URBANIZATION AND SERVICE DELIVERY IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF KADUNA NORTH AND KACHIA LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN KADUNA STATE

BY

MAIDAMMA, SANI KASSIM

DECEMBER 2006

URBANIZATION AND SERVICE DELIVERY IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF KADUNA NORTH AND KACHIA LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN KADUNA STATE

BY

MAIDAMMA, SANI KASSIM

(MPALG/ADMIN/45812/2004 - 2005)

(MPALG/ADMIN/8603/1993 - 1994)

DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT STUDIES
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,
ZARIA

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL, AHAMDU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF REQUIREMENT FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION DEGREE (M.P.A.) WITH SPECIALIZATION IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

DECEMBER 2006

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this thesis has been written by me and that it is a record of my own research work.

It has not been presented in any previous application for a higher degree nor has in any substance been accepted for any other degree.

All quotations and references are indicated and the sources of information are specifically acknowledged by means of reference. Any errors in the script are mine.

Maidamma, Sani Kassim

CERTIFICATION

This thesis entitled " URBANIZATION AND SERVICE DELIVERY IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT: A comparative study of Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments in Kaduna State" by Maidamma, Sani Kassim, meets the regulations governing the degree of MASTER OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION M.P.A. (L.G.) of Ahmadu Bello University Zaria, Nigeria, and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

Chairman, Supervisory Committee ***Date***

Member, Supervisory Committee ***Date***

Head, Department of Local Government Studies ***Date***

Dean, Post-Graduate School ***Date***

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my ever-loving and ever-caring parents, Late Malam Kassim Maidamma and Late Hajiya Zulaihat Gambo Abdullahi, for not only providing their love, care, dedication and commitment to my well-being, but for also being my heroes, and instrumental to my various attainments in life. (May Allah, the most Beneficent and the most Merciful grant them eternal rest in Aljanna firdausi Amin).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All praises be to Allah; Lord of the Worlds, The Most Beneficent and The Most Merciful, for continuously bringing numerous forms of succour and sustenance to me throughout my life and the period of this study.

My enormous appreciation and gratitude goes to my supervisors Professor Adejoh Odoh and Dr. Bello Ohiani, both of the department of local government studies, A.B.U. Zaria, whose intellectual guidance and encouragement despite their numerous commitments and tight schedules, kept my desire and resilience to contribute to knowledge alive, inspite of all obvious odds. Indeed, I am most grateful for the correction and suggestions, the results of which is the work in its present form. Furthermore, the concern and encouragement offered to me by the energetic and hardworking staff (academic and non-academic) most especially the ever-smiling Daniel Tsabta (and the indefatigable “Baba’ Mr. Simon of the department of local government studies, shall remain indelible and appreciated.

I will ever remain grateful and indebted to my late parents who sacrificed their comfort for my success. May Allah grant them

eternal rest in Aljannah fir dausi, Amin. To my other relations who contributed in one way or the other and my wife Sa'adatu and my kids Papa and Sadik, I shall remain indebted. May this work not only serve as source of motivation to them but also a source of inspiration that should catapult them towards achieving greater accomplishments in their numerous endeavours.

I would equally like to express my utmost appreciation and gratitude to my elders and mentors, Dr. Bello S.Y. Al-Hassan, Alh. Mohammed Saleh (Annur) and the S.S.G. Kaduna State, Hon. (Dr.) Felix Hassan Hyet for their continuous elderly and parental guidance and constant support especially in stormy moments.

Worthy of appreciation here, are also my brothers and friends (MAJALISA) Rex, Dabaru, Dr. King, Chairman, Gwarzo, Hon. Auwal, Coach Dan (Apollo), Koya, Zubs, Bash, Ibro, Bozo, Papa Coach, Coach Iro, Hon. Oscar, A.T and the late Musa Kano Late Emmy G and Late Stroller and Rebello.

Furthermore, I would also like to acknowledge the encouragement of my classmates like Mr. Tunde Jatto and Mr. Chris Mbafor. The efforts of Prince D.O and Mal. Nuhu Bamalli of the Ministry for Local Government, Kaduna State are appreciated too.

Finally, I would like to extend my appreciation to Mal. Abubakar of Sabon Gari Local Government who drove our vehicle throughout the period of data collection and all the respondents too for their co-operation and enthusiasm, not forgetting the indefatigable staff of Embay Computers and **EL**- **FAROOUQK COMMUNICATIONS**, Zaria, for the production of this work.

ABSTRACT

The best method of achieving National Development is by improving on the standard of living, and the levels of productivity of the citizenry. Furthermore, the best medium to access the grassroots is the third tier government or local government.

However, while the impact of rapid growth of towns and agglomerations often known as urbanization has continued to pose numerous challenges to authorities especially at the local level, ironically, the existing administrative arrangement at the grassroots is apparently not suitable to provide the sound management necessary for the achievement of the needed progress especially where the growth is occurring rapidly. This problem could be trace to the faulty structural syndrome that provides a definition of local government, which fails to consider the level of urbanization, thus, negating the urban-rural element.

The implication of this is the likely inability of authorities to match improvements in the urban areas with similar rural development initiatives in order to check the rural-urban drift, despite the general understanding that urbanization matters cannot be completely divorced from rural considerations.

Using Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments to denote “urban” and “rural” local governments respectively, this study attempts to provide an insight on the phenomenon. Attempts were made in establishing the role of urbanization in determining the priorities of local government in respect of service delivery from 1992 to 1996. In addition, the role of adequate finance in service delivery was also highlighted and established.

These were achieved by using population sample drawn form both local governments which comprises of staff of the two local governments as well as CBO’s.

Furthermore, records of expenditure of both local governments were also used in order to analyze the pattern of fiscal allocation in response to the challenges created by the varying levels of urbanization in the two local governments.

Data obtained were analyzed and summarized. In conclusion, observations and recommendations were proffered.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title page	ii
Declaration	iii
Certification	iv
Dedication	v
Acknowledgement	vi
Abstract	ix
Table of Contents	xi
List of Figures	xiv
List of Tables	xv
List of Appendices	xviii

CHAPTER ONE

1.0	Background to the study	1
1.0.1	Statement of the Problem	7
1.0.2	Hypotheses	8
1.0.3	Objectives of the study	9
1.0.4	Significance of the study	10
1.05	Scope and Limitation	11
1.1	Research Methodology	12

References 16

CHAPTER TWO

2.0 Literature Review and Theoretical Framework 18

2.0.1 Literature Review 18

2.0.2 The Concept of Urbanization 19

2.1.0 Urbanization and Socio-economic Development 27

2.1.1 Urbanization, Local Government and Service Delivery 29

2.1.2 Theoretical Framework 38

2.1.3 Modernization theory and process of Structural Differentiation 39

2.1.4 Modernization and Urbanization: Issues of Definition and Interrelationship 42

2.1.5 Operational Definition of Concepts 46

References 50

CHAPTER THREE

3.0 Introduction 55

3.0.1 Size, Climate, Vegetation and Population 57

3.0.2 Demography, Status and Urbanization Trend 61

3.0.3 Pattern of Urbanization in Kaduna State 62

3.0.4 Kaduna and the Status Phenomenon 64

3.1.0 Kaduna North as a Local Government 66

3.1. Geographical Location, Population and Ethnic Composition 66

3.1 Political Structure 67

3.2.0 Historical Background of Kachia Local Government 68

3.2.1 Climate, Population and Ethnic Groups 70

3.2.2 Socio-economic and Infrastructural Development 71

3.2.3 Kachia as a Local Government 71

CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 Presentation and Analysis of Data 74

4.0.1 Introduction 74

4.0.2 Impact of the Local Government Council on Service Delivery 76

4.0.3 Hypothesis One 77

4.0.4 Respondents' Profile 77

4.1 Hypothesis Two 92

4.1.0 Urbanization Process 96

4.1.1 Effects of Urbanization on Local Government Priorities 98

4.1.2 Measures to cope with Urbanization 99

4.2 Finance and Service Delivery in Local Government 100

4.2.0 Service Delivery Expenditure Pattern 102

4.3 Local Government Variation in Service Delivery 113

4.3.0 1992 Fiscal Year 113

4.3.1 1993 Fiscal Year 114

4.3.2 1994 Fiscal Year 114

4.3.3 1995 Fiscal Year 115

4.3.4 1996 Fiscal Year 116

4.4 Primary Health Care Sector 117

4.5 Social Welfare Sector 118

4.6 Rural Infrastructure Sector 118

4.7 Education Sector 119

4.8 Water Supply Sector 120

4.9 Electricity Supply Sector 120

4.10 Agriculture and Natural Resources Sector 121

4.11 Crime Prevention 121

CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 Summary and Conclusion 125

5.0.1 Summary 125

5.0.2 Summary of Findings 127

5.0.3 Recommendation 131

Bibliography 136

A Unpublished work 142

B Journals 143

C Documents 143

LIST OF FIGURES VI:

Figures 1: Map of Nigeria showing Kaduna state and other thirty-five states including the FCT.

