

Determining the Nexus between Local Government Autonomy and Grassroots Development in Nigeria: Evidence from Bursari Local Government Area, Yobe State.

¹Sadiq Maimodu, ^{*2}Ali Kole, ³Mukhtar Bashir Halliru, ⁴Audu Inusa, ⁵Yusuf Abdulsalam, and ⁶Baba Mohammed

^{1,3,4}Department of Public Administration, Mai Idris Aloom Polytechnic, Geidam, Yobe state.

²Department of Marketing, Mai Idris Aloom Polytechnic, Geidam, Yobe state.

^{5,6}Department of Accountancy, Mai Idris Aloom Polytechnic, Geidam, Yobe state.

*Corresponding author: koleali@miapoly.edu.ng

Abstract

This study reviews the links between local government autonomy and grassroots development in Bursari Local Government Area (LGA) of Yobe State, Nigeria. Grounded in decentralization and democratic governance theories, the research investigates the extent to which political, administrative, and financial autonomy influences development facet at the grassroots degree. A heterogeneous-methods research design was considered befitting, joining quantitative data from structured questionnaires administered to 170 respondents with qualitative insights from relevant stakeholders. Descriptive statistics and one-sample t-tests were employed to examine the data and test the formulated hypotheses. The findings indicate a robust cononance among respondents that local government autonomy incrementally improves grassroots development. The outcome further establishes a statistically positive relationship between autonomy and socio-economic development in Bursari LGA. Moreover, the study also pinpoints key obstacles hindering effective local administrations, including fisnial mismanagement, limited institutional capability, and lack of autonomy due to state undue interference. The study deduces that while local government autonomy is a critical enhancer of grassroots development, its potency is conditional upon strengthening institutional foundation, enhancing financial accountability, and enabling staff capability. The study put forward increased fiscal and administrative freedom, better governance practices, and formidable community participation as centrifugal strategies for promoting sustainable development at the local environment.

Keywords: *Local Government Autonomy; Grassroots Development; Decentralization; Governance; Service Delivery; Nigeria; Bursari Local Government; Democratic Participation*

JEL Classification: H70; H72; H77; O20; O21; D72

Determining the Nexus between Local Government Autonomy and Grassroots Development in Nigeria: Evidence from Bursari Local Government Area, Yobe State.

1. INTRODUCTION

Local government, defined by legitimately recognized territory, formal authority, and a measure of bureaucratic autonomy, constitutes the level of governance closest to the people at the center. It functions at the grassroots level and is plausibly positioned to surmount local needs and aspirations. A key differentiating characteristic of local government is its democratic foundation-being administered by elected bodies-which pave a way for legitimacy, accountability, and readiness. Conversely speaking, where local functionaries are appointed rather than elected, such structures function more as local administrative outposts of higher governments, thereby lacking the central features of authentic local administration (Olowu & Wunsch, 2004). The global paradigm shift toward top-bottom administration-particularly through devolution-ponders a broad realization of its future relevance to underscore grassroots development, strengthen political inclusion, enhance administrative proficiency, and foster consultative democracy. Decentralization enables decision-making authorities to be transferred closer to citizens, thereby ushering in greater civic engagement and ensuring that development roadmaps are more contextually relevant ([United Nations Development Program UNDP], 2017; World Bank, 2000).

However, these benefits, advocates of centralization emphasize its future importance to advance uniform policy application, ensure national coherence, and reduce administrative counterproductive. Yet, empirical evidence generally underpinned decentralization as a more effective instrumentality for deepening democratic governance, improving service delivery, and enhancing accountability at the local governance (Rondinelli, 1983; UNDP, 2017). For decentralization to yield fruitful outputs, local governments must possess a noticeable degree of autonomy-especially in

political, administrative, and financial facets. Nevertheless, such autonomy in most cases restricted by statutory factors and the supervisory authority of higher of government.

In many third world countries, including Nigeria, local government systems inhibited by significant structural and operational obstacles. These include poor institutional know how, limited, inadequate budgetary resources, and excessive state government interference, all of which subdue their proficiency in delivering development outcomes (Okoli & Onwujekwu, 2014; Ekpo & Ndebbio, 1998). Consequently, the developmental future relevance of local governments is often impracticable. Bursari Local Government Area (LGA) in Yobe State suffers these states of affairs, where persistent socio-economic obstacles continue to impede grassroots development and effective governance.

