become increasingly popular and is very important to the electoral process and voting behavior because it bridges the communication gap between political parties, political candidates, and electorates.

References

Amuwo, K. Agbaje, A. Suberu, R. and Herault, G. (2003) (eds) *Federalism and Political Restructuring in Nigeria*. Spectrum Books Limited.

- Anifowose, R. and Enomou, F. (1999) Elements of Politics. Ikeja: Malt House Press Ltd.
- Awa IO (1964) Federal government in Nigeria, a study of the development of the Nigerian state. Berkeley: University of California, USA.
- Awolowo O (1947) Path to Nigerian Freedom. AfrAff 46: 239-240.
- Awolowo, O. (2011). Thoughts on Nigerian Constitution, Oxford: Oxford University Press, London.
- Ayoade, J.A.A. (1996) "The Changing Structure of Nigerian Federalism". In Elaigwu, J.I., and Akindele, R.A. (eds) Foundations of Nigerian Federalism: 1960-1995. Vol.3: National Council on Intergovernmental Relations, Abuja.
- Bird, R. and Ebel, R. (2005). Fiscal Federalism and National Unity, Washington: Urban Institute.
- Chatuverdi, A.K. (1996). Dictionary of Political Science, New Delhi: Academic Publishers.
- Dibie CC (2003) Essential government for senior secondary schools, Lagos: Tonad Publishers Ltd, Lagos, Nigeria.
- Elaigwu JI, Uzongwe GN (1996) Foundations of Nigerian federalism 1900- 1960. Abuja: NCIR.
- Agbu O (2004) Re-inventing federalism in post-transition Nigeria: Problems and prospects, Lagos: AfrDev 29: 1.
- Elaigwu, J.I. and Akindele, R.A. (1996) (eds) Foundation of Nigerian Federalism: 1960-1995. Vol. 3: National Council on Intergovernmental Relations, Abuja.
- Eze TC, Okpala CS, Ogbodo JC (2014) Patterns of inequality in human development across Nigeria's six geopolitical zones. Dev Country Stud 4: 97-101
- Idachaba E (2001) Chronology of major political events in the Abacha era (1993-1998) in Nigeria during the Abacha years (1993-1998): The domestic and

international politics of democratization [online] Ibadan: Institutfrançais de recherché en Afrique.

Lapegna A (2017) A background on Nigeria and its oil, Aspenia online

Livingston, W.S. (1956). *Federalism and Constitutional Change*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ndu A (2003) *Renewing the federal paradigm in Nigeria: contending issues and perspectives* in Aaron Gana and Samuel G. Egwu *federalism in Africa*. Eritrea: Africa World Press, Inc

Nkwede JO, Nwali TB, Orga J (2013) *Fiscal federalism and challenges of development in Nigeria: A search for remediation*. *Rev Publ Admin Manage* 2: 121-132

Nnoli, O. (1980) *Ethnic Politics in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Fourth Dimension Publishers.

Odofin, A.P. (2003). *Federalism and the challenges of Citizenship in Nigeria's Multi-Ethnic State*, Department of Political Science, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Odofin, A.P. (2003). *Federalism and the challenges of Citizenship in Nigeria's Multi-Ethnic State*, Department of Political Science, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Okadigbo, C. (1987) *Power and Leadership in Nigeria*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Company Limited.

Okediji TO (2003) *Pluralism, federalism, and economic development: A comparative perspective on Brazil and Nigeria*, in Aaron Gana and Samuel G. Egwu *federalism in Africa* Eritrea: Africa World Press, Inc.

Okorie, O. (2003) *Nigeria Weeps*. Owerro: Snaaps Press Ltd.

Onuigbo R, Eme O (2015) *State governors and revenue allocation formula in Nigeria: A case of the fourth republic*. *Int J Account Res* 2: 14-36

