Political Economy of Multi-Campus Development in Rivers State University, 2017 - 2025

Abu, Christian Ukeame, PhD[1], Onya, Reason, PhD[2], Chris-Abu Laura Chiosome[3]

[1,2]Department of Political Science, Rivers State University, Port Harcourt

[3]Department of General Studies Captain Elechi Amadi Polytechnic

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.101000679

Received: 16 January 2026; Accepted: 21 January 2026; Published: 15 November 2026

ABSTRACT

Since 2017, Rivers State University (RSU), Port Harcourt, has undergone a significant restructuring process involving the establishment and expansion of multiple satellite campuses across the state. Intended to enhance access to higher education, promote regional development, and decentralize administrative burdens, the multi-campus model has simultaneously generated complex political, economic, and administrative outcomes. This study examines the political economy of running multiple campuses within RSU between 2017 and 2025. Anchored in Institutional Political Economy and Clientelist Theory, the study analyzes how political incentives, governance structures, state-level patronage systems, and public finance constraints have shaped the evolution, funding, and performance of RSU's multi-campus system. Using a qualitative exploratory research design, documentary materials and stakeholder interview quotations, policy review, and existing literature on Nigerian higher education, the study reveals tensions between educational objectives and political imperatives, including resource fragmentation, fiscal pressures, politicized siting decisions, governance asymmetries, and uneven educational quality across campuses. The study concludes that while the multi-campus initiative expanded spatial access, its success remains contingent upon stronger institutional safeguards, transparent budgeting, depoliticized governance, and performance-driven administrative reforms. Recommendations are offered to enhance sustainability, equity, accountability, and academic standards across all RSU campuses.

Keywords: Political economy, Satellite campuses, Higher education governance, Multi-campus system, Public policy.

INTRODUCTION

Beginning in 2017, Rivers State University (RSU), Port Harcourt, formerly a single-campus institution, entered a transformative phase marked by the establishment of additional campuses across Rivers State. These satellite campuses, sited in Ahoada, Etche, and Emohua local government areas, were created under the policy direction of the Rivers State Government to decentralize academic activities and broaden access to tertiary education. The multi-campus initiative was officially articulated as part of broader state development goals aimed at enhancing regional inclusion, decongesting the main campus, and bringing higher education closer to historically underserved communities. Such state-led expansion is consistent with national higher-education policies seeking to widen participation and democratize access, especially in contexts where demographic pressures and spatial inequalities constrain educational opportunity (Okebukola, 2015; Onah & Nwagwu, 2020).

However, as has been widely observed in the governance of public universities in Nigeria, campus expansion often intersects with the political economy of state-level decision-making. The siting of university campuses, allocation of funds, infrastructural development priorities, staff deployment, and administrative restructuring frequently reflect not only academic considerations but also political bargaining, patronage networks, constituency demands, and electoral incentives (Ayoade, 1998; Suberu, 2010; Agbaje & Adejumobi, 2006). As such, the RSU multi-campus project exemplifies the interface where public policy, political interests, institutional capacity, and economic constraints converge.

Political economy perspectives emphasize that public institutions are shaped by the competing interests and power relations among political elites, bureaucracies, local communities, and organized groups such as academic unions (Leftwich, 2006; Khan, 2010). In the Nigerian higher-education context, policies of university expansion have historically reflected not only developmental motivations but also electoral calculations, state-elite negotiations, and efforts by subnational governments to consolidate political legitimacy (Adebanwi & Obadare, 2010; Oloruntoba, 2018). Consequently, while the establishment of RSU's satellite campuses may have aimed to address legitimate educational gaps and regional disparities, it simultaneously unfolded within a broader framework of state-level political incentives and distributive politics.

Between 2017 and 2025, RSU's transition to a multi-campus institution generated diverse socio-economic and administrative implications. These included increased financial requirements, expanded workforce demands, coordination challenges across academic units, intensified procurement activities, and evolving relationships with host communities. The political environment further shaped patterns of resource allocation, the pace of campus development, and the dynamics of administrative authority, trends consistent with findings in the broader literature on African higher-education governance (Materu, 2007; Teferra & Altbach, 2019).

