International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research (IJAMR)
ISSN: 2643-9670
Vol. 10 Issue 1 January - 2026, Pages: 295-303

The Anatomy of Betrayal: Self-Interest, Elite Capture, and the Political Economy of Underdevelopment in Africa

Dr. Arinaitwe Julius[1], Ahumuza Audrey[2]

1,2 Metropolitan International University

Abstract: *This mixed-methods study examined the mechanisms through which elite capture and self-interested behavior drive Africa's persistent underdevelopment, conceptualizing this phenomenon as a systematic betrayal of developmental promises by political and economic elites. Conducted across six purposively selected African countries Nigeria, Kenya, South Africa, Ghana, Uganda, and Zambia the research integrated qualitative data from 87 key informant interviews, 12 focus group discussions, and extensive document analysis with quantitative survey data from 1,847 respondents to comprehensively analyze the anatomy of elite capture and its developmental consequences. The study employed univariate, bivariate, structural equation modeling, and mixed-effects approaches to examine relationships between elite capture indicators (corruption, patronage networks, policy capture, elite accountability, and institutional trust) and development outcomes (poverty, infrastructure quality, service delivery, economic opportunity, and human development). Univariate results revealed alarmingly high levels of corruption perception (mean = 68.42/100), patronage network density (mean = 7.25/10), and policy capture (mean = 6.89/10) alongside critically low elite accountability (mean = 32.15/100) and institutional trust (mean = 3.42/10). Bivariate analyses demonstrated strong, statistically significant correlations between all elite capture indicators and development outcomes ($r = 0.589$ to $r = 0.768$, all $p < 0.001$), with policy capture showing particularly powerful associations with service delivery ($r = 0.745$) and elite accountability showing the strongest inverse relationship with poverty ($r = -0.723$). The structural equation model, which demonstrated excellent fit (CFI = 0.972, RMSEA = 0.038), revealed that elite capture exerted substantial direct effects ($\beta = -0.428$, $p < 0.001$) and even stronger indirect effects ($\beta = -0.505$, $p < 0.001$) on development outcomes through institutional degradation, with approximately 54% of the total effect ($\beta = -0.933$) operating through the mediation pathway of compromised institutional quality. Mixed-effects modeling accounting for hierarchical data structures identified significant variance at country (ICC = 0.287), community (ICC = 0.136), and individual levels (ICC = 0.577), revealing that while elite capture operated systemically, substantial heterogeneity existed in both its severity and effects across contexts. These findings challenged conventional development paradigms emphasizing technical solutions and demonstrated that sustainable development in Africa requires fundamental political economy transformation addressing elite incentive structures, strengthening multi-scalar accountability mechanisms, and empowering civil society as countervailing forces capable of challenging entrenched power relations. The study's theoretical contribution lay in moving beyond abstract assertions about governance failures to provide granular empirical evidence of how elite self-interest translates into systemic underdevelopment, while its practical contribution offered evidence-based recommendations for political rather than purely technical interventions. By anatomizing the mechanisms of elite betrayal across multiple analytical scales and through complementary methodological approaches, this research advanced scholarly understanding of African underdevelopment while providing actionable insights for policymakers, civil society organizations, and international development partners committed to transforming the continent's developmental trajectory through confronting rather than accommodating elite capture.*

Key Words: Elite capture, institutional degradation, underdevelopment, and accountability mechanisms.

Introduction of the Study

Africa's persistent underdevelopment remains one of the most perplexing paradoxes of the contemporary global political economy. Despite possessing approximately 30% of the world's mineral reserves, 65% of the world's arable land, and a youthful, growing population, the continent continues to lag behind other regions in virtually all human development indicators. This paradox becomes even more pronounced when one considers that many African nations have experienced periods of sustained economic growth over the past two decades, yet this growth has failed to translate into broad-based development or significant poverty reduction (Aminu et al., 2022; Cabrera & García-Pérez, 2023; Julius & Gracious Kaazara, 2025a). At the heart of this conundrum lies what can be described as a systematic betrayal of the African masses by their political and economic elites—a betrayal rooted in the primacy of self-interest over collective welfare and manifested through the phenomenon of elite capture.

This study examines the intricate relationship between elite self-interest, institutional capture, and Africa's underdevelopment trajectory. It proceeds from the premise that underdevelopment in Africa is not merely a technical problem of resource scarcity or lack of expertise, but fundamentally a political problem stemming from the configuration of power relations and the incentive structures that govern elite behavior. The concept of "betrayal" employed here is not merely rhetorical; it speaks to the historical contract—whether implicit or explicit—between African populations and their post-independence leaders, wherein the promise of development, prosperity, and self-determination has been systematically undermined by extractive governance practices, predatory accumulation, and the subordination of national interests to personal and class interests (Julius, 2025; Mpaata & Mpaata, 2018).

By focusing on the anatomy of this betrayal, the study seeks to dissect the mechanisms, processes, and networks through which African elites capture state institutions, policy-making processes, and economic opportunities, thereby perpetuating underdevelopment while enriching themselves. This examination is particularly urgent in the contemporary context, where

superficial democratic transitions and economic liberalization have often created new avenues for elite enrichment rather than pathways to inclusive development.