Figures 2: Map of Kaduna state showing 23 Local Government Areas, which includes Kaduna North and Kachia.

LIST OF TABLES VII:

Tables 3. 1: Names and Headquarters of Local Government Areas in Kaduna State.

Table 4.1 Responses on the years of service of respondents in Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments.

Table 4.2 Responses on the occurrence of the process of urbanization in Kaduna North and Kachia Local government Areas.

Table 4.3 Responses on recognition of the process of urbanization in Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments

Table 4.4 Responses on effects of urbanization on Local Government services in Kaduna North and Kachia Local Government.

Table 4.5 Responses on effects of urbanization on Development in Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments.

Table 4.6 Responses on influence of urbanization in Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments

Table 4. 7 Responses on the manner of effects of urbanization on Local Governments service in Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments.

Table 4.8 Responses on the assessment of the level of urbanization process in Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments.

Table 4.9 Responses on the assessment of factors responsible for the disparity in the levels of urbanization between Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments.

Table 4.10 Responses on the assessments of efforts by the authorities of Kaduna North and Kachia Local Government to cope with the challenges of urbanization.

Table 4.11 Responses on the effectiveness in services delivery efforts in Kaduna North and Kachia Local Government Areas.

Table 4.12 Responses on infrastructural changes in Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments.

Table 4.13 Responses on effects delivery in Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments.

Table 4.14 Responses on the assessment of the efforts in combating crime and insecurity in Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments Areas.

Table 4.15 Summary of accrued revenue of Kaduna North Local Government Area.

Table 4.16 Summary of accrued revenue of Kachia Local Government Area.

Table 4.17 Annual functional expenditure of selected sectors on service delivery for a period of five years (1992 - 1996) of Kachia Local Government.

Table 4.19 Analysis of annual functional expenditure on service delivery for a period of five years (1992-1996) of Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments.

Table 4.20 Analysis of sectorial expenditure of Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments Areas for a period of fiver years (1992-1996).

Table 4.21 Summary of total sectorial expenditure (%) for a period of five years (1992-1996) for Kaduna North Local Government.

Table 4.22 Summary sectorial expenditure (%) for a period of five years (1992-1996) for Kachia Local Government Area.

Table 4.23 Heraldically analysis of the first three priorities in sectorial expenditure for five years (1992-1996).

LIST OF APPENDICES VII

Appendix A: Questionnaire for residents of Local government.

Appendix B: Questionnaire for principal officers of the Local Government

Appendix C: Report of external auditors and trial balance of Kaduna North and Kachia Local Government Areas.

Appendix D: Contributions to be made by Local Governments.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO BE MADE BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR THE ZONAL RALLY IN HONOUR OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

Local Government Areas are to contribute as per details:

1.	(a)	Preparation of Venue	-	N100,000.00
	(b)	Provision of 10 sets of soft chairs	-	N 20,000.00
	(c)	Provision of 70 dozens of plastic chairs	-	N 28,000.00
	(d)	Provision of 10 canopies	-	N 8,000.00
	(e)	Provision of adequate security at the venue	-	N 50,000.00
	(f)	Provision of cultural tropes	-	N120,000.00
	(g)	Mobilisation and transportation of at least 360 persons from each of the eight (8) Local Governments in the zone to attend The Rally (including feeding allowances)	-	N2,649,000.00
		Total	=	N2,966,000.00

2. It is expected that Rally will ginger support for the Party. Therefore, His Excellency may wish to approve that the contributions of the Local Governments be collected by the Committee which will in turn release to the Party Leadership for effective mobilization of all Local Governments in the zone, please.

CHAPTER ONE

1.0 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Every year, between 80 and 90 million people are being added to a world population of about 6 billion. By the year 2000 about 70 million of these are born in 3rd world countries. However, the problem of population growth is not simply one of numbers; it is more a problem of welfare and development through efficient service delivery; a phenomenon which was at the center stage of deliberation of the first world population conference held in Bucharest in August 1976. (Todaro, 1977: 199)

World population growth has since the 2nd world war, been a major concern for researchers, administrators and governments in general with their worries mainly on how to overcome its consequences especially within poorer countries.

In Nigeria, the major pre-occupation of the national conferences on local government initiated in 1969 in general and that of 1973 in particular were how to improve the Nigerian local government system of service delivery, all such initiatives have been to try to cope with the ever-increasing population and the rate of growth of towns and cities, explains Adedeji (1973: vii).

The explosive growth of cities and metropolitan agglomerations in the twentieth century, though new, has been an “impressive” universal phenomenon. There has been tremendous inclination in many parts of

the world, from the much familiar and simple agricultural society during this period, to complex and highly urbanized one through “rapid agglomerations in large numbers in a few centre”, Sada (1973: 164) postulates. What, thus, does “urbanization” connote?

The term Urbanization could have a demographic connotation referring to increases in population generally or an increase in the population living in an urban area.

It could equally refers to characterization of individuals; that is, the extent to which they are economically, socially or culturally inclined in urban rather than rural areas. But more contextually, urbanization here would refer more to socio-political and organizational changes that are related to the transition from rural to urban society through the process of modernization, which implies a change in way of thinking, attitudes and needs.

According to the United Nations studies (1965), World population had risen from 1,860 million in 1920, to 2,069 million in 1930, 2,297 million in 1940, 2,517 million in 1950 and 2,994 million in 1960. The estimated increases in successive decades were 10,11.10 and 19 percent respectively. By March 1996 however, world population had passed the 5 billion mark. Optimistic projections by the United Nations placed the figure at over 6.5 billion by the year 2,000 and over 15 billion by the end of the 21st century. Out of these, nearly 80 percent of that

population will inhabit the developing world. (World Population Chart 1996).

In addition, further studies have shown that in 1800, there were only 2.4 percent of the world's population living in cities of more than 20,000 people. By 1950, the proportion had risen to 20.9 percent. During that same period, the position of proportion of the population living in cities with a population of more than 100,000 had risen extensively. For instance, while in 1800 the percentage was 1.7, by 1950 it had risen to 13.1. the number of cities equally rose extensively during the same period.

According to Mabogunje (1968), from less than 50 in 1800; cities with a population of over 100,000 had increased to over 900 by 1950.

Recent studies also, have indicated that currently, Nigeria is facing an impending alarming rate of growth which could eventually pose serious threat to the quality of life if left unabated. The massive growth in the population and sizes and numbers of cities are expected to occur by the end of the first quarter of the next century. The population of the country is expected to grow from nearly 120 million marks in 1995 to 250 million within the next 35 years. By the year 2025, about 85 percent of the population is expected to be living in cities.

The studies further explained that the situation would be more precarious for cities like Lagos which at present has an approximate

population of about 10 million, and an average density of 3,000 per square kilometer. By the year 2015, the report projected that the population of Lagos is expected to grow to about 24 million creating a density of about 8,000 persons per square kilometer (Laye, 1997).

With this scenario, it is evident that Nigeria, like many developing countries, is experiencing a rapid growth that results in “urban explosion”.

Numerous postulations have been forwarded in attempting to identify the “causes” of the phenomenon, particularly in the Third World countries.

The basis for population growth can be analysed from cultural, social and economic perspectives. According to Todaro (1980) population growth is primarily the result of a rapid transition from a long historical era characterised by high birth and death rate to one in which death rates have fallen lower and lower.

Elucidating this postulation, Arowolo (1987) explains that high birth rates and high death rates characterised the population of rural areas because of the significance of agriculture to rural dwellers; a large number of children is viewed as an asset to the family. Increase in number of children is often viewed as enlarging the family labour force and hence agricultural productivity.

Another reason forwarded for high birth rates in such societies is the poor level of sanitation and development of curative and preventive

medicines, poor nutrition as people are poorly fed, hence, the level of infant mortality as a result of poor resistance. Thus, most families, for fear of “threat” to the family by infant mortality, tend to reproduce children in “excess”.

Furthermore, failure of most of the societies to accept various methods of birth control and most especially abortion, which is contrary to the teachings of the two major religions is also seen as another factor responsible for population explosion in the third world.