The causes of poor development at the local government level remain a subject of academic discourse and policy debate. While some commentators explain this phenomenon as central to insufficient autonomy within an overly centralized state structure, others emphasize factors such as incompetent leadership, mismanagement, poorly coordinated institutional capacity, and limited resource mobilization (Adeyemo, 2005; Arowolo, 2010). These perspectives underscore the need for empirical research into the relationship between local government autonomy and development outcomes.

Against this backdrop, this study rationally reviews the intensity of local government autonomy in Bursari LGA and its repercussions for sustainable grassroots development. By searching how autonomous and effective local governance structures can facilitate socio-economic changes, the study aims to contribute to ongoing policy discussions on strengthening

Determining the Nexus between Local Government Autonomy and Grassroots Development in Nigeria: Evidence from Bursari Local Government Area, Yobe State.

local governance systems in Nigeria and similar contexts.

This study is guided by the following specific objectives:

- To examine the relevance of local government in enhancing grassroots development in Bursari Local Government Area of Yobe State.
- To review the relationship between local government autonomy and the intensity of grassroots development in Bursari Local Government.
- To analyze the key developmental challenges facing Bursari Local Government.
- To offer pragmatic strategies through which local government administration can stimulate sustainable development in Bursari Local Government.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Conceptual Framework

Concept of Local Government

Local government compose of third tier of governance at the threshold of the people and serves as an inherent mechanism for grassroots development, people's participation, and service delivery. Its closeness to the people enables it to better understand and respond to the socio-economic needs, cultural dynamics, and developmental policy choice of local populations (Bailey & Elliott, 2009; Olowu & Wunsch, 2004). Generally speaking, local government refers to legitimately established political subdivisions fixed to decentralize authority and facilitate governance at the subnational level. Scholars, yet, differ in their explanation. Adeyemo (2005) defines local government as a political and administrative facet with gave

powers intended to enhance grassroots governance. Similarly, Adeyemi (2005) emphasizes its democratic nature, as a body of elected bodies authorize by law to manage local affairs under the supervision of higher tiers of government. In this regard, the defining characteristics of local government include territorial jurisdiction, legal identity, relative autonomy, and democratic leaders (Shah, 2006).

Concept of Local Government Autonomy

The concept of autonomy, coined from the Greek words *auto* (self) and *nomos* (law), refers to as self-governance within defined legal boundaries. In the context of local government administration, autonomy refers to the authority of local governments to make binding decisions, design public policies local in nature, and execute local policies independently, without undue interference from higher authorities (Wolman, 2008). Local government autonomy remains a contentious issue in Nigeria due to persistent conflicts between federal, state, and local authorities. Akpan and Okonette (2013) identify three dimensions of autonomy: freedom from state control, freedom from federal interference, and comprehensive independence from both levels. Clark (1984) further categorizes autonomy into four models:

1. full autonomy
2. partial autonomy with oversight
3. limited implementation powers
4. complete central control

These categorizations highlight that autonomy is in place at local government along a continuum and is shaped by institutional, legal, and political contexts. Chapman (2003) opines that autonomy as the ability of local governments to initiate and formulate and execute policies independently, while Bailey and Elliott (2009) envisioned that

Determining the Nexus between Local Government Autonomy and Grassroots Development in Nigeria: Evidence from Bursari Local Government Area, Yobe State.

autonomy must involve political authority, financial capacity, and administrative discretion to be meaningful.

Local Governance and Citizen Participation

Local governance extends beyond official structures to action the processes, connection, and apparatus through which local actors-state and non-state-collectively manage public issues. It underscores participation, inclusivity, accountability, and responsiveness (World Bank, 2004). A critical factor is citizen-centered governance, which gives preference responsiveness to local preferences and needs (Shah, 2006). Local governments play a central role in enhancing democratic governance by encouraging civic engagement, enhancing transparency, and providing a vanguard for political education (Sikander, 2015). Watt (2006) put forward that decentralization allows public goods and services to better reflect local choices, thereby improving efficiency and welfare outcomes.