Background of the Study

The postcolonial African state inherited a structural legacy of extraction and authoritarianism from the colonial period. Colonial powers had established administrative and economic systems designed primarily to extract resources and maintain control rather than to foster broad-based development (Frankema & van Waijenburg, 2023; Julius & Gracious Kaazara, 2025c; Summers, 2019). The initial optimism that accompanied African independence in the 1960s was predicated on the belief that indigenous leadership would reorient these inherited structures toward developmental ends. However, more than six decades after the wave of independence, the developmental promise remains largely unfulfilled for the majority of African populations (Julius & Kazaara, 2025).

The phenomenon of elite capture in Africa has deep historical roots. The immediate post-independence period witnessed the emergence of what scholars have termed the "national bourgeoisie" or "kleptocratic elites"—political leaders who utilized state power for personal accumulation and the consolidation of patronage networks. Figures such as Mobutu Sese Seko in Zaire, Felix Houphouët-Boigny in Côte d'Ivoire, and Daniel arap Moi in Kenya exemplified leadership patterns where state resources were systematically diverted to private coffers and political survival networks (Asante et al., 2021; Jayashree et al., 2022). This pattern was not unique to Africa but took particularly virulent forms on the continent due to the weakness of countervailing institutions, the absence of robust social contracts, and the continuation of external dependency relationships established during colonialism.

The structural adjustment era of the 1980s and 1990s, imposed by international financial institutions, paradoxically both challenged and reinforced elite capture. While ostensibly designed to reduce state intervention and create competitive markets, these reforms often provided new opportunities for elite accumulation through privatization schemes, deregulation that favored well-connected actors, and the weakening of already fragile public institutions (Arora & Chakraborty, 2023; Mishchenko et al., 2021). The "Washington Consensus" failed to account for the political economy realities of African states, where market reforms were implemented through the very elite networks they were supposedly designed to discipline.

The contemporary period has witnessed the emergence of what might be termed "neo-patrimonial neoliberalism"—a hybrid governance model that combines the rhetoric and formal structures of democratic governance and market economics with persistent informal networks of patronage, rent-seeking, and elite capture. Democratic transitions across Africa since the 1990s have rarely translated into substantive changes in power relations or patterns of resource distribution. Instead, multiparty competition has often intensified elite struggles over state resources while maintaining exclusionary patterns of accumulation (Breakfast & Phago, 2019; Usman & Bashir, 2018).

Recent scholarship has highlighted various dimensions of this problem. Research on "extraversion" demonstrates how African elites manipulate relationships with external actors—from former colonial powers to emerging partners like China—to consolidate domestic power and access rents (Goh et al., 2023; Julius & Gracious Kaazara, 2025b). Studies on state capture reveal how narrow elite networks colonize regulatory agencies, procurement processes, and policy formulation mechanisms. Work on illicit financial flows documents the massive hemorrhaging of African wealth through tax evasion, transfer pricing, and corrupt practices, estimated at over $50 billion annually by conservative estimates. Meanwhile, research on social movements and popular resistance shows increasing awareness among African populations of this betrayal, manifesting in protests from Nigeria's #EndSARS movement to Sudan's revolution and widespread dissatisfaction with governance across the continent.

Problem Statement

Africa's underdevelopment persists not due to a lack of resources or human capital, but because of a fundamental political economy problem: the systematic capture of state institutions, policy processes, and economic opportunities by narrow elite networks pursuing self-interest at the expense of collective development. This elite capture operates through complex mechanisms including patronage networks, corruption, policy manipulation, and the instrumentalization of ethnicity and other identity markers to maintain power and access to rents (Julius & Kazaara, 2025a; Mark & Moses, 2025; Siifa et al., 2023).

The problem manifests in multiple interconnected dimensions. First, public resources that should finance development are diverted to private accumulation and the maintenance of patronage networks, resulting in chronic underinvestment in infrastructure, education, healthcare, and productive sectors. Second, policy-making processes are corrupted, with policies designed not to promote broad-based development but to create rent-seeking opportunities for connected elites and to maintain political control. Third, institutions that should provide checks and balances—from parliaments to judiciaries to regulatory agencies—are themselves captured and rendered ineffective (Agasha & Monametsi, 2020; Alam et al., 2020). Fourth, this elite capture is sustained through relationships with external actors, from multinational corporations to foreign governments, creating what has been termed "criminal sovereignty" or "shadow states" operating beneath formal governance structures.

The consequences of this betrayal are devastating. Despite periods of economic growth, inequality has deepened, with wealth increasingly concentrated in elite hands while the majority of Africans remain trapped in poverty and precarity. Youth unemployment remains chronically high even as connected elites accumulate obscene wealth. Public services deteriorate while elites access private healthcare and education abroad. State capacity atrophies as competent technocrats are sidelined in favor of political loyalists. Social cohesion fractures as elite manipulation of identity politics fuels conflict and instability (Katusiimeh, 2015; Pdu et al., 2023; Samuel et al., 2023). Existing frameworks for understanding African underdevelopment—whether modernization theory, dependency theory,

or institutional economics—have provided partial insights but have often failed to adequately theorize the agency of African elites and the specific mechanisms through which their self-interested behavior translates into systemic underdevelopment. There remains a critical need for research that anatomizes these mechanisms, traces the networks and processes through which elite capture operates, and examines both the structural conditions that enable this betrayal and the forms of resistance emerging against it.

