

**ROLE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION ON RURAL  
AGRICULTURE AND HEALTH DEVELOPMENT IN DELTA CENTRAL  
SENATORIAL DISTRICT, DELTA STATE, NIGERIA**

**BY**

**Wisdom A. EDUDJE**

**AGR1800014**

**UNIVERSITY OF BENIN**

**BENIN CITY**

**MAY, 2024**

**CERTIFICATION**

This is to certify that this project work was carried out by Wisdom Akpomeadiaye EDUDJE (AGR1800014) of the Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension Services, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Benin, Benin City.

---

Dr J. I. Osabuohien  
(Project Supervisor)

---

Prof. (Mrs) M. J. Koyenikan  
(Head of Department)

---

Date

---

Date

### **DEDICATION**

This project is dedicated to God Almighty for His benevolence and faithfulness and to my family particularly my parents for their unmatched care and guidance.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I would like to acknowledge my supervisor; Dr J. I. Osabuohien for guiding me through this research. I appreciate his commitment in taking time out of his busy schedule to pay detailed attention to this work, making corrections and invaluable contributions that have led to the success of this research.

I also like to acknowledge the Head of Department; Prof. (Mrs) M. J. Koyenikan, my admirable course adviser; Mr Alex Ehigie, seminar coordinator; Dr (Mrs) A. I. Kenneth, project coordinator; Miss O. Anozie, Dr (Mrs) O. B. Izekor, Dr Gbenga, and all other lecturers and staff of the Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension Services (AEE) for their role in modelling me as a student.

I also like to acknowledge Prof. R.E Orhue and Dr. Peter A. Ebabhamiegbho- the former Dean and Assistant Dean, Faculty of Agriculture for their kindness, guidance and support towards me during my time as the President of the Nigerian Association of Agriculture Students (NAAS).

My unreserved appreciation to my parents, Mr and Mrs Edudje E. Joseph and all my brothers and sisters- Edudje I. Raymond, Edudje K. Rachael, Edudje N. Daniel, Edudje Tegiri, Edudje Oghenebrorhie and Edudje Ogheneruona for their unwavering support, empathy and encouragement throughout my academic journey in the University of Benin (UNIBEN).

Special thanks to my super friends; Godwin B. Oghenero, Erirue E. Wisdom, Apepe Akpevwe, Omaghomi Maris, Ogor Precious, Gubare Williams, Omor Francis, Udugba K. Raphael, Adogamhe A. Alexander, Chibueze E. Benny, Tudebi Ruth, Adeoye Johanna, Enofe Success, Valere and the entire AGR 23/24 graduation class. Special thanks to Mrs Omojeveb Agoreyo, Mr. Umukuafe Fegor Henry, Rt. Hon. Merit Nzekor, Comr. Neyin Frances, Comr. Uvewho Akpo, and Legacy team for the support and immeasurable assistance.

Lastly, I would like to acknowledge my spiritual family at home and on campus; Rev. Mike Avwerono and the entire Christ Missionaries Crusaders Church (CMCC)- Iyara branch, Hospitality Unit headed by Mr Ogiebor Uyi, and the entire Living Faith Church (Winners Chapel), Ekosodin for their prayers, spiritual and moral support.

## TABLE OF CONTENT

|                    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |
|--------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Cover page         | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | i   |
| Title page         | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | ii  |
| Certification page | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | iii |
| Dedication         | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | iv  |
| Acknowledgement    | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | v   |
| Table of contents  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | vi  |
| List of tables     | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | ix  |
| Abstract           | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | x   |

### CHAPTER ONE

|     |                            |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|-----|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.0 | Introduction               | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| 1.1 | Background of study        | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| 1.2 | Statement of Problem       | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |
| 1.3 | Objectives of the Study    | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 |
| 1.4 | Justification of the Study | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 |
| 1.5 | Hypotheses of the Study    | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 |

### CHAPTER TWO

|     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 2.0 | Literature review                                     | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5  |
| 2.1 | Rurality  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5  |
| 2.2 | Rural Development                                     | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8  |
| 2.3 | Approaches to Rural Development                       | - | - | - | - | - | - | 10 |
| 2.4 | Local Government                                      | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11 |
| 2.5 | Integral Characteristics of Local Government          | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13 |
| 2.6 | Historical Development of Local Government in Nigeria | - | - | - | - | - | - | 14 |
| 2.7 | Structures of Local Government                        | - | - | - | - | - | - | 28 |
| 2.8 | Functions of Local Government                         | - | - | - | - | - | - | 29 |

|      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 2.9  | Major Problems of Local Government in Nigeria                         | - | - | - | - | - | - | 31 |
| 2.10 | Prospect of Local Government Efficient and Effective Service Delivery |   |   |   |   |   |   | 33 |

### **CHAPTER THREE**

|     |                                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |
|-----|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 3.0 | Methodology                          | - | - | - | - | - | - | 36 |
| 3.1 | Study Area and Scope                 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 36 |
| 3.2 | Sampling Technique and Sampling Size | - | - | - | - | - | - | 36 |
| 3.4 | Data Collection                      | - | - | - | - | - | - | 37 |
| 3.5 | Measurement of Variables             | - | - | - | - | - | - | 37 |
| 3.6 | Data Analysis                        | - | - | - | - | - | - | 38 |

### **CHAPTER FOUR**

|     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 4.0 | Result and discussion   | - | - | - | - | - | - | 39 |
| 4.1 | Socio-economic Characteristics  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 39 |
| 4.2 | Local government administration on rural agriculture development  | - |   |   |   |   |   | 44 |
| 4.3 | Satisfaction of respondents with local government administration on rural agriculture and health development programmes | - | - | - | - | - | - | 47 |
| 4.4 | Constraints to local government administration on rural agriculture and health developments                             | - | - | - | - | - | - | 49 |
| 4.5 | Hypothesis testing  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 50 |

### **CHAPTER FIVE**

|     |                |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |
|-----|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 5.0 | Summary        | - | - | - | - | - | - | 52 |
| 5.1 | Conclusion     | - | - | - | - | - | - | 53 |
| 5.3 | Recommendation | - | - | - | - | - | - | 54 |

|                  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |
|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| <b>REFERENCE</b> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 55 |
|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|

|                 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| <b>APPENDIX</b> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 60 |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|

## LIST OF TABLES

| <b>Table</b> | <b>Title</b>   | <b>Page</b> |
|--------------|--|-------------|
| 1:           | Socio-economic characteristics - - - - -   | 44          |
| 2:           | Local governments administration on rural health development -   | 46          |
| 3:           | Local governments administration on rural agricultural development   | 47          |
| 4:           | Respondents 'satisfaction on local government health programmes -  | 48          |
| 5:           | Respondents' satisfaction of local government rural agriculture programmes                                   | 49          |
| 6:           | Constraints hindering local government administration on rural agriculture and health developments - - - - - | 51          |

7: Correlations between selected socio-economic characteristics and respondent's satisfaction with local government administration on rural agriculture and health developments programmes - - - - - 57

## ABSTRACT

This research studied the role of local government administration on rural agriculture and health development in Delta central senatorial district, Delta State, Nigeria. The specific objectives are to; ascertain the extent local government have ensured rural development; identify the programmes and projects put in place by local government for rural development; and to identify the constraints hindering local government towards rural agriculture and health development in the study area.

A multi-staged sampling technique was adopted in the selection of respondents in the study. Data for the study were obtained from both primary and secondary sources. Primary data were obtained through the use of a structured questionnaire administered to eighty (80) selected respondents in the study area through interview schedule. Data obtained were measured and analyzed using descriptive statistics while the hypothesis testing was analyzed using Pearson's Product Moment Correlation (PPMC).

Result showed that over 63.7% of the sampled respondents consist of an aging population whose age ranges from fifty-one (51) and above while majority (73.3% and 93.7%) of the sampled respondents are female and married respectively. About 39% of the sampled respondents had no formal education, while 61.2% had at least primary education. The sampled respondents had an average household and family size of five (5) and seven (7) respectively- an indication that family members remain the primary source of labour. Furthermore, respondents indicated significant satisfaction with local government health development programmes- construction of healthcare facilities, supply of medicine and vaccines, address health workers shortage and improved health care accessibility and dissatisfaction with all agriculture development programmes put in place by local government administration in the study area. Result of Pearson's Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) showed significant relationship between selected socio-economic

characteristics and respondents' satisfaction with local government administration on rural agriculture and health development programmes at 5% and 1% level of probability.

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.0**

#### **1.1 Background of Study**

Local government is the tier of government closest to the people at the grassroots level. It is responsible for the provision of essential services and infrastructure such as roads, sanitation, water, education and healthcare among others at the local level. Its creation is essential for good governance as well as economic and rural/community development (World Bank, 2022). Given that local governments are the closest to the citizens, they are arguably critical to the protection and improvement of their lives and livelihoods. The federal government sits in Abuja- Nigeria's capital city, while the state governments are usually stationed in the capital cities of their respective states. This makes these entities somewhat removed from the development needs and realities of the populace, especially when compared to local governments that can sometimes be found at the community level. Local governments are the centre of local governance and ought to be the main drivers of equitable and sustainable development as well as providers of access to basic public services; however, this is not the case. Local governance in Nigeria is plagued with several issues that have radically undermined its capacity to deliver on any developmental gains for communities (UN, 2022).

Sub-Saharan Africa is one of the regions in the World that is most backward in terms of poverty, hunger, unemployment and underdevelopment, especially the rural areas, where most of the population resides. Most rural areas in Nigeria lack basic amenities, infrastructure and agricultural standards to help reduce poverty, improve the skills of the rural dwellers, and in turn contribute to rural development (Sakpere, 2021).

The purpose for the establishment of local government as a third tier of government in Nigeria was to promote, provide and sustain development at the grass root level (rural areas).

However, rural communities continue to suffer from underdevelopment, which has led to massive migration from rural areas to urban areas thereby distorting the demography of urban areas through increase in population of urban centres. This in turn has led to increase in unemployment rate in the urban centres, increase in the cost of living in the urban centres and increasing insecurity in the cities (Sakpere, 2021). Rural agricultural development occupies a critical part in global governance; hence United Nations in its bid to reduce poverty in the world came up with the millennium development goals (MDGs) in 2000. Nevertheless, the fifteen years plan could not be achieved through the MDGs, hence, the plan was reviewed and rechristened sustainable development goals (SDGs) in 2015 in order to address global poverty and underdevelopment.

## **1.2 Statement of Problem**

The development of local government administration in Nigeria took a new turn since the return of the country- Nigeria to democracy on May 29, 1999, after long years of military rule. The hope of Nigerians was high that expectedly, democratic government would lead to good governance viz-a-viz enthronement of due process, constitutionality, and respect for the rule of law, transparency, and accountability and, free and fair elections. However, the reverse is the case, especially at the local government levels, which has made genuine democracy elude the grassroots in Nigeria. The consequences are a lack of meaningful socio-economic development at the local level, which should typically provide a solid foundation for the nation's infrastructural development and security (Aluko, 2010).

Local government has been created essentially to compliment the efforts of the states and national government in the task of rural development. Agricultural activities are controlled or directed in one way or the other by government through their ministries of agriculture, nevertheless, abject poverty and underdevelopment remains a common feature in rural

communities. With reference to the central problem stated above, this study seeks to provide answers to the following;

- i. What is the extent that local government administration has ensured rural agriculture and health development in Delta central senatorial district;
- ii. What are the rural agriculture and health programmes/projects put in place by local government in Delta Central Senatorial District;
- iii. What are the constraints hindering local government administration towards rural agriculture and health development in the study area?

### **1.3 Objectives of Study**

The general objective of this study is to examine the role of local government administration in rural agriculture and health development in Delta central senatorial district. However, the specific objectives are to:

- i. ascertain the extent local government have ensured rural agriculture and health development in Delta central senatorial district;
- ii. identify the rural agriculture and health programmes/projects put in place by local government in Delta Central senatorial district;
- iii. examine the constraints hindering local government administration towards rural agriculture and health development in the study area;

### **1.4 Justification of the Study**

The significance of this research is owing to the fact that successive government administrations are particularly concerned rural development across the country and the local government wields a strong influence on agriculture and socio-economic developmental process of rural areas among others. The scientific study of the role of local government administration in rural agriculture and health development is therefore paramount as local

government administration forms a critical component of any democratic system, being the level of government closest to the grassroot people.

This study will also contribute to existing body of knowledge and the information obtained can be used to formulate policies that will lead to the development of grassroots. No doubt, the result of this study will equally be of help to other like-minded researchers who may want to research on similar or related topics in the nearest future.

### **1.5 Hypotheses of the Study**

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no relationship between selected socio-economic characteristics and respondent's satisfaction with local government' rural agriculture and health developments programmes

## CHAPTER TWO

### 2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1 Rurality

What makes a place rural? It might be its people living far apart from one another, its location relative to small and widely spaced towns and villages or big cities, and the presence of farming or forestry. A person's view probably depends on her own experience, so that a Belgian and a Nigerian would likely have very different pictures in mind. Such subjectivity in identifying rural places is to be expected, but it makes it harder to agree on a common definition of a rural area for statistical purposes. And, indeed, there is no standard international definition of rural. An individual country can have a definition of what is rural that is simple (it is what is not urban) or more complicated (with different kinds of rural areas distinguished by the main activity, say, farming or tourism). For use within the country, there is no reason to be concerned if a neighbouring country has a different set of criteria. However, when making comparisons of statistics between and among countries, the lack of a consistent definition can create confusion. It should be noted that there is no one "correct" definition of what rural is. Rather, the one chosen should be useful for the purpose to which it is to be put (FAO, 2018). A review of definitions previously used in a variety of settings identified three common dimensions of "rurality" - sparse settlement, land cover and use, and remoteness from urban areas.