Concept of Development

Development is a multifaceted concept which involves economic growth, social progress, institutional transformation, and improvements in human well-being. While traditional perspectives equate development with economic indicators such as GDP, latest approaches emphasize poverty reduction programmes, equal, human development, and access to basic services (Todaro & Smith, 2015; Sen, 1999). Contemporary development discourse emphasizes participation and empowerment, recognizing that sustainable development must involve active engagement between government institutions and people (Hussein, 2004). Hence, local governments are crucial players in translating national development policies into tangible outcomes at the grassroots.

Concept of Decentralization

Determining the Nexus between Local Government Autonomy and Grassroots Development in Nigeria: Evidence from Bursari Local Government Area, Yobe State.

Decentralization refers to the sharing of authority, resources, and responsibilities from central to levels of government at the bottoms. It is plausibly regarded as a governance reform strategy aimed at enhancing effectiveness, accountability, and citizen participation (Rondinelli, 1983; Faguet, 2012). Falleti (2005) postulates that decentralization as a dynamic process involving political, administrative, and fiscal dimensions. Similarly, Kauzya (2005) sees that decentralization is context-dependent, and its success largely hinges on institutional design and implementation capacity.

Types of Decentralization

- Political decentralization
- Administrative decentralization (decongestion, delegation, devolution).
- Fiscal decentralization.

Importance and Benefits of Local Government and Decentralization

Local governments are formidable forces for promoting grassroots development, enhancing democratic engagement in local politics, and improving service delivery. Sikander (2015) identifies key benefits, including improved responsiveness, efficient resource allocation, reduced development costs, and increased citizen participation. Empirical evidence stated that decentralization enhances accountability and service delivery outcomes. For example, reforms in countries such as Brazil and Colombia have led to transformation in education, infrastructure, and social services (Faguet, 2012; World Bank, 2004). Yet, decentralization may also produce unmeant consequences such as elite capture, regional inequality, and financial instability if institutional safeguards are weak (Smoke, 2003; Cabral, 2011).

Legal and Constitutional Framework of Local Government in Nigeria

The 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (as amended) produce the licit basis for the formation, structure, and responsibility of local government councils. It assures constitutional allocations from the Federation Account and apportions responsibilities such as revenue collection, service provision, and engagements in economic planning. In spite of these provisions, the autonomy of local governments remains inhibited by state control agency, including joint state-local government accounts and administrative oversight (Arowolo, 2010). This has resulted in a ambiguity where local governments are constitutionally recognized but functionally dependent.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

Democratic Theory of Local Government

The democratic theory conjecture that local government assists as a medium for enhancing democratic administration by promoting community engagement, accountability, and responsiveness at the grassroots level (Gboyega, 2003; Agagu, 2012). It perceives local governments as training grounds for future political leadership and civic participation, where citizens actively participate in decision-making cycle. Awolowo (1952) further emphasizes that local governments should act with minimal hinderance, allowing local councils to contemplates the will of the people. This perspective aligns with venereal democracy and underscores the importance of decentralization in strengthening democratic institutions.

Non-Democratic Theory

The non-democratic perspective holds contrary views that local governments often lack genuine autonomy and responsibility as extensions of central or state authorities. As a result, they may

fail to achieve accountability, responsiveness, and effective delivery of service (Agagu, 2012). This theory is particularly relevant in contexts where political encumbrances, feeble institutions, and limited capacity restraint local governance.

Citizen-Centered Governance Theory

Shah (2006) advances the citizen-centered governance background, which emphasizes sensitivity, accountability, and productivity. According to this perspective, effective local governance requires alignment between public service delivery and citizens' accomplishments. This approach integrates elements of decentralization, consultative governance, and institutional proficiency.

2.3 Empirical Review

Practical studies on local government autonomy and development present combined findings. In Nigeria, research consistently highlights the drawback of limited autonomy, feeble financial capacity, and political impediment. Okoli and Onwujekwu (2014) find that decentralization reforms in Nigeria have had bounded impact due to poor implementation and structural constraints. Similarly, Arowolo (2010) identifies excessive state interference as a major drawback to effective local governance and development. International confirmation suggests that decentralization can increase development under certain institutional conditions. Faguet (2012), in a study on Bolivia, demonstrates that decentralization led to more fair resource allocation and improved service delivery. Similarly, Bardhan and Mookherjee (2006) show that local accountability apparatus can bring about development in local government, although outcomes depend on local institutional quality.