- Osadolor, O. B. (2003) “The Development of the Federal Idea and the Federal Framework, 1914 – 1960”. In Amuwo, K. et al Federalism and Political Restructuring in Nigeria. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
- Osaghae EE (1998) managing minority problems in a developing society: The Nigerian Experience. *J Mod Afr stud* 36: 1.
- Oyedirin, O., Nwosu, Takaya, B., Anifowose, R. Badejo, Ogboghodo and Agbaje, A. (2008) (eds) *New Approach to Government*. Ikeja: Longman Nigeria Plc.
- Oyeneye, I. et al (2001) *Government: A Complete Guide*. Lagos: Longman Publishers.
- Oyovbaire, S.E. (1979). “The Theory of Federalism: A Critical Appraisal”, *Nigerian Journal of Political Science*, Vol.1, No.1, June, Zaria: Ahmadu Bello University, Nigeria.
- Oyovbaire, S.E. (1985). *Federalism in Nigeria: A Study in Development of Nigeria State*, London: Macmillan Publishers.
- Oyovbaire, S.E. (1985). *Federalism in Nigeria: A Study in Development of Nigeria State*, London: Macmillan Publishers.
- Phillips AO (1991) Managing issues of fiscal federalism: Revenue allocation in Nigeria *Publius. Journal Federal* 21: 1-4.
- Rodney, W. (1972) *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. London: BoglehL’ourverture Publishers.
- Sagay, I.E. (2004). *Anatomy of Federalism, With Special Reference to Nigeria, A 15th Distinguished Lecture and Luncheon Delivered to The House of Lords, Nigeria, at Broking House, Ibadan. 1st May 2004.*
- Sagay, I.E. (2008). “How a True Federal System Should Run”, *The Nation*, Lagos: Vintage Press Limited, 19th May.
- Stepan A (1999) *Federalism and democracy: Beyond the US model. J Democratiz* 10: 19-34.

- Takaya, B. (1996) “The Structure of Conflict in Nigerian Federalism”. In Elaigwu, J.I., and Akindele, R.A. (eds) Foundations of Nigerian Federalism: 1960-1995. Abuja: Vol.3: National Council on Intergovernmental Relations.
- Tamuno, T. N. (2003) “Nigerian Federalism in Historical Perspective”. In Amuwo, K. et al (ed) Federalism and Political Restructuring in Nigeria. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
- The 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (2016) Africlaw.
- Toyo, E. (2001). “Federalism and National Unity in Nigeria: Reflections on Ethnicist Pervasions”. A lecture delivered under the auspices of the Human Rights Committee of Nigeria ASSU and other Human Rights Groups, Benue State University, Markurdi, March.
- Twomey, A. and Withers, G. (2007). Federalist paper 1, Australia’s Federal Future: Delivering Growth and Prosperity: A Report for the Council for the Australian Federation, Australia: the Council for the Australian Federation, April.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, we discussed the methods and procedures that were employed in providing answers to the research questions as well as addressing the research objectives and hypotheses stated earlier in this study. The chapter contains the details of the research design, area of the study, the population of the study, sample and sampling technique, research instrument, method of data collection, method of data analysis, and decision rule, the empirical study will be adopted.

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

Research Design is the plan, structure, and strategy of investigation conceived to obtain answers to a research question(s). The plan is the overall scheme or program of the research. It includes an outline of what the investigator will do from writing the hypotheses and their operational implications to the final analysis of data. The survey research method will be adopted to enable the researcher to carry out a systematic investigation and obtain information across the population of the study.

3.3 POPULATION OF THE STUDY

The study population refers to the entire people or objects or cases which are of interest to a researcher. For Kumar (2005) study population is a population from whom the required information to find answers to research questions are obtained.

The population of the study consists of all staff in the University of Benin both academic and non-academic.

3.4 SAMPLE SIZE AND SAMPLING TECHNIQUE

The simple random sampling technique will be used to select a sample of 135 respondents (University of Benin Staff).

3.5 VALIDITY OF THE INSTRUMENT

The validation of the questionnaire will be undertaken by the researchers' supervisor to ascertain suitability and appropriateness for the research and one other expert in the Department of political science, faculty of social sciences, University of Benin, Benin City. Their suggestions and criticism will make up the final copy.

3.6 RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

The structured questionnaire will be used to collect data for this study. The questionnaire will be distributed to the staff of the university. The structured questionnaire will be divided into four sections.

Section A will provide information concerning the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents, on respondent's age, marital status, educational attainment, employment status, and gender.

Section B will give information on the formula distribution of the federation account resources across the three tiers of government in Nigeria;

Section C will provide information on how the federal system of government affect nation-building and national development in Nigeria;

Section D tends to investigate the rational principles of federalism in Nigeria.

3.7 METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

The study will adopt the one-time survey method of data collection using the close-ended questionnaire as the primary method of data collection. 135 questionnaire will be distributed within one day using three (3) research assistants.

The secondary data for this study will be sourced from existing work done by various researchers on the topic that are closely related to this research. Given this, these sources include the library, journals, magazines, the internet, and other publication.