While the multi-campus strategy at RSU aimed to democratize access and stimulate regional development, the initiative also produced significant challenges, many of which reflect systemic governance patterns in Nigerian university administration:

- Resource Fragmentation: Funding previously concentrated at the main campus became dispersed, straining RSU's budget and slowing infrastructure provision in newer campuses, a common challenge observed in rapidly expanding Nigerian universities (Okojie, 2010).
- Fiscal Sustainability Pressures: State subventions and internally generated revenues (IGR) were often insufficient to support both recurrent and capital expenditures across multiple campuses, exacerbating debates on sustainable financing in Nigerian higher education (Ibukun, 2014).
- Politicized Siting and Development: Campus locations and development sequences were linked to political promises and subnational patronage considerations, mirroring patterns described in the political economy of Nigerian state-level public investments (Suberu, 2010; Omotola, 2016).
- Governance and Coordination Difficulties: Managing academic standards, staff deployment, student affairs, and administrative processes across dispersed campuses proved complex, consistent with earlier analyses of multi-campus management in Africa (Varghese, 2004; Materu, 2007).
- Quality and Equity Concerns: Uneven deployment of qualified staff, laboratories, libraries, and hostel facilities created disparities between the main campus and satellite campuses, reinforcing concerns about quality assurance in Nigeria's expanding tertiary sector (NUC, 2019).
- Stakeholder Conflicts: Tensions emerged among university management, academic unions, local communities, and state actors over responsibilities, staffing, and control of resources, patterns widely documented in Nigerian university governance literature (Jega, 1994; Ojo, 2018).

These challenges reflect a broader systemic issue: multi-campus expansions in Nigeria often evolve within highly politicized environments where institutional capacity and resource flows do not expand at the same pace as physical infrastructure or political expectations. A political economy lens is therefore essential for analyzing RSU's multi-campus experience, particularly in understanding how governance arrangements, elite incentives, and state - university relations shape educational outcomes.

This study therefore examines the political economy of running multiple campuses at Rivers State University from 2017-2025. It analyzes how political structures, economic constraints, governance dynamics, policy choices, and stakeholder interests collectively shaped the evolution and functioning of RSU's satellite campuses. The justification for this periodization stem from the fact that in 2017, Rivers State University (RSU), Port Harcourt, formerly a single-campus institution, entered a transformative phase characterized by the establishment of multiple campuses across Rivers State

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The adoption of a coherent theoretical framework is fundamental to scholarly inquiry. No credible research can be undertaken without an underlying theoretical construct to guide explanation, generalization, prediction, and interpretation. Theorizing enables researchers to identify the causal mechanisms that shape social outcomes and to embed empirical findings within broader patterns of institutional and political behavior. In line with this scholarly tradition, the present study adopts two interrelated theoretical perspectives widely applied in political economy and public policy analysis: Institutional Political Economy and Clientelist Theory. Together, these frameworks provide a robust analytical foundation for understanding why and how Rivers State University (RSU) transitioned into a multi-campus institution between 2017 and 2025, and how political incentives, institutional arrangements, and governance practices shaped the outcomes of this transformation.

Institutional Political Economy

Origins and Intellectual Foundations

Institutional Political Economy does not originate from a single scholar; rather, it developed through contributions from economists, political scientists, and institutional theorists. However, Douglass C. North's landmark publication, Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance (1990), is widely regarded as the seminal foundation of modern institutional political economy. North argued that institutions, defined as the formal and informal rules that structure human interaction, shape economic and political outcomes by reducing uncertainty and structuring incentives.

Other major contributors include:

- Geoffrey Hodgson (1988-2006), who advanced the evolutionary and sociological dimensions of institutionalism and stressed that institutions are both enabling and constraining structures.
- Peter Hall and Rosemary Taylor (1996), whose influential article "Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms" consolidated the application of institutional theory in comparative politics.

Core Premise of the Theory

Institutional Political Economy examines how formal rules (laws, policies, regulations) and informal norms (patronage, political bargaining, social expectations) shape political and economic behavior. It emphasizes that institutions are not merely administrative arrangements but deeply political structures that guide decision-making, resource flows, and governance effectiveness (North, 1990; Hodgson, 2006).

Application to the RSU Multi-Campus System

Applying this theoretical lens to RSU provides insight into how institutional rules and political imperatives shaped the university's expansion:

a. Explaining the Decision to Expand: The establishment of satellite campuses under Rivers State goernment was framed as a formal institutional reform aimed at improving access to tertiary education. Political leaders sought to institutionalize developmental legacies through infrastructural expansion. Thus, the decision to expand was shaped simultaneously by policy goals (equity, access, regional development) and political motivations (legacy building and territorial presence).

b. Understanding Resource Allocation Patterns: Despite the existence of formal budgeting frameworks for state-owned universities, actual resource allocation at RSU often reflected informal institutional practices. Patronage networks, political negotiations, and unwritten agreements influenced which campus received priority attention in staffing, capital projects, and administrative support.

c. Interpreting Governance Challenges: The creation of satellite campuses introduced new layers of bureaucracy and administrative fragmentation. Each campus began to develop its own operational routines, leading to

overlapping responsibilities between the main campus leadership, satellite campus heads, and state government officials. This fragmentation reflects what Hall and Taylor (1996) describe as institutional complexity, where formal rules interact with informal practices in ways that may undermine policy coherence.

Institutional Political Economy therefore helps explain why RSU's formal goals of expansion and equity were moderated and sometimes distorted by informal political pressures and institutional constraints.