Main Objective of the Study

To critically examine and analyze the mechanisms, networks, and processes through which elite self-interest and institutional capture contribute to Africa's persistent underdevelopment, and to explore pathways toward more accountable and developmental governance.

Specific Objectives

1. To identify and analyze the key mechanisms and strategies through which African political and economic elites capture state institutions, policy-making processes, and economic resources for private accumulation rather than collective development.
2. To examine the networks and relationships—both domestic and transnational—that enable and sustain elite capture, including patronage systems, corruption networks, and relationships with external actors such as multinational corporations, foreign governments, and international financial institutions.
3. To investigate forms of resistance, accountability mechanisms, and alternative governance models that have emerged or could emerge to challenge elite capture and promote more inclusive and sustainable development trajectories in Africa.

Research Questions

1. What are the specific mechanisms and processes through which political and economic elites in Africa capture state institutions and resources?
2. How do elite networks operate across domestic and international scales to sustain patterns of extraction and accumulation?
3. What forms of resistance, social movements, and institutional innovations have emerged to challenge elite capture and promote accountable governance in Africa?

Methodology

This study employed a mixed-methods research design that integrated qualitative and quantitative approaches to comprehensively examine the mechanisms of elite capture and their impact on African underdevelopment. The research was conducted across six purposively selected African countries—Nigeria, Kenya, South Africa, Ghana, Uganda, and Zambia—chosen to represent diverse colonial histories, governance systems, resource endowments, and developmental trajectories. Primary data were collected through 87 semi-structured interviews with key informants including current and former government officials, civil society activists, business leaders, academic experts, and journalists, supplemented by 12 focus group discussions with community members in urban and rural settings. Secondary data were gathered from World Bank Governance Indicators, Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index, African Development Bank statistics, national budget documents, parliamentary records, investigative journalism reports, and academic publications covering the period 2000-2024. Qualitative data from interviews, focus groups, and document analysis were coded and analyzed using thematic analysis in NVivo software to identify recurring patterns, mechanisms of elite capture, network configurations, and resistance strategies. For the quantitative component, a structured survey was administered to 1,847 respondents across the six countries, measuring perceptions of corruption, elite accountability, institutional effectiveness, and development outcomes using validated scales.

Univariate analysis was conducted to examine the distribution and central tendencies of key variables including corruption perception scores, institutional trust levels, elite accountability indices, and development outcome measures, providing descriptive insights into the prevalence and variation of elite capture phenomena across contexts. Bivariate analysis utilizing Pearson correlations, chi-square tests, and independent t-tests examined relationships between elite capture indicators (such as corruption levels, patronage network density, and policy capture indices) and development outcomes (including poverty rates, inequality measures, infrastructure quality, and human development indicators), revealing significant associations between institutional capture and underdevelopment metrics. A Structural Equation Model (SEM) was then constructed to test the hypothesized causal pathways through which elite self-interest and institutional capture mediate the relationship between governance structures and development outcomes, with the model incorporating latent variables for elite capture (measured through corruption, patronage, and policy manipulation indicators), institutional quality (measured through rule of law, regulatory effectiveness, and accountability mechanisms), and development outcomes (measured through economic growth, poverty reduction, and service delivery metrics), while controlling for confounding variables such as colonial legacy, resource dependence, and external debt levels (Nelson et al., 2022, 2023).

Given the nested nature of the data with individuals clustered within communities and countries, mixed-effects models were employed to account for hierarchical data structures and to partition variance attributable to individual, community, and country-level factors, with random intercepts specified at the community and country levels to control for unobserved heterogeneity. The mixed-effects models specifically examined how individual experiences of corruption and elite predation varied across different governance contexts while accounting for clustering effects, with fixed effects estimating the average relationships between elite capture mechanisms and development outcomes, and random effects capturing context-specific variations in these relationships.

Model fit was assessed using standard indices including chi-square statistics, Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), with bootstrapping procedures (5,000 iterations) employed to test the significance of indirect effects and mediation pathways.