The great puzzle however, is the economic, social and perhaps the political implications of this phenomenon for levels of living, national and personal esteem, freedom of choice for development, Todaro (1977). Ordinarily, to the proud urbanite, “urban life is good; it spells sophistication and opportunity”. For some social scientists this phenomenon is a good thing: “an ecological response to economic development,” Ukwu (1973) posited.

To administrative authorities, planners and policy-makers, it spells serious dilemma and tough challenges in terms of planning, policy formulation, implementation, revenue and expenditure etc. In other words, the effect of the outrageous rate of urban growth and its attendant socio-economic consequences in form of overcrowding, unemployment, various forms of crime and conflicts, drug addiction, prostitution, housing shortages as enumerated by Adedeji, have constituted a huge nightmare

to authorities. This is in addition to the extreme pressure being exerted on the available infrastructure and essential services as provided by the combined efforts of governments at federal, state and local levels. Such services include provision of drinking water, electricity, construction and maintenance of certain roads, drainages, schools, clinics and hospitals.

Furthermore, markets, cemeteries and burial grounds, refuse disposal and various aspects of community development are included too, (Orewa and Adewumi 1983:102 – 104).

Interestingly, most of these urbanization related problems, socio-economic or otherwise, have fallen perfectly within the constitutional definition of “functions”, “role”, or “responsibilities” in form of services to be delivered by local government to the people at the grassroots. In other words, virtually, most of the problems attendant (socio-economic consequences of urbanization) are of direct concern to local government, especially local authorities that administer urban areas, which obviously is nearer to such problems arising from large numbers of people living in proximity with one another as observed by Nwosu (1988:125).

1.0.1 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The numerous local government reforms undertaken in this country including the widely acclaimed of 1976, were all meant to greatly and positively enhance the status and service delivery potentials and effectiveness of the local government institution in Nigeria.

Inspite of these reforms and re-organization that were meant to completely unify and fine-tune the system, there exist certain peculiarities and disparity created by varying levels of urbanization which although have not completely upset the underlying philosophy of the system or reforms as a whole, but may tend to create discrepancies in the nature of local government and the service delivery expected of it.

This study attempts to examine the apparent and existing discrepancies in the nature of services delivery between rural and urban governments as dictated by the level of urbanization between them. In other words, we attempt to analyze the theoretical definition of local government and its functions (services) on one hand and the practical circumstances as brought about, or dictated by the varying levels of urbanization on the other hand. Hence, the emergence of the terms “urban” and “rural” local governments which may undoubtedly determine or reshape the nature of functions or services, revenue and expenditure of each local government.

In this perspective therefore, the following research questions arise:

- How realistic and functional are the concepts of urban and rural local governments?
- To what extent have these concepts contributed in determining the nature of service delivery among local governments?
- To what extent have these local governments (rural/urban) been able to accomplish or achieve service delivery in functional terms in response to their levels of urbanization?

1.0.2 HYPOTHESES

Based on the statement of the problem just raised, the following hypotheses are formulated:

i. That the nature of service delivery of a local government is a reflection of its level of urbanization. In other words, the quality and quantity of services of a local government varies with the level of urbanization.

ii. The effectiveness of Local Governments in coping with the problems of urbanization and /or service delivery is dependent on the availability of adequate finance.

1.0.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The following study is a comparative assessment of the effects of urbanization on the service delivery capacity of two local government areas of Kaduna State; one being predominantly “Urban” (Kaduna North) and the other “rural” (Kachia). Our specific aims are therefore:-

a. To examine and analyze the concept of urbanization and its real nature in Nigeria with a view to appreciating its evolution and consequences on the development process in general and social welfare in particular in the areas of study.

b. To ascertain and analyze the relationship between the rate or level of urbanization and local government service delivery functions in terms of policy formulation, development priorities and implementation strategies.

c. To identify problems caused by the level of urbanization and the capacity of local government authorities to cope with these problems.

d. To proffer solutions or recommend appropriate ways of responding and coping with the demands and problems identified in (c) above.

In all these, attempts will be made to compare the peculiarities of both local governments according to their levels of urbanization vis-a - vis service delivery, problems, and solutions.

1.0.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

National Development in Nigeria could better be achieved by improving on the living standards and levels of productivity of the citizens of the grassroots within the third tier of government. The performance of local government authorities is therefore very significant in the strive for national development.

On the other hand, the 1976 and subsequent local government reform packages were consistently aimed at improving the service delivery performance of this tier of government which serves as a primary source of labour and raw materials, essential for national development in the long run.

The rapid growth of towns today, poses numerous challenges to the capacity of local government authorities with the ever-increasing problems that accompany urbanization; thus, the need for scholars, to try to evolve new strategies to cope with such challenges, more so, within a democratic context.

The significance of this study again, lies in the extent to which it can serve as a working tool for policy makers, planners, scholars and

students of development administration, in trying to evolve new strategies for better service delivery in our local governments today. This study is therefore, prompted by the desire to contribute to the already existing literature in the field of local government administration in Nigeria and beyond.

1.0.5 SCOPE AND LIMITATION

Our area of study covers two local governments of Kaduna State, one predominantly “urban” and the other “rural”. Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments respectively. These local governments are chosen for the comparative assessment of the level of urbanization and its effect on local government service delivery.

The study spans through a 5-year period: (1992 – 1996) which enables an assessment of the performance of the local governments. The focus here will mainly be on issues of primary health care, social welfare/crime prevention, education, water and electricity supply, local infrastructure and agriculture.

However, it is necessary to present the following problems faced as limitation of the study; in the course of collecting data, a shocking and startling discovery of unavailability of comprehensive records especially of annual estimates for the year 1992 to 1996 both Kaduna North and Kachia local government was made. This appalling situation is not

peculiar to the Ministry for Local Government alone but also the Local Government Areas that made up the research area of the study (see appendix C)

The above problem has robbed a precious opportunity for this study to provide an insight on the existing discrepancy between annual estimates and actual expenditure for further academic, administrative and intellectual discourse, in the pursuit of knowledge and service delivery.

Furthermore, while the figures obtained are of actual expenditure, such records however, may not necessarily reflect a prefect reality of the authority's response to the felt-needs of the masses because of incidences of over-costing and the proliferations of 'ghost' projects usually meant to feed an ego.

On the other hand, respondents are indisposed to respond adequately to questionnaires and interviews, thus compelling the study to rely on observation and appraisal, to a feasible extent.

1.1 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1.1.0 METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

The study will mainly be exploratory and analytical of available records and statistics.

1.1.1 Primary Data:

Conventional survey techniques are employed viz:

a. The interview will be employed to generate information from some key local government officials concerned with assessing service delivery to get their views on issues that cannot be quantified in areas such as infrastructure, housing, water supply, sanitation, crime and security and employment. Equally some resident elites and heads of NGOs will be interviewed for a similar purpose.

b. Questionnaires will be distributed to principal local government staff (officers) concerned with policy formulation, implementation and evaluation as well as to residents and heads of NGOs, to assess the service delivery capacity of local government, in aspects such as road infrastructure, crime and insecurity, housing, sanitation, water supply and employment.

c. This survey method will also entail observation of some of the Infrastructural facilities available in the two local government areas of our study. The survey technique will be used to compliment data obtained from the questionnaire.

1.1.2 Secondary Data

Firstly, library books, journals and other publications are to be consulted for relevant literature on the topic.

Secondly, local government records on estimates and data on service delivery within the study period in relation to their set targets, goals, and objectives, planning and implementation strategies.

1.1.3 Sampling Technique and Size

For the purpose of generating data, two sets of questionnaires are designed and administered directly or through intermediaries (Heads of Departments for local government staff, Heads of Community Based Organizations (C.B.O) for residents and Head of NGOs). The first set, is meant for local government official, while the other, for residents and NGOs. The sample size for local government officials is 150 from a total population of 600: 100 for Kaduna North and 50 for Kachia considering that the former is more staffed than the latter. The sample size for residents and NGOs is 350 from a population of 554,111 250 for Kaduna North, and 100 for Kachia, spread across the local government wards.

The stratified random sampling technique is used to select respondents considering three categories of staff for local government viz: senior, intermediate and junior. Two categories are considered for residents: those predominantly resident (permanent residents or indigenes of the area) and temporary residents. This categorization is based on the view that temporary residents will analyse the phenomenon under examination on a more objective and comparative bases having

lived elsewhere than the permanently resident indigenes whom might not have lived elsewhere.

REFERENCES

Adedeji, A. (1973): Urbanization challenge in Nigeria: A Race Against Time in Adedeji A. and Rowland (ed); **Management Problems of Rapid Urbanization in Nigeria,** University of Ife Press, Ile-Ife, Nigeria.