Clientelist Theory

Clientelist Theory is most commonly associated with James C. Scott, who formally articulated its political logic in his influential works (Scott, 1972; 1977). Earlier precursors include:

- S.N. Eisenstadt (1963), who explored traditional patron–client relations in developing societies.
- René Lemarchand (1972; 1981), who examined the role of clientelism in African political systems.

More contemporary analyses, such as Ayoade (1998), Lindberg (2003), and Van de Walle (2007), demonstrate that clientelism remains central to governance in many African states, including Nigeria.

Core Premise of the Theory

Clientelist Theory emphasizes the exchange of material benefits, such as jobs, contracts, or infrastructure, for political loyalty within hierarchical patron–client networks. It explains how public institutions often become sites for distributing political dividends, reinforcing elite power and shaping policy outcomes.

Application to RSU's Multi-Campus Development

Using the clientelist lens, the RSU expansion can be interpreted as part of broader political strategies in Rivers State:

a. Politically Patterned Campus Siting: The locations of the new RSU campuses, Etche, Ahoada, and Emohua, corresponded with political constituencies whose elites used educational infrastructure as political dividends for their supporters.

b. Elite Consolidation through Campus Creation: The establishment and development of campuses provided avenues for distributing patronage benefits, including:

- construction contracts
- academic and non-academic employment
- procurement opportunities
- symbolic political presence

This aligns with Scott's (1972) argument that public institutions often serve as arenas for clientelist exchanges.

c. Patronage-Driven Administrative Appointments: The selection of campus heads, project contractors, and certain administrative officers frequently reflected political alignments rather than strictly meritocratic criteria. This reflects Lemarchand's (1972) description of African bureaucracies as embedded within elite patronage networks.

d. Unequal and Politically Mediated Resource Flows: Campuses aligned with powerful political blocs often received faster infrastructural development, consistent with Van de Walle's (2007) observation that political loyalty often determines the distribution of state resources in African political economies.

Through this lens, the RSU multi-campus structure appears not only as an educational reform but also as a political strategy embedded in broader patron-client dynamics.

Justification for Using These Theories

Institutional Political Economy and Clientelist Theory complement each other in explaining the RSU experience between 2017 and 2025.

- Institutional Political Economy illuminates the structural context, how formal rules, governance systems, and institutional incentives shape decisions within a public university.
- Clientelist Theory highlights personalized political incentives, how elite interests, patronage networks, and political bargaining influence campus siting, resource allocation, and administrative appointments.

Together, they provide a comprehensive framework for understanding the interaction between institutional structures and political agency. This dual-theory approach captures both the systemic and the personalized dimensions of the RSU multi-campus transition, offering a nuanced interpretation consistent with contemporary political economy scholarship.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a qualitative exploratory research design, which is most appropriate for investigating complex political, institutional, and governance dynamics in higher education systems. Exploratory research is particularly suited to contexts where phenomena have not been extensively studied or where existing literature provides limited explanatory guidance (Creswell, 2014; Stebbins, 2001). Given that the transformation of Rivers State University (RSU) into a multi-campus institution between 2017 and 2025 is a relatively recent development, and one embedded in political decision-making, institutional negotiations, and informal governance structures, a qualitative exploratory approach allows for an in-depth examination of these nuanced processes.

This design enables the researcher to understand how and why specific decisions were made, which actors were involved, and what institutional and political factors influenced the outcomes. It provides a flexible approach suitable for capturing competing narratives, uncovering hidden power dynamics, and interpreting institutional behavior in real-world settings. The exploratory design incorporates multiple qualitative data collection methods to allow for triangulation and ensure depth and validity of insights.

The study draws on documentary materials and stakeholder interview quotations presented in the findings, including perspectives attributed to administrators, lecturers, students and host-community representatives. These perspectives help illuminate how political decisions and administrative arrangements may affect teaching conditions, campus services, staff deployment and community relations.

Operational Indicators for Campus-Level Assessment

To improve conceptual precision, the study distinguishes proposed assessment indicators from measured outcomes. Academic quality may be assessed through student-staff ratios, accreditation outcomes and laboratory/library availability; institutional performance through retention, graduation and administrative service indicators; resource fragmentation through per-campus budget shares, capital expenditure per student and duplicated overheads; and governance effectiveness through procurement compliance, reporting regularity and decision-making transparency. The indicators below constitute an evaluation framework.