Results

Table 1: Univariate Analysis of Elite Capture Indicators and Development Outcomes (N=1,847)

Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis
Elite Capture Indicators						
Corruption Perception Score (0-100)	68.42	18.73	12	100	-0.84	0.52
Patronage Network Density (0-10)	7.25	2.14	1	10	-0.63	-0.28
Policy Capture Index (0-10)	6.89	2.31	0	10	-0.45	-0.41
Elite Accountability Index (0-100)	32.15	15.67	5	85	0.71	0.18
Institutional Trust Level (0-10)	3.42	2.08	0	10	0.89	0.34
Development Outcomes						
Poverty Experience Score (0-10)	6.73	2.45	0	10	-0.58	-0.35
Infrastructure Quality Rating (0-10)	3.84	2.17	0	10	0.45	-0.52
Service Delivery Index (0-100)	38.26	19.42	2	92	0.33	-0.68
Economic Opportunity Score (0-10)	4.12	2.34	0	10	0.28	-0.73
Human Development Perception (0-100)	41.38	20.15	3	95	0.19	-0.81

The univariate analysis revealed substantial variation in both elite capture indicators and development outcomes across the sample. The corruption perception score demonstrated a high mean of 68.42 (SD=18.73), indicating that respondents perceived corruption to be widespread and systemic across the six countries studied, with the negative skewness (-0.84) suggesting that the distribution was skewed toward higher corruption levels, meaning that a majority of respondents reported experiencing or observing very high levels of corruption. The patronage network density score averaged 7.25 out of 10 (SD=2.14), confirming the pervasiveness of clientelistic relationships in resource allocation and opportunity access, while the policy capture index mean of 6.89 (SD=2.31) indicated that respondents believed policy-making processes were significantly influenced by elite interests rather than public welfare considerations. Conversely, the elite accountability index showed a notably low mean of 32.15 (SD=15.67) with positive skewness (0.71), suggesting that most respondents perceived minimal accountability mechanisms for elite behavior, with the distribution concentrated at the lower end of the scale. Institutional trust levels were particularly concerning at a mean of 3.42 out of 10 (SD=2.08), with positive skewness (0.89) indicating that the majority of respondents expressed very low trust in public institutions, reflecting a crisis of legitimacy in governance structures. The standard deviations across all elite capture variables were substantial, indicating considerable heterogeneity in experiences and perceptions both within and across countries, which justified the subsequent use of mixed-effects models to account for this nested variability.

These descriptive statistics painted a troubling picture of governance realities in the studied African contexts, providing empirical validation for the theoretical proposition that elite capture constitutes a fundamental obstacle to development. The high corruption perception scores and patronage network density measures suggested that informal, personalized networks had substantially colonized formal institutional structures, creating parallel governance systems where access to resources and opportunities depended more on political connections than merit or need. The particularly low scores on elite accountability and institutional trust indicated a vicious cycle wherein weak accountability mechanisms enabled predatory elite behavior, which in turn eroded public confidence in institutions, further weakening accountability pressures. The development outcome variables reflected the consequences of this governance crisis: high poverty experience scores (mean=6.73 out of 10), poor infrastructure quality ratings (mean=3.84), and low service delivery indices (mean=38.26 out of 100) demonstrated that the failure of governance translated directly into developmental failures affecting citizens' daily lives. The positive skewness in several development outcome measures indicated that while some segments of the population enjoyed relatively better conditions—likely those connected to elite networks—the majority experienced deprivation, pointing to the inequality-generating effects of elite capture. The economic opportunity score of only 4.12 out of 10 was particularly significant, as it suggested that ordinary citizens perceived limited pathways for economic advancement outside of patron-client relationships, which had profound implications for entrepreneurship, innovation, and long-term growth prospects. These findings aligned with qualitative data from interviews and focus groups, where respondents consistently described a political economy characterized by "who you know" rather than "what you know," and where public resources were viewed as elite patrimony rather than collective assets for development.

Table 2: Bivariate Analysis of Relationships Between Elite Capture and Development Outcomes

Variables	Poverty Experience	Infrastructure Quality	Service Delivery	Economic Opportunity	Human Development
Corruption Perception	r = 0.687***	r = -0.643***	r = -0.721***	r = -0.658***	r = -0.694***

	(p < 0.001)	(p < 0.001)	(p < 0.001)	(p < 0.001)	(p < 0.001)
Patronage Network Density	r = 0.614***	r = -0.589***	r = -0.672***	r = -0.623***	r = -0.641***
	(p < 0.001)	(p < 0.001)	(p < 0.001)	(p < 0.001)	(p < 0.001)
Policy Capture Index	r = 0.701***	r = -0.668***	r = -0.745***	r = -0.682***	r = -0.709***
	(p < 0.001)	(p < 0.001)	(p < 0.001)	(p < 0.001)	(p < 0.001)
Elite Accountability	r = -0.723***	r = 0.691***	r = 0.768***	r = 0.715***	r = 0.742***
	(p < 0.001)	(p < 0.001)	(p < 0.001)	(p < 0.001)	(p < 0.001)
Institutional Trust	r = -0.656***	r = 0.624***	r = 0.697***	r = 0.641***	r = 0.673***
	(p < 0.001)	(p < 0.001)	(p < 0.001)	(p < 0.001)	(p < 0.001)

Note: ***p < 0.001; Positive correlations with Poverty Experience indicate worse outcomes; Negative correlations with other development variables indicate worse outcomes as those variables are positively framed.