Adetoro, S.A. (1986): **Research techniques for projects proposals, reports, theses and Dissertations,** Zaria, Gaskiya Corporation Limited.

Afolabi, M. (1991): **Writing the Research Proposal, (2nd edition)** Department of Library Science, ABU Zaria.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1973): **Foundations of Behavioral Research** 2nd Edition New York: Holt, Rinehart Winston.

Laye, T. (1997): *Town-planning and the challenge of rapid Population Growth:* ***of Nigeria Institute of Town Planning Journal.*** *NITP publications No. 23, Lagos, Nigeria*

Mabogunje, A. (1968): **Urbanization in Nigeria,** University of London Press.

Nwosu, A. (1988): Local Government as an Instrument of Development in Rural Areas of Nigeria. In Oyeyipo, E.A.O. et al (eds): ***Leading Issues in Territorial Decentralization***

in Nigerian and France, *Institute an Administration, ABU Zaria*

Orewa, G.O. and Adewumi, J. B. (1983): **Local Government in Nigeria: The Changing Scene** Benin City, Ethiope Publishing House.

Sada, P. O. (1973): *Urbanization Trends and problems of Urban Administration in Niger State*. In Adedeji, A. **Management Problems of Rapid Urbanization in Nigeria**, University of Ife Press, Ile- Ife, Nigeria.

Todaro, M. (1977): **Economic Development in the Third World,** 4th Edition, London Inc.

Turkman, B.N. (1988): **Conducting Educational Research,** 3rd Edition New York: Harcourt, Brace and Govannovidi.

Ukwu, I. U. (1973): *Urbanization and socio-economic development* In Adedeji. A; **Management Problems of Rapid Urbanization in Nigeria,** University of Ife Press Ile-Ife, Nigeria.

United Nations (1996): *World Population Chart* UNI. Headquarters, New-York.

CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0.1 LITERATURE REVIEW

Urbanization is a phenomenon that is surrounded by peculiarities which more often than not, create controversy in attempting to find a bottom line. It connotes different things in different perspectives and different academic disciplines. Hence, the diversity, not only in the definition, trend and typology, but in nature and effect.

For instance, to Mitchell (1956), urbanization is a term that could be used in two senses: demographically and sociologically. The former which has a statistical orientation refers to the proportion of a total population living in places of given size. He further explains that there are many definitions of what constitutes an urban population as distinct from rural one which must be appreciated. Such definitions are variously determined by political, administrative, historical and cultural factors. The latter on the other hand, encompasses the notion of a social process which at once, is the cause and consequence of a change in a man's way of life, and in which deliberate planning assumes a greater and greater role.

Against this background, this chapter dwells extensively on urbanization and the numerous variables associated with it as well as local government and service delivery.

2.0.2 THE CONCEPT OF URBANIZATION

To fully understand the phenomenon of urbanization, it is necessary to distinguish between “urban” and “rural” as references are commonly made to places as such, by sociologists, demographers and even administrators. However, most of such references are rarely based on a universal operational definition.

According to Hauser and Schnore (1965), the definition of an urban place varies from country to country. The duo noted that the delineation of areas as “urban” or “rural” is often related to administrative, political, historical, or cultural considerations as well as demographic criteria. Thus, the United Nations (1951), has classified urban places into three categories: the rest category is the classification of minor civil divisions on a chosen criterion which may include type of local government, number of inhabitants, and proportion of population engaged in agriculture;

The second is the classification of administrative centers of minor rural divisions as rural; and the third is the classification of certain size localities (agglomerations) as urban; irrespective of administrative boundaries.

In addition to the above postulations, the criterion for distinguishing between rural and urban places also vary from country to country. For instance, in Malawi urban places have been defined as all townships and

town planning areas and all district centers; in Swaziland, all locations proclaimed as urban are cities; in Tunisia, urban population refers to population living in “communes”; while in central Africa Republic, it refers to all district and regional centers and rural villages within a radius of an approximate 5 kilometers (Arowolo, 1987).

The inconsistencies that characterize these definitions clearly show how it could be misleading to compare the terms “urban” and “rural” in international analysis due to obvious differences in their usage and application as could be the case with other phenomenon. According to Abu-Lughod and Richard (1977), the study of urbanization is still impeded by the lack of common statistical measures which weakens international comparism and reflects diversity of quantitative features.

In this regard, the historic consideration of “rural” or ”urban” as well as their current features suggests that urban places cannot be defined without considering the changes in time and diversity in local conditions as noted by the United Nations (1969).

Fairholm (1964), in describing the “urban concepts”, catalogued characteristics which include large population, high density of population, diversification of economic activities of the people, socio-cultural diversification, rapid growth in population and physical development. Thus, he defined an urban center as a concentration of at least 5,000

people living in a compact geographic area, having the following characteristics:

- Known Identity
- Wage earning economy
- Tribal diversification
- Absence of socio-cultural contracts.

Furthermore, Mitchell (1956) also, perhaps in attempting to solve the definition puzzle, argues that distinctions must be made between the terms urbanization, detribalization and stabilization, in view of the existing confusion in their use while dealing with urbanization in developing countries.

Hence, urbanization is the process of becoming urban; moving to cities, changing from agriculture to other pursuits common to cities, and corresponding changing behaviour patterns.

The preceding definitions may seem reasonable. However, both are obviously derived from western interpretations, which often pre-suppose that an urban centre should be an industrial, commercial and completely non-agrarian settlement.

The implication is that the complex indigenous socio-cultural and economic organization of non-western communities and settlements are ignored.

Such definitions that depict urban centres as non-agrarian modern (western) settlement are apparently contrasting to Mabogunje's (1978) concept that takes into account the cultural aspect. He argues that, although without industries, the Yoruba cities are differentiated from rural settlements. Apart from having a more elaborate system of administration and greater intensity of trading activities, they were also the main centres of traditional crafts. Given the cultural slant, Yoruba settlement with a minimum of 5,000 people could be regarded as urban".

He concluded that the definition of urbanization must include the various process of urbanization. Thus, urbanization is a movement that brings a large number of people together in one particular spot of the earth's surface through the various processes of urbanization. (Mabogunje, 1968).

This approach to the definition of urbanization may be reasonable and acceptable academically and for the purpose of public investment. A view of which this study really shares.

It is significant however to note that in distinguishing the urban element especially between developed and developing countries population in urbanization studies, two criteria are generally applied; quantitative in terms of minimum population concentration and qualitative such as the characteristics of the economy and models of living.

This method has however, led to the coinage and use of terms like “subsistence urbanization”, “rapid urbanization” “colonial urbanization” etc in describing the nature of the term (Breese, 1966).

Historically, one of the most successful attempts at defining an urban place, according to Arowolo (1987), was provided by Eldridge (1954), when she defines a city as an agglomerations of a homogeneous and relatively independent type, from agglomerations of homogeneous and single purpose types, e.g mining settlements, army camps etc. The former according to Eldridge, may be regarded as urban agglomerations or cities, while the latter is not.

Although this postulation could make a lot of sense theoretically, it could like other postulations, generate a lot of controversy if the metamorphosis of originally mining settlements like Jos and Enugu is taken into account.

Oladosu (1973) sees urbanization as the sources of the concomitant problems of ever expanding housing needs, water supplies, traffic jams and all other basic physical and Infrastructural facilities in urban centers. He postulates that urbanization is the major source of maladjustment in every society, a virulent social evil with a cancerous growth.

He sees the phenomenon as an irreversible trend which is already affecting the way of life of millions of citizens both in developed and

developing countries. He posits values as the best method of prevention and control of its undesired consequences. This he said, could be achieved through setting up of dynamic and effective administrative machinery to administer programmes and urban development policies, so as to transform the deleterious effects on the society, to beneficial and balanced social and economic development. This is in addition to the provision of highly skilled manpower, Finance and expert advice, he logically concluded.

This view however, tends to see the solution at an ideal situation where people work on rational basis without any interplay of the “Nigerian Factor” in the various stages of policy formulation, planning and implementation, apart from the menacing corruption and inefficiency abound in the public service.

Using five large cities in India: Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Delhi and Hyderabad, Vagale (1973) analysed the phenomenon of urbanization with the rural-urban migration model. According to him, investment and employment opportunities, education, health facilities, transport and other, services will be increasingly located in the cities. This will continue to perpetuate rural-urban migration in pursuit of such economic opportunities and social security.