Dimension	Proposed indicators	Potential evidence sources
Academic quality	Student-lecturer ratio; accreditation status; laboratory and library provision	Academic records; accreditation reports
Institutional performance	Retention and graduation rates; academic-calendar compliance	Registry and campus annual reports

Resource fragmentation	Budget per campus; capital expenditure per student; duplicated overheads	Approved budgets; audited accounts
Fiscal efficiency	Budget execution rate; utilisation of facilities; maintenance costs	Finance and asset registers
Governance effectiveness	Procurement compliance; reporting frequency; oversight actions	Procurement records; council minutes
Stakeholder and community outcomes	Student satisfaction; grievance resolution; local employment and outreach	Verified surveys; community reports

Data Analysis

Data collected from interviews, documents, and media sources are analyzed using thematic analysis, following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-step framework:

1. Familiarization with the data
2. Generating initial codes
3. Searching for themes
4. Reviewing themes
5. Defining and naming themes
6. Producing the report

This method allows for systematic identification of patterns relating to institutional behavior, political influence, resource allocation, and governance challenges. Thematic analysis is particularly suitable for multi-layered political and institutional phenomena because it enables the integration of formal and informal dynamics consistent with the study's theoretical frameworks.

The analysis is further guided by the concepts derived from Institutional Political Economy (e.g., formal vs. informal rules, institutional incentives) and Clientelist Theory (e.g., patron-client exchanges, political dividends, elite bargaining).

Comparative Context and Transferability

RSU can be analytically situated alongside geographically dispersed university systems elsewhere in Africa, including the University of KwaZulu-Natal in South Africa and the University of Ghana. These examples differ in ownership, historical development and governance and are not presented as matched empirical cases. They illustrate useful comparative questions: how authority is coordinated across sites, how resources are allocated among campuses, and how common academic standards are maintained. Without comparable campus-level data, this discussion supports theoretical transferability rather than statistical generalisation or claims that other universities experience the same political mechanisms.

FINDINGS / DISCUSSION

Political Legacies and Developmental Narratives

Every governor of Rivers State attempts to leave a legacy in education. For the administration between 2015 and 2023, higher education expansion became a signature initiative. Establishing satellite campuses allowed political leaders to highlight visible achievements in semi-urban/rural constituencies. Campuses were presented as instruments of local development, youth empowerment, and spatial equity.

Findings from interviews, document analysis, and media reports indicate that the establishment of RSU satellite campuses between 2017 and 2022 was strongly shaped by the administration's desire to construct a political legacy in higher education. Historically, governors in Rivers State have attempted to demonstrate performance through visible and symbolic investments, particularly in education. For that particular administration, higher education expansion became a flagship initiative, partly motivated by the need to extend infrastructural footprints across semi-urban and rural constituencies.

Interview evidence supports the finding that the multi-campus policy was deliberately communicated as a developmental and legacy-building intervention. A senior RSU administrator explained that:

"From the very beginning, it was clear that the multi-campus project was not only an academic initiative. The government wanted something that would stand as a legacy… the campuses became the easiest way to demonstrate that commitment visibly."

This sentiment was echoed by an official from the Rivers State Ministry of Education, who noted that:

"The governor wanted physical development in rural areas. Establishing campuses in Etche, Ahoada, and Emohua made it possible to point to tangible achievements. It was both policy and politics, a two-in-one strategy."

Developmental Framing as Political Communication

The study finds that the administration framed campus creation as a developmental necessity, covering themes of youth empowerment, local development, and spatial equity. This aligns with broader political messaging in the state's policy communication. A community leader in Ahoada confirmed this dual framing when he stated:

"Our people saw it as a political blessing… it was presented to us as development and also as a reward for our loyalty during elections."

Similarly, academic staff at the satellite campuses recognized the political undertones embedded in the developmental narrative. As one lecturer at the Etche campus observed:

"We were told repeatedly that the campus is for local development. But everyone also knew it was a political dividend… the narrative of youth empowerment was strong, but politics was the driver."

Symbolic and Electoral Dimensions of Legacy Building

Beyond development rhetoric, the multi-campus initiative served an electoral function by enabling the administration to consolidate visibility across previously underserved communities. Political events such as ground-breaking ceremonies and inauguration programmes became opportunities for symbolic projection. A local contractor in Emohua recounted:

"Most of the speeches during the ground-breaking ceremony were about legacy… they said the project would write the administration's name in gold. The political intention was almost as visible as the construction itself."

Even student representatives perceived the developmental messaging as part of a carefully orchestrated political narrative:

"During visits by government officials, they emphasized that these campuses are their contribution to building the future. It sounded more like a legacy speech than an academic policy explanation."

A policy analyst based in Port Harcourt summarized this pattern effectively:

"Campus creation in Rivers State fits the broader Nigerian practice where major projects are used to mark political territories. The administration used educational expansion to reinforce influence across key constituencies."

Overall, the evidence demonstrates that the multi-campus expansion was simultaneously:

- A developmental claim, focused on access, empowerment, and distribution of tertiary education.
- A political legacy project, intended to cement the administration's imprint on the state's educational landscape.
- A territorial strategy, designed to extend political presence and strengthen relationships with key constituencies.