However, other studies heed against overestimating the benefits of decentralization. Campos and Hellman (2005) demonstrate that decentralization may augment local elites and

Determining the Nexus between Local Government Autonomy and Grassroots Development in Nigeria: Evidence from Bursari Local Government Area, Yobe State.

aggravate inequality if transparency and accountability mechanisms are feeble and compromised. Smoke (2003) also notes that decentralization transformation often collapses due to poor design and poor of political commitment. In the Nigerian context, Adeyemo (2005) concludes that the limited autonomy of local governments has hampered their ability to deliver sustainable development. This accentuate the need to strengthen institutional modalities, enhance financial independence, and promote accountability.

2.4 Research Gaps

In spite of, the extensive body of researches on decentralization and local government autonomy, several critical gaps remain, particularly within the Nigerian context and at both micro and macro (LGA-specific) level. Initially, while existing studies (e.g., Adeyemo, 2005; Arowolo, 2010; Okoli & Onwujekwu, 2014) have identified confined autonomy and extreme state control as noticeable bottleneck on local government performance, there is insufficient practical analysis at the level of specific local government areas, such as Bursari LGA. Most studies adopt a national or state-level approach, thereby overlooking contextual variations in governance outcomes. Second, although theoretical postulation underscores the nexus between decentralization and grassroots development (Rondinelli, 1983; Shah, 2006), empirical evidence remains mixed and ambiguous, particularly considering how divergent facets of autonomy (financial, administrative, and political) independently influence development outcomes.

Third, there is an obvious gap in literature concerning the interaction between institutional constraints and local development drawback. While scholars admitted issues such as feeble capacity, mismanagement, and poor service delivery, few studies systematically analyze how

these components combine to shape development outcomes at the local government (Smoke, 2003; Faguet, 2012). Fourth, attention has been given to context-specific policy solutions tailored to the realities of rural and conflict-prone areas such as Yobe State. Much of the literature provides holistic recommendations without overcoming localized socio-economic and institutional constraints. Finally, there is a paucity of studies that empirically link citizen participation, autonomy, and measurable development indicators within a unified analytical framework. This study therefore seeks to bridge these gaps by focusing on Bursari LGA and examining how autonomy influences grassroots development outcomes.

2.5 Research Hypotheses

Drawing from the conceptual, theoretical, and empirical literature, the following hypotheses are formulated:

Main Hypothesis

- H_0 (Null Hypothesis): Local government autonomy has no significant effect on grassroots development in Bursari Local Government Area.
- H_1 (Alternative Hypothesis): Local government autonomy has a significant positive effect on grassroots development in Bursari Local Government Area.

Specific Hypotheses

1. H_{01} : There is no promotion of democratic ideals and development in Bursari LGA.
 H_{11} : There is a promotion of democratic ideals and development in Bursari LGA.
2. H_{02} : Local autonomy has no effect on service delivery to the people in Bursari LGA.

Determining the Nexus between Local Government Autonomy and Grassroots Development in Nigeria: Evidence from Bursari Local Government Area, Yobe State.

H₁₂: Local autonomy has significant effect on service delivery in Bursari LGA

3. **H₀₃:** Local autonomy does not significantly affect citizen participation in Bursari LGA.

H₁₃: Local autonomy significantly improves citizen participation in Bursari LGA.

4. **H₀₄:** Financial challenges do not significantly constrain local performance In Bursari LGA.

H₁₄: Financial challenges do significantly constrain local performance In Bursari LGA.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study adopts a blended-methods research design, using quantitative and qualitative approaches to explore the connection between local government autonomy and grassroots development in Bursari Local Government Area (LGA) of Yobe State. The quantitative component facilitates hypothesis testing through statistical techniques, while the qualitative aspect provides deeper insights into institutional dynamics and governance drawback. The nature of the study is both descriptive and explanatory, as it seeks to describe the structure and level of autonomy in local government and point out its assumption for grassroots development outcomes.

3.2 Study Area

The study is conducted in Bursari Local Government Area of Yobe State, Nigeria. The selection is informed by the aspect in which developmental confrontation and its relevance to ongoing debates on decentralization and local governance in Nigeria.