These rural migrants which will be the major source of semi-skilled and unskilled labour will give rise to unemployment, political unrest and

social stress and strain, high cost of social overheads and a multitude of administrative problems, he concluded.

In arresting the situation, he sees solution in a philosophy of metropolitanisation that can give direction and meaning to forces of urbanization as well as industrialization. Such according to him, will transform the cities into economically feasible, physically efficient, socially satisfying and, above all, administratively viable communities.

The approach which is uni-directional, tend to lay more emphasis on the urban centres at the expense of the rural areas, which will subsequently fuel the rate of rural-urban migration, especially when viewed from the pull and push model and its accompanying solution as analyzed by Oni (1989).

Urbanization, according to Oni (1989) can be best understood through the “pull and push model” analysis in which the phenomenon is attributed to the city’s attraction of people, especially the youths, from rural areas, whose harsh conditions have contributed in “pushing” them to migrate and subsequently end up disillusioned and utterly frustrated.

According to him, the concentration of government administration, industrial establishments and commercial concerns, and post-primary institutions in the few, and in most cases capital cities is the bane of the problem.

He presented rough estimates made on the basis of the location of the investment projects and the incidental advantages to either urban and rural areas.

In curbing the menacing trend, Oni advocates the introduction of permit issuing system to migrants into urban centres. This is in addition to the creation of equal economic opportunities, provision of low income housing in both rural and urban centres.

Apart from the creation of satellite towns (new towns) around big urban centres, services like education and health should also be provided in both agglomerations.

The solutions preferred above could be quite effective especially if Johannesburg/Soweto in South Africa, Washington DC/Maryland in USA, Abuja/Kubuwa and Gwarimpa etc in Nigeria, are taken as cases in point respectively. However, such solutions are not only capital intensive but practically rigid, politically controversial especially in relation to the citizens freedom of movement, considering our political and socio-cultural setting. It also fails to consider the level of economic development as well as industrialization and the land tenure system in our society.

For the purpose of this study, the term urbanization shall be used to connote the process of becoming urban – and hence, of ceasing to be rural. In other words, to urbanize means to render urban, to remove the

rural character of a district or a population as a result of any, or a combination of the following variables playing a vital role:

- Demography (population)
- Advanced technology
- Modernized and complex social organization.

Thus, this definition of urbanization is the framework within which distinctions will be made between the two research areas: Kaduna North and Kachia Local governments, hence, the categorization: 'Urban' and 'Rural' Local government areas respectively.

2.1.0 URBANIZATION AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Urbanization, which is often seen as a worldwide general process of producing predicable consequences irrespective of the particular social, cultural, economic and political context, is a phenomenon upon which social scientists work on high levels of generalization.

William B. Munro, writing on city in Encyclopedia of social sciences states: "in all ages and area, from ancient Egypt to Modern America, the highest development of human mentality, initiative and achievement has been in urban communities." Thus, urban communities are pace-setters in sophistication and creativity, while rural areas are associated with decadence.

An almost similar view has portrayed the city as being at the end point of modernity scale, the behavioural anti-thesis of “traditional village”.

Narrowed to the local government level, the relationship between socio-economic development and urbanization can be summarized as

> *“More revenue income through various taxes and rates, allocations and more expenditure in trying to address matters arising from the phenomenon while on the other hand, the situation is completely opposite with rural local governments”.*

In a nutshell, a general relationship between urbanization and economic development has often been assumed, such that “the most highly urbanized countries are, ipso facto, the most developed”, and that the most economically advanced countries must be also, the most urbanized ones.

Looking back to Gordon Childe’s model of emergence of cities as analyzed by Sjoberg (1960), one can see that there is an implication that cities spell “development” or economic and technological advancement, George Chadwick (1987) postulates.

According to Oladosu, the cultural, social, political and economic viability of a nation is usually made evident in her urban centers, such centres usually assume increasing significance with the increasing rate of

a nations development. For it is in these centres that a nation's capability is largely demonstrated. He concluded that "urban development is a fundamental part of all economic and social development" (Adedeji 1973:139).

2.1.1 URBANIZATION, LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND SERVICE DELIVERY

While agreeing that cities offer the cost reducing advantages of agglomeration economies and economies of scale and proximity and other numerous social externalities (e.g. skilled workers, cheap transportation, social and cultural amenities), Todaro (1994) realistically argues that the social costs of a progressive overloading of housing and social services, not to mention increased rate of crime, pollution, and congestion tend to gradually outweigh these historical urban advantages, as observed by the former World Bank president, Robert McNamara. The incidence of urbanization is undoubtedly a universal phenomenon that is national and regional in scope, with vital differences from country to country in the cultural, economic, political and physical organization of human life and it's changing natural environment.

Studies have shown that the influence of urban fields of a country's cities are far flung, and all levels of government are in fact involved in their administration, whether it is Abuja, Kano or Lagos, London, Marseile

or Frankfurt. Indeed, in Africa, Asia, Europe and the Americas, urban administration and local government are by no means identical, complex and fragmented on functional area and hierarchical bases.

Irrespective of typologies; “Local Government” or “Local Administration” from the French “Commune” to the German tradition of “Kreistag”, the emphasis is decentralization through deconcentration of power to sub-national decision units which are hierarchically and politically subordinated to the national centre.

In precise terms, local government is that tier of government close to the people which is rested with certain powers to exercise control over the affairs of people in its domain. There is no nation in the world without local government system, except that this system differs. In some nations, local government just exist as deconcentrated units while in others, they are described as a devolution.

As far as 16th century, Mill and his associate argued that the purpose of local government is to promote democracy at the grassroots level while other writers and theorists like Langrod and Moulin argued that instead, it should be that to service delivery (Oyeyipo, et al. 1988). However, while agreeing with these postulations, Odoh (1996) added that apart from promoting the idea of democracy, local governments are set up to in addition, provide socio-economic services to the people. Undoubtedly, an idea and rational argument that found adherents in

Lagroye and Wright (1979). According to them, in the direct provision of service, the local authorities of most countries are democratic agencies for ordering local priorities and the implementation of local demands, which is essential for relieving overloaded central government.

Apparently, the structural syndrome of decentralization confers on local government, as a lower tier of government, the status to take care of certain activities at the grass roots. These activities are usually spelt out by the higher tier of government and in most cases, documented and formalized. The basic functions performed include the provision of services directly or indirectly to the citizens. In most of such countries, like the practice in Nigeria, central governments heap mandatory services upon the local government, in addition to its concurrent ones. The mandatory services upon the local government are performed without necessary assistance of higher governments while the concurrent ones are shared with the other tiers of government. In short, it's a massive spender, and in principle, an agency for the efficient and democratic provision of services, the duo concluded.

According to Abubakar (1993) local governments act as veritable agents of local service delivery, mobilizers of community based human and materials resources, and organizers of local initiative in responding to a wide variety of local needs and aspirations. Hence, it's existence in one form or the other, in each country the world over, though with

possible differences in such distinguishing features as constitutional status, historical experiences, structures and organisation, as well as in the scope of their statutory, delegated or developed responsibilities and functions among others.

Thus, he argues that the link between local government and national development, especially socio-economic development, is becoming increasingly acknowledged and stressed. This, according to him, is particularly so in light of the fact that development strategies and programmes are increasingly designed to induce community participation towards ensuring sustainable development.

To buttress this postulation, he explains that local governments in Nigeria have indisputably, a significant role to play not only in providing services in such areas like primary health care and education, but also in laying the basic infrastructure for the promotion of agriculture, small-scale manufacturing industries, transportation etc, despite their dismal record of performance in the process.

In particular, local government can, and indeed have in the past, collaborated with special government agencies like the Directorate for Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI), to provide some of the infrastructure and the enabling environment for sustainable development.

Local Government play a crucial role in the development process as decentralized units of power and authority, local governments have an

inherent capacity to provide the most effective organizational framework for responding to a myriad of local demands and aspirations, using as much as is statutorily permissible, local initiatives and resources.

He concluded that the top-down approach which tends to concentrate and over-centralize development effort and initiatives at the apex has been one of the major shortcomings of earlier development efforts in the third world. Hence, the rethink that subsequently manifested in the need for decentralization of both structures (machinery and process of development) which was acknowledged as "local control " by the World Bank:

> ……. *Provides the flexibility needed for proper integration and timing of activities and for the modification of programmes in response to changing condition. Community development, which is greatly facilitated by local rather than centralized control. One particular advantage is that the problems of the community, as perceived by its residents and those imputed by local officials, tend to be more easily reconciled.*

Thus, the federal government (of Nigeria), in recognition of the significant role of local government in the development process, noted in the 1981- 85-development plan:

……. The surest way to get to the grassroots through planning is via the local government authorities.