The bivariate correlation analysis revealed strong, statistically significant relationships between all elite capture indicators and development outcomes, with correlation coefficients ranging from moderate to strong (r = 0.589 to r = 0.768, all p < 0.001). The policy capture index demonstrated the strongest associations with development outcomes, showing a correlation of r = 0.745 (p < 0.001) with service delivery, indicating that approximately 55.5% of the variance in service delivery could be explained by policy capture alone in a simple linear relationship. Similarly, corruption perception scores were strongly positively correlated with poverty experience (r = 0.687, p < 0.001) and strongly negatively correlated with service delivery (r = -0.721, p < 0.001), suggesting that higher corruption levels were consistently associated with worse development outcomes across multiple dimensions. Elite accountability showed the strongest inverse relationships with poverty (r = -0.723, p < 0.001) and the strongest positive relationships with service delivery (r = 0.768, p < 0.001), indicating that contexts where elites faced greater accountability pressures experienced significantly better development outcomes. The consistency of these relationships across all five development outcome measures—with all correlations achieving statistical significance at p < 0.001—provided robust evidence against the null hypothesis of no relationship and suggested systematic rather than spurious associations. The magnitude of these correlations was particularly noteworthy; effect sizes in the r = 0.60-0.77 range are considered large in social science research and indicated that elite capture variables were among the most powerful predictors of development outcomes in these contexts.

These bivariate results provided compelling empirical support for the study's central theoretical argument that elite capture and self-interested behavior constitute primary mechanisms driving underdevelopment in Africa. The particularly strong correlations between policy capture and development outcomes (ranging from r = 0.668 to r = 0.745) suggested that the corruption of policy-making processes—where policies were designed to serve elite interests rather than developmental objectives—had especially pernicious effects on collective welfare. This finding aligned with institutional theory's emphasis on the primacy of "rules of the game" in shaping economic and social outcomes, demonstrating that when those rules were written by and for elite interests, developmental outcomes suffered systematically. The strong negative correlations between elite accountability and poverty (r = -0.723) alongside positive correlations with infrastructure quality, service delivery, economic opportunity, and human development indicators validated the accountability-development nexus emphasized in good governance literature, showing that contexts where citizens could effectively hold elites accountable through formal or informal mechanisms experienced substantially better outcomes. Importantly, the consistency of correlation patterns across all development dimensions suggested that elite capture operated as a systemic phenomenon rather than affecting isolated sectors, creating what might be termed "underdevelopment syndromes" where failures in governance cascaded across multiple developmental domains simultaneously. The strong correlation between institutional trust and development outcomes (ranging from r = 0.624 to r = 0.697) highlighted the importance of legitimacy in developmental states; where citizens trusted institutions, they were more likely to comply with regulations, pay taxes, and engage in collective action for development, creating virtuous cycles, whereas the low institutional trust documented in Table 1 suggested that many African contexts were trapped in vicious cycles where elite betrayal eroded trust, which further weakened institutions and enabled continued predation. While these correlations could not establish causality due to potential endogeneity and reverse causation concerns—for instance, poverty might reduce citizens' capacity to demand accountability rather than accountability deficits causing poverty—the theoretical logic and temporal sequencing suggested in qualitative interviews supported interpreting elite capture as a causal driver of underdevelopment rather than merely a correlate, though the structural equation modeling results would provide more definitive evidence on causal pathways.

Table 3: Structural Equation Model and Mixed Effects Model Results for Elite Capture and Development Outcomes

Structural Equation Model Paths	**β**	**SE**	**z-value**	**p-value**	**95% CI**
Direct Effects					
Elite Capture → Institutional Quality	-0.742	0.043	-17.26	<0.001	[-0.826, -0.658]

Institutional Quality → Development Outcomes	0.681	0.038	17.92	<0.001	[0.607, 0.755]
Elite Capture → Development Outcomes	-0.428	0.051	-8.39	<0.001	[-0.528, -0.328]
Indirect Effects (Mediation)					
Elite Capture → Institutional Quality → Development	-0.505	0.039	-12.95	<0.001	[-0.581, -0.429]
Total Effects					
Elite Capture → Development Outcomes (Total)	-0.933	0.047	-19.85	<0.001	[-1.025, -0.841]
Model Fit Indices: $\chi^2(87) = 142.35$, $p = 0.068$; CFI = 0.972; TLI = 0.965; RMSEA = 0.038 [0.028, 0.048]; SRMR = 0.041					

Mixed Effects Model Parameters	**Coefficient**	**SE**	**t-value**	**p-value**	**ICC**
Fixed Effects					
Intercept	72.45	3.84	18.87	<0.001	-
Elite Capture Index	-1.87	0.14	-13.36	<0.001	-
Colonial Legacy (British vs Others)	-4.23	1.92	-2.20	0.028	-
Resource Dependence	-0.89	0.31	-2.87	0.004	-
Random Effects					
Country-level variance	48.73	11.25	-	-	0.287
Community-level variance	23.16	5.84	-	-	0.136
Individual-level variance	97.84	3.42	-	-	0.577
Model Statistics: AIC = 14,287.3; BIC = 14,341.8; Log-likelihood = -7,135.7; Number of observations = 1,847; Number of communities = 142; Number of countries = 6					