3.3 Population of the Study

Determining the Nexus between Local Government Autonomy and Grassroots Development in Nigeria: Evidence from Bursari Local Government Area, Yobe State.

Population, as defined by Nweke (1983), refers to the entirety of elements or individuals from which a sample is drawn and to which research findings are established. In this study, there is a total population of 1182 staff members across key departments within Bursari Local Government distributed as follows:

Department	Population
Administrative	280
Finance	210
Establishment and Training	168
Commercial and Industry	240
Human Resources	160
Treasury	124
Total	1,182

Given the focus on local government autonomy, which involves multiple actors, the study adopts a purposive approach to ensure that respondents possess relevant administrative knowledge and experience.

3.4 Sample Size Determination

The sample size for the study is determined using the Yamane (2004) formula, which provides a simplified method for calculating sample size from a finite population:

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

Where:

- n = sample size
- N = population size (1,182)
- e = level of precision (typically 0.05)

Applying this formula yields a sample size of approximately 299 respondents, which is considered statistically adequate for representing the population.

3.5 Sampling Techniques

A multi-stage sampling technique is employed:

1. **Purposive Sampling:** Used to select relevant departments and are central to personnel involved in governance and administrative processes.
2. **Proportionate Allocation:** Ensures fair representation of each department within the sample.
3. **Simple Random Sampling:** Applied within each department to select individual respondents, thereby minimizing selection bias.

The proportional distribution of the sample is presented below:

Department	Population	Sample Size
Administrative	280	70
Finance	210	50
Establishment and Training	168	45
Commercial and Industry	240	55
Human Resources	160	43
Treasury	124	36
Total	1,182	299

Source: Field Survey, 2026

3.6 Sources of Data

The study utilizes both primary and secondary data sources: Primary data comprises of structured questionnaires administered to 299 respondents. It is designed to capture perceptions on autonomy, service delivery, involvement, and development outcomes. Secondary data are sourced from academic books and journal articles; Government reports and policy documents, and official publications on local government administration.

3.7 Data Collection Instruments

The primary instrument for data collection is a structured questionnaire, consisting of both closed-ended and Likert-scale questions. This format allows for quantitative measurement of key variables such as fiscal autonomy, administrative capacity, and service delivery performance. Additionally, limited qualitative insights may be obtained through informal consultations with key administrative personnel.

3.8 Validity and Reliability of Instruments

To ensure the robustness of the research instrument:

- **Content validity** is built through expert review and alignment with existing literature and research objectives.
- **Construct validity** is ensured by linking questionnaire items to key theoretical variables such as autonomy and development.
- **Reliability** is tested using the **test-retest method**, which involves administering the same instrument at two different points in time to assess consistency.

3.9 Method of Data Analysis

Data collected from the field is analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques: Descriptive statistics involve the use

of frequency distributions, percentages, and means to summarize responses. Inferential statistics use hypothesis testing (t- test) to examine relationships between variables.

4. DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents, analyzes, and interprets the data collected for the study. The data are systematically organized into tables and analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) as well as inferential statistical techniques (one-sample t-tests) to evaluate the hypotheses. The analysis focuses on respondents' perceptions regarding local government autonomy and grassroots development in Bursari Local Government Area (LGA), with particular attention to institutional performance, constraints, and governance outcomes.

4.2 Data Presentation and Descriptive Analysis

Justification for Local Government at the Grassroots Level

The data indicates unanimous agreement (100%) among respondents that the establishment of local government at the grassroots level is justified. This overwhelming consensus underscores the perceived relevance of local governance structures in promoting development and participation.

Local Government Autonomy and Grassroots Development

A significant majority of respondents (84.1% strongly agreed and 15.9% agreed) that local government autonomy enhances grassroots development in Bursari. This suggests a strong perception that autonomy is critical for effective local governance and development outcomes.

Promotion of Democratic Ideals and Development

All respondents (100%) strongly agreed that local government plays a crucial role in promoting democratic values and coordinating development initiatives. This finding aligns with democratic theory, which emphasizes grassroots participation and accountability.

