

Jurisdictional Partitioning, Development and Spatial Inequalities in Urban Nigeria

A Presentation at the 7th European Conference on African Studies
University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland
29th June – 1st July, 2017

By

Yemi ADEWOYIN (Ph.D)

Dept of Geography,
University of Nigeria,
Nsukka, Nigeria

Table of Content

- Introduction
- Development Planning in Nigeria
- National Development Strategies
- Local Government in Nigeria
- Statement of the Problem
- Methodology
- Results and Discussion
- Conclusion

Introduction

- Uneven development within spatial contexts is a reflection of;
 - natural and human resources endowment
 - levels of spatial organization of places including their connectivity and relative location to other places and
 - the interplay of politics and the prevailing mode of economic production in places
- Diversity in ecology, relief, resource endowment, spatial organization and political economy thus present a space economy characterized by different levels of development among the constituent areal units from the local through the state to the global scale.

Development Planning in Nigeria

- With a landmass in excess of 920,000 square kilometers, encompassing a wide range of diversity in ecology and natural resources, and a population of about 200 million spread across settlements in rural and urban landscapes, Nigeria presents a mosaic of development surfaces that are largely uneven.
- A recognition of this wide disparity informed the government's decision that 'a situation where some parts of the country are experiencing rapid economic growth while other parts are lagging behind can no longer be tolerated' (Nigeria, 1975:30).
- In effect, addressing uneven development and spatial inequalities in development in Nigeria is a State affair backed with the requisite legislations.

National Development Strategies

- In Nigeria's National Development Plans, a number of strategies have been employed to address uneven development among places. These include;
 - Investments in rural electrification
 - Setting up river basin development authorities
 - Setting up of area development commissions
 - Reorganization of federal ministries and development agencies
 - Community banking
 - Development banks and
 - The creation of local governments

Local Government in Nigeria

- The creation of Local Governments in Nigeria is therefore a regional planning strategy to address uneven development by decentralizing governance and bringing it closer to the people
- Its aims are the provision of services and development activities at the sub-national level and the creation of a two-way communication channel between the local communities and the government.
- The LGs are also expected to facilitate the exercise of democratic self-governance and mobilization of human and natural resources for development

Statement of the Problem

- With the national exercises of 1963, 1967, 1976, 1987, 1991 and 1996, jurisdictional partitioning, as exemplified by the creation of additional states and local governments from existing constitutionally recognized jurisdictions within the Nigerian State, appears to be the most widely used regional development tool in Nigeria.
- This follows from their being recognized as units of decentralization of governance for rapid development at the local level, the rapid transformation of rural areas into urban centers, and for balancing spatial inequalities in development
- The partitioning exercise of 1996 brought the total number of local government areas (LGAs) in Nigeria to 774. In the succeeding 20 years, the clamor for autonomy from several urban centers and the proliferation of local council development authorities (LCDAs) indicate that the demands for more LGAs are far from over.
- It becomes imperative therefore to assess how well the creation of local governments has addressed development inequalities in urban Nigeria.

Methods

- Nigeria has 36 States with Kano and Oyo having the highest number of LGAs. The study is situated in Oyo State purposively as it has a higher number of urban settlements than Kano or any other State in the country.
- The scope of study covered the level of development before the 1996 decentralization exercise and 2016.
- To describe the spatial pattern of development before and after the decentralization exercise, twenty four development indicators were identified and reduced to four uncorrelated variables using the Principal Component Analysis statistical technique.
- The four principal components accounted for 83% of the total variance in the indicators and were used to compare the levels of development among the newly autonomous urban centers.
- A composite ranking of the LGAs on a three-level development surface was thereafter carried out using the Hierarchical Cluster analysis

The Jurisdictions

- From old Oyo LG was created Oyo West and Atiba LGs.
- Atisbo and Saki East LGs were excised from Old Ifedapo.
- Itesiwaju and Iwajowa came from Iseyin and Kajola respectively while
- Ibarapa North and Olorunsogo were carved out of Ifeloju and Irepo LGs.
- Old Oyo, Ifedapo and Ifeloju LGs, mother LGs from which the new LGs were created, were renamed Oyo East, Saki West and Ibarapa Central LGs respectively after the creation
- Iseyin, Kajola and Irepo retained their old names. The headquarters of the mother LGs remained the same.