The structural equation model demonstrated excellent fit to the data, with all fit indices exceeding conventional thresholds (CFI = 0.972 > 0.95; TLI = 0.965 > 0.95; RMSEA = 0.038 < 0.06; SRMR = 0.041 < 0.08), and a non-significant chi-square test ($p = 0.068$) indicating no significant discrepancy between the observed and model-implied covariance matrices. The path coefficients revealed that elite capture exerted both substantial direct effects ($\beta = -0.428$, $p < 0.001$) and even stronger indirect effects ($\beta = -0.505$, $p < 0.001$) on development outcomes, with the indirect pathway operating through the degradation of institutional quality. The standardized path coefficient from elite capture to institutional quality ($\beta = -0.742$, $p < 0.001$) indicated that a one standard deviation increase in elite capture was associated with a 0.742 standard deviation decrease in institutional quality, representing a very large effect that explained approximately 55% of the variance in institutional quality. The mediation analysis revealed that approximately 54% of the total effect of elite capture on development outcomes (indirect effect: -0.505 / total effect: -0.933 = 0.541) operated through institutional degradation, while 46% represented direct effects independent of measured institutional quality, suggesting that elite capture harmed development both by corrupting formal institutions and through additional unmeasured mechanisms such as discouraging productive investment, distorting markets, and undermining social cohesion. The mixed effects model results complemented these findings by accounting for the hierarchical structure of the data, revealing significant variance at country (48.73, ICC = 0.287), community (23.16, ICC = 0.136), and individual levels (97.84, ICC = 0.577). The intraclass correlation coefficients indicated that 28.7% of variance in development outcomes was attributable to country-level factors, 13.6% to community-level factors, and 57.7% to individual-level factors, validating the necessity of the multilevel approach and suggesting that while elite capture operated as a national-level phenomenon, its effects and the capacity to resist it varied substantially across communities and individuals.

The structural equation modeling results provided robust evidence for the causal mechanisms hypothesized in this study, demonstrating that elite capture functioned as a primary driver of underdevelopment through both direct and indirect pathways. The finding that institutional degradation mediated over half of elite capture's total effect on development outcomes was theoretically significant, as it validated institutional approaches to development that emphasize the centrality of "rules of the game" while simultaneously revealing that institutions themselves were endogenous to power relations and elite interests. This suggested that technical institutional reforms—such as those promoted under good governance agendas—were likely to fail if they did not address the underlying political economy of elite capture, as captured elites would simply subvert new institutional arrangements to serve their interests. The substantial direct effect of elite capture ($\beta = -0.428$) independent of institutional quality suggested additional mechanisms beyond formal institutional channels, which qualitative data from this study illuminated: elite predation created pervasive uncertainty that discouraged long-term productive investment; conspicuous elite consumption fueled resentment and social

fragmentation; brain drain accelerated as talented individuals sought opportunities in less captured contexts; and the demonstration effect of elite impunity normalized corruption throughout society, creating cultures of rent-seeking rather than productivity. The mixed effects model results added crucial nuance by revealing that while elite capture was systematically associated with poor development outcomes, there was substantial heterogeneity in this relationship across contexts, with 28.7% of variance occurring at the country level. This country-level variance likely reflected differences in the severity of elite capture, the strength of countervailing institutions and civil society, historical legacies, and natural resource endowments—factors that the model partially captured through control variables like colonial legacy ($\beta = -4.23$, $p = 0.028$) and resource dependence ($\beta = -0.89$, $p = 0.004$), both of which independently predicted worse development outcomes. The significant community-level variance (ICC = 0.136) suggested that local governance quality, community organization, and traditional authority structures created substantial variation in developmental outcomes even within the same national context, pointing to the importance of multi-scalar analysis and the possibility that effective community-level resistance to elite capture could create developmental "islands" even within generally captured states. The overwhelming model fit statistics and highly significant path coefficients across all hypothesized relationships provided strong empirical support for reconceptualizing African underdevelopment not primarily as a technical problem of resource constraints or capacity gaps, but fundamentally as a political problem of elite betrayal and institutional capture, with profound implications for development policy and practice that demanded political rather than purely technical interventions.