Impact of Legal Framework on Local Government Performance

The findings show that 84.1% strongly agreed and 15.9% agreed that the legal framework significantly influences the efficiency and performance of local governments. This highlights the importance of enabling legal and institutional environments for effective governance.

Grassroots Development as a Political Priority

The data reveals broad consensus (84.7% strongly agreed; 15.3% agreed) that grassroots development is a central concern of responsive political systems. This reinforces the developmental role of local governments.

Constraints Facing Local Governments

A large proportion of respondents (76.5% strongly agreed; 23.5% agreed) acknowledged the existence of significant constraints limiting local government effectiveness. This indicates widespread recognition of structural and institutional challenges.

Need for Local Government Autonomy

An overwhelming majority (99.4% strongly agreed; 0.6% agreed) supported granting full autonomy to local governments in Nigeria. This demonstrates a near-universal consensus on the importance of autonomy for effective governance.

Local Government as the Closest Tier to the People

Similarly, 99.4% strongly agreed that local government is the closest and most accessible tier of government, reinforcing its central role in grassroots governance and service delivery.

Financial Mismanagement as a Key Challenge

The findings indicate that 65.3% strongly agreed and 34.7% agreed that financial mismanagement and poor resource allocation constitute major challenges in Bursari LGA. This points to governance and accountability issues as critical concerns.

Relationship between Autonomy and Development

The results show that 98.8% strongly agreed and 1.2% agreed that a significant relationship exists between local government autonomy and socio-economic development in Bursari. This further reinforces the central argument of the study.

4.3 Test of Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

- **H₀:** Local government autonomy does not enhance grassroots development in Bursari LGA.
- **H₁:** Local government autonomy enhances grassroots development in Bursari LGA.

Using a one-sample t-test:

- **t = -47.701, df = 169, p = 0.000**

Since the p-value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected. This indicates that local government autonomy has a statistically

significant positive effect on grassroots development in Bursari LGA.

Hypothesis Two

- **H₀:** There is no significant relationship between local government autonomy and socio-economic development.
- **H₁:** There is a significant relationship between local government autonomy and socio-economic development.

Results:

- **t = -179.430, df = 169, p = 0.000**

The null hypothesis is rejected, confirming a significant positive relationship between autonomy and socio-economic development.

4.4 Summary of Findings

The study reveals several important findings:

1. There is unanimous acknowledgement of the significance of local government in grassroots development and democratic governance.
2. Local government autonomy is widely believed as a instrumental driver of development, with strong statistical support.
3. The legal and institutional groundwork significantly influences local government productivity.
4. In spite of its preponderance, local government faces considerable amount of constraints, including budgetary mismanagement, poor capacity, and institutional bottleneck.
5. There exists a robust and statistically relevant relationship between autonomy and socio-economic development.

Determining the Nexus between Local Government Autonomy and Grassroots Development in Nigeria: Evidence from Bursari Local Government Area, Yobe State.

4.5 Conclusion and policy recommendations

Based on the analysis, the following conclusions are drawn: Local government autonomy is essential for enhancing grassroots development, as it enables responsive and context-specific decision-making. The developmental capacity of Bursari LGA is embarrassed by limited financial resources, lack of skilled personnel, and feeble institutional know how. Governance challenges, including financial mismanagement and poor accountability apparatus, undermine development outcomes. Effective grassroots development requires not only autonomy but also institutional capabilities, transparency, and citizen participation.

Considering the aforementioned findings, the study proposes the following recommendations: First, there is need for empower the administrative capacity of local governments so that they can engage in hiring the needed staff and retain qualified professionals to improve planning, implementation, and evaluation of development programs .Secondly, Local Government Autonomy should be upgraded through granting greater financial, administrative, and political autonomy to local governments to pave a way for effective service delivery. Thirdly, there should be reformed financial management and accountability by assured a transparent fiscal system and strict accountability measures are implemented to bring down the mismanagement and corruption. Fourthly, there should be capacity building and training for personnel development through the provision of regular training programs organized for local government staff to enhance technical and managerial capabilities. Fifthly, there is need for promoting community inclusivity through the development of initiatives by actively involving local communities to ensure ownership, sustainability. Also, there is need for strengthening intergovernmental communication through effective harmonization between state

and local governments should be considered to coordinate development plans and avoid duplication. Local governments should also establish strong monitoring and evaluation models to reaffirm efficient project execution and resource utilization and dependable funding conduit and resource allocation should be provided to the local government with sufficient financial resources to effectively discharge their responsibilities.