##### 2.1.1 Sparse Settlement

What is rural is a relative concept, based on observation of variation in the number and distribution of people over the land. The most populous and densely settled parts of a country are its urban areas. Rural areas are relatively less densely populated and are seen as different in degree, if not in kind (Chomitz *et al.*, 2005). The sparse settlement dimension of rurality can be represented by variables that measure or reflect population size and distribution.

Population density (number of inhabitants divided by unit of area) is frequently used in characterizing the urban/rural continuum. Moreover, using density as opposed to population size “neutralizes some of the distorting effects” of differences in the size of spatial units defined by political or administrative boundaries. Population density may be correlated with other variables that could also be used to represent sparse settlement. According to the Wye Group Handbook (2012), “Population density reflects characteristics of settlement, distance, and even intensity of communication and land use.” So, for example, a measure of built-up area could be mapped onto the urban/rural continuum as a proxy for a direct measure of population density.

Population density is one variable that could be used to represent the sparse settlement dimension of rurality. By itself, however, it may not adequately capture the concept. A relatively densely populated area could be found in a town surrounded by a less densely settled rural region. That town could be classified as urban if no reference were made to its otherwise rural context. For this reason, urban/rural definition includes a variable measuring the size of a population in a densely settled cluster. For example, the OECD considers an area otherwise deemed rural by virtue of low population density to be “intermediate” between urban and rural if it contains an urban center of more than 200,000 representing at least a quarter of the population. The threshold that moves an area out of the rural category is a choice that depends heavily on context. In any event, both population density and population size may be included as variables representing the dimension of sparse settlement (FAO, 2018).

### **2.1.2 Land Cover and Land Use**

The physical cover on the land consists of vegetation (occurring naturally or cultivated) and of buildings and roads and other man-made features (FAO, 2014). Data on land cover will describe what areas are covered by forest, grassland, impervious surfaces, cropland and other

land and water types (such as wetlands and open water). In contrast, land use is what people do on the landscape (for example, build factories, construct houses, create parks, and livestock grazing etc.) with the intention of getting benefit from its use. A given type of land cover, say a tree cover, could support multiple land uses: recreation, logging, and/or conservation. Because physical cover varies over the landscape, an empirical representation has to have different categories to reflect the kinds of cover.

### **2.1.3 Remoteness**

Remoteness as a dimension of rurality represents the opportunity, or lack of opportunity, people have to gain access to markets and to public services. Considering the relevant dimensions of rurality in the context of Latin America and the Caribbean, Chomitz et al. (2005) select population density and remoteness from large cities. We argue that these criteria constitute important gradients along with economic behaviour and where population densities are low, markets of all kinds are thin, and unit costs of delivering most social services and many types of infrastructure are high. Where large urban areas are distant, farm-gate (or factory-gate) prices of outputs will be low and prices of inputs will be high, and it will be difficult to recruit skilled personnel to public service or private enterprises. Thus, remoteness and low population density together define a set of rural areas that face special challenges in development. Moving people from place to place, bringing goods to them, or reaching them with services comes at a cost associated either with physical transport or with telecommunications.

Remoteness is a stand-in concept for access to labor markets and needed goods and services. It is not a perfect proxy, however, as distance may not restrict access to one service (for example, on-line education) but it may be a significant barrier to another (for example, surgery at a regional hospital). Still, distance from urban areas is generally thought to be an important dimension of rurality. Regarding the benefits of being near an urban area, the 2009

World Development Report (WDR) emphasized the importance of development of agglomeration economies. These are the benefits that come when firms and people locate near one another together in cities and industrial clusters, effectively lowering the costs of transporting goods and sharing knowledge (NBER 2010). Remote populations will find it costlier to take advantage of the benefits associated with urbanization. Intuitively, a remote area is far from an urban area in terms of distance, the time it takes to travel physically from one place to another. The mode and speed of transportation, however, would be expected to vary depending on terrain and on the presence or absence of infrastructure. Travel by road or train might be most usual in one place, but travel by water or foot in another. While the variables chosen would be different across countries, or even within countries, the underlying supposition is that physical presence in an urban area is key, however it is achieved (FAO, 2018).

## **2.2 Rural Development**

According to Nwobi, (2007), rural development can be viewed as the development of the moral, social, political and economic potentialities of rural communities to enhance their self-reliance through the provision of appropriate infrastructure such as pipe-borne water, electricity, good roads and small scale industries, increase their political consciousness and participation, promote their moral and social well-being which will result in tolerance, good discipline, justice, fairness, kindness, love and peace. Mosley (2003) defined rural development as the process of improving the quality of life and economic well-being of people living in rural areas. Rural development involves efforts that are economic and social in nature intended to encourage concepts of retention, growth and expansion in areas outside cities, including improving quality of life for rural residents through such activity (Cukwuemeka et al, 2022). According to the United Nation (UN), rural development is a

comprehensive economic and social process that aims to improve the quality of life for people living in rural areas.

Rural areas are home to about 43 per cent of the world's population and most of the global population living in poverty. Not only do rural populations generally have less access to education, health and other social services, the work available to them is often characterized by human rights abuses, gender inequality, poor working conditions, and the violation of indigenous land rights. Without inclusion and improvement of the well-being of rural populations as a central goal, sustainable development cannot be achieved; the general principle of leaving no one behind also warrants their inclusion. However, the rural populations need not be viewed as just passive recipients of attention. Instead, with the adoption of appropriate strategies, rural development can be a powerful force for achieving sustainable development in general, and the SDGs in particular (UN, 2021).

The share of rural population in national population differs greatly from country to country, so does the depth of the rural development challenge. About 90 per cent of the world's rural population lives in countries where the rural population constitutes at least 30 per cent of the national population. Also, about 70 per cent of the world's rural population lives in low-income or lower-middle-income countries, and rural population comprises about 60 and 67 per cent of the population in lower-middle-income and low-income countries, respectively. It is therefore clear that the issue of rural development is central for most of the low-income and lower-middle-income countries. Even in high-income countries, the rural population comprises about one fifth of the total population, making rural development important for these countries too. More importantly, rural areas are critical to the ecology and environment of a country; consequently, the importance of rural development cannot be gauged only by the share of population living in rural areas. From this viewpoint, strategies of rural development assume much greater significance for upper-middle-income and high-income

countries than what may appear from the shares of rural population in total population of these countries (UN, 2021).

### **2.3 Approaches to Rural Development**

Overtime, successive governments have embarked on several programmes targeted at rural development. Other approaches have been by NGOs, cooperatives, individuals through private initiatives, corporate bodies as well as International Organizations. According to Mammud (2019), the various programmes initiated and mostly targeted at the rural sector by government include the following:

- i. National Accelerated Food Production Programme (NAFPP)
- ii. River-Basin Development Authority (RBDA)
- iii. Agricultural Development Programme (ADP)
- iv. Operation Feed the Nation (OFN)
- v. The Green Revolution (GR)
- vi. Agricultural Credit Guarantee Scheme (ACGS)
- vii. Directorate for Food, Road and Rural Infrastructure (DFFRI)
- viii. Better Life for Rural Dwellers (BETTER LIFE)
- ix. National Agricultural Insurance Corporation (NAIC)
- x. National Directorate of Employment (NDE)
- xi. National Agricultural Land Development Authority (NALDA)
- xii. National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP)
- xiii. National Rural Roads Development Fund (NRRDF)
- xiv. Rural Banking Scheme (RBS)
- xv. Family Support Programme (FSP)
- xvi. Universal Basic Education (UBE)
- xvii. Rural Infrastructure Development Scheme (RIDS)

A cursory look at the introduction, establishment, implementation and the objectives of majority of the programmes above, will reveal that they are mainly targeted at rural development in an attempt to better the lives of rural dwellers, stimulate and enhance economic growth, as well as get the rural sector to contribute meaningfully to the national economic and social development. The programmes have both direct and indirect impact on rural development and can broadly be grouped into specific and multi-specific programmes. The specific programmes are those directed mainly at agriculture, health, education, housing, transport, infrastructure, finance and manufacturing. Such programmes were initiated in the early 1970s and 1980s. On the other hand, most of the multi-specific programmes were put in place in the early 1990s and thereafter to handle general projects, such as NDE, DFRRI, Better Life, Family support etc (Mammud, 2019).

#### **2.4 Local Government**

Nigeria operates a federal system with three-tier structure of government (federal, state, and local governments). The local government is the lowest level of government and the closest to the people at the grassroots. Due to its proximity to the people, it has a multi-purpose functionality in terms of socio-economic service delivery at the local level; stimulating and encouraging local initiatives in community works; promoting the democratic process; serving as training ground for national political leaders; serving as medium of communication between the people and the higher levels of government; among others. Local government activities have therefore, generated a lot of interest from the people due to the tremendous impact and influence they could exert on the general life of the rural inhabitants who constitute the larger majority of the Nigerian population (Odo, 2016).

Local government have been defined differently by various scholars and researchers based on the various perspectives and functionality of local government. According to Oni 1993, local government is that level of government exercised through representative councils, established

by law to exercise geographical area with common social and political ties. Fajobi (2010), defined local government as government at the grassroots level exercised through representative councils set up by law to carry out certain responsibilities within the area covered. Local government is thus, concerned with the regulation and administration of local affairs by the local people themselves through their representatives. According to Hasluck (2010), local government is the sphere of government where local authorities are allowed by law to issue acts or decisions to adjust the way of governance. In a socio-developmental definition, given by Godwin, (2014) on local governance, he defines this kind of government as management of their affairs by the people of the locality where they are.

Aurora (2016), defined local government as an authority that decides or determines certain measures within a given territory. It means governance or management of local affairs by the people part of that community according to which local needs can be better met and fulfilled by people close to them, than the central government. The United Nations Division of Public Administration cited in Nnaa and Abeki (2017) defines local government as: A political division of a nation or (in federal system), state, which is constituted by law and has substantial control of local affairs, including the powers to impose taxes or to exact labour for prescribed purpose. To Nweneka (2018), local government areas are essentially the actual, physical places or regions that are governed or under the administration of local system of government. Ola (2019) views local government as a form of government whose primary goal is to address the needs of its constituents at the local level.

From the analysis of the above definitions, local governments;

- a. Have statutory status, therefore it is defined, recognized and functions on the basis of the laws of a country.
- b. Have the right to decide about their own local taxes on the territory where jurisdiction extend,

- c. Are characterized by the right of local community participation in decision making process or management of local affairs,
- d. Have the capacity to act independently from central government bodies, within the limits set by law, through the decentralization process or the principle of local autonomy,
- e. Serve the general interest of the citizens, i.e. common interest.

## **2.5 Integral Characteristics of Local Government**

According to Aurora (2016), local governments have the following characteristics.

- a. **Defined Area:** Each local government unit has a clearly defined area where it operates. This area may be a city, village, region, etc., depending on the territorial organization of the state itself.
- b. **Local Authority.** Management or governance of a certain locality is made by a body composed of persons directly elected by the people of that area. This representative body is responsible for the administration of local affairs in that area.
- c. It provides public services for residents of the area within its jurisdiction, which is the main goal of this government.
- d. **Local finances-** in order to provide services and perform functions effectively, it is imperative that the local unit has its own finances. These finances can be obtained from local taxes but also from state subsidies.
- e. **Local autonomy:** This means that the local government has the right to establish and operate in the activities and functions that are recognized by law. It also includes the legal right of local residents to choose their representatives that will govern the territory under the set laws. It should be noted that autonomy does not mean sovereignty over these bodies, as belonging and legally depending on state structures

- f. **Local Participation:** The success or failure of the development plans of the territory it control, relates to the active participation of the local people.
- g. **Local Leadership:** Usually people who deal with local governments, especially in rural areas, are characterized by a lack of experience, professionalism. Therefore they should be provided with leadership-management skills in order to develop various projects initiated.
- h. **Local Accountability:** This means that local representatives of the people are elected by them to meet the ultimate goal, that is, to provide services in the most effective manner possible. If this is not achieved then the vote of the people make them to not be re-elected at the next election.
- i. **Local Development:** This is a very important feature, because the primary goal is the development of local government within the area which exercises jurisdiction.

## **2.6 Historical Development of Local Government in Nigeria**

Local government administration system in Nigeria has undergone series of metamorphosis. It has been in a state of transition since the Nigeria's political independence till date. The local government system overtime, has been restructured and reorganized depending on the regime (either military or civilian administration) in power. These regime/administration changes have resulted to varying degree of uncertainties with peculiar characteristics of the system. Local government administration has passed through torturous phases of development in the country, from pre-colonial settlements, colonial rule, independence local council administration, military rule, the 1976 local government reform to the fourth republic.