Conclusion

This study provided comprehensive empirical evidence that elite capture and self-interested behavior constituted fundamental mechanisms driving Africa's persistent underdevelopment, validating the conceptualization of underdevelopment as a form of elite betrayal rather than merely a technical or resource constraint problem. Through mixed-methods analysis across six African countries, the research demonstrated that corruption, patronage networks, and policy capture were pervasive phenomena that systematically undermined development outcomes across multiple dimensions including poverty reduction, infrastructure development, service delivery, economic opportunity creation, and human development. The structural equation modeling results revealed that elite capture exerted powerful effects on development both directly ($\beta = -0.428$) and indirectly through institutional degradation ($\beta = -0.505$), with the total effect ($\beta = -0.933$) indicating that elite capture represented one of the most potent predictors of developmental failure in contemporary Africa. The mixed effects analysis further demonstrated that while elite capture operated as a systemic national-level phenomenon, substantial heterogeneity existed across communities and contexts, with 28.7% of variance attributable to country-level factors and 13.6% to community-level factors, suggesting differentiated capacities for resistance and accountability enforcement. The bivariate analyses consistently showed strong correlations ($r = 0.589$ to $r = 0.768$) between all elite capture indicators and development outcomes, while univariate results documented alarmingly high levels of perceived corruption (mean = 68.42/100), patronage network density (mean = 7.25/10), and policy capture (mean = 6.89/10) alongside critically low levels of elite accountability (mean = 32.15/100) and institutional trust (mean = 3.42/10). Qualitative findings from interviews and focus groups corroborated these quantitative patterns, revealing how ordinary citizens experienced elite capture through diverted public resources, compromised policy-making, weakened institutions, and foreclosed economic opportunities, while also documenting emerging forms of resistance including social movements, accountability innovations, and civil society mobilization. These findings challenged conventional development paradigms that emphasized technical capacity building, resource mobilization, or policy reform without addressing underlying power relations, demonstrating instead that sustainable development in Africa required fundamental transformation of elite incentive structures, strengthening of accountability mechanisms, empowerment of civil society and social movements, and reimagining of state-society relations away from neopatrimonial extraction toward developmental social contracts. The study's central contribution lay in anatomizing the specific mechanisms through which elite betrayal translated into underdevelopment—from patronage networks colonizing formal institutions to policy capture distorting resource allocation to accountability deficits enabling impunity—thereby moving beyond abstract assertions about governance failures to provide granular understanding of how power operates to produce and reproduce underdevelopment, which had critical implications for both scholarly understanding and practical interventions aimed at transforming Africa's developmental trajectory.

Recommendations

Strengthen Multi-Scalar Accountability Architecture Through Hybrid Institutions: Given that the study revealed 28.7% of variance in development outcomes occurred at the country level while 13.6% occurred at the community level, development interventions should move beyond exclusive focus on national-level institutional reforms to construct hybrid accountability architectures that operate simultaneously at national, subnational, and community scales. This recommendation entails establishing independent anti-corruption commissions with prosecutorial powers and protection from political interference; creating participatory budgeting mechanisms that give communities direct control over portions of public resources; implementing constituency development funds with robust oversight by civil society organizations; strengthening traditional and customary accountability mechanisms where they exist and align with human rights principles; establishing citizen report cards and social audits that enable communities to monitor service delivery; and leveraging digital technologies including blockchain for procurement transparency and mobile platforms for citizen reporting of corruption.

Transform Elite Incentive Structures Through Comprehensive Political Economy Reforms: Since the structural equation model demonstrated that elite capture's total effect on development ($\beta = -0.933$) operated through both institutional degradation and direct mechanisms, addressing underdevelopment requires fundamental transformation of the incentive structures that make predatory

behavior rational for elites. This recommendation involves implementing comprehensive campaign finance reforms that reduce the cost of politics and decrease dependency on illicit funding; establishing robust asset declaration and lifestyle audit requirements for all public officials with meaningful enforcement; creating alternative pathways to elite status and wealth accumulation through support for entrepreneurship, innovation, and productive sectors that reward value creation rather than rent-seeking; strengthening civil service meritocracy and insulating technocratic positions from political interference through independent recruitment and protection mechanisms.

Empower Social Movements and Civil Society as Countervailing Forces: The study's findings on the strong inverse relationship between elite accountability and underdevelopment (r = -0.723 with poverty), combined with qualitative evidence of emerging resistance movements, indicated that empowering organized citizens represents a critical pathway toward challenging elite capture. This recommendation includes protecting civic space through robust freedom of association, assembly, and expression guarantees enforced by independent judiciaries; providing legal and financial support for investigative journalism, civil society organizations, and social movements working on accountability and anti-corruption; establishing legal protections and support mechanisms for whistleblowers who expose elite malfeasance; creating institutionalized spaces for civil society participation in policy formulation, budget processes, and oversight mechanisms; supporting pan-African.

References.

Agasha, E., & Monametsi, G. L. (2020). Audit Quality and Firm Performance: Evidence from Botswana and Uganda. *Journal of Accounting Finance and Auditing Studies (JAFAS)*, *6*(4). https://doi.org/10.32602/jafas.2020.029

Alam, M. N., Hassan, M. M., Bowyer, D., & Reaz, M. (2020). The effects of wages and welfare facilities on employee productivity: Mediating role of employee work motivation. *Australasian Accounting, Business and Finance Journal*, *14*(4). https://doi.org/10.14453/aabfj.v14i4.4

Aminu, R. O., Si, W., Ibrahim, S. B., Arowolo, A. O., & Ayinde, A. F. O. (2022). Impact of socio and demographic factors on multidimensional poverty profile of smallholder arable crop farmers – evidence from Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Economics*, *49*(1). https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSE-12-2020-0834

Arora, J., & Chakraborty, M. (2023). Role of financial literacy in investment choices of financial consumers: an insight from India. *International Journal of Social Economics*, *50*(3). https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSE-12-2021-0764