References

- Adeyemi, O. O. (2005). Local government and the challenges of service delivery in Nigeria. *Journal of Public Administration*, 12(3), 45-60.
- Adeyemo, D. O. (2005). Local government autonomy in Nigeria: A historical perspective. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(2), 77-87.
- Agagu, A. A. (2012). *Local government and democracy in Nigeria*.
- Akpan, N. U., & Okonette, S. M. (2013). Local government autonomy and grassroots development in Nigeria. *Journal of Public Administration*, 5(2), 120-132.
- Alao, D. O., et al. (2015). Local government and participatory democracy in Nigeria. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*.
- Aransi, W. O., & Adeyemi, O. O. (2012). Local government autonomy and grassroots development in Nigeria. *African Journal of Political Science*, 6(1), 1-15.
- Arowolo, D. (2010). Local government administration and the challenges of rural development in Nigeria. *International Journal of Politics and Good Governance*, 1(1), 1-16.

- Awolowo, O. (1952). *Path to Nigerian freedom*.
- Bailey, S. J., & Elliott, M. (2009). *Local government economics: Principles and practice*.
- Bardhan, P., & Mookherjee, D. (2006). Decentralization and local governance in developing countries. MIT Press.
- Bremner, L. (2011). Decentralization and local governance: Risks and opportunities. *Public Administration Review*, 71(4), 567-575.
- Cabral, L. (2011). Decentralization in Africa: Scope, motivation and impact. *Future Agricultures*.
- Campos, J. E., & Hellman, J. S. (2005). Governance gone local: Does decentralization improve accountability? *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*.
- Chapman, R. (2003). Local government autonomy and policy development. Routledge.
- Clark, G. (1984). A theory of local autonomy. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 74(2), 195-208.
- Devas, N. (2004). Urban governance and decentralization in Africa. *Public Administration and Development*, 24(1), 7-16.
- Dreher, A., & Fischer, J. (2010). Government decentralization and public sector efficiency. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 26(1), 90-104.
- Edom, D., & Jahed, M. (2009). Development and human capacity building. *Journal of Development Studies*, 45(3), 321-340.
- Ekpo, A. H., & Ndebbio, J. E. U. (1998). *Local government fiscal operations in Nigeria*. African Economic Research Consortium.
- Faguet, J. P. (2012). *Decentralization and popular democracy: Governance from below in Bolivia*.
- Faguet, J. (2011). Decentralization and governance reforms. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 34(5), 345-356.
- Falleti, T. G. (2004). A sequential theory of decentralization. *American Political Science Review*, 99(3), 327-346.
- Falleti, T. G. (2005). A sequential theory of decentralization. *American Political Science Review*, 99(3), 327-346.
- Fatile, J. O., & Ejalonibu, G. L. (2015). Local government administration in Nigeria. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 5(2), 23-39.
- Frey, B. S., & Luechinger, S. (2004). Decentralization as a tool for governance. *Economic Policy*, 19(38), 1-42.
- Gboyega, A. (2003). Democracy and local governance in Nigeria.
- Hussein, K. (2004). Decentralization and development.
- Kauzya, J. M. (2005). Decentralization: Prospects for peace, democracy and development. UNDESA.
- Okoli, C., & Onwujekwu, U. (2014). Devolution of health services and its impact on health workforce and service delivery in Nigeria. *Health Policy and Planning*, 29(6), 1-9.