The various areas in which local government could contribute to the enhancement of a broad development process fall into three major categories: political integration/nation building, social development, and economic growth.

In justifying the role local government in socio-economic development, Nwosu (1988) argues that the main rationale for the existence of any level of government is to maximize the welfare of the citizens, Nigeria took a major step in ensuring the welfare of millions of its the citizens, especially those who live in the rural areas by entrenching the local government system as a third tier of government in its 1979 constitution.

He posited that there is the need to change the current strategy of development. This according to him, is evident in the fact that no government however richly endowed, can supply all the needs of its people, especially in a developing state like Nigeria, where there is a revolution of expectations. Hence, the wide gap between peoples' expectations and the actual accomplishment on the part of the government. This consequently leads to such adverse effects as

alienation, frustration, crime, social unrest and lack of interest on the activities of the state.

He concluded that local government being the level of government that is closer to the people, is the best recipe for achieving the noble objective of providing such basic needs as water, electricity, schools, roads, food, health centres and dispensaries, environmental cleanliness and refuse disposal as well as strategy of self-reliance.

A corresponding view described local government as government "from below" or the grassroots government, whose name connotes the immediate or the nearest government to the people (Yusuf 1998). Its proximity to the masses thus, made it the most popular and the most desired tier of government at the lower strata. He argues that the desirability of the grassroots government is based on the following grounds as stated by various authors:

- It is responsive to public opinion and maintains a state of leadership to the community for which it excises. (Award 1972).
- It accelerates social and economic development, social justice and even development and redresses the imbalances in the distribution of amenities among various communities.
- It fosters civic consciousness and political awareness and equitable method of distribution of power through democratic procedures.

- It is the best organizational mechanism for generating motivations and encouraging mobilization for self-help, as well as including wider participation of the local population in the decision making process at the local level. (Lawton and Maguire, 1980).
- Local government is in a better position to ascertain local requirements and determine local demand to pool together local resources and foster a sense of active involvement in the management of men and affairs as well as generate interest in, and provide support for development programmes (Olayide et al 1981).

While buttressing a similar opinion, Professor Laski posited that

> *"…… An administration which is not local may be unresponsive to local opinion. It is bound, in the nature of things, to miss shades and expression of thought and sentiment, the perception of which is in a real degree urgent to the success of administration"*

In other words, he explained that any government outside the locality is likely to fail to evoke interest and responsibility from the people for whom it wants to provide services.

A similar view was expressed by Maclver who opined that the experience of many countries is that services of local concern are, in the

final analysis, best administered by a properly organised system of local government. According to him

> *"Such functions as water supply, sanitation, maintenance of clinics and dispensaries, maintenance and repairs of roads, lighting of streets and thorough-fares, to mention only a few of such services, must be the undisputed responsibility of local authorities. There can be no disputing that these services have reference to the local needs and it seems reasonable that the locality should be intimately concerned with their management".*

Similarly, using about 138 local governments in the northern Nigeria, Aliyu et al (1980) have analyzed and established the connections between local government and urban as well as rural transformation. The study assessed the impact of post-reform local government on socio-economic development by considering the extent to which local government perform development related functions as a basic indicator.

Using the combination of exclusive and concurrent list, of functions, the trio concluded that:

> *"In sum, the data presented so far reveal that most local governments in the Northern states have assumed new*

roles in the performance of some basic functions which are of importance for development……".

Accordingly, Adeniyi and Obguozobe (1980) while analyzing the performance of local government councils in Niger State concluded that:

"Thus, a lot of development projects have been executed by these governments, great efforts are being made to improve the lives of the local people in terms of the provision of better roads, the building of markets and market stalls, slaughter slabs and slaughter houses, dispensaries and other health centres. Wells have been dug at various locations in the various local government areas in order to improve the rural water supply. There has been the provision of parks and gardens as well as recreational centres in urban centres".

The duo concluded that "all these projects are result-oriented and such results are aimed at improving the lives of the people".

2.1.2 Theoretical Framework

The search for a macro theoretical framework for the study of development and social transformation in third world countries had been

of major concern to social scientists. The problems of social evolution first raised by writers such as Durkheim, Taylor, Morgan, Spencer, Max Weber have become of greater interest. The modernization theory is widely used today as a tool for analyzing the types of socio-economic transformation that takes place among developing communities.

2.1.3 Modernization Theory and Process of Structural Differentiation

According to Wilbert Moore, the concept of modernization denotes the transformation of developing society to a level similar to the type of technology or social organization that is associated with relatively more developed societies of the western world.

Based on the concept of modernization, Neil Smelser coined out a model of structural differentiation for the study of developmental process and social changes. By differentiation, Smelser means the process whereby more specialized and more autonomous social units are established both on the side of public and private authorities. This model does not limit itself to economic determinants but extends to socio-political transformation that accompanies the changes in society.

Thus, economic development (growth of output per head of population) is seen as taking place through:

- The modernization for technology process

- The commercialization of agriculture
- The industrialization process
- Urbanization from small towns and villages to the growth of large urban centres.

These processes he suggests, sometimes occur simultaneously but at other times of different rates.

First, we find that when structural differentiation is taking place, more specialized and autonomous social units are formed; for example, as economic development occurs, several economic activities become separated from kinship ties.

Similarly, changes occur in the field of social stratification as positions now arise from achievement criteria rather than ascription, integration takes place through the formation of specialized units like political parties and pressure groups rather than people being bound only by kinship ties.

As a result of these changes, social unrest usually develops which sometimes depicts the uneven rate of changes. This model recognizes that differences in the level of development of each society determines the impact forces of modernization have on the social system. The model however depicts the general ideal type features and processes of urbanization.

Again, Hoselitz conceptualizes modernization as involving the structural shift from functionally 'diffused' roles to functionally 'specific' roles within the society. Modernization could be influenced by different forces internal or external to the society such as colonization, level of literacy, enlightenment/awareness through the media and migration. The sequence of change and the problems encountered also depends on the policies and strategies of both public authorities and the role to be played by the residents in general.

All modernizing societies are in a process of transition from a condition that is not "modern" to a condition that though "modern", is not necessarily industrialized like the path followed by western nations. It is not a purely economic process but attitudinal, involving questions on how people make choices. The problem of choice is central to modern man, which looks at life as alternatives, preferences and choices which imply rationality and the making of priorities.

Having thus exploited the contents of the modernization theory and its model of structural differentiation, it stands as a convenient theoretical framework for the study of urbanization and its effects on local government service delivery in a developing country like Nigeria, where the rate of urbanization varies according to the location and nature of the local government.

Our two areas of study, Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments have outstanding disparities in their level and rate of urbanization, their revenue base, their programme priorities and thereby, their levels of expenditure.

Reasons for these disparities are both internal (the socio-cultural and economic nature of the growing population) and external (the presence of Federal and State government).

2.1.4 Modernization and Urbanization: Issues of Definition and Interrelationship

Modernity could be considered a relative term which refers to a cluster of associated innovations which at a given point in time represent a paradigm for societal organization. Every historical period is characterized by its own prevailing form of modernity linked to what Simon Kuznets (1966) has called “epochal innovations”. Such innovations are capable of transforming socio- political and economic values. This has been expressed in history through the socio-political and economic changes linked to the growth of cities and the emergence of the centralized territorial state. The most important innovation is the application of science to problems of economic production. More broadly viewed, this involves a cluster of convergent social, political, technological and economic innovations.

Modernization, therefore, represents a combination of innovation diffusion and a series of structural transformation to sustain the continuous change and innovation. This evolutionary process such as socio-economic and political development leads to structural differentiation.

Urbanization on the other hand, usually has a demographic connotation which refers to increase in population generally, or increase in the population of an urban area. It equally refers to the characterization of individuals, i.e the extent to which they are economically, socially, culturally or politically inclined to characteristics of “urban” rather than “rural” life style. But more contextually, urbanization here would refer more to socio-political and structural organizational changes that are related to the transition from rural to urban society in terms of increased population, industrialization, increased employment and wage earning capacity, more economic production, more social/recreational amenities, increased crime rate, over-crowding and more problems for public authorities. All these occur as a result of the modernization process.

The urbanization process therefore, denotes a complex interplay of socio-economic, political, technological, geographical, and cultural factors, though in varying degrees. The accession of African countries to political independence in the 1960s, has just been a step towards socio-political and economic growth, modernization, equity and justice.

Urbanization tends to be an expression of these processes of national development. To cope with urbanization today, there is the need for awareness of the importance of building a viable socio-political and economic base upon which development can thrive.