Development Indicators

CLASS	INDICATORS	TYPE	SOURCE
Education	1 Population per primary sch	Secondary	SUBEB
	2 Population per pry sch teacher	Secondary	SUBEB
	3 Percent enrolment	Secondary	SUBEB
	4 Percent female enrolment	Secondary	SUBEB
	5 Population per secondary sch	Secondary	TESCOM
	6 Availability of tertiary institution	Primary	Field survey
Health-care	7 Number of state/general hospital	Secondary	MOH
	8 Number of medical doctors	Secondary	MOH
Transport	9 Road distance to state capital	Secondary	Road Maps
	10 Mode of intra-city transport	Primary	Field survey
	11 Density of tarred road	Primary	Field survey
Communication and Infrastructure	12 Availability of public phone	Secondary	State records
	13 Availability of daily newspaper	Primary	Field survey
	14 Availability of postal services	Primary	Field survey
	15 Availability of rec facilities	Primary	Field survey
	16 Spread of functional electricity	Primary	Field survey
	17 Availability of pipe borne water	Primary	Field survey
Population and Urbanization	18 Population	Secondary	NPC
	19 Population Density	Secondary	NPC
	20 Level of Urbanization	Primary	Field
Services and Industry	21 Type of judicial services	Primary	Field survey
	22 Spread of Banking facilities	Primary	Field survey
	23 Density of large manufacturing	Primary	Field survey
	24 Density of pop in primary activities	Secondary	State records

Development Indicators Rotated Factor Loadings Pre-1996

Variables	P.Component I	P.Component II	P.Component III	P.Component IV
1 Population per primary sch	0.436	0.637	0.461	0.243
2 Population per pry sch teacher	0.170	-0.073	0.893	0.136
3 Percent enrolment	0.135	0.541	0.664	-0.206
4 Percent female enrolment	-0.054	0.170	0.127	0.900
5 Population per secondary sch	0.281	0.433	0.666	-0.062
6 Availability of tertiary institution	0.770	0.332	0.326	-0.247
7 Number of state/general hospital	0.721	0.254	0.251	-0.012
8 Number of medical doctors	0.786	0.383	0.256	0.256
9 Road distance to state capital	0.122	0.894	-0.061	-0.091
10 Mode of intra-city transport	0.601	0.650	0.312	0.207
11 Density of tarred road	0.545	0.756	0.250	0.126
12 Availability of public phone	0.532	0.790	0.142	0.138
13 Availability of daily newspaper	0.613	0.651	0.316	0.122
14 Availability of postal services	0.570	0.506	0.470	0.131
15 Availability of rec facilities	0.739	0.364	0.357	-0.097
16 Spread of functional electricity	0.486	0.537	0.468	-0.089
17 Availability of pipe borne water	0.774	0.337	-0.019	-0.053
18 Population	0.442	0.246	0.635	0.251
19 Population Density	0.379	0.838	0.196	0.257
20 Level of Urbanization	0.566	0.530	0.365	0.254
21 Type of judicial services	0.674	-0.214	0.579	-0.121
22 Spread of Banking facilities	0.635	0.529	0.358	0.145
23 Density of large manufacturing	0.231	0.657	0.107	-0.376
24Density of pop in primary activities	0.666	0.618	0.312	0.205
Eigenvalues	15.283	2.111	1.425	1.101
Percent of Total variance	63.680	8.796	5.937	4.586
Cummulative Percent	63.680	72.476	78.413	82.999