3.8 METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS

The data will be organized in tables using simple percentages. The simple percentages will be used to answer the research questions. The relationship is given as;

Percentage (%) = value /total value ×100.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSES, AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter contains the presentation, analysis, and interpretation of the data collected for this study, through the administration of questionnaires. The section A of the analysis is concerned with details that reveal the demographic data of the respondents, and section B of the analysis is concerned with drawing up certain conclusions based on the stated research questions and the objectives of the study.

4.2 Data Presentation and Analyses

The data analyses were based on the data collected from the field and have been fully analyzed using the frequency distribution. The analyses are based on questions contained in section A and B of the questionnaire. One hundred and thirty-five (135) questionnaires were distributed to the staff at the University of Benin both academic and non-academic. University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State, and out of which one hundred (100) questionnaires were filled and returned for the analyses. Tables and percentages were used in this chapter; the use of a table is the most appropriate means of interpreting information for easy understanding.

Table 4.1 Distribution and returned Questionnaire

Population	Number of Respondents	Number Distributed	Number Returned	Percentage of Returned
Students	135	135	100	74

Source: *Fieldwork Survey, 2021*

Table 4.2 Analysis of Demographic Information of the Respondents

Variables	Frequency Distribution	(%)
Gender		
• Male	63	63
• Female	37	37
Total	100	100
Age Distribution		
• Below 20yrs	3	3
• 21 -25yrs	50	50
• 26 -30yrs	44	44
• 31 yrs and above	3	3
Total	100	100
Marital Status		
• Single	8	8
• Married	92	92
Total	100	100
Highest Education		
• SSCE	1	1
• ND/NCE	12	12
• HND/B.Sc	83	83
• Others	4	4
Total	100	100

Source: *Fieldwork Survey, 2021*

Interpretation;

From table 4.2 above, there are different socio-demographic information of the respondents of the study. They are gender distribution of the respondents, the age distribution of the respondents, marital status of the respondents, and educational status or qualifications, It shows that 63(63%) respondents were male and 37 (37%) of the respondents are female. Under the age distribution, 3 respondents representing 3% are below 20 years, 50 respondents representing 50%

are age brackets of 21-25 years, 44 respondents representing 44% are age brackets of 26-30 year, 3 respondents representing 3% are age brackets of 31 and above. Under the marital status, 8 respondents representing 8% are single, 92 respondents representing 92% are married. Lastly, under the educational qualifications or status, 1(1%) of the respondents are SSCE holders, 12 (12%) of the respondents are ND/NCE holders, while 83 (83%) of the respondents are HND/B.Sc. holders while 4 (4%) of the respondents are holders of other certifications.

Analysis of Research Questions

Research Question One: What is the formula distribution of the federation account resources across the three tiers of government in Nigeria?

Table 4.3 Formula distribution of the federation account across the 3 tiers of government in Nigeria

S/N	Items	SA	A	D	SD
1	Federation determines the distribution of nature, manner, and resources	47 47%	39 39%	9 9%	5 5%
2	True federalism remains the theoretical and practical exclusive	55 55%	42 42%	1 1%	2 2%
3	The three (3) tiers of government in Nigeria do not enjoy fair play	29 29%	48 48%	22 22%	1 1%
4	Formula distribution involves representation, power-sharing resources generation, and power shift	69 69%	30 30%	1 1%	0 0%
5	The problem of distribution is not equitable	29 29%	48 48%	22 22%	1 1%

Source: Field Survey (2021)

Interpretation;

From the analysis above starting from the first question. It shows that 47% of the respondents are strongly agreed that the Federation determines the distribution of nature, manner, and resources, 39% of the respondents agree, 9% disagree and 5% of the respondents strongly disagree. On the same table answering the second question which states True federalism remains theoretical and practical exclusive. 55% of the respondents strongly agreed to the question above, 42% agreed, 1% disagree, and lastly, 2% of the respondents strongly disagreed.

The third question states that the three (3) tiers of government in Nigeria do not enjoy fair play with 29% of the respondents strongly agreed, 48% agreed, 22% of the respondent disagreed while 1% strongly disagreed.

Question number four states that Formula distribution involves representation, power-sharing resources generation and power shift with 69% of the respondents strongly agreed to the question, 30% agree, 1% disagree, and lastly none strongly agree.

The last question on the table states that the Problem of distribution is not equitable with 29% of the respondents strongly agreed, 48% agree, 22% of the respondent disagree while 1% strongly disagree.

Research Question Two: To what extent does the federal system of government affect nation-building and national development in Nigeria?