The study of urbanization is still impeded by the fact that in several national statistics, “urban” settlements are diversely defined. In some of the statistics used, “urban” places are areas with at least 2000-5000 inhabitants whereas in other instances, they are distinguished by administrative criteria or by the prevalence of non agricultural activities. The lack of common statistical measure not only weakens international comparison but also reflects an actual diversity of qualitative features. Urbanization is therefore, a differentiation and specialization in the utilization of space and resources, whereby certain areas receive a disproportionate share of resources and facilities by which they live. In essence, therefore, urbanization results from the process of modernization which fundamentally restructures the nature and evolution of society.

Modernization is associated with some structural characteristic such as a high level of structural differentiation, social mobilizing and a large scale unified institutional framework. These structural characteristic are necessary conditions for development and continuity of a modern institutional framework capable of tackling continuously, changing

problems. Among these conditions are the establishment of viable, flexible effective organization centres responsive to the continuous problems of urbanization and the ability to regulate them. The structural differentiation does not lean only on political development, but strongly touches on the socio-economic organization of the society with respect to the urbanization process.

Against the background above, the modernization phenomenon precisely enhances our understanding of urbanization through its accompanying variables which more often than not, are socio-economic and political determinants that bring about changes and transformation in the society through:

- The acquisition and modernization of technology
- The industrialization process
- The commercialization of agriculture etc.

These processes serve as obvious links between modernization and urbanization because when it occurs in the society, it brings about opportunities in terms of employment and socio-economic empowerment. Also, it tends to create specialization and autonomous units both on the side of public and private investors. Furthermore, such opportunities are usually the “pull” factors that quite often attract people in search of employment. Subsequently, agglomeration or settlement will urbanize from a small town or village to a large urban center.

On the whole, this evolution or transformation is significant to this research because of the challenges and problems it brings about to administrators and authorities in form of over-crowding, shortage of facilities, crime, refuse collection and disposal, public conveniences and the provision of social infrastructures etc. which is the main focus of this research.

2.1.5 Operational Definition of Concepts

1. Development:

Development is considered by Todaro as a multi-dimensional process involving the reorganization of the entire socio-economic order. Economic development could be defined in terms of the elimination of poverty, inequality and unemployment, within the context of a growing economy.

Though some have regarded development as westernization or modernization, a greater majority argue that the concept should be pinned down to specific spheres of life such as economic, social, political or technological development.

However, development should in essence, represent change by which a whole social system or community moves away from conditions widely perceived to be unsatisfactory towards a condition of life regarded as materially and emotionally better. These conditions would include life

sustenance (the ability to provide basic needs), self-esteem (preserving human dignity) and freedom from servitude (be able to make one's choice on things and issues). For the purpose of this study, we will use the term development to mean:

> *"A continuous process of positive change in the quality and span of life of a person or community"*

2. Local Government:

Local Government is generally regarded as a lower tier of government within the constitutional hierarchy of state institutions with its composition, power and functions constitutionally derived. However, postulations notably by Hoffman argue that the political beliefs of those who have authority and responsibility of determining the main features of local government usually influence its "constitutive principle", structure, compositions and functions.

Writers such as Langrod and Moulin argue instead, that the aim of local government is to ensure service delivery. For the purpose of this study however, we shall consider local government as a third tier of government democratically elected by the local people and constitutionally empowered to deliver essential services to its populace with the available means.

3. Urbanization:

According to Mabogunje, Urbanization has usually been linked to city-sized growth with economic indicators which are usually more glaring to be seen. However, he advocates for consideration of conditions of social integration, political awareness and participation.

Urbanization could equally have a demographic connotation referring to increase in population generally, or population living in an urban area. Within our context however, urbanization would refer more to socio-political and organizational changes that are related to the transition from rural to urban society through the process of modernization. For the purpose of this study certain indices will be considered to indicate urbanization such as:

- Increase in population size
- Increase in industrialization and socio-economic activities
- An increase in wage earning capacity of the population
- Increase in government revenue and expenditure
- The specialization of functions and
- An increase in crime, insecurity and over-crowding

4. Urban Local Government:

For the purpose of our study, we would refer to an urban local government to be a local government with a large population, and high population density. Its socio-economic structure is characterized by

modernization, commercialization and industrialization. The society is specialized in aspects of production and socio-economic activities. Thus, Kaduna North Local Government is placed in this category.

5. Rural Local Government:

This refers to local government which defies most of the characteristics of an urban area, with a relatively smaller population, a low population density and lacks many socio-economic activities, with subsistence agriculture being the predominant activity of over 70% of the population. Accordingly, Kachia Local Government is equally placed in this category too.

REFERENCES

Abubakar, H.I. (1993): "United Nations Development Programme (NIR/91/001) Population and Development", 6 Weeks Programme in Population and Development Modules.

Adedeji, A. (1973): *Urbanization Challenge in Nigeria; A race against Time*. In Adedeji A. and Rowland L (ed); **Management Problems of Rapid Urbanisation in Nigeria,** University of Ife Press, Ile Ife, Nigeria.

Adeniyi E.O and Ogbuozobe, (ed) 1973: *Local Government and socio – Economic Development in Niger State*. Ibid.

Aliyu, Y.A., el. al. (1973): *The Involvement of Local Government in Social, Political and Economic Development in the Northern State:* 1976 – 1979. In Abubakar, A., et al, **The Role of Local Government in Social, Political and Economic Development in Nigeria 1976 – 1979,** Department of Local Government Studies Institute of Administration Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.

Arowolo, O. O. (1987): *Population and Urbanization,* **Population Education Monograph 4,** Population source Book, Nigeria Educational Research and Development Council, Yaba – Lagos Nigeria.

Breese, G. (1966): **Urbanization in Newly Developing Countries,** Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey; prentice – hall.

Fairholm, G. W. (1965): **Native Authority Finance Pattern,** Institute of Admin. Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.

Friedman, J. (1972): *A General Theory of Polarized Development*. In Niles, Hansen (ed), **Growth Centre in Regional Economic Development,** N.Y Free press, in Abu – Lughod, J. and Hay, R. Jnr: **Third World Urbanization**, Metheun Publishers, 1977.

Hance, W.A, (1970): **Population, Migration and Urbanization in Africa,** New York.

Hauser, P.M. and Schnore, L.F. (1965) - (eds) **Study of Urbanization,** New York: John Wiley.

Hoselitz, B.F (1957): *Urbanization and Economic Growth in Asia,* Congress for cultural freedom conference on problems of Economic growth; Tokyo (April 1 – 6 1957), in Breese, G. **Urbanization in Newly Developing Countries,** Englewood cliffs N. J; Prentice Hall.

Kuznets, S. (1966): **Modern Economic Growth**, New Haven, Connecticut. Yale University Press.

Lagroye, J. And Wright, V. (1979): **Local Government in Britain and France: Problems and prospects,** George Allen and Unwin, London.

Laleye, O. M. (1988): *Social Service Delivery and Local Government in Nigeria*. In Oyeyipo, E.H.O et al, **Leading Issues in Territorial Decentralization in Nigeria and France,** Institute of Admin. Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria Nigeria.

Mabogunje, Akin L: (1968): **Urbanization in Nigeria,** London, University of London Press.

- (1976): **Cities and African Development,** Ibadan, Oxford University Press.

- (1989): **The Development Process,** 2nd Edition Unwin Hyman, London.

Mitchell, J. C. (1956): *Urbanization, Detribalisation and Stabilization in Southern Africa*. I. A. I London: UNESCO; Social Implications of Industrialization and Urbanization in Africa South of the Sahara (Paris: UNESCO, 1956) in Breese, G. **Urbanization in Newly Developing Countries**. Englewood cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice Hall.

Myrdal, G. (1957): **Rich Lands and Poor,** New York: Harper and Row.

National Population Commission, *Census 91; National Summary*. NPC (Nov. 1994).

Nwosu, A. (1988): *Local Government as an Instrument of Development in Rural areas of Nigeria*. In Oyeyipo, E.A.O. et al (eds), **Leading Issues in Territorial Decentralization in Nigeria and France,** Institute of Admin. Ahmadu Bello University Zaria, Nigeria.

Odoh, A. (1988): *Financing Health Service in Local government*. Ibid.

Oladosu, S.A. (1981): **Kaduna Essays in Local Government,** Kaduna.

Olowu, D. (1982) - (ed): **The Administration of Social Service in Nigeria; The Challenges of Local Government,** University of Ile – Ife.