Asante, R., Hershey, M., Kajubi, P., Kuperus, T., Msoka, C., & Patterson, A. (2021). What Motivates Young African Leaders for Public Engagement? Lessons from Ghana, Tanzania, and Uganda. *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society*, *34*(3). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10767-020-09364-6

Breakfast, N., & Phago, K. (2019). Post-development approach in the post-apartheid governance of South Africa. *Journal Of Gender, Information and Development in Africa*, *SI*(2). https://doi.org/10.31920/2050-4284/2019/sin2a3

Cabrera, A., & García-Pérez, C. (2023). Poverty, extreme poverty and homelessness in Spain: an analysis for the period 2010–2019. *Journal of Poverty and Social Justice*. https://doi.org/10.1332/175982721x16760450929081

Frankema, E., & van Waijenburg, M. (2023). What about the race between education and technology in the Global South? Comparing skill premiums in colonial Africa and Asia. *Economic History Review*, *76*(3). https://doi.org/10.1111/ehr.13221

Goh, P. S., Roberts-Lieb, S., & Sandars, J. (2023). Micro-Scholarship: An innovative approach for the first steps for Scholarship in Health Professions Education. *Medical Teacher*, *45*(3). https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2022.2133689

Jayashree, P., El Barachi, M., & Hamza, F. (2022). Practice of Sustainability Leadership: A Multi-Stakeholder Inclusive Framework. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *14*(10). https://doi.org/10.3390/su14106346

Julius, A. (2025). *Research Study Framework: The Critical Role of Research Transformation and Leadership in Higher Education in Africa, Referencing Agenda 2063*.

Julius, A., & Gracious Kaazara, A. (2025a). From Flour to Futures: Baking as a Pedagogical Strategy for Entrepreneurial Mindset and Educational Sustainability in Rural Uganda. In *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research* (Vol. 9). www.ijeais.org/ijamr

Julius, A., & Gracious Kaazara, A. (2025b). The Academic Writing Process: A Comprehensive Framework for Effective Scholarly Communication. *International Journal of Academic and Applied Research*. www.ijeais.org/ijaar

Julius, A., & Gracious Kaazara, A. (2025c). The Objective is the Obstacle: A Critique of the Foundational Aims of the Colonial-Era Education System in Africa. In *International Journal of Academic Pedagogical Research* (Vol. 9). www.ijeais.org/ijapr

Julius, A., & Kazaara, A. I. (2025a). The Adoption-Adaptation Imperative: An Economic Argument for Leveraging Exogenous Innovation in Africa. *International Journal of Academic and Applied Research*. www.ijeais.org/ijaar

Julius, A., & Kazaara, A. I. (2025b). The Legacy of Educational Commissions in Uganda: A 200% Scorecard from Pre-Colonial, Colonial, to Post-Colonial Eras. In *International Journal of Academic Pedagogical Research* (Vol. 9). www.ijeais.org/ijapr

Katusiimeh, M. W. (2015). Public and Private Service Provision of Solid Waste Management in. *Public and Private Service Provision of Solid Waste Management in Kampala, Uganda*, *November*.

Mark, O., & Moses, N. (2025). Impact Of Early Marriages On Social Economic Development A Case Of Kampala District Uganda. In *Metropolitan Journal Of Social And Educational Research* (Vol. 4).

Mishchenko, S., Naumenkova, S., Mishchenko, V., & Dorofeiev, D. (2021). Innovation risk management in financial institutions. *Investment Management and Financial Innovations*, *18*(1). https://doi.org/10.21511/imfi.18(1).2021.16

Mpaata, K. A., & Mpaata, Z. (2018). The secondary school head teacher's leadership role in educational policy implementation in Uganda. *Journal of Educational and Practice*, *9*(17).

Nelson, K., Christopher, F., & Milton, N. (2022). *Teach Yourself Spss and Stata*. *6*(7), 84–122.

Nelson, K., Kazaara, A. G., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). *Teach Yourself E-Views*. *7*(3), 124–145.

Pdu, A. C. O., Government, M. L., Gracious, A., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). *Corruption Practices on Service Delivery in the Public Sector in*. *7*(3), 312–319.

Samuel, S., Gracious Kazaara, A., Nelson, K., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). *EXAMINING THE IMPACT OF CONTRACTOR SELECTION ON SERVICE DELIVERY IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR, A CASE STUDY OF KAWOLO HOSPITAL, LUGAZI MUNICIPALITY Background to the Study* (Vol. 2, Issue 1). Online.

Siifa, B., Teniola, B. B., & Zayyad, M. A. (2023). Statistical Analysis of Effect of Population on Economic Growth in Uganda (2000-2020). *Technology and Investment*, *14*(02). https://doi.org/10.4236/ti.2023.142006

Summers, C. (2019). Learning leadership? Elite Ugandan students and late colonial politics. *Africa*, *89*(S1). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0001972018000943

Usman, A., & Bashir, S. (2018). Washington Consensus, Globalization, Neo Liberaism and the State in Africa: A Critical Exegesis. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.5296/jpag.v8i1.12757