Development Indicators Rotated Factor Loadings 2016

Variables	P.Component I	P.Component II	P.Component III	P.Component IV
1 Population per primary sch	0.580	0.517	0.417	0.290
2 Population per pry sch teacher	-0.068	-0.100	0.871	0.157
3 Percent enrolment	0.268	0.432	0.666	-0.144
4 Percent female enrolment	-0.038	-0.014	0.183	0.914
5 Population per secondary sch	0.319	0.179	0.778	0.124
6 Availability of tertiary institution	0.763	0.333	0.190	-0.197
7 Number of state/general hospital	0.664	0.347	-0.030	-0.091
8 Number of medical doctors	0.822	0.351	-0.081	0.183
9 Road distance to state capital	0.257	0.900	-0.113	-0.026
10 Mode of intra-city transport	0.696	0.603	0.219	0.112
11 Density of tarred road	0.798	0.434	0.183	0.136
12 Availability of public phone	0.652	0.642	0.129	-0.044
13 Availability of daily newspaper	0.778	0.407	0.264	0.107
14 Availability of postal services	0.772	0.167	0.413	0.142
15 Availability of rec facilities	0.847	0.223	0.152	-0.083
16 Spread of functional electricity	0.753	0.302	0.301	-0.023
17 Availability of pipe borne water	0.684	0.245	-0.031	-0.225
18 Population	0.338	0.744	0.360	0.111
19 Population Density	0.540	0.742	0.128	0.232
20 Level of Urbanization	0.834	0.285	0.223	0.107
21 Type of judicial services	0.821	-0.001	0.217	-0.326
22 Spread of Banking facilities	0.638	0.508	0.260	0.147
23 Density of large manufacturing	0.231	0.700	0.109	-0.219
24Density of pop in primary activities	0.864	0.370	0.198	-0.070
Eigenvalues	14.495	1.947	1.597	1.140
Percent of Total variance	60.396	8.113	6.654	4.750
Cummulative Percent	60.396	68.508	75.163	79.913

Dimensions of Development

- | ● | Principal Component | Dimension of Development |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| ● | I | Social Services and Communication |
| ● | II | Transport and Industry |
| ● | III | Education |
| ● | IV | Female Education |

LGs Performance on the Development Dimensions before 1996

Dimension	Performance	Local Government Area
Social Services and Communication	High	Ibadan North, NE, NW, SE, SW, Afijio, Ifedapo, Iseyin, Ogbomoso North, Ogbomoso South, Oyo
	Medium	Irepo, Orellope, Surulere, Oluyole, Lagelu
	Low	Kajola, Ifeloju, Ibarapa East, Ido, Akinyele, Onaara, Egbeda, Ogooluwa, Oriire
Transport and Industry	High	Ibadan North, NE, NW, SE, SW, Afijio, Akinyele, Egbeda, Oluyole, Onaara, Lagelu, Ogbomoso North, Ogbomoso South
	Medium	Ifedapo, Kajola, Ifeloju, Iseyin, Oyo, Ogooluwa, Surulere, Orellope, Irepo
	Low	Ibarapa East, Oriire, Ido
Education	High	Ibadan North, NE, SE, SW, Ifedapo, Orellope, Oriire, Oyo, Ogbomoso North, Iseyin, Ibarapa East, Ifeloju, Kajola
	Medium	Ibadan NW, Onaara, Egbeda, Akinyele, Irepo
	Low	Ido, Afijio, Oluyole, Lagelu, Ogooluwa, Surulere, Ogbomoso South
Female Education	High	Ibadan North, NW, NE, SE, Onaara, Ogooluwa, Surulere, Ogbomoso South, Irepo, Ifedapo, Iseyin, Kajola
	Medium	Ifeloju, Oyo, Akinyele, Lagelu
	Low	Ibarapa East, Orellope, Ido, Oriire, Afijio, Oluyole, Ibadan SW, Egbeda