### **2.6.1 Local Government Administration During Pre-Colonial Era**

Prior to amalgamation, the pre-colonial societies in Nigeria were made up of empires, a caliphate, kingdoms, chiefdoms, city states and villages with ruler that exercise absolute

authority over them as in the case of empire or kingdom in the northern region, the Oba in the West, whose power can be checkmated by constituted authority and the Igbo society in the East with its republic and egalitarian status (Adeyemi, 2018). Local administration in Nigeria predated colonial rule as each of the separate entity that make up the nation had a unique but relatively effective system (Alao *et al.*, 2015). It had been part of a kind system of government especially at the grassroots level among ethnic groups in Nigeria, particularly among the Yoruba and Fulani. An examination of the three main geographical zones in Nigeria clearly reveals that by the early sixteenth century, the Hausa emirates had developed a well-organized fiscal system, a definite code of land tenure, a regular scheme of local rule through appointed district and village heads, as well as a trained judiciary which administer the Islamic laws (Ola and Tonwe, 2009).

In Western part of Nigeria, local rule had also developed around the local rulers (the Kings or Obas) where they had existed. Though the fiscal system was less rigorously organized as it was characterised by check and balances, there was a definite code of land tenure based on the local ruler who administered it at the will of the lesser chiefs and the general people. There also existed a clear scheme of local rule through the lesser local ruler, his chief and their appointed aides. In this case, the judiciary was not distinct from the executive as in the Hausa states. The basis of justice in the West was also different. It was not the Islamic law. It was based on three major factors; Oral traditions; Rule of precedence and Native Philosophy (Ola and Tonwe, 2009).

The patterns of local rule in the -Eastern part of Nigeria, particularly in the Igbo communities were different from the North and the West. The communities in that part of the country largely were acephalous or stateless societies which had no system of kinship or political headship where authority and power emanated from. The Igbo had no king. Most of the communities were not or less hierarchically structured. Local administration system of

governance was carried out by decisions of the age groups, village square meetings and input from individual within community. The Igbo system was democratic than any other system in the pre-colonial Nigeria based on its egalitarian principle. Therefore, local government administration system has always been an integral part and feature of various communities before the introduction of colonial rule in Nigeria.

### **2.6.2 Nigerian Local Government Administration System Under Colonial Rule (1900-1950)**

Under colonial administration, local government was known as Native Administration or Indirect rule system. It was meant to govern the people through the native chief. The idea was to preserve and use the authority of the local rulers, local institutions, traditions and habits rather than attempt to impose totally new unfamiliar ideas from outside. Local development would, thus come about through the delegation of authority to chiefs and through a gradual participation of the citizen (Ola and Tonwe, 2009). Contrary to this view, the use of native traditional rulers by colonialist was not meant to preserve the culture and custom of the natives. Rather, it was meant for the British's economies and administrative convenience advantage to save huge personnel costs that might have arisen by employing British officials to govern these local societies.

It must be noted that, right from inception, the structure of local government in Nigeria was basically designed to serve colonial interests and facilitate the exploitation of the Nigerian people and resources. Indirect rule, in other words, was to be based essentially on the chief; the local ruler. The localization policy was to ensure his firm grip on his local administration, whilst local standards were to be adopted, presumably in the interest of peace. They were to maintain law and order, prevent crimes and apprehend criminals. Law and order were

extremely important to British administration as this was crucial to promoting commerce (Ola and Tonwe, 2009). The local administration comprises of four main features, which are:

- a. The British Resident Officer, who direct and control
- b. The Native Authority headed by a Chief and often supported by a council of elder
- c. The Native Treasury
- d. The Native Court composed of representatives of the Native Administration

The system, was however, generally built on strong chief. The strength of the chiefs varied, from the very strong autocratic ruler of Hausa emirates to the semi democratic chiefs of South-West and to the acephalous and highly decentralised and egalitarian societies of the South-East. On the whole, three types of native authorities could be distinguished during indirect rule era: The Chief; the Chief- in –Council and the Chief and Council.

**The Chief:** Here the Chief was a sole authority, he had all powers and all authority emanated from him. He made all appointments and was responsible to the Resident of the province and to the colonial administration for all local administrative affairs. Many of the Hausa/Fulani emirates fell under this form of local administration in this era.

**The Chief – in – Council:** The Chief in this type of local administration was at liberty to accept or reject the advice of his council. What really differentiated this from the sole authority type of local administration was the existence of the council of chiefs where matters concerning the communities are decided.

**The Chief and Council:** in this case, the Chief had a council of advisers who shared with him the power of decision-making authority. In other word, the council with him were involved in the making of appointments, land, disbursement, expenditures and various priority areas. This type of limited or Constitutional Chief was the more common with the more liberal Chiefs of the Yoruba Kingdom of the South-West at this time.

### **2.6.3 Local Government Administration in Nigeria Between 1950 and 1966**

The second phase of local administration development started in 1950s or thereabout. The first phase was defective for so many reasons among which regulatory rather than executive power was what it had. It had no mandate to provide any social welfare services and consequently engaged only the staff essential for their rudimentary administrative purpose. Another important reason for rejecting indirect rule system was that the affected communities had no strong sense of belonging or self-involvement in the running of local administration (Adeyemi, 2019).

The Eastern region was the first in 1950 to initiate a radical change in the operation and administration of local government not only in Nigeria but also in the whole of British West-Africa. Generally, the Eastern Region Local Government Ordinance of 1950 created local government structures that closely resembled the English system. A three-tier local government system, with each having independent operation was introduced. The three tiers were County, District and Local council (Agagu, 2004). The county councils were responsible for road and customary courts; the district councils provided for health and sanitation while local councils were saddled with other petty services (Adeola, 2009). Within a short period, however, the operation of Local Government Ordinance of 1950 began to fail in some ways. The first reason was that it was too ambitious. The second reason was that the implementation throughout the region was done without adequate preparation. The third reason was corruption. The fourth reason was that it was too complex to operate by the councillors and staffs (Agagu, 2004). The Eastern Region Local Government Law of 1955 was promulgated to replace that of 1950 in an attempt to correct the defects. Furthermore, the Law equally transferred the powers and responsibilities of the Regional Authority to the Minister of Internal Affairs who had ministerial responsibility for local government (Gboyega, 1987).

Local Government Service Board was also created in July 1956 to serve as an advisory body to the minister on issues, such as local government staffs, employment and condition of service. The increasing difficulty in understanding the operation of multi-tier system of local government led to the abolition of the upper and lower tiers thus leaving the middle tier, i.e, the district council. With a single tier left, the district council assumed the role of an all-purpose local government, although in some rural areas. Another major change in the operation of Local Government in Eastern Region came in 1960 when a new Local Government Law was enacted. The 1960 Local Government Law introduced full adult suffrage to replace the indirect and limited mode of election. It also introduced the committee system into the council management particularly finance as well as medical and health committees. The business of the council was to be presided over by an elected chairman. With much wobbling and trial, the first experiment of modern local government administration in the Eastern Region continued until the collapse of First Republic. (Agagu, 2004).

In the West, the Western Region's Local Government Law of 1952 was also enacted. It is pertinent to state here that, the Western Regional experience in local government reform which came in with the 1952 Local Government Law also provided for three local authorities. These were the Divisional, District and Local Councils. This arrangement was similar to the one in the Eastern region except that the communities were allowed to remain together in the councils so created. It was reasoned that the togetherness of the communities must be preserved (Adeola, 2009). The councils had tenure of three years presided over by a paramount Chief designated President, in the area of authority of the council and where there was no paramount Chief, the position of the President was filled by rotation among the recognised chiefs in the area. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman of these councils were elected by their members. One other important feature was the inclusion of finance

committee and any other committee that may be deemed necessary. Another law was enacted in 1957 to replace the 1952 reform. The 1957 reform abolished the provincial administration. It made detailed review of past amendments and a special provision for inclusion of one and a maximum of six women in a council. In the area of finance, Income Tax Law, which allowed the Councils to collect more of their revenue themselves through rates, replaced the Direct Taxation Ordinance which depended more on a share of the tax collected. As far back as 1957, it was obvious that the experiment in Western Region had run short of expectation just like that of the Eastern Region. The political crisis in the Region between 1962 and 1965, which emanated from the split in the leadership of the Action Group, also contributed immensely to the problems of the operation of local government in the region (Agagu, 2004).

In the Northern Region, the Native Authorities Law of 1954 that could be equated with the reforms in the Eastern and Western Regions, rather than making a radical departure from the past, it only served as a consolidating means. The Emir were still in charge but had to operate through either the Chief-in –Council or Chief –and- Council. Whereas in the Chief-and Council, the traditional ruler retained his full authority; in the Chief-and-Council, the traditional (paramount) ruler must recognise the collective desire of other chiefs. These reforms continued with minor adjustment here and there until the military took over in 1966 (Adeola, 2009).

#### **2.6.4 Local Government Under Military Rule (1966-1976)**

Different types of local government administrative systems were operated in the different states of the country following the 1966 military coup and civil war. As a result of military intervention in politics, the policy direction at the local level was not that of enlarging the coast of political participation but administrative restructuring and consolidation. The military Governor took a bold step in this direction by appointing Divisional Officers as Sole

Administrators. Essentially, this policy drive returned Nigeria to era of full centralisation as the military command is unitary and pyramidal (Adeola, 2009). With the creation of 12 states in 1967 and further administrative realignment, the local councils lost virtually all competent hands to the states which are better positioned to offer good conditions of service (Adeola, 2009). The Eastern part of Nigeria was at this time the battle ground and so local administration was totally in disarray not to talk of any meaningful development or growth. In the Northern part, as far as 1950, the Northern People Congress (NPC) government headed by Sir Ahmadu Bello had desired the reform, if not complete abolition of Native Authorities. During the same period, NPC also called for abolition of House of Chief in the North and its replacement by an advisory council of Chief. So, the Mid-West and the Western part remained the theatre for local administration dramatic spectacles (Olasupo, 2001:18).

In the Western State for instance, the Sole Administrator system was adopted, and it was a system supported by force and the emergency situation of the period. It was not meant to perform any meaningful duty other than mobilizing support geared towards the war efforts. This arrangement was later replaced with one tier system of local government under a system known as the Council Manager system. This development led to Agbekoya Riots in Western State in 1968 and 1969 when they protested payment of tax without representation. A circular was issued in January 1971 by Ministry of Local Government equating local government staff with the civil servants on the basis of pay and status. This was meant to encourage qualified personnel to join the local government council.

In the Eastern States, different systems were adopted after the civil war. Essentially the philosophy of local government in war torn areas was a system of centralization that decentralised powers and functions to headquarters from the centre of state headquarter. The system was described as development administration particularly in the South-Eastern State as well as Bendel State (Agagu, 2004). The aim of Development Administration in this area

was to involve the people of the state from grassroots upward in meaningful and productive partnership with central government in matters of social and economic development which were both close and relevant to their needs and could effectively contribute to the general development and progress of the state (Olasupo, 2001a). In the East Central State, Divisional Administration was adopted. This system of local administration was designed primarily to co-ordinate the activities of state government functionaries in the field and at the local government councils in such a way as to ensure proper decentralisation of functions and active participation of local people in general development programme and management of their own affairs under supervision and guidance of the local authority.

In the Northern Region, structural and administrative changes occurred with the creation of states in 1967. The divisional administration and Native Authority system were abolished. In their place were, two-tiered pyramidal structure consisting of a local authority and subordinate district authorities. The Emir's towering image was reduced in the new dispensation (Adeola, 2009). Kano State for instance, the state was divided into eight administrative districts and each was controlled by a civil servant appointed by the military government (Olasupo, 2001a).

#### **2.6.5 The 1976 Local Government Reform and Aftermath (1976-1983).**

According to Adeyemi (2019), the major components or features of the 1976 reform were largely institutional and financial and can be summarised as follows;

- a. Creation of local government units on a uniform population of criteria of 150,000-800,000 throughout the country, and with a uniform political/administrative structure.
- b. Local governments are to be democratically elected by same electorate as done for other units of governments in the federal system.
- c. Local government responsibilities were articulated and divided into mandatory and optional.

- d. Local government revenue sources were to comprise the traditional source – rates, fees, fines etc. but also annual transfers from the federal governments and state governments. Specifically, urban local governments were to develop the property rates in several cities where they had not been developed.
- e. Senior personnel of local governments were to have similar condition of service as those of the state government. Special training programmes were mounted for senior local government management personnel in three of the nation's federal University (Ife, Nsukka and Zaria).
- f. Virtually all these provisions were incorporated into the nation's 1979 and 1989 constitutions.

The role of traditional rulers was also clearly specified in the reform guidelines. They were to serve in advisory capacity through traditional council. According to Agagu (2004), the Guidelines for Local Government Reform of 1976 highlighted some of the aims of establishing the local government system as follows:

- a. To make appropriate services and development activities responsive to local wishes and initiatives by devolving or delegating them to local representative bodies.
- b. To facilitate the exercise of democratic self-government close to the local levels of our society and to encourage initiative and leadership potential
- c. To mobilise human and material resources through the involvement of the public in their local development
- d. To provide a two-way channel of communication between local communities and government.