The convergence of these elements reveals that the RSU multi-campus system was not merely an academic reform but a politically embedded initiative framed through developmental narratives to legitimize broader political goals.

Constituency Demand and Elite Bargaining

The establishment of multiple campuses of Rivers State University (RSU) was strongly shaped by constituency pressures from various local government areas seeking political recognition, infrastructural presence, and increased access to tertiary education. Communities such as Ahoada, Etche, and Emohua actively mobilized political, traditional, and civic leaders to lobby for campus siting. These demands were framed around:

- historical marginalization in state resource distribution,
- calls for geographical equity in educational infrastructure,
- expectations of social amenities and economic spillovers,
- the need to stimulate local development through higher education.

Data from interviews and government policy documents show that communities perceived a university campus as both an economic catalyst and a political symbol. Consequently, constituency agitation played a substantial role in determining which LGAs received campuses.

Table 1: Forms of Constituency Demand Observed Across LGAs

Form of Demand	Ahoada	Etche	Emohua	Overall Influence Level
Traditional rulers' advocacy	High	Moderate	High	High
Youth/community agitation	Moderate	High	Moderate	High
Petitions and memoranda to government	High	High	Low	Moderate
Political endorsements & campaign bargaining	High	High	High	Very High
Development equity arguments	Moderate	High	High	High

Source: Fieldwork, Interviews 2024; RSU Expansion Policy Papers (2017-2021).

Elite Bargaining and Patronage-Based Allocation of Campuses

The RSU multi-campus expansion occurred within a framework of elite negotiations involving state executives, legislators, political appointees, party leaders, and influential traditional rulers. Decisions were not solely based on educational planning metrics but were tied to political reciprocity, coalition maintenance, and patronage structures.

Elite bargaining manifested in several forms:

1. Negotiated Political Support: LGAs that delivered high electoral returns or were considered politically strategic were prioritized for campus siting.
2. Patronage Politics: Influential elites lobbied for infrastructure projects, including campuses, as rewards for loyalty or as part of intra-party balancing.
3. Resource Distribution Logic: Campuses served as visible state investments used to maintain political stability and appease competing interest blocs.
4. Contractual Politics: Campus construction offered avenues for politically connected contractors to benefit from state-funded projects.

Table 2: Key Elite Actors Involved in Bargaining Processes

Elite Category	Role in Bargaining	Observed Level of Influence
State Executive (Governor's Office)	Final approval, budget allocation, political mapping	Very High
House of Assembly Members	Lobbying for constituency projects, legislative backing	High
Local Government Chairpersons	Mobilizing local support, coordinating community demands	Moderate
Traditional Rulers	Legitimizing proposals, community coordination	Moderate
Party Leaders/Influencers	Negotiating political rewards, balancing factions	High
Contractors/Business Elites	Funding political actors, benefiting from construction contracts	Moderate–High

Source: Fieldwork, Interviews 2024; RSU Expansion Policy Papers (2017-2021).

Interplay Between Constituency Demand and Elite Bargaining

The RSU multi-campus model emerged not from a purely academic expansion strategy but from a negotiated process where constituency agitation intersected with elite political calculations. Evidence shows:

- LGAs with strong constituency mobilization paired with influential political elites had a higher likelihood of receiving a campus.
- Campuses served as political compensation to maintain loyalty within ruling party networks.
- State-level elites used campus distribution to project developmental performance and electoral competitiveness.
- Community demands were often reframed by elites to justify state-level capital investment decisions.

This interplay reinforces the argument that public institutions in Nigeria often expand in ways consistent with political economy dynamics, where state resources reflect the preferences and bargaining power of political actors and their constituencies.

Table 3: Combined Influence Matrix - Constituency Demand vs. Elite Bargaining

LGA	Constituency Demand Score	Elite Bargaining Strength	Combined Political Economy Influence	Campus Allocation Outcome
Ahoada	High	High	Very High	Campus Approved
Etche	High	Very High	Very High	Campus Approved
Emohua	Moderate	High	High	Campus Approved
Others (Non-beneficiary LGAs)	Low–Moderate	Low–Moderate	Low	Not Approved

Source: Scoring derived from field interviews, government statements, community mobilization data, and political mapping (2017-2025).

Implications for Multi-Campus Sustainability

The political economy dynamics that shaped campus allocation have implications:

1. Mismatch between Demand and Academic Planning: Political considerations overrode technical criteria like projected student enrollments, infrastructure availability, and human resources.
2. Uneven Development: Some campuses received faster infrastructural attention due to stronger elite backing.
3. Financial Strain: Expansion driven by political pressures contributed to budget fragmentation.
4. Institutional Vulnerability: Campuses remain subject to shifting political alignments, affecting long-term sustainability.

A mechanism for stimulating local economies.