LGs Performance on the Development Dimensions in 2016

Dimension	Performance	Local Government Area
Social Services and Communication	High	Ibadan N, NE, NW, SE, SW, Saki West, Iseyin, Ibarapa Central, Oyo West, Oyo East, Afijio, Ogbomoso North, Ogbomoso South
	Medium	Atisbo, Atiba, Orellope, Ogooluwa, Surulere
	Low	Irepo, Saki East, Olorunsogo, Itesiwaju, Kajola, Iwajowa, Ibarapa North, Ibarapa East, Ido, Akinyele, Lagelu, Egbeda, Onaara, Oluyole, Orire
Transport and Population	High	Ibadan North, NE, NW, SW, SE, Ido, Akinyele, Lagelu, Oluyole, Onaara, Egbeda, Afijio, Oyo East, Ibarapa East
	Medium	Kajola, Iseyin, Atiba, Oyo West, Ogbomoso North, Ogbomoso South, Surulere
	Low	Irepo, Orellope, Olorunsogo, Orire, Ogooluwa, Saki East, Saki West, Atisbo, Itesiwaju, Iwajowa, Ibarapa North, Ibarapa Central
Education	High	Ibadan North, NE, SW, SE, Egbeda, Ibarapa East, Oyo West, Oyo East, Orire, Atiba, Itesiwaju, Kajola, Iwajowa, Atisbo, Saki West, Saki East, Ogbomoso North
	Medium	Irepo, Orellope, Akinyele, Ibadan NW, Onaara, Ibarapa Central
	Low	Olorunsogo, Ogbomoso South, Ogooluwa, Afijio, Iseyin, Ibarapa North, Ido, Oluyole, Lagelu, Surulere
Female Education	High	Ibadan North, NE, NW, SE, Onaara, Ogooluwa, Surulere, Ogbomoso South, Oyo East, Oyo West, Itesiwaju, Kajola, Iwajowa, Atisbo, Olorunsogo
	Medium	Saki West, Ibarapa Central, Akinyele, Lagelu, Egbeda
	Low	Ibadan SW, Oluyole, Ido, Ibarapa East, Ibarapa North, Iseyin, Afijio, Orire, Atiba, Orellope, Irepo, Saki East, Ogbomoso North

The Development Surface in 1996

Level of Development	Local Government
First Level (Most Developed)	Ibadan North, Ibadan North-West, Ibadan South-West Ibadan North-East, Ibadan South-East, Ogbomoso North Oyo, Ogbomoso South, Ifedapo, Iseyin, Afijio
Second Level (Intermediate)	Akinyele, Onaara Egbeda Kajola, Oriire
Third Level (Least Developed)	Oluyole, Lagelu, Ibarapa Ifeloju, Ido, Irepo Ogooluwa, Orelope, Surulere

The Development Surface in 2016

Level of Development	Local Government
First Level (Most Developed)	Ibadan North, Ibadan North-West, Ibadan South-West Ibadan North-East, Ibadan South-East, Ogbomoso North Oyo East, Saki West, Iseyin Ogbomoso South, Afijio, Ibarapa Central
Second Level (Intermediate)	Akinyele, Onaara, Egbeda Atiba, Oyo West, Atisbo Ibarapa East, Kajola, Itesiwaju Ogooluwa, Orelope, Oriire, Surulere
Third Level (Least Developed)	Oluyole, Lagelu, Ido Ibarapa North, Olorunsogo Iwajowa, Irepo, Saki East

Summary of Findings

- From the analysis, Ibarapa Central (formerly Ifeloju) moved from the least developed category to being among the most developed LGs after Ibarapa North was excised from it.
- Both Irepo and Olorunsogo that was excised from it remained in the least developed category.
- Kajola belonged in the second level of development in 1996 and still retained the same ranking in 2016, whereas Iwajowa that was created out of it is one of the least developed LGs in 2016.
- Oyo West LG and Atiba LG created from Oyo LG are among the second tier LGs after partitioning while the mother LG, renamed Oyo East remained in the first tier.
- From Ifedapo came Atisbo (second level) and Saki East (Third level) while the remaining part of old Ifedapo, renamed Saki West LG, maintained its status among the most developed LGs.
- Iseyin also maintained its status in the first level while Itesiwaju LG created from it belonged in the second level.

Conclusion

- In all the partitioned LGs and the new ones created from them;
 - Only Ibarapa Central improved in its ranking while seven other LGs maintained their status.
 - Six declined in status.
- In other words, levels of development in the urban centers that were excised to form the new LGAs remained same in seven, improved in one, and declined in six of the LGAs.
- This implies that decentralization in itself is not an inadequate tool for addressing spatial inequalities in development but a veritable tool for the identification of priority areas for development planning within existing urban jurisdictions

Thank you.