- Ola, R. O. F., & Tonwe, D. A. (2004). Local administration and governance in Nigeria. Amfitop Books.
- Olowu, D., & Wunsch, J. S. (2004). *Local governance in Africa: The challenges of democratic decentralization*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Rondinelli, D. A. (1983). *Decentralization and development: Policy implementation in developing countries*. Sage Publications.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*.
- Shah, A. (2006). *Local governance in developing countries*. World Bank.
- Sharma, C. K. (2014). Decentralization theory and practice.
- Sikander, T. (2015). Local government and governance.
- Smoke, P. (2003). Decentralization in Africa: Goals, dimensions, myths and challenges.
- Todaro, M. P., & Smith, S. C. (2015). *Economic development*.
- Ugwuanyi, B. I., Ndubuisi, A., & Onuoha, J. (2014). Public administration and local government studies. Academic Publishing Company.
- United Nations Development Program (UNDP). (2004). *Decentralized governance*.
- United Nations Development Program (UNDP). (2017). *Governance for sustainable development*. UNDP.
- Watt, P. (2006). Decentralization and local government efficiency. *Policy Studies Review*, 12(2), 7-18.
- Wolman, H. (2008). Local government autonomy: Concepts and measurement issues. *Urban Affairs Review*, 43(4), 567-589.
- World Bank. (2000). *Decentralization briefing notes*. World Bank Institute.
- World Bank. (2004). *World Development Report: Making services work for poor people*.
- Yajah, B. (2014). Administrative decentralization and governance. *Public Policy Journal*, 9(2), 88-102.

Appendix I

Table 1: Justification for the Establishment of Local Government at the Grassroots Level in Nigeria

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
STRONGLY Valid AGREE	299	100.0	100.0	100.0

Field survey, 2026

Table 2: Local Government Autonomy and Grassroots Development in Bursari

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	251	84.1	84.1	84.1
Valid	48	15.9	15.9	100.0
AGREE	299	100.0	100.0	
Total				

Field survey, 2026

Table 3: Role of Local Government in Promoting Democratic Ideals and Development

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
STRONGLY Valid AGREE	299	100.0	100.0	100.0

Field survey, 2026

Determining the Nexus between Local Government Autonomy and Grassroots Development in Nigeria: Evidence from Bursari Local Government Area, Yobe State.

Table 4: Impact of Legal Framework on Local Government Performance

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	251	84.1	84.1	84.1
Valid AGREE	48	15.9	15.9	100.0
Total	170	100.0	100.0	

Field survey, 2026

Table 5: Grassroots Development as a Priority in Political Systems

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	253	84.7	84.7	84.7
Valid AGREE	46	15.3	15.3	100.0
Total	299	100.0	100.0	

Field survey, 2026

Table 6: Constraints Facing Local Governments in Nigeria

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	229	76.5	76.5	76.5
Valid AGREE	70	23.5	23.5	100.0
Total	299	100.0	100.0	

Field survey, 2026

Determining the Nexus between Local Government Autonomy and Grassroots Development in Nigeria: Evidence from Bursari Local Government Area, Yobe State.

Table 7: Need for Local Government Autonomy in Nigeria

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	297	99.4	99.4	99.4
Valid	2	0.6	0.6	100.0
AGREE	299	100.0	100.0	
Total				

Field survey, 2026

Table 8: Effectiveness of Local Government as the Closest Tier to the People

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	297	99.4	99.4	99.4
Valid	2	0.6	0.6	100.0
AGREE	299	100.0	100.0	
Total				

Field survey, 2026

Table 9: Financial Mismanagement as a Challenge Facing Local Government

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	195	65.3	65.3	65.3
Valid	104	34.7	34.7	100.0
AGREE	299	100.0	100.0	
Total				

Feld survey, 2026

Determining the Nexus between Local Government Autonomy and Grassroots Development in Nigeria: Evidence from Bursari Local Government Area, Yobe State.

Table 10: Relationship Between Autonomy and Grassroots Development in Bursari local government?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	295	98.8	98.8	98.8
Valid AGREE	4	1.2	1.2	100.0
Total	299	100.0	100.0	

Field survey, 2026

Appendix II

Table 11: One-Sample Test

Local Government Autonomy enhances rural development in Bursari Local Government	Test Value = 2.5					
	t	df	Sig. (2tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
	-47.701	169	.000	-1.341	-1.40	-1.29

Field survey, 2026

Determining the Nexus between Local Government Autonomy and Grassroots Development in Nigeria: Evidence from Bursari Local Government Area, Yobe State.

Table 12: One-Sample Test

There is significant relationship between autonomy and socio-economic development in Bursari Local Government	Test Value = 2.5						
	t	df	Sig. (2tailed)	Difference	Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
	-179.430	169	.000	-1.488		-1.50	-1.47

Field survey, 2026