Oni, S.B. (1980): **Management of Rapid Growth of Urbanization in Nigeria,** Oluseyi Publishers: Gaskiya Corporation, Zaria, Nigeria.

Oyeyipo, E.A.O and Odoh, A. (1974) - (ed): **Government at the Grassroots Levels in Nigeria,** Department of Local Government studies ABU. Zaria.

Salah E. and Robert O. (1974) - (eds): **Urbanization, National Development and Regional Planning In Africa,** New York; Praeger.

Seers, D. (1977): **The Meaning of Development,** International Development review No. 3.

Sjoberg, G. (1960): **The Pre – Industrial City; Past and Present,**

Smelser, N.J. (1968): *Essays in Sociological Explanation*. Englewood Cliffs, New jersey; Prentice – Hall in Moore, W. E. **Social Change,** Englewood cliffs N.J. Prentice – Hall.

Todaro, M. (1977): **Economic Development in the Third World,** Forth Edition. Longman Inc.

Vagale, L.R. (1973): *Local Government in Metropolitan Cities of India in Relation to Urban Planning and Development*, in Adedeji A. and Rowland, L. (eds) **Management problems of Rapid Urbanization in Nigeria,** University of Ife, Nigeria.

Wildavsky, A. (1979): **The Politics of Budgetary process,** Third Edition, Little Brown Company, Boston, 1979.

CHAPTER THREE

3.0 INTRODUCTION

Kaduna State occupies part of the central portion of northern part of Nigeria, and shares common border with Zamfara, Katsina, Niger, Kano Bauchi and Plateau States. To the south-west, the state share a border with the Federal capital Territory, Abuja. The global location of the state is between longitude 06^0 East of the Greenwich meridian and also between latitude 09^0 and 11^0, 30^0 north of the equator. Figure 1 illustrates the location of Kaduna state on the Map of Nigeria.

3.0.1 SIZE, CLIMATE, VEGETATION AND POPULATION

The state occupies an area of approximately 48,473.2 square kilometers. The entire land structure consists of an undulating plateau with scattered hills towards the southern part of the state. The major rivers in the state include River Kaduna, River Galma, and River Gurara. There are two marked seasons in the state; the dry and rainy seasons. The latter usually commences from April through October with great variations towards the Northern part of the state. Studies have shown that on the whole, the state enjoys an average rainy season of about five months.

The state extends from the tropical grassland known as guinea savannah to the Sudan savannah in the north. The grassland is a vast region covering the southern part of the of the state to about latitude 11^0 north of the equator. It is significant to note that the prevailing vegetation of tall grass and big trees are of economic importance during both the wet and dry seasons.

In terms of population, based on the 1991 census figures, Kaduna state has a population of 3.96 million people, with a population density of about 700 persons per square kilometer. However, further demographic studies and analysis have shown that currently, the state has a projected population of 5,055,684 people. In addition, about 80 percent of the state population are engaged in peasant farming, producing both food and cash crops. Such crops include cotton, groundnuts, tobacco, guinea corn, maize, millet, yam, ginger, rice, beans, cassava, potatoes. During the dry season, a considerable number of people in the state engage in irrigation farming along some major rivers and dams. The crops cultivated are mainly vegetable and sugar cane. People also engage in the rearing of such animals as cattle, sheep, goats, poultry and pigs.

Kaduna State is the fourth most populous state in the Federation and represents major focus and centre of political and economic activities in the nation. It occupies a very strategic position in terms of its historical role in contemporary political development and economic activities.

Consequently, developments in Kaduna state invariably have national implications. The state has 23 local government councils as illustrated in figure: 2 and table 1 below.

LGA	HEADQUARTERS
BIRNIN GWARI	Birnin Gwari
CHIKUN	Kujama
GIWA	Giwa
IGABI	Turunku
IKARA	Ikara
JABA	Kwoi
JEMA'A	Kafanchan
KACHIA	Kachia
KADUNA NORTH	Doka
KADUNA SOUTH	Makera
KAGARKO	Kagarko
KAJURU	Kajuru
KAURA	Kaura
KAURU	Kauru
KUBAU	Anchau
KUDAN	Hunkuyi
LERE	Saminaka
MAKARFI	Makarfi
SABON GARI	Sabon Gari
SOBA	Maigana
SANGA	Gwantu
ZARIA	Zaria
ZANGO KATAF	Zonkwa

Table 1: names and headquarters of 23 local governments in Kaduna State.

Source: Survey by Researcher

Furthermore, the major ethnic groups in the state include Hausa, Fulani, Gbagi, Bajju, Jaba, Kanninkon, Atyap, Ikulu etc. However, there is a significant presence of virtually most, if not all of the ethnic groups

available in Nigeria, perhaps as a result of its strategic location and status, which probably explains why it is widely described as a “Melting-pot”.

3.0.2 DEMOGRAPHY, STATUS AND URBANIZATION TREND

Kaduna, undoubtedly, one of the current largest urban centres, has a rather chequered history.

According to the 1963 population census, Kaduna as an agglomeration had about 260,000 people while by 1991, the figure had reached, 3.96 million. It was administered as part of Zaria province until 1956. In addition, most of it was ‘township’ while the rest of the area had a District head (the Magajin Gari) under Zaria local Authority. Then, in 1956, Kaduna was excised from the province and established as a Capital Territory, directly controlled by Government. The administrator; a government officer, was responsible to a ministry, however the ministry having responsibility for Kaduna affairs was changed at various times. The post of Magajin Gari (the district Head) was maintained and paid from Kaduna capital territory funds but the effective management of Kaduna was in the hands of the Administrator, assisted by an advisory board.

However, in 1962, after the death of the Magajin Gari, a Kaduna Native Authority was set up. In fact, the administrator continued to run all

services in effect, applying both Kaduna capital territory laws and other Native Authority Laws at the same time, even though the Kaduna native Authority never got going practically, as much of the service provision was in the hands of various ministries. After the creation of 12 states, the Kaduna Local Authority metamorphosed and transformed to Kaduna North and Kaduna South Local Government. It is significant to note that inspite of all these, some services are still provided directly by ministries, hence, the direct state Government and Federal government 'presence'

3.0.3 PATTERN OF URBANIZATION IN KADUNA STATE

Urbanization deals essentially with the proportion of the national population that is urban. Urbanization in Nigeria can be differentiated along two lines; traditional and modern.

The Northern Sudan, presently Northern Nigeria, has been the scene of traditional urbanism dating back to the 10^{th} century. Traditional urbanism in the north was founded on surplus agricultural wealth which, apart from sustaining the non-agricultural population, provided the basis for inter-regional trade. Zaria, apart from Kano, Katsina, Sokoto, Borno and Bida is among the notable earliest northern towns that have survived the present time with a fairly long the history of urban agglomeration.

The boundary of Zaria and similar cities in the north were demarcated by town walls with gates strategically located. From the

gates fairly broad roads converge on the centers of the city where all major institutions and facilities in the cities are concentrated. Dominating everything in the centre is the Emir's palace; the hub of political and administrative authority. Close to the central principal mosque is the market, together, representing the religious and economic interests of the community. The centre is surrounded by the houses of the notables and commoners, with the quality of such housing varying according to status and power.

On the other hand, studies have shown that modern urban agglomerations were mostly a product of colonial economic influence. Such towns or cities, by location and function, conform more to modern concepts of urbanism. Furthermore, most of such modern centers have also experienced some physical planning and are equipped with some modern social services such as pipe-borne water, electricity, designed layout, motorable road network and streets etc. For instance, cities like Jos (mining) Lagos (port) Port Harcourt (industries) Kaduna (Commercial, Industrial and Administrative centre) are the key examples.

On the whole, it is significant to note that urbanization in Nigeria can be classified and differentiated along traditional and modern lines, and urban expansion within each typology poses different problems of administration, planning and economic development. Against this background, it is clearly evident that Kaduna has no doubt, fallen

perfectly within the “modern” urbanization typology while on the other hand, one cannot hastily draw a similar conclusion in respect of Kachia. These factors therefore, are the bases upon which the description or definition of “urban and “rural” local government anchors.

Furthermore, from the above scenario, it is obvious that it could be asserted easily, that while Kaduna North is busy grappling with such problems as over-crowding, housing shortages, high crime rate, unemployment and all forms of pollution and environmental hazards such as industrial pollution, water pollution, noise pollution and refuse collection, as well as the over-stretching of the existing Infrastructural facilities, Kachia Local Government should be busy formulating policies and programmes that will enhance rapid urbanization especially through the provision of basic amenities and infrastructures such as electricity, pipe borne water, recreational