The 1976 comprehensive reform were given practical application in December 1976, nine of the nineteen states (Bendel, Imo, Benue, Rivers, Kwara, Lagos, Ogun, Ondo and Oyo States) conducted direct election into the councils. Though, the council elections were marred with

low turnout, it was generally agreed that it was a good beginning. The absence of partisan politicking was also addressed as part of the problems (Adeola, 2009). For the first time in the history of Nigeria, the constitution recognizes local government as the third tier of government. For instance, section 7 (1) stated that: “The system of local government by democratically elected local government councils is under this constitution guarantee, the Government of every state shall ensure their existence under a law which provides for the establishments, structure, composition, finance and functions of such councils (FGN, 1979:13).”

Local government under the Second Republic witnessed over bearing influence of state governments on their operations and activities. For political reasons, some state governments had to create new local government councils which were neither effective nor efficient in the area of service delivery and provision (Adeyemi, 2019).

#### **2.6.6 Local Government in the Aftermath of Second Republic (1983-1999)**

Given the shortcomings that local government administration witness during the Second Republic and with the military rule of Buhari’s administration, the existing Local Government Management Committees were dissolved in January 1984. The Federal Military Government appointed Sole Administrators made up of senior civil servants to administer the erstwhile 301 local government councils created by the 1976 Reforms (Adeyemi, 2019). Buhari and Idiagbon administration set up a 21-Man Committee headed by Alhaji Ibrahim Dasuki. The objective was to depoliticise local government activities, make it efficient as the third tier of government. The term of reference given to the Committee includes:

- a. Evolve the most suitable mode of managing the local governments within the context of the present Military Administration
- b. Re-examine the existing structures, functions and financial resources available to local governments for the performance of those function

- c. Look into the accounting/management (staff) problems of Local Governments, including the standardisation of the various departments of the councils.
- d. Evolve proper place of traditional authorities in Local Governments.
- e. Propose how best to manage intergovernmental relations between Federal, State and Local Governments and also, between Local Governments and Ministry for Local Governments, Local Service Boards/Commissions etc;
- f. Work out manpower development schemes for all cadres of Local Government staff relevant for improvement of local government administration in the country
- g. Deliberate and recommend on other matters the Committee considers relevant for the improvement of Local Government Administration in the country (Awotokun, 2001:45)

The Committee submitted its report in September 1984, but the report was not made public before the Buhari's regime was overthrown in August 1985 through a military coup. The Babaginda's Administration who succeeded Buhari/Idiagbon's regime however published its white paper on the Report in 1986. The military government accepted the recommendation that the structure of local government introduced in 1976 should be retained. It endorsed the pruning of local councils to the 1976 figure and proposes that a Management Committee should be set up to run the councils. The subordination of the local governments to the States was completed with the introduction of Sole- Administrators, who became agents of the State governments and the gain of 1976 reform was lost. The recommendations also led to the scrapping of the state ministries of local council in 1988 and the policy of direct disbursement of statutory allocations was introduced (Adeyemi, 2019).

Additional 149 councils were created in 1989 and new allocation formula gave 15 per cent to the councils. Primary Health care programme was transferred to the local council in 1990. Primary school administration followed in 1991. There was separation of power and

appointment of political secretaries. The revenue allocation formula was raised to 20 per cent. Later the councils were increased to 774, with administration and financial autonomy granted. Gains in Council reforms appeared harmed by the 1999 Constitution, which introduced ambiguity and contradictions in the control and running of the local councils. For example, Section 7 (I) States: "The system of Local Government by democratically elected local councils is under this constitution guaranteed; and accordingly, the government of every state shall subject to Section 8 of this constitution, ensure their existence under a law which provide for the establishment structure, composition, finance and functions of such councils." Section 7 (6a) provide that "the National Assembly shall make provisions for statutory allocation of public revenue to local councils in the federation." And Section 7(6b) compounds the confusion by stating that "House of Assembly of a State shall make provisions for statutory allocation of public revenue to local councils, within the state." In addition, Section 8 (5 and 6) empowers the National Assembly to legislate on new councils before they can become legal. With the state government, state House of Assembly and the National Assembly all having roles to play in the affairs of the local council, it is not a surprise that confusion, intrigues and non-performance has been the lot of governance at the grassroots levels, hence the need for reforms (Adeyemi 2019).

#### **2.6.7 Other Local Government Review (Til Date)**

In 2004, Local government review took place under the chairmanship of the Late Etsu Nupe, Alhaji Umaru Sanda Ndayako and later replaced by Alhaji Liman Ciroma. The Federal Government issued a white paper on the report and the National Council of States endorsed the report. The contents of the report were:

- a. It retained the existing 774 local government councils
- b. All local government council must submit their annual budgets to their State Houses of Assembly for approval

- c. Ensure that whatever is due to local governments is made available to them, including 10 per cent of the monthly generated revenue or whatever portion of money that comes from the federal to the States that is meant for the local government
- d. That local government should fund their various services and Agencies, including paying salaries of paramount Traditional Rulers and primary school teachers.
- e. Administration of local government is purely the responsibility of State House of Assembly, which will make appropriate legislation and Establishment of inspectorate department to enforce compliance with the local government budget as approved by the planning and legal units in the local government councils.

In 2005, another provision was enacted into law by the National Assembly which empowers Local Government Allocation to be paid directly to them, instead of the previous arrangement of having State-Local Government Joint Account (GJA). President Buhari recently reverted to this format too after the 2019 General Elections. Statutory allocation meant for local government was increased to 23 per cent. The idea of paying the statutory allocation direct to local government is to forestall the possibility of State Governments manipulation of the joint account to their favour.

This latest provision has received criticism from the Conference of Assembly of Speakers, who looked at such provision as unconstitutional and encouraging corruptions in Local Government Administration. Though, the Assembly of Speakers criticize this provision, majority of Nigerians welcome this development, in view of clever manipulations of State Governments to State-Local Government Joint Accounts. It was believed that the reform would enable the Local Government Councils fulfill their primary functions of grass-root development.

Another important innovation arising from the reform was the policy decision to provide training at all levels for all categories of local government officials. Before then, local

government positions were filled by unskilled functionaries, most of them with a maximum of primary or secondary school education. The reform initiated training programmes for senior local government officials in three centers- the Universities of Ife, Zaria and Nsukka. These reforms led to a considerable change of Nigerian administrative and political institutions. It has become a primary level of grassroots democracy and distribution of socio-economic programmes in Nigeria (Adeyemi, 2019).

The 8<sup>th</sup> National Assembly had during the amendment on the 1999 constitution, passed similar bills to empower local governments and the judiciary, but could not scale through. In 2020, President Buhari signed into law, an Executive Order number 10 to grant financial autonomy to the legislatures, judiciary across the 36 states of the federation. The order also mandated the Accountant-General of the federation to deduct from source amount due to state legislatures and judiciaries from the monthly allocation to each state that refuse to grant such autonomy. However, in a split decision of six justices to one, the Supreme Court nullified the Executive Order 10 initiated by Buhari to grant financial autonomy to the state judiciary and legislature. The Supreme Court agrees with state governors by declaring Executive order 10 unconstitutional, illegal, null, void and of no effect whatsoever. In 2023, the Nigerian states rejected the proposed financial and legislative autonomy for local government.

## **2.7 Structures of Local Government**

Nigeria operates presidential system of government since 1979. The local government administration as the third-tier of government in Nigeria has its powers divided into two (2) arms of government. There is plurality of administrative structure. They include the executive arm and legislative arm (Adeyemi, 2019).

### **Administrative Structure of The Executive Arm**

The Executive arm of local government administration comprises the chairman, vice-chairman, supervisors, the secretary and other principal officers of the local government. The office of the secretary to the local government is now political. The staff of the local government (career civil servants) constitutes the administrative unit which is under the supervision of the executive arm of government. They comprise of the “Head of Personnel Management, Heads of department of works, education, agriculture, health, finance and supplies” The Heads of departments are subjected to annual performance evaluation based on concrete achievement. Each Head of department will be evaluated by the Secretary to local government in consultation with the chairman. The secretary will in turn be evaluated by the chairman of the relevant local government.

### **Administrative Structure of The Legislature Arm**

The Legislative arm of local government consists of elected councilors representing various wards in the local government. The Council is the legislative arm and consists of the Leader, the Deputy Leader and Councilors. The Council is conferred with the power to make bye - laws. To become effective, such bye-laws must be assented to by the Chairman of the Local Government Council. The Chairman may, however, withhold his assent in exercise of his power of veto. This could be over-ridden by two-third (2/3) majority of members if the Chairman refuses to assent to bye-law duly passed by the Council.

### **2.8 Functions of Local Government**

According to Eneanya cited in Adeyemi (2019), The functions of local governments in Nigeria as a third-tier of government is clearly recognized in the Fourth Schedule of 1979, 1989 and 1999 constitution, Section 7(1) and these include;

- i. Collection of rates (including tenement rates) radio, television and non-mechanically propelled vehicle licenses (bicycles and trucks).

- ii. Establishment and maintenance of cemeteries, burial grounds, homes for destitute and infirm, market, motor-parks, public conveniences, roads, drawn and recreation facilities (including play-grounds and parks).
- iii. Construction and maintenance of roads, streets lighting, drains and other public highways, parks, gardens, open spaces or such facilities as may be prescribed from time to time by the State House of Assembly.
- iv. Assessment of privately owned house or tenements for the purpose of levying such rates as may be prescribed by the house of Assembly of State; v. Naming of roads and streets and numbering of houses;
- v. Licensing, regulation and control of the sale of liquor.
- vi. Control and regulation of outdoor advertising and hoardings, pots, shops, kiosks, restaurants and laundries.
- vii. Registration of all births, deaths and marriages.

Other Local Governments function include;

- i. State economic planning and development;
- ii. Provision and maintenance of primary education services, adult and vocational education;
- iii. Development of agriculture and natural resources (other than the exploitation of minerals)
- iv. Provision and maintenance of health services.
- v. Other functions as may be conferred on a local government council by the House of Assembly of the State.

The functions of local government are numerous. The Fourth Schedule of the 1999 Constitution made elaborate provisions on the functions of local government. These functions cut across all states of the federation. However, the environment of every local

government council will to a large extent determine the nature and volume of the functions of the local government. For instance, the functions of urban local governments will significantly differ from that of rural local government in respect of the degree of involvement and nature of the roles to be performed. Despite this, all local governments throughout the federation shall perform the above functions (Adeyemi, 2019).

## **2.9 Major Problems Facing Local Government in Nigeria**

**Lack of Funds (Financial Constraints):** For local government to effectively provide essential services at the grassroots, enabling environment most especially funds must be available to carry out its assigned responsibilities. In Nigeria, aside from other common problems, non-provision of enough funds to local government has hindered effective performance by the local council (Ibok, 2014). Ibok (2014) pointed out that: Aside from the fact that statutory allocations and grants from the federal and state governments to councils are inadequate, the problem is exacerbated by the low revenue generation capacity of the council. Associated with this problem is also exacerbated by frequent sundry deductions by the federal and state governments from their monthly allocations. Worst still is failure of most state governments to fulfill their monthly statutory obligations to local government by outright refusal to remit 10% internally generated revenue accrued to the state monthly. These financial constraints account for the inadequacy of fund in the local government administration in Nigeria and they inhibit the efforts of local council to provide better, efficient and effective social services to the grassroots.

**Corruption:** The inability of local governments to provide services to the people at the grassroots has been linked to high levels of corruption among local governments' officials (Agba, Akwara, & Idu, 2013). Corruption has eaten deep into the fabric of Nigeria local councils and it is the greatest bane of local government administration in Nigeria. Bolatito & Ibrahim (2014) pointed out that: At the grassroots level, corruption has been canonically

accommodated, entertained, and celebrated within the system. In the local government setting corruption is Misnomer labeled and euphemistically referred to as “Egunje” (a slogan which means “illegal offer” in Nigeria) and a major hindrance to good government.

There have been glaring cases of embezzlement and misappropriation of the councils’ funds by the official of the council (Ibok, 2014). For instance, in February 2010, the chairman of Ijebu East Local Government Council in Ogun State was suspended from office on account of various financial misdeeds. Similarly, in April 2010, the House of Assembly in Benue State suspended 12 council chairmen in the state and directed that the chairmen should refund a total of 150 million naira being financial misdeeds associated with the excess crude funds received by local governments in the state (National Mail cited in Agba, Akwara, & Idu, 2013). Unarguably, Chukwuemeka et al., (2014) stressed that the high level of corruption in the local government makes it difficult for them to channel even the available scarce resources towards development projects and programs.

**Undue Political Interference (Lack of Autonomy):** According to Eboh & Diejomaoh (2010) there is high degree of external influence and interference in local government affairs by the higher levels of government, particularly the state governments. The governors are found of taking over their financial allocation, taxes, counterpart funding and refuse to conduct Local Government elections, but instead ruling local governments with appointed administrators, most of whom are party loyalist and their friends and relations turning the entire process of local governments into irrelevance schemes of things (Ukonga 2012). As soon as a new governor comes into office, one of the first actions is to dissolve the existing local councils, whether elected or care taker (Abutudu, 2011). The outright denial of democratically elected local councils through caretaker committees demonstrates the increasing authoritarian holds of the councils by state governors. As such most state governors never bothered of conducting local government elections. This is central to the whole problem because it is by

planting stooges called caretaker committee, who neither have the mandate of the people nor the moral strength to resist the excruciating control of the state government that perpetuates the rot. This undue interference has incapacitated local government from effective functioning on one hand, and alienated grassroots people from enjoying social service delivery expected of local governments in Nigeria (Agba, Akwara, & Idu, 2013). Consequently, local governments now function mostly as extension or appendages of state governments (Eboh & Diejomaoh, 2010; Ajibulu, 2012).