Although the RSU multi-campus policy is often justified as a catalyst for local economic development, evidence shows that the extent of economic stimulation is uneven, short-lived, and distorted by political interests. The economic benefits tend to be fragmented, poorly coordinated, and unsustainable, revealing major weaknesses in the multi-campus model as an instrument of local development.

Overstated Infrastructure Spillovers

Campus-related infrastructural projects, roads, electricity, water, were implemented selectively and often incomplete. Instead of catalysing broad economic transformation, they disproportionately favoured politically connected zones.

Table 4: Critical Assessment of Infrastructural Outcomes

Table 4: Critical Assessment of Infrastructural Outcomes

Infrastructural Input | Observed Weakness | Critical Implication

Access road upgrades | Many roads uncompleted or poorly maintained | Limits mobility; benefits fade quickly

Water supply expansion | Installed only within campus; minimal community reach | Weak linkage to community productivity

Electricity extension | Irregular supply; vulnerable to vandalism | No real support for small businesses

Campus buildings | Prioritized for political display | Little alignment with genuine community needs

Infrastructure gains were symbolic rather than developmental, producing highly localised benefits confined mainly to the campus perimeter.

Employment Gains Are Temporary and Politically Filtered: Employment multipliers are weakened by patronage logic, short contract cycles, and lack of skills transfer. Most construction jobs disappeared after initial building phases, leaving minimal long-term employment.

Table 5: Critical Evaluation of Employment Effects

Type of Employment	Critical Weakness	Overall Sustainability
Direct Employment	Recruitment influenced by political patronage	Low

Indirect Employment	Saturated markets (food, printing) quickly become overcrowded	Low–Moderate
Induced Employment	Dependent on student population fluctuations	Low
Temporary Employment	Ends after construction; no continuity	Very Low

Source: Fieldwork, Interviews 2024; RSU Expansion Policy Papers (2017-2021).

Employment contributions are unstable, highly political, and fail to create structural transformation in host communities.

Micro-Enterprise Growth Is Fragile and Opportunistic: Many small businesses that emerged around the campuses operate informally, lack capital, and depend heavily on student presence. This results in a shallow, consumption-driven local economy.

Table 6: Critical Review of MSE Expansion

Business Type | Observed Weakness | Critical Outcome

Food services | Poor hygiene, low skill levels; high turnover | Inefficient market growth

Retail shops | Highly dependent on student buying power | Vulnerable to session disruptions/strikes

Transport services | Unregulated, conflict-prone | Limited long-term benefit

ICT & printing shops | Low innovation; dependence on campus | Minimal technological upgrading

Hostels/real estate | Inflated rents; land speculation | Excludes indigent residents

MSE growth is consumption-heavy, low-tech, vulnerable, and prone to decline during academic breaks or strikes.

Revenue Benefits Are Minimal and Easily Politicized: Local government revenues do not significantly increase because most businesses do not operate formally, and informal levies collected by unions rarely enter official accounts.

Table 7: Critical Issues in Revenue Mobilization

Revenue Channel	Weakness	Implication
Local business levies	Informal collection; poor accountability	No real LGA revenue growth
Transport union dues	Dominated by transport unions, not LGAs	Weak fiscal benefit
Land value appreciation	Speculative, elite-captured	Displaces locals; raises inequality
Market levies	Poor record-keeping	Revenue leakage

Source: Fieldwork, Interviews 2024; RSU Expansion Policy Papers (2017-2021).

Claims of higher internally generated revenue (IGR) are largely political rhetoric rather than verifiable fiscal improvement.

Human Capital Effects Are Minimal or Unrealized: Despite claims that campuses improve literacy, innovation, and skill spillovers, most host communities experience little interaction with academic activities.

Table 8: Human Capital Critique

Human Capital Claim	Observed Reality	Critical Interpretation
Skills improvement	Limited community outreach; no sustained programmes	Minimal human capital upgrading
Knowledge spillovers	Campus-community divide persists	Weak knowledge diffusion
Youth retention	High unemployment pushes youths away	No real reversal of rural–urban migration
Professional services expansion	Services priced out of community's affordability	Benefits captured by external actors

Source: Fieldwork, Interviews 2024; RSU Expansion Policy Papers (2017-2021).

Human capital effects are weak, elite-centered, and do not transform local production systems.

The RSU multi-campus expansion does not operate as an effective mechanism for stimulating local economies. Instead:

- economic gains are short-term and shallow,
- infrastructure benefits are selective and politically skewed,
- employment effects are temporary and unsustainable,
- business growth is fragile and consumption-driven,
- revenue increases are minimal and poorly managed,
- human capital effects are largely aspirational rather than real.

Thus, the developmental justification for multi-campus expansion appears politically convenient but economically overstated, revealing the dominance of political economy interests over genuine community development outcomes.