Table 4.4 Federal system of government affect nation-building and development in Nigeria

S/N	Items	SA	A	D	SD
5	The essence of a federal system of government is the need to achieve greater economic and political freedom	59 59%	41 41%	0 0%	0 0%
6	The federal system of government does not promote nation-building and development in Nigeria	40 40%	47 47%	8 8%	5 5%
7	Does nation-building entails regional, political, social, and economic activities that are directed towards national development in Nigeria	36 36%	51 51%	9 9%	4 4%
8	Nation-building does not mean restoration of the economic infrastructure of a nation	53 53%	38 38%	6 6%	3 3%
9	Federal system of government became inevitable for the administrative convenience in Nigeria	36 36%	51 51%	9 9%	4 4%
	Mean (%)	47%	44%	6%	3%
	Ranking	1st	2nd	3rd	4th

Source: Field Survey (2021)

Interpretation;

From the table above 47% of the respondents strongly agree, 44% of the population agree, 6% of the respondents disagree and 3% strongly disagree. It reveals that the majority of the respondents are in favor of the view Federal system of government affects nation-building and development in Nigeria.

Research Question Three: What are the rational principles of federalism in Nigeria?

Table 4.5 Rational principles of federalism in Nigeria

S/N	Items	SA	A	D	SD
9	Federalism does not relate to the problem of empiricism in Nigeria	49 49%	24 24%	15 15%	12 12%
10	Is federalism a treaty or agreement over the distribution of the sphere of operation	44 44%	49 49%	4 4%	3 3%
11	Federalism in any nation requires the understanding of nature and character	46 46%	52 52%	2 2%	0 0%
12	The practice of federalism differs in various countries	47 47%	41 41%	8 8%	4 4%
13	Federalism is not a static concept but rather an application of changes in Nigeria	44 44%	49 49%	4 4%	3 3%

Source: Field Survey (2021)

Interpretation;

From the table above, question one states that federalism does not relate to the problem of empiricism in Nigeria which 49% of the respondents strongly agree, 24% of the respondents are agree, 15% of the respondents disagree while 12% strongly disagrees. The second question states that is federalism a treaty or agreement over the distribution of the sphere of operation? 44% of the respondents strongly agreed to the question, 49% agreed, 4% of the respondents disagreed and lastly, 3% of the respondents strongly disagreed.

The third question states that federalism in any nation requires the understanding of nature and character which 46% of the respondents strongly agree to the statement, 52% agree, 2% disagree, while none strongly disagree.

The fourth question on the table states that the practice of federalism differs in various countries with 47% of the respondents strongly agreeing to it, 41%

agreeing, 8% disagreed while 4% strongly disagree. This simply states that the practice of federalism differs in various countries.

The last question on the table states that federalism is not a static concept but rather an application of changes in Nigeria. 44% of the respondents strongly agreed, 49% agreed, 4% of the respondents disagreed and lastly 3% strongly disagreed. This implies that federalism should not be a static concept but rather it should be an application to change Nigeria.

Discussion of Findings

The research is aimed at deconstructing federalism and determining how federal the federal republic of Nigeria is. Therefore, a discussion of the findings of this research will be made to enable conclusions and recommendations to be drawn on the subject matter. True federalism remains theoretical and practical exclusive, the three (3) tiers of government in Nigeria do not enjoy fair play with 48% of the respondents agreeing to it.

Findings also revealed that the essence of the federal system of government is the need to achieve greater economic and political freedom with 59% of the respondents strongly agreeing to that statement. It revealed that the federal system of government does not promote nation-building and development in Nigeria.

Findings revealed that federalism does not relate to the problem of empiricism in Nigeria with more than half of the respondents agreeing to that, this implies that

the main reason of been a federal country is not been achieved, there is a need for improvement. Findings revealed that federalism is not a static concept but rather an application of changes in Nigeria. This implies that Nigerians have not been enjoying the dividend of democracy.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1.Introduction

This chapter presented the summary conclusion and recommendations of the study based on the results of the findings.

5.2 Summary

This study titled “deconstructing federalism: How federal is the federal republic of Nigeria?.” this research work was structured into five chapters to effectively carry out this research. The study raised three objectives that guided the study. Based on these objectives, research questions and hypotheses were formulated, the assumptions and significance of the study were highlighted, and scope and delimitations were also discussed. Chapter two reviewed literature related to the research topic. The review critically examined and analyzed the views of some psychologists, and other concerned scholars on the concepts. The theoretical framework for this study was the Structural Functionalist Theory. In chapter three the design and methodology of the study were discussed. The research design was a survey design, the population of the study comprises the University of Benin Staff (academic and non-academic). A total of 135 staff were sampled using a simple random sampling procedure. The instrument used for data collection was the questionnaire. The returned questionnaires were analyzed using a simple percentage table for the demographic response. Chapter four presented the analysis of data collected which were analyzed through the use of a simple percentage table.