## **2.10 Prospect of Local Government Efficient and Effective Service Delivery**

**Constitutional Reforms to Ensure Total Autonomy:** Reforms are needed to increase the fiscal and spending autonomy of local governments and minimise the interference and control of state governments (Eboh & Diejomaoh, 2010). The undue interference of the state governors should be eliminated to allow the council heads to govern and manage their natural resources using appropriate planning standards; opportunity to design appropriate policies, programmes and project suited to peculiar areas; preservation of cultural heritage of communities; and effectively delivery of democratic dividends to the grassroots (Amaechi, 2012; Adeyemi, 2013). There is therefore need for constitutional reforms to provide unique guarantees for the autonomy and powers of the local government. To ensure responsive governance, local government executive must be elected by the people and not superimposed by the ruling party or state governor. Elections at specific intervals should be conducted into the local government council and with outright prohibition of any other alternative arrangement to administer the local governments (Ibok, 2014; Chukwuemeka et al., 2014).

**Curtailling Corrupt Practice:** To stem corruption and embezzlement, all financial transaction of the council must be audited and publicized. There should be monitoring and evaluation unit aim at measuring efficiency and effectiveness (Ibok, 2014). To ensure accountability and transparency in local government administration, the civil society organizations should also monitor the performance of local government officials and report any found wanting to anti-corruption agent. The anti-corrupt agencies like the Independent Corrupt Practices Commission (ICPC) and the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFFCC) should intensify their efforts at tackling the problem of pervasive corruption in the local government system. Government could further assist in this direction by introducing more effective anti-corruption clauses and fraud detecting mechanisms as well as ensuring the conduct of free and fair elections through which people could only get into power on the basis of their perceived honesty and ability to deliver democracy dividends to the rural and grassroots people (Chukwuemeka *et al.*, 2014).

**Adequate Financial Allocation:** Lower levels of government must have legal authority to raising needy revenue to support its expenditure requirements. Thus, the fiscal relationship between the center and lower levels of government must be clearly worked out on the basis of equality, fairness and justice (Ekpo, 2008). Local governments should have direct and unfettered access to the statutory allocations from the Federation account and their share of the internally generated revenue. State government should be compelled to relinquish their 10% internally generated revenue to the local council to avoid their overdependence on statutory allocation. Thus, the provision for the State Local Government Joint Account should be expunged from the constitution and also the statutory allocation from the federation account should be increased from the present 20 to 30 percent (Abutudu, 2011; Chukwuemeka *et al.*, 2014; Ibok, 2014). The internal revenue base can also be enhanced, if

rural inhabitants are properly educated on their civic responsibilities to support their local governments financially, by paying their taxes and rate promptly (Adeyemi, 2013).

**Capacity Building (Institutional and Human Resources):** There should be capacity building for local councils to take advantage of modern tools of local governance that are being developed world wide. This must combine the political and administrative cadre of the councils (Abutudu, 2011). Building institutional and system capacity that produces the human capital that is committed to the principles of good governance briefly summarized as transparency, accountability, honesty, foresightedness, equity, justice, prudent management of public funds, strong leadership inspired by vision and direction that is beneficial to the masses (Agba, Akwara, & Idu, 2013). According to Eboh & Diejomaoh (2010) the capacity building programme should be two-dimensional. The first is institutional strengthening – with respect to the various organs, departments, units and relationships and operational matters. This should involve training and orientation in policy development, monitoring and evaluation, public participation, public service delivery, social mobilization and government collaboration with the private sector. The other dimension is human resources upgrading – including training and education of staff to enhance their knowledge, skills and competencies.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **3.0 METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Study Area and Scope**

The research was conducted in Delta-Central Senatorial District, Delta state, Nigeria. Delta state is geographically located in Nigeria's mid-west region; bounded by Edo state to the north, Anambra to the south-east, Bayelsa state to the south, the Bight of Benin of the Atlantic ocean to the west and Ondo state to the north-west. The state has a land mass which covers an area of 17,698 square kilometer and a population of about 5,663,400 (2006 census) is inhabited by the Igbo people in the east, the Edos in the North and the Itsekiri, Urhobo, Isoko and Ijaw in the south and west. Agriculture is the main stay of the state economy; yams, cassava, oil palm produce, rice and maize are grown for local consumption. Delta state is also the major exporter of petroleum (crude oil), palm oil and palm kernel (Britannica, 2023).

The scope of this study is to examine the role of local government administration in rural agriculture and health development in Delta central senatorial district.

### **3.2 Sampling Technique and Sampling Size**

A multi-stage sampling techniques was adopted in the selection of respondents for the study. The first stage was the purposeful sampling of Okpe and Sapele local government areas from the existing eight (8) local government areas in Delta-Central senatorial district. Both Okpe and Sapele local government area comprises of about twenty-five (25) villages/towns each respectively.

The second stage involved proportional sampling in the selection of ten (10) villages from Okpe and ten (10) villages from Sapele local government areas respectively making a total of 20 villages.

The third stage involved the use of simple random sampling technique in the selection of four (4) farmers from each of the selected villages, making a total sample size of eighty (80) farmers/respondents.

### **3.4 Data Collection**

Primary data was collected for this study. The primary data was collected using a structured questionnaire of eighty (80) copies which were personally administered through field survey and interview. The questionnaire was designed in a simple language using close-ended and open-ended questions.

### **3.5 Measurement of Variables**

The independent variables were measured as shown below;

- a. Number of time lived in the town/village was measured in years
- b. Age was measured in years
- c. Gender was measured as male and female
- d. Marital status was measured as single, married, separated, divorced and widowed
- e. Household size was measured by number of persons eating from same pot of food

- f. Family size was measured by the actual number of family members related by blood
- g. Level of educational was measured on the basis of formal education, primary school, secondary school, OND/NCE, HND/BSC and post graduate
- h. Estimated average annual income for the main occupation was measured in Naira
- i. Estimated average annual income for other occupation was measured in Naira

The dependent variable was measured using Likert scale.

### 3.6 Data Analysis

Analysis of data collected was done using descriptive and inferential statistics such as; frequency distribution, tables, mean, and percentages among others. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) was used to test the hypothesis as shown below;

$$r = \frac{n\sum xy - \sum x \sum y}{\sqrt{n\sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2} \sqrt{n\sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2}}$$

Where;

r = Coefficient

n = Number of observation

x = Quantitative value of the first set of observation

y = Quantitative value of the second set of observation

## **4.0**

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **4.1 Socio-economic Characteristics**

#### **4.1.1 Sex**

Result in Table 1 showed that majority (73.7%) of the respondents sampled were female while 26.3% were male. The result indicates female dominance in rural agriculture activities in the study areas. This is in line with the findings of Ogunlela & Mukhtar (2009) who noted that rural women in Nigeria takes the lead in agricultural development of the country making about 60-80% of the Nigerian labour force, yet their contribution is hardly notice and therefore are rarely involved in decision making in agricultural issues or rural development. This view is also supported by a study financed by the United Nation Development Programme (UNDP), which reveal that women make up 60-80% of agricultural labour in Nigeria. The role that women play and their position in meeting the challenges of agricultural production and development are quite dominant and prominent.

#### **4.1.2 Age**

As shown in Table1, the mean age of the sampled respondents was 53 years. However, most (63.7%) of the respondents were found to be above 51 years, 23.7% of the respondents were found within the age bracket of 41-50 years, 11.3% were found within the age bracket of 31-40 years and 1.3% were less than 30 years respectively. This result shows that the sampled respondents consist of an aging labour force and that fewer young people are engaged in rural agriculture. Global age watch (2014), reported that a large majority (73%) of older people reported agriculture as a source of income in sub-Saharan Africa. An analysis of dataset including United Nation Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), Population Division data, National Agricultural Censuses and Labour Force Surveys (LFS) (2014) shows a universal trend across regions, from sub-Saharan Africa and Asia to Latin America and the

Caribbean: there is an increase in the proportion of older people living in rural areas and a decline in the proportion of younger people.

#### **4.1.3 Marital status**

Result shown in Table 1 showed that a majority (93.7%) of the sampled respondents were married while a small fraction (6.3%) were single (unmarried). Muhammad et al. (2019) also reported that majority (90%) of farmers were married while others were single or divorced (unmarried). This simply implies that majority (93.7%) of the respondents are adult and have mature orientation of life as no adult will be considered responsible if unmarried and perhaps, could be an indication that marriage is held in high esteem. This is in line with the findings of Yekini and Ajayi (2011) who posited that marriage is as a serious institution particularly in rural areas and that no adult is considered responsible without it. This view is also supported by Omotosho et al. (2018) when he reported that majority (55.2%) of the respondents were married indicating that the respondents are adults and people who have mature orientation of life

#### **4.1.4 Household size**

Result shown in Table 1 showed that 7.5% of the sampled respondents had a household size that is less than three (3), 41.2% had 4-5 household size and 51.3% had above six (6) household. The average household size for the sampled respondent is five (5). The findings showed that rural families had a relatively large household size which may be an indication that household size may likely enhance the family labour supply in the farm, hence supplying favourably the production capacities of the farmers. This supports the findings of Orebiyi et al. (2012) that an increase in household size will make the farmer meet the additional financial commitment. In addition, larger household size may be beneficial as family labour may be maximized.

#### **4.1.5 Family size**

Table 1 showed that 20% of the sampled respondents had a family size of five (5), 57.7% had a family size of six to seven (6-7) and 18% had a family size above eight (8). The average family size of the sampled respondent was about seven (7). This result supports the findings of Ojo et al. (2010) and Muhammad et al. (2019) who reported that in an agrarian settlement, a relatively large household size permit free and cheap labour.

#### **4.1.6 Education**

Based on the result shown in Table 1, 38.8% of the sampled respondents had no formal education, 26.2% had primary education, 8.7% had secondary education, 11.3% had OND/NCE degrees and 15.0% had HND/BSC degrees. None of the sampled respondent had post graduate education status. The data showed that a considerable number (38.8%) of the respondents had no formal education, however a large number (61.2%) of the respondents had at least primary education which suggest that most of the sampled respondent can read and write. This might be a good sign of development as education plays a very crucial role in adopting and utilization of new/improved technologies, utilization of information communication technology (ICT) and improved agricultural production among others. Sirisha et al. (2016) opined that illiterate farmers are unable to compete with the present changing environment which leads to low productivity due to lack of awareness and knowledge on modern agricultural farming.

#### **4.1.7 Occupation**

From the result shown in Table 1, 70.0% and 27.5% of the sampled respondents had main occupation and other occupation as farming, 18.7% and 10.0% had main occupation and other occupation as traders, 1.2% had main occupation and other occupation as hair dressing, and 1.3% had main occupation as a civil servant, 5.0% had main occupation as driver, 2.5%

had main occupation as engineer, and 2.5% had main occupation as teachers. However, 61.2% of the respondents indicated they had no other occupation other than the indicted main occupation. The analysed occupation result reiterates the obvious fact that the agricultural sector remains the main employer of labour in rural areas in Nigeria. This finding is supported by Ndidi (2011) who reported that agriculture employs 60% of Nigerians including rural women and contributes 35% of the economy. FAO (2021) also reported that over 70% of Nigerians engage in the agricultural sector mainly at the subsistence level which contribute about 22.35% of the total GDP.

#### **4.1.7 Average annual income**

Result shown in Table 1 showed that 45.5% and 58.7% of the sampled respondents had average annual income below ₦601,000 from main occupation and other occupation respectively, 43.7% and 32.5% had average annual income of ₦601,000 - ₦800,000 from their main occupation and other occupation respectively, and 6.3% and 8.7% had average annual income of ₦801,000 - ₦900,000 from their main occupation and other occupation respectively. None of the respondent had annual income of a million naira and above. Furthermore, the mean annual income is shown to be ₦ 669871.80 for main occupation.