Decentralization as a Political Strategy

The creation of multiple RSU campuses, Ahoada, Etche, and Emohua, reflects more than an educational or administrative reform. Evidence shows that decentralization was strategically deployed by political elites in Rivers State as a political consolidation mechanism, enabling the ruling government to strengthen territorial influence, reward loyal constituencies, manage intra-state power balances, and project developmental legitimacy. The policy functioned as a tool for political bargaining rather than a purely technocratic decision aimed at improving educational efficiency.

Decentralization as Territorial Political Control

Decentralization dispersed RSU's institutional presence across multiple LGAs, allowing the State Government to extend visibility, surveillance, and influence beyond Port Harcourt. Each new campus acted as a state presence node, embedding political authority within local territories.

This produced a model of "administrative stretching," where public institutions serve as instruments of territorial integration and political oversight.

Table 9: Political Motives behind RSU Decentralization

Political Motive	Description of Strategic Use	Observed Impact on Host LGAs
Territorial Presence Expansion	Using campuses to extend state power and influence across LGAs	Increased visibility of state actors; enhanced political monitoring

Constituency Reward System	Allocating campuses to loyal or politically strategic LGAs	Strengthened ruling-party support; reward for electoral loyalty
Political Inclusion & Balancing	Managing tensions among ethnic groups, clans, and political blocs	Reduced intra-party conflict; appeased competing elite factions
Developmental Legitimacy	Framing decentralization as evidence of performance	Improved public perception; strengthened electoral narratives

Source: Fieldwork, Interviews 2024; RSU Expansion Policy Papers (2017-2021).

Decentralization functioned as a political investment tool, deployed to normalize state authority and cultivate political allegiance at the sub-state level.

Decentralization as Electoral and Patronage Engineering: The timing, location, and implementation of RSU campuses reveal strong alignment with electoral cycles, party mobilization efforts, and patronage distribution networks. Campus siting was highly correlated with:

- LGAs with strong voting power
- Areas with influential political brokers
- Regions seeking compensation for political support
- Zones critical for maintaining party dominance

Furthermore, decentralization offered new patronage channels through appointment of campus administrators, allocation of construction contracts, student admissions, and local employment.

Table 10: Patronage Channels Embedded in the Decentralization Strategy

Patronage Channel	Mechanism of Distribution	Political Outcome
Construction Contracts	Awarded to politically aligned contractors	Consolidation of elite networks; financial loyalty
Campus Administrative Appointments	Placement of loyalists as directors, heads of units	Increased political control within RSU structure
Local Employment Opportunities	Prioritizing host community members in non-academic jobs	Improved local political goodwill; strengthened voter loyalty
Admission Slot Allocation	Informal quotas for political patrons and community elites	Reinforced patron–client relationships; electoral leverage

Source: Fieldwork, Interviews 2024; RSU Expansion Policy Papers (2017-2021).

Decentralization was structured to generate new patronage pipelines, ensuring political returns for the ruling elite while maintaining elite cohesion.

Critical Implications

The strategic use of decentralization in RSU's multi-campus expansion highlights a broader political economy dynamic where educational reforms double as political tools. While decentralization is typically promoted as a mechanism for administrative efficiency and equity, in this case it also:

- Reshaped power relations
- Reinforced patronage networks
- Influenced resource distribution
- Determined campus viability
- Shaped long-term institutional sustainability

This finding reflects how state actors often appropriate decentralization policies to secure political continuity rather than solely to improve institutional performance.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the political economy of multi-campus development at Rivers State University (RSU) between 2017 and 2025, with particular emphasis on how political interests, institutional arrangements, constituency demands and resource allocation shaped the establishment, governance and sustainability of satellite campuses in Ahoada, Etche and Emohua. The study established that the multi-campus initiative represented an important policy intervention intended to expand access to higher education, promote geographical equity and stimulate socioeconomic development in underserved communities. However, the analysis revealed that the implementation of these developmental objectives was considerably influenced by political bargaining, elite interests, institutional constraints and competing demands on limited public resources.

Drawing on Institutional Political Economy and Clientelist Theory, the study demonstrated that multi-campus expansion cannot be adequately understood solely as an educational or administrative reform. Rather, it constitutes a politically embedded process in which formal institutional objectives interact with informal power relations, patronage networks and distributive political considerations. The findings suggest that constituency mobilisation and elite bargaining influenced campus siting and development priorities, while the expansion of administrative responsibilities created additional pressures on institutional coordination, financial sustainability and equitable resource distribution. Although the establishment of satellite campuses created opportunities for improved educational access and local economic activities, the available evidence raises concerns about the sustainability and equitable distribution of these benefits.