5.3 Conclusion

This study investigates deconstructing federalism and how federal the federal republic of Nigeria is. The Nigerian state is relatively young in the normal process of evolution, consolidation (single/united entity for about 100 years), and adopting

a federal system of government (about 60 years ago). Therefore, adequate time and experience are required to develop a national culture/political system and then substantively judge.

Diversities among humans is a natural virtue and a means of collective benefits for states and societal development as obtained in most federal states across the world, but in Nigeria, it has resulted to slow and poor planning in decisions making and implementation, unnecessary societal fragmentations, and particularistic feelings. The instruments of achieving national unity and development including the state apparatus have been bastardized. Nigerian federalism has suffered unequal resources endowment among the parts due to negligence and corruption and has to a large extent contributed to disaffection and apathy among Nigerians. Nigerians are further divided and especially in recent times between north and south over the nature of federalism, convening of national conference and whether (sovereign or mini). While some believe convening the national conference might lead to the break-up of the country, others feel that failure to hold the same will jeopardize the unity and political future of Nigeria. Much is therefore needed from both the leaders and the led for Nigeria to attain the cherished levels of federalism and national development.

5.4 Recommendations

The following recommendations are suggested as a result of the findings of the study:

1. There should be design and working out of development plans at the federal, state, and local levels of governance to guide the authorities in planning and execution of development programs.
2. Governments at all levels should develop and adhere strictly to the provisions of realistic development plans and also ensure controlled development.
3. Corruption, ethnicity, religious bigotry, and all other particularistic feelings and tendencies should be properly checked through functional laws and stiff penalties to minimize ethnoreligious and sectional identities among Nigerians.
4. Decision-making processes should be more popular based to ensure inclusiveness, transparency, and good governance between and among leaders and the followership.
5. A generally fair and acceptable revenue sharing formula should be devised to minimize the disaffection and superiority/inferiority complex among the states and the local governments of the federation.

Questionnaire

Department of Political Science,

Faculty of Social Sciences,

University of Benin, Benin City,

Edo State.,

February, 2021.

Dear Respondent,

REQUEST FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

I am an undergraduate student of the above-named institution currently undertaking research on **deconstructing federalism and how federal is the federal republic of Nigeria**. The study is a prerequisite for the partial fulfillment for the award of Bachelor of Science Degree (B.Sc) in Political Science. I, therefore, crave your indulgence to assist to fill the questionnaire. Any information given will be treated with the utmost confidentiality. Thanks for your anticipated cooperation.

Yours faithfully

Christopher Osaheni

Instruction

Kindly tick () on that which represents your opinion.

Section A (Bio-Data)

1. Age: Below 20 (), 21-30 (), 31-40(), 41 and above ().
2. Sex: Male (), Female ()
3. Educational Qualification: SSCE (), NCE/OND (), HND/B.SC (), M.Sc/M.Ed (), Others ()

4. Marital Status: Single (), Married (), Divorced (), widowed ().

Section B (KEY)

SA= Strongly agree, A= Agree, D = Disagree and SA= Strongly disagree

S/N	Formula distribution of the federation account across the 3 tiers of government in Nigeria	SA	A	D	SD
5	Federation determines the distribution of nature, manner, and resources				
6	True federalism remains the theoretical and practical exclusive				
7	The three (3) tiers of government in Nigeria do not enjoy fair play				
8	Formula distribution involves representation, power-sharing resources generation, and power shift				
9	The problem of distribution is not equitable				
	The federal system of government affect nation-building and development in Nigeria				
10	The essence of a federal system of government is the need to achieve greater economic and political freedom				
11	The federal system of government does not promote nation-building and development in Nigeria				
12	Does nation-building entails regional, political, social, and economic activities that are directed towards national development in Nigeria				

13	Nation-building does not mean restoration of the economic infrastructure of a nation				
14	Federal system of government became inevitable for the administrative convenience in Nigeria				
	Rational principles of federalism in Nigeria				
15	Federalism does not relate to the problem of empiricism in Nigeria				
16	Is federalism a treaty or agreement over the distribution of the sphere of operation				
17	Federalism in any nation requires the understanding of nature and character ...				
18	The practice of federalism differs in various countries				
19	Federalism is not a static concept but rather an application of changes in Nigeria				