**Table 1: Socio-economic characteristics**

|   | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>%</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Std. Deviation</b> |
|---|------------------|----------|-------------|-----------------------|
| <b>Duration of stay in town/village</b> |                  |          |             |                       |
| 1.00 - 10.00                            | 9                | 11.3     |             |                       |
| 11.00 - 20.00                           | 44               | 55.0     | 20.82       | 7.62                  |
| 21.00 - 30.00                           | 20               | 25.0     |             |                       |
| 31.00+                                  | 7                | 8.7      |             |                       |
| <b>Age in years</b>                     |                  |          |             |                       |
| 25.00 - 30.00                           | 1                | 1.3      |             |                       |
| 31.00 - 40.00                           | 9                | 11.3     |             |                       |
| 41.00 - 50.00                           | 19               | 23.7     | 53.19       | 9.59                  |
| 51.00 – 70.00                           | 51               | 63.7     |             |                       |
| <b>Sex</b>                              |                  |          |             |                       |
| Male                                    | 21               | 26.3     |             |                       |
| Female                                  | 59               | 73.7     |             |                       |
| <b>Marital Status</b>                   |                  |          |             |                       |
| Single                                  | 5                | 6.3      |             |                       |
| Married                                 | 75               | 93.7     |             |                       |
| <b>Household size</b>                   |                  |          |             |                       |
| 1.00 - 3.00                             | 6                | 7.5      |             |                       |
| 4.00 - 5.00                             | 33               | 41.2     | 5.21        | 1.31                  |
| 6.00 – 9.00                             | 41               | 51.3     |             |                       |
| <b>Family size</b>                      |                  |          |             |                       |
| 4.00 -5.00                              | 16               | 20.0     |             |                       |
| 6.00 - 7.00                             | 46               | 57.5     | 6.46        | 1.32                  |

---

|   |    |      |
|---|----|------|
| 8.00 - 9.00   | 18 | 22.5 |
| <b>Level of educational</b>                           |    |      |
| No formal education                                   | 31 | 38.8 |
| Primary school  | 21 | 26.2 |
| Secondary school                                      | 7  | 8.7  |
| OND/NCE   | 9  | 11.3 |
| HND/BSC   | 12 | 15.0 |
| Post graduate   |    |      |
| <b>Main occupation</b>                                |    |      |
| Civil Servant   | 1  | 1.2  |
| Driver  | 4  | 5.0  |
| Engineer  | 2  | 2.5  |
| Farming   | 56 | 70.0 |
| Hair dressing   | 1  | 1.2  |
| Teacher   | 2  | 2.5  |
| Trader  | 15 | 18.7 |
| <b>Other occupation</b>                               |    |      |
| No Response   | 49 | 61.2 |
| Farming   | 22 | 27.5 |
| Hair dressing   | 1  | 1.2  |
| Trader  | 8  | 10.0 |
| <b>Average annual income from<br/>main occupation</b> |    |      |
| Below N600, 000                                       | 38 | 47.5 |

---

|                                     |    |      |         |            |
|-------------------------------------|----|------|---------|------------|
| ₦60, 001 to ₦800,000                | 35 | 43.7 |         |            |
| ₦800, 001 to ₦900, 000              | 5  |      | 669871. |            |
|                                     |    | 6.3  | 80      | 210,551.57 |
| ₦900,001 to ₦1,000,000              | 2  | 2.5  |         |            |
| Above ₦1,000, 000                   |    |      |         |            |
| <b>Estimate average annual</b>      |    |      |         |            |
| <b>income from other occupation</b> |    |      |         |            |
| Below ₦600, 000                     | 47 | 58.7 |         |            |
| ₦601, 000 to ₦800,000               | 26 | 32.5 |         |            |
| ₦801, 000 to ₦900, 000              | 7  |      | 629687. |            |
|                                     |    | 8.7  | 5       | 167371.09  |
| ₦901,000 to ₦1,000,000              | -  | -    |         |            |
| Above ₦1,000, 000                   | -  | -    |         |            |

---

Source: Field Survey Data, 2024

## **4.2 Local government administration on rural agriculture and health development**

### **4.2.1 Local government administration on rural health development**

Result in Table 2 showed that 64.1% of the sampled respondents indicated that construction of healthcare facilities were put in place, 61.4% indicated local government addressed health worker's shortage, 60.3% indicated local government improved healthcare accessibility, 57.7% indicated the supply of vaccines and medicine by local government, 37.2% indicated that the local government has provided new or improved equipment in the health sector, 17.9% indicated provision of assistance to health victim by local government. 16.7% indicated that renovation of healthcare building was put in place. The overall indication of the above result confirms local government efforts towards rural health development.

**Table 2: Local governments administration on health development**

| <b>Health Efforts</b>                     | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>%</b> |
|---|------------------|----------|
| Construction of healthcare facilities     | 50               | 64.1     |
| Renovation of healthcare building         | 13               | 16.7     |
| Provision of new/improved equipment       | 29               | 37.2     |
| Supply of vaccines and medicines          | 45               | 57.7     |
| Address healthcare worker's shortage      | 48               | 61.5     |
| Improved healthcare accessibility         | 47               | 60.3     |
| Provision of assistance to health victims | 14               | 17.9     |

Source: Field Survey, 2024.

#### **4.2.2 Local government administration on rural agriculture development**

Result in Table 3 showed that 8.6% indicated establishment of agricultural programmes, 4.7% indicated provision of improved planting materials by local government administration and 0.7% of the sampled respondents indicated provision of financial assistance by local government. Likewise, 37.5%, 35.2% and 13.3 of the sampled respondents indicated the provision of road, electricity and water supply respectively. Furthermore, from interview session of respondents during field work shows that most of the available source of water (such as well and tap) were done by individuals. The few source of water supply made by local government were damaged due to lack of maintenance. Regarding electricity, some of the transformers were damage without no hope of repair and those not damaged barely receives power for transmission.

The findings of this research is supported by Sakpere (2021), who reported that the provision of agricultural extension services by local government administration to farmers in rural areas is negative and statistically not significant ( $\beta = -.062$ ,  $t = -1.500$ ,  $p > .05$ ). This also validates the findings of Ijere (1992) who asserted that the rural areas in Nigeria which produces 95 percent of the food crops in the country is plagued with poverty, underdevelopment, poor standard of living and lack of basic agricultural facilities and other farm inputs like fertilizer for enhanced rural agricultural activities for promotion of rural industrialization. Zakariya (2014), also reported that rural electricity efforts by local government is very low which signifies that there is no rural electrification while Osanyinlusi *et al.* (2017) concluded that rural areas in Nigeria have been experiencing severe neglect and inadequate rural electrification infrastructural development.

**Table 3: Local governments administration on rural agricultural development**

| Agricultural programme                   | Frequency | %    |
|--|-----------|------|
| Provision of financial assistance        | 1         | 0.7  |
| Establishment of agricultural programmes | 11        | 8.6  |
| Provision of extension services          | 0         | 0    |
| Provision of agricultural education:     | 0         | 0    |
| Provision of farm inputs:                | 0         | 0    |
| Improved planting materials              | 6         | 4.7  |
| Fertilizers                              | 0         | 0    |
| Chemicals                                | 0         | 0    |
| Animal feeds                             | 0         | 0    |
| Electricity                              | 45        | 35.2 |
| Road                                     | 48        | 37.5 |
| Water supply                             | 17        | 13.3 |

Source: Field Survey Data, 2024.

### **4.3 Satisfaction of respondents with local government administration on rural agriculture and health development programmes**

#### **4.3.1 Satisfaction of respondents with local government administration on rural health development programmes**

Result in Table 4 showed that the sampled respondents' were satisfied with addressed healthcare worker's shortage (Mean = 4.29), supply of vaccines and medicines (Mean = 4.14), improved healthcare accessibility (Mean = 4.11), the construction of healthcare facilities (Mean = 4.0), renovation of healthcare buildings (Mean = 3.46), provision of new and improved equipment (Mean = 3.25), and provision of assistance to health victims (Mean = 3.0). All the health development programmes put in place by the local government had a benchmark of/above the mean benchmark (3.0).

This is in line with the findings of Odunsanya (2017) who reported that 73% of sampled respondents preferred government owned health facilities while 78% were satisfied with the quality of healthcare received in Ogun state. This is also supported by Oluwadare (2012) who reported that majority (76%) of respondents were satisfied with the general healthcare development, however, waiting time is a major source of dissatisfaction.

**Table 4: Respondents satisfaction on rural health projects/programme**

| <b>Healthcare development programmes</b> | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Std. Deviation</b> |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|
| Construction of healthcare facilities    | 3.73*       | 0.84                  |
| Renovation of healthcare building        | 3.46*       | 0.51                  |
| Provision of new/improved equipment      | 3.24*       | 0.49                  |
| Supply of vaccines and medicines         | 4.12*       | 0.68                  |
| Address healthcare worker's shortage     | 4.15*       | 0.76                  |
| Improved healthcare accessibility        | 3.98*       | 0.77                  |

Source: Field Survey Data, 2024

\*Mean  $\geq$  3.0 = Satisfied

#### **4.3.2 Satisfaction of respondents with local government administration on rural agriculture development programmes**

Result in Table 5 showed that the sampled respondents were not satisfied with the provision of road (Mean = 2.81) and provision of water supply (Mean = 2.18), provision of extension services (Mean = 2.07), provision of electricity (Mean = 1.96) electricity, provision of agricultural education (Mean = 1.41), and agricultural programmes (Mean = 1.0). The above agriculture programmes put in place by the local government were adjudged unsatisfactory as these programmes fails to meet the benchmark (Mean = 3.0).

In support of the above findings, Sakpere (2021) reported that local government administration involvement in rural electrification is statistically not significant ( $\beta=.049$ ,  $t=.638$ ,  $p>.05$ ). The result also supported the views of Aklilu (2004) who acknowledged that rural electrification has occupied the development agenda towards enhancing the welfare of rural dwellers, nevertheless, majority of the rural populace are still in darkness due to lack of electricity. The work of Idachaba (2006) advocated that provision of rural infrastructure such as electricity is one of the main methods and means of improving the standard of living and accelerating rural development. Zakariya (2014) also noted that majority (74%), of respondents were not satisfied with the state of rural roads in Zoba and Zaria rural communities. This is in line with the findings of Sakpere (2021), who reported that the effect of local government administration on provision of earth and tarred roads is statistically not significant in the Nigerian rural areas ( $\beta=.015$ ,  $t=.250$ ,  $p>.05$ ). He also noted that visitation, observation and interviews with residents of Guni village (Munya LGA in Niger State), Yanturaku village (Batsari LGA in Katsina State), Boole village (Odo-Otin LGA in Osun State) and Etekwuru village (Ohafia/Egbema LGA in Imo State) shows bad roads due to water logged earth/untarred road with gullies due to erosion and floods. This has limited means of transportation of the rural dwellers to foot paths, bicycle and motorcycles to convey their farm produce from their farms to the market.

**Table 5: Respondents' satisfaction of rural agricultural programmes**

| <b>Satisfaction</b>                      | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Std. Deviation</b> |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|
| Agricultural programme                   | 1.00        |                       |
| Provision of financial assistance        | 0           | 0                     |
| Establishment of agricultural programmes | 0           | 0                     |
| Provision of extension services          | 2.07        | 0.46                  |
| Provision of agricultural education:     | 1.41        | 0.63                  |
| Provision of farm inputs:                | 0           | 0                     |
| Improved planting materials              | 0           | 0                     |
| Fertilizers                              | 0           | 0                     |
| Chemicals                                | 0           | 0                     |
| Animal feeds                             | 0           | 0                     |
| Electricity                              | 1.96        | 0.43                  |
| Road                                     | 2.81        | 0.78                  |
| Water supply                             | 2.18        | 0.60                  |

Source: Field Survey Data, 2024.

\*Mean  $\geq$  3.0 = Satisfied

#### **4.4 Constraints to local government administration on rural agriculture and health developments**

Table 6 shows that four (4) of the identified constraints were found to be very serious—corruption (Mean = 4.87), insufficient financial allocation (Mean = 4.13), ineffective management (Mean = 3.96) and tribalism/nepotism/favouritism (Mean = 3.93). The above constraints were adjudged to be very serious as they surpass the bench mark (Mean = 3.0) out of the eleven (11) identified constraints. Seven (7) of the eleven (11) constraints have a mean score below the bench mark and are thus considered relatively unserious.

In support of the above findings, Zakariya (2014) reported that, inadequate funding has been the bane of rural development and that revenue has not been proficiently managed as this exist in reasonable proportion. Sakpere (2021) revealed that local government councils are inadequately funded. This implies that inadequately funding of local government councils significantly affect rural development. This result was reiterated during interviews by the Directors of Finance of local governments in Osun, Imo, Plateau, Cross River, Katsina and Kebbi states, who admitted that funds released by state governments to their respective local governments fell short of the actual funds released from the federation account. This also validates the findings of Ammani (2012) who recounted how state governments diverted revenue meant for local governments from federal allocations to the state-joint local governments account. The also supports the findings of Doho *et al.* (2018) who inferred that the joint state-local government account provides state governors privilege to allot local governments whatever amount they chose to thereby denying them what is due to them.

Findings from Sakpere (2021) also showed that corruption by public officials and other stakeholders through mismanagement, embezzlement and misappropriation of local government funds is positive and statistically significant. He also noted that lack of accountability and transparency in local government administration is positive and

statistically significant, suggesting that the local government councils have not operated a transparent and accountable system. This is in consonance with the findings of Ibok (2014) and Adedire (2014) who stated that a major obstacle to rural development is the menace of corruption due to lack of integrity, accountability and transparency among local government officials who are entrusted with the responsibility to execute development projects and programmes in the rural areas.

**Table 6: Constraints to local government administration on rural agriculture and health developments**

| <b>Constraints</b>                                 | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Std. Dev.</b> |
|--|-------------|------------------|
| Corruption   | 4.87*       | 0.34             |
| Insufficient financial allocation                  | 4.13*       | 0.38             |
| Ineffective management                             | 3.96*       | 0.44             |
| Wrong policies                                     | 2.84        | 0.51             |
| Lack of cooperation with other tiers of government | 2.83        | 0.66             |
| Lack of community participation                    | 1.43        | 0.68             |
| Political instability                              | 2.49        | 0.68             |
| Political interference                             | 2.95        | 0.86             |
| Tribalism/Nepotism/Favoritism                      | 3.93*       | 1.19             |
| Partisan politics                                  | 2.22        | 0.79             |
| Conflict among rural dwellers                      | 1.68        | 0.88             |

Source: Field Survey Data, 2024.