The study further underscores the importance of distinguishing physical expansion from substantive institutional development. The establishment of additional campuses does not automatically guarantee improvements in academic quality, administrative efficiency or community welfare. Such outcomes depend on adequate funding, transparent governance, effective institutional coordination and the equitable distribution of qualified personnel and educational facilities. Nevertheless, the absence of comprehensive campus-level performance and financial data limits definitive conclusions about the magnitude of resource fragmentation, academic quality disparities and fiscal inefficiencies.

The central conclusion is that the sustainability of RSU's multi-campus system depends not merely on the geographical expansion of university infrastructure but on the institutional capacity to reconcile political interests with academic priorities, fiscal responsibility and accountable governance. Consequently, transforming the multi-campus initiative into a sustainable instrument of educational and socioeconomic development requires a unified budgeting framework, transparent resource allocation, performance-informed funding, independent institutional oversight and meaningful stakeholder participation.

Beyond Rivers State University, the study contributes to the political economy of higher education by illustrating how decentralisation policies may simultaneously advance developmental objectives and create opportunities for political influence over public institutions. While the single-institution focus limits broader empirical generalisation, the findings provide a useful analytical foundation for comparative investigations of multi-campus university governance in Nigeria and Sub-Saharan Africa. Ultimately, the long-term success of RSU's multi-campus development should be assessed not by the number of campuses established or the visibility of physical infrastructure, but by measurable improvements in educational quality, institutional effectiveness, fiscal sustainability, equitable access and the socioeconomic well-being of host communities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following four recommendations are proposed to strengthen the governance, academic quality, fiscal sustainability and socioeconomic contributions of Rivers State University's multi-campus system.

1. To address the findings on political interference, administrative fragmentation and overlapping institutional responsibilities, the RSU Governing Council should establish an Independent Multi-Campus Coordinating Directorate (IMCD) with clearly defined responsibilities and operational autonomy. The Directorate should coordinate campus development plans, harmonise administrative procedures, monitor institutional performance and ensure that decisions concerning campus expansion and management are guided by established academic and administrative criteria rather than political patronage.
2. In response to the findings on resource fragmentation, fiscal pressures and uneven infrastructural development, RSU management, in collaboration with the Rivers State Government, should introduce a unified multi-campus budgeting framework supported by transparent procurement procedures and periodic financial audits. Resource allocation should be determined by student enrolment, academic programme requirements, infrastructural deficits and operational needs. This would minimise wasteful expenditure, prevent unnecessary duplication of facilities and promote fiscal sustainability across campuses.
3. Given the findings on uneven academic facilities, staffing challenges and politically influenced administrative decisions, RSU should institutionalise a comprehensive academic quality assurance framework across its campuses. The Directorate of Academic Planning and relevant university authorities should conduct periodic assessments of staff-student ratios, programme accreditation, teaching facilities, research infrastructure and academic performance. Academic appointments, staff deployment and programme expansion should be guided by professional competence, institutional needs and established regulatory standards to ensure consistent educational quality across campuses.
4. To address the findings on constituency bargaining, elite capture, limited economic spillovers and weak community development outcomes, RSU should establish Community-University Development Partnership Councils (CUDPCs) in Ahoada, Etche and Emohua. These councils should facilitate inclusive community participation, identify local development priorities and promote entrepreneurship, vocational training, research partnerships and sustainable employment opportunities. Regular assessments of campus contributions to host-community development should be undertaken to ensure that the socioeconomic benefits of university expansion extend beyond politically connected individuals and interest groups.

These four recommendations correspond to four distinct findings: institutional and political interference, fiscal and resource fragmentation, academic quality disparities, and limited socioeconomic benefits to host communities. Together, they provide an integrated policy framework without duplicating responsibilities or proposed interventions.

REFERENCES

1. Adebanwi, W., & Obadare, E. (2010). Introducing Nigeria at fifty: The nation in narration. Journal of Contemporary African Studies, 28(4), 379–405.
2. Ayoade, J. A. (1998). The federal character principle and the search for national integration. Ibadan: University Press.
3. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101.
4. Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Sage.
5. Hall, P. A., & Taylor, R. C. (1996). Political science and the three new institutionalisms. Political Studies, 44(5), 936–957.
6. Hodgson, G. M. (2006). What are institutions? Journal of Economic Issues, 40(1), 1–25.
7. Ibukun, O. (2014). Financing higher education in Nigeria. Journal of Education Finance, 39(4), 347–367.
8. Khan, M. (2010). Political settlements and the governance of growth-enhancing institutions. SOAS Working Paper.
9. Materu, P. (2007). Higher education quality assurance in Sub-Saharan Africa. World Bank.
10. North, D. C. (1990). Institutions, institutional change and economic performance. Cambridge University Press.

11. Scott, J. C. (1972). Patron-client politics and political change in Southeast Asia. American Political Science Review, 66(1), 91–113.
12. Van de Walle, N. (2007). The path from neopatrimonialism: Democracy and clientelism in Africa today. Brown Journal of World Affairs, 13(2), 71–78.