\*Mean  $\geq$  3.0 = High

#### 4.5 Hypothesis Testing

Results of Pearson's Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) as depicted in Table 7 showed that there is significant relationship between the selected socio-economic characteristics of respondent's satisfaction with local government administration on rural agriculture and health development programmes. The table showed that correlation of age ( $r = 0.379$ ,  $p=0.050$ ), household size ( $r = 0.641$ ,  $p<0.000$ ), family size ( $r = 0.317$ ,  $p=0.050$ ), average annual income from main occupation ( $r = 0.436$ ,  $p<0.000$ ) and average annual income from other occupation ( $r = 0.551$ ,  $p<0.000$ ) were all significantly at 5% and 1% level of probability. The variables above showed respondent's satisfaction with local government administration on rural agriculture and health development- an indication that older rural dwellers with higher family size, household size and income expressed more satisfaction with local government agriculture and health development programmes. The null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is therefore rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted that there is significant relationship between the variables under discussion.

This finding is in line with the findings of Xinxin and Jing (2022) who reported that the relationship between the socio-economic characteristics and rural health satisfaction is significant. Nicholas *et al.* (2022), reported that there is evidence that socioeconomic status (SES) affects individual's health outcomes and the health care they receive. People of lower SES are more likely to have worse self-reported health, lower life expectancy, and suffer from more chronic conditions when compared with those of higher SES. They also receive fewer diagnostic tests and medications for many chronic diseases and have limited access to health care due to cost and coverage.

**Table 7: Correlations between selected socio-economic characteristics and respondent’s satisfaction with local government’ rural agriculture and health developments programmes**

|  | Correlation     |         |             |
|--|-----------------|---------|-------------|
|  | Coefficient (r) | P-value | Decision    |
| Age in years   | 0.379*          | 0.050   | Significant |
| Household size                                       | 0.641**         | 0.000   | Significant |
| Family size  | 0.317*          | 0.050   | Significant |
| Average annual income from main occupation           | 0.436**         | 0.000   | Significant |
| Estimate average annual income from other occupation | 0.551**         | 0.000   | Significant |

Source: Field Survey Data, 2024.

\*Sig. at 0.05 level of significance; \*\*Sign. at 0.01 level of significance

## CHAPTER FIVE

### 5.0 SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

#### 5.1 Summary

Rural development occupies a critical part in global governance. It is sheer knowledge that the establishment of local government as a third tier of government in Nigeria was to provide, promote and sustain grassroot and rural development. Local government administration forms the most critical level of any democratic system at which the momentum to sustain rural development can be created, being the level of government closest to the rural people and its existence is essential to compliment the efforts of the states and national government in the task of rural development.

This study investigates the role of local government administration on rural agriculture and health development in Delta central senatorial district, Delta state, Nigeria. The researcher therefore, sought to ascertain the extent local government had ensured rural development, identify agriculture and health programme(s) put in place by local government to ensure rural development and to identify, examine and determine the constraint(s) hindering local government administration on rural agriculture and health development in the study area.

Scientifically recognised and accepted sampling procedure was used to sample eighty (80) respondents from Okpe and Sapele local government areas with the aid of a validated questionnaire and interviewed schedule. Some of the data collected were measured using binary and Likert kind of scale. The measured data was then analysed statistically using frequency count, percentages, mean, standard deviation. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) was then used to analyse the hypothesis of the study.

The result shows that over 51% of the sampled respondents consist of an aging population whose age ranges from fifty-one (51) and above. Most (73.7% and 93.7%) of the sampled

respondents are female and married respectively. 38.8% of the sampled respondents have no formal education, while 61.2% has at least primary education. The sampled respondents also showed an average household and family size of five (5) and seven (7) respectively- this is an indication and suggestion that family labour is the primary source of labour.

The findings of this research also showed that, the sampled respondents were not satisfied with the agriculture development programmes put in place by the local government in Delta central senatorial district (Okpe and Sapele in particular). However, the rural people are satisfied with the health development programmes put in place by the local government. The failure of the local government administration on rural agriculture can be attributed to four (4) major constraints which were considered very serious among other constraints; corruption, insufficient financial allocation, ineffective management and tribalism/nepotism/favouritism. The result of PPMC indicated that there is significant relationship between the selected socio-economic characteristics and respondents' satisfaction of local government administration on rural agriculture and health development programmes.

## **5.2 Conclusion**

The study was able to establish that the sampled respondents were satisfied with local government administration on rural health developments. However, the sampled respondents showed significant dissatisfaction with local government administration on rural agriculture development.

It is of essence to note that from the interviewed session during the field work, it can be inferred and assumed that most of the respondents are either unaware or cannot recall any agriculture development programmes that have been carried out by local government administration.

Nevertheless, from the observed data, the major constraints posing problems and hindering local government administration are corruption, insufficient financial allocation, ineffective management and Tribalism/Nepotism/Favouritism.

## **5.2 Recommendation**

Having considered the findings of this research, the following recommendations were made;

1. Local government administration should put more effort in bringing about a more realistic rural agriculture development through the provision of credits, planting materials, extension services and education among others.
2. Local government administration should put more effort to enhance and improve health care provision and utilization especially in areas where such provisions are lacking.
3. Efforts should be to tackle the major and numerous constraints hindering local government administration particularly corruption, inadequate fund allocation, ineffective management and nepotism/tribalism/favouritism.

## REFERENCE

- Abutudu, M. (2011) The Challenges and Opportunities for Improving the Local Government System in Nigeria, Paper Prepared for Presentation at the Third Biennial National Conference on Community Development in Nigeria Held at Grand Hotel, Asaba, November, 20-24, 2011.
- Agba, M. S., Akwara, A. F. & Idu, A. Y. 2013. "Local Government and Social Service Delivery in Nigeria: A Content Analysis." *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2(2), 455-462
- Adeola, G. L. (2009). From Native Authority to Local Government: Is there a System of Local Government in Nigeria?" in Akhaine, S. O (ed) *Local Government Administration in Nigeria: Old and New Visions*, Lagos: Centre for Constitutionalism and Demilitarisation. P. 6
- Adeyemi, O. O. (2018). Amalgamation and the Crisis of Governance: The Nigeria Experience. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 8(3), Macrothink Institute. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jpag.v8i3.13390>
- Adeyemi O. O. (2019). Local Government Administration in Nigeria: A Historical Perspective. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 9(2), Macrothink Institute. ISSN 2161-7104 2019. (161-175). doi:10.5296/jpag.v9i2.14813
- African Development Bank (2014). Rural Water Supply and Sanitation. Retrieved from [www.afdb.org/en/projects-and-operations/projects](http://www.afdb.org/en/projects-and-operations/projects).
- Agagu, A. A. (2004). Continuity and Change in Local Government Administration and Politics of Underdevelopment" in Agagu, A.A., & Ola, R.O.F. (eds) *Development Agenda of Nigerians State*, Ibadan: Flag (Nigeria) Publisher. P. 191
- Akani, E. C. (2017). Local government administration and grassroots development in Nigeria: a theoretical appraisal. *Journal of Political Science Leadership Research*, 3(2): 22-32.
- Akinseye (2020). Administration of Primary Health Care Programme in Local Government in Nigeria: A Case Study of Ibadan South West Local Government. Ananti, M.O., Onyekwelu, R.U. and Madubueze, M.C. (2015). Caretaker committee system: 2003-2014 in Anambra State. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research: Administration and Management*, 15(1): 32-38.
- Aklilu, D. (2004). Rural Electrification in Ethiopia: Opportunities and bottlenecks. [https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/RURALELECTRIFICATION-IN-ETHIOPIA-%3AOPPORTUNITIESDalelo/2046e8ad61b1fa4af72ff219b380c44fc266d8\\_e2](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/RURALELECTRIFICATION-IN-ETHIOPIA-%3AOPPORTUNITIESDalelo/2046e8ad61b1fa4af72ff219b380c44fc266d8_e2)

- Alao, D. O, Osakede, K. O., & Owolabi, T. Y (2015). Challenges of Local Government in Nigeria: Lessons from Comparative Analysis. *International Journal of Development and Economic Sustainability*, 3(4), European Centre for Research Training and Development.
- Aluko, J.O. (2010). Local Government Elections and The Challenges of Democratic Governance in Nigeria. [www.nigeriaworld.com>articles>aug](http://www.nigeriaworld.com>articles>aug) accessed on 15/11/2023
- Aurora N. (2016). The definition and importance of local governance. (10) p. 6-8. SSN 1804-4158
- Awotokun, K. (2001). Constitutional Roles and Responsibilities of Local Government Councils under Current Dispensation in Orekoya, T., & Agbugba, T. (eds) *Local Government Administration in Nigeria*, Vol. 1, Lagos: Pure Language Communication Limited.
- Balogun, Verere S.; Onokerhoraye, Andrew G. (2022). "Climate change vulnerability mapping across ecological zones in Delta State, Niger Delta Region of Nigeria". *Climate Services*. 27: 100304. doi:10.1016/j.cliser.2022.100304. ISSN 2405-8807.
- Bartlett, J. E., Kotrlik, J. W. and Higgins, C.E. (2001). *Organizational Research: Determining Appropriate Sample Size in Survey Research*. Retrieved January 15, 2018
- Britannica, The Editors of Encyclopaedia. "Delta". *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1 Sep. 2023, <https://www.britannica.com/place/Delta-state-Nigeria>. Accessed 29 October 2023
- Bolatito, S. & Ibrahim, B. S. (2014). "Challenges of Local Government Administration in Nigeria; An Appraisal of Nigerian Experience." *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)* Vol. 3 (7), 562-568.
- Chilokwu, I. (2006) "Corporate & Rural Community Programmes." *Readings in Cooperative Economics & Management*: Computer Edge Publishers, Lagos.
- Chomitz, K.M., P. Buys, and T.S. Thomas (2005). Quantifying the rural/urban gradient in Latin America and the Caribbean. Policy Research Working Paper No. 3634. The World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Chukwuemeka E., Ewuim N. and Ikechukwu O. (2022). Global encyclopedia of public administration, public policy and governance. P 1. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5\_4136-1
- Chukwuemeka, E., Ugwuanyi, B. I., Ndubuisi-Okolo, P. & Onuoha, C. E. (2014). "Nigeria Local Government: A Discourse on the Theoretical Imperatives in a Governmental System." *An International Multidisciplinary Journal*, Ethiopia, Vol. 8 (2), 305-324.
- Eboh, E. & Diejomaoh, I. (2010). "Local Governments in Nigeria: Relevance and Effectiveness in Poverty Reduction and Economic Development." *Journal of Economic and Sustainable Development*, Vol.1, (1), 12-28.
- Dioha, M.O., and Emodi, N.V. (2019). 'Investigating the Impacts of Energy Access Scenarios in the Nigerian Household Sector by 2030', *Resources*, vol. 8(3), 127.
- Eneanya, A. N. (2012). *Policy Research Analysis and Effective Policy Making*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press Ltd
- Eneanya, A.N. (2012). *Local Government Administration in Nigeria: A Comparative Perspective*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press.

- Etebom J. M. and Junior H. W. (February, 2022). "The historical development of local government administration and its contemporary realities in Nigeria". <http://thejournalish.com/ojs/index.php/thejournalish/index>
- Eze, F.O . (2015). Elements of government. Enugu: Torjan Publishers Hamza, M. and Yahaya, M. (2019). The role of local government in rural.
- Fajobi, O.F. (2010). X-ray of local government administration in Nigeria. Ibadan: Crest Hill Publishers Ltd.
- Filani, M.O. (2000). —Nigeria: The need to modify center-down development planning. In W. A. Stehr and D.R.P. Taylor (Ed.) Development from above or below. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations (2018). Guidelines on defining rural areas and compiling indicators for development policy. Page 1 and page 19-22.
- FAO (2014). Global Land Cover Network, Global Land Cover – SHARE. [www.glnc.org](http://www.glnc.org), accessed 15/12/17.
- Idachaba, F.S. (2006). Good Intentions are not Enough. Vol. 1-3. Ibadan: University Press PLC. p110-145
- Ijere, M. (1992). Leading Issues in Rural Development. Enugu: Acena Ventures.
- Global Age Watch (2014). How rural and farm populations are ageing. [www.globalagewatch.org](http://www.globalagewatch.org) ISBN: 187259091
- Godwin, M. L. and Foreman, D. S. (2014). "Local politics and mayoral elections in 21st century America: The keys to City Hall (Routledge Research in Urban Politics and Policy) , Routledge 1st edition, ISBN-13:978-1138821316.
- Gboyegan, A. (1987). Political Values and Local Government in Nigeria, Lagos: Malthouse Press.
- Hasluck, E. L. (2010). "Local government in England
- Muhammad H. U., Adesiji G. B., Tyabo I. S., Muhammed Y. and Loko A. I. (2019). Assessment of factors influencing the use of information and communication technologies by small-scale farmers in federal capital territory (FCT), Abuja, Nigeria. Journal of agriculture and environment. (15) 2: 61-70 ISSN: 1595-465
- Ibok, E. E. (2014). "Local Governance and Service Delivery in Nigeria." Caribbean Journal of Science and Technology, Vol.2, 536-541
- International Monetary Fund (2014). "Government Finance Statistics Manual 2014" (PDF).
- Local Public Sector Alliance (2023). "Guidance Note: Preparing a LoGICA Intergovernmental Profile" (PDF).
- Mammud V. E. (2019). Rural development in Nigeria: concept, approaches, challenges and prospects. *Global Scientific Journal (GSJ)*: Volume 7 (5). ISSN 2320-9186. 2-13.
- Moseley, M. J. (2003). Rural development: principles and practice (1. Publ. ed). London: SAGE. P. 5. ISBN 9780-7619-4766-0
- National Bureau of Statistics (2022). Nigeria Multidimensional Poverty Index.

- NBER (2010). *Agglomeration Economics*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. P25
- Nnaa, B. G. & Abeki, S. O. (2017). *The changing trends in the dialectics of public administration in Nigeria: Myths and Realities*. Owerri: Springfield Publishers.
- Nweneke, E. (2018). A comparative analysis of the local government systems in Nigeria and Ghana towards enhancing their effectiveness. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Research | Social & Management Sciences*, 4(10), 29-42.
- Nwobi, T.U. (2006). *Cooperatives and rural financing*. In E.E. Umehali (Eds.) *Readings in cooperative economics and management*. Lagos: Computer Egde Publishers.
- Obadan, M. T. (2002) "Integrated Approach to Rural poverty Reduction in Nigeria" *Nigerian Tribune* Tuesday 12, and 19, p. 40 and 26 respectively.
- Odalonu H. B. (2015). Challenges confronting local government administration in efficient and effective social service delivery: the Nigerian experience. *International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research (IJPAMR)*, (2) 5 ISSN: 2350-2231
- Odo L. U. (2016). The Search for Viable Local Government System in Nigeria: An Interrogation. *International Journal of Arts and Humanities (IJAH) Bahir Dar-Ethiopia*. Vol. 5(3), S/No 18, ISSN: 2225-8590 (Print) ISSN 2227-5452. 179-189. DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ijahv5i3.15>
- OECD/UCLG (2016). "Subnational Governments around the world: Structure and finance" (PDF). United Nation Nigeria (September, 2022). Common Country Analysis (CCA) of Nigeria.
- OECD. 2011. *OECD Regional Typology*. OECD Directorate for Governance and Territorial Development, Paris.
- Ola, E. (2019). Local government administration and service delivery in Nigeria: prospects and challenges. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 3(4), 211-217
- Ola, R. O. F., & Tonwe, D. A. (2009). *Local Administration and Local Government in Nigeria* Lagos: Amfitop Books.
- Olasupo, F. A. (2001). *Evolution of Local Government Administration in Nigeria* in Orekoya, T., & Agbugba, T. (eds) *Local Government Administration in Nigeria*, Vol. 1, Lagos: Pure Language Communication Limited.
- Olasupo, F. A. (2001a). *Historical Phases of Local Government in Nigeria* in Orekoya, T. and Agbugba, T. (eds) *Local Government Administration in Nigeria*, Vol. 1, Lagos: Pure Language Communication Limited.
- Omotoso A. B.1 – Daud A. S., Adebayo R. A., Omotayo A. O.4 (2018). Socio-economic determinants of rural households' food crop production in ogun state, Nigeria. DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.15666/aeer/1603\\_36273635](http://dx.doi.org/10.15666/aeer/1603_36273635). ISSN 1785 0037
- Oni, E.O. (1999). *An introduction to Local Government Administration in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Ejon Publishers.
- Orebiyi, J.S., Henri-Ukoha, A., Ben-Chendo ,N.G., Tasie, C.M. and Ekine D.I. (2012). *Determinants of Credit supplied by IFAD to Rural Farmers beneficiaries in Rivers*

State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Agricultural Economics, Management and Development (IJAMD)*, 2:84-76

- Osanyinlusi, O. I., Awotide, B. A., Awoyemi, T. T., Ogunniyi, A. I., & Ogundipe, A. A. (2017). An Evaluation of Rural Electrification and Households' Poverty in Ikole Local Government Area, Ekiti State, Nigeria: An FGT Approach. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, 7(3), 24-30.
- Nicholas C. Arpey, Anne H. Gaglioti, and Marcy E. Rosenbaum (2022). How Socioeconomic Status Affects Patient Perceptions of Health Care: A Qualitative Study. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2150131917697>
- Sakpere, R. O. (2021). Local Government Administration and Rural Development in Nigeria: The Missing Link. *Indiana Journal of Arts & Literature*, 2(7), 16-29.
- World Bank (2022). Local Government and Poverty Reduction: A Review of the Evidence. World Bank, Oct 02, 2023. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/nigeria/overview>
- Ugwu, S. C. (2000). *Issues in Local Government and Urban Administration in Nigeria*. Enugu: Academic Publishing Company.
- United Nations (1960). *Report on Public Administration aspect of Community Development Programmes*
- United Nation (2012). *The Wye Group Handbook – Rural Households' Livelihood and Well Being Statistics on Rural Development and Agriculture Household Income*. UN Statistical Commission, New York.
- United Nation, Department of economics and social affairs (2021). *World Social Report 2021. Reconsidering Rural Development*. (p. 4)
- United Nations, Nigeria (2022). *Common country analysis (67)*
- Zakariya I. (2014). *Assessment of the impact of local government on rural development in soba and zaria local government areas kaduna state*. Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.

## APPENDIX

**RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE  
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS AND EXTENSION SERVICES  
FACULTY OF AGRICULTURE  
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN (UNIBEN)  
BENIN CITY-EDO STATE**

### SECTION A: INTRODUCTION

Dear sir/madam,

I am Wisdom A. Edudje; a final year undergraduate student of the faculty of agriculture in the above institution. I am carrying out research on the “ROLE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION ON RURAL AGRICULTURE AND HEALTH DEVELOPMENT IN DELTA CENTRAL SENATORIAL DISTRICT, DELTA STATE, NIGERIA”.

Please, assist in answering the questionnaire before you. You are expected to give your honest and sincere views on the questions by ticking the option(s) that bear your views to the questions below. The study is purely for academic purpose. I promised and urged you to be rest assured that all information given here shall be treated with absolute confidentiality and only be used for the purpose of this study.

Thanks for the anticipated cooperation.

**WISDOM A. EDUDJE**

### SECTION B: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA OF RESPONDENTS

Please, kindly Tick (√) where appropriate

1. Name \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_ village/town:
2. How long have you lived/stayed in this town/village? \_\_\_\_ (a) Months [ ] (b)Years [ ]
3. Age: \_\_\_\_\_ Years

4. Sex: (a) Male [ ] (b) Female [ ]
5. Marital status: (a) Single (b) Married
6. Household size (Number of persons eating from same pot of food): \_\_\_\_\_
7. Family size (members of family): \_\_\_\_\_
8. Level of educational: (a) No formal education [ ] (b) Primary school [ ] (d) Secondary school [ ] (e) OND/NCE [ ] (f) HND/BSC [ ] (g) post graduate [ ]
9. Main occupation: \_\_\_\_\_
10. Other occupation: \_\_\_\_\_
11. Estimate average annual income from main occupation: (a) below ₦600, 000 [ ] (b) ₦601, 000 to ₦800,000 [ ] (c) ₦801, 000 to ₦900, 000 [ ] (d) ₦901,000 to ₦1,000,000 [ ] (e) Above ₦1,000, 000 [ ]
12. Estimate average annual income from other occupation: (a) below ₦600, 000 [ ] (b) ₦601, 000 to ₦800,000 [ ] (c) ₦801, 000 to ₦900, 000 [ ] (d) ₦901,000 to ₦1,000,000 [ ] (e) Above ₦1,000, 000 [ ]

**SECTION C (Objective 1): AGRICULTURE AND HEALTH DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS**

Using the scale shown below, kindly tick (√) to identify and rate the quality of health efforts provided by your local government council

| <b>Healthcare Efforts</b>                 | <b>Yes<br/>1</b> | <b>No<br/>2</b> | <b>Undecided<br/>3</b> |
|---|------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Construction of healthcare facilities     |                  |                 |                        |
| Renovation of healthcare building         |                  |                 |                        |
| Provision of new/improved equipment       |                  |                 |                        |
| Supply of vaccines and medicines          |                  |                 |                        |
| Address healthcare worker's shortage      |                  |                 |                        |
| Improved healthcare accessibility         |                  |                 |                        |
| Provision of assistance to health victims |                  |                 |                        |
| Others (please specify):                  |                  |                 |                        |

Using the scale shown below, kindly tick (√) to identify and rate the quality of agriculture efforts provided by your local government council

| <b>Agriculture Efforts</b>               | <b>Yes<br/>1</b> | <b>No<br/>2</b> | <b>Undecided<br/>3</b> |
|--|------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Provision of financial assistance        |                  |                 |                        |
| Establishment of agricultural programmes |                  |                 |                        |

|                                      |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Provision of extension services      |  |  |  |
| Provision of agricultural education: |  |  |  |
| Provision of farm inputs:            |  |  |  |
| Improved planting materials          |  |  |  |
| Fertilizers                          |  |  |  |
| Herbicides                           |  |  |  |
| Pesticides                           |  |  |  |
| Animal feeds                         |  |  |  |
| Provision of basic amenities:        |  |  |  |
| Electricity                          |  |  |  |
| Road                                 |  |  |  |
| Water supply                         |  |  |  |
| Others (please specify):             |  |  |  |
|                                      |  |  |  |

**SECTION C (Objective 2):**

Please, kindly tick (√) to show how satisfied you are with the overall performance of your local government toward agriculture and health development efforts carried out?

| <b>Healthcare Efforts</b>                 | <b>Very Dissatisfied<br/>1</b> | <b>Dissatisfied<br/>2</b> | <b>Neutral<br/>3</b> | <b>Satisfied<br/>4</b> | <b>Very Satisfied<br/>5</b> |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Construction of healthcare facilities     |                                |                           |                      |                        |                             |
| Renovation of healthcare building         |                                |                           |                      |                        |                             |
| Provision of new/improved equipment       |                                |                           |                      |                        |                             |
| Supply of vaccines and medicines          |                                |                           |                      |                        |                             |
| Address healthcare worker's shortage      |                                |                           |                      |                        |                             |
| Improved healthcare accessibility         |                                |                           |                      |                        |                             |
| Provision of assistance to health victims |                                |                           |                      |                        |                             |
| Others (please specify):                  |                                |                           |                      |                        |                             |
|   |                                |                           |                      |                        |                             |
|   |                                |                           |                      |                        |                             |

| <b>Agriculture Efforts</b>               | <b>Very Dissatisfied<br/>1</b> | <b>Dissatisfied<br/>2</b> | <b>Neutral<br/>3</b> | <b>Satisfied<br/>4</b> | <b>Very Satisfied<br/>5</b> |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Provision of financial assistance        |                                |                           |                      |                        |                             |
| Establishment of agricultural programmes |                                |                           |                      |                        |                             |
| Provision of extension services          |                                |                           |                      |                        |                             |
| Provision of agricultural education:     |                                |                           |                      |                        |                             |
| Provision of farm inputs:                |                                |                           |                      |                        |                             |
| Improved planting materials              |                                |                           |                      |                        |                             |

|                               |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Fertilizers                   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Herbicides                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pesticides                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Animal feeds                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Provision of basic amenities: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electricity                   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Road                          |  |  |  |  |  |
| Water supply                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Healthcare services           |  |  |  |  |  |
| Others (please specify):      |  |  |  |  |  |

**SECTION D: BENEFITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT DEVELOPMENTAL EFFORTS**

Using the scale shown below, kindly identify the benefits of local government agriculture and health development efforts on rural dwellers by ticking (√)

| Benefits                                    | Strongly Disagree<br>1 | Disagree<br>2 | Neutral<br>3 | Agree<br>4 | Strongly Agree<br>5 |
|---|------------------------|---------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|
| Improved cost of living                     |                        |               |              |            |                     |
| Reduced pollution                           |                        |               |              |            |                     |
| Increased responsibility among the people   |                        |               |              |            |                     |
| Increased personal growth                   |                        |               |              |            |                     |
| Increased civic engagement                  |                        |               |              |            |                     |
| Boosting community morale                   |                        |               |              |            |                     |
| Fostering unity                             |                        |               |              |            |                     |
| Increased accessibility to social amenities |                        |               |              |            |                     |
| Poverty reduction                           |                        |               |              |            |                     |
| Others: (please specify)                    |                        |               |              |            |                     |

**SECTION E: Hindrances to local government administration agriculture and health development efforts**

Please, kindly rate the hindrances to local government developmental efforts by ticking (√)

| Hindrances   | Strongly Disagree<br>1 | Disagree<br>2 | Neutral<br>3 | Agree<br>4 | Strongly Agree<br>5 |
|--|------------------------|---------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|
| Corruption   |                        |               |              |            |                     |
| Insufficient financial allocation                  |                        |               |              |            |                     |
| Ineffective management                             |                        |               |              |            |                     |
| Wrong policies                                     |                        |               |              |            |                     |
| Lack of cooperation with other tiers of government |                        |               |              |            |                     |
| Lack of community participation                    |                        |               |              |            |                     |

|                               |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Political instability         |  |  |  |  |  |
| Political interference        |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tribalism/Nepotism/Favoritism |  |  |  |  |  |
| Partisan politics             |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conflict among rural dwellers |  |  |  |  |  |
| Others: (please specify)      |  |  |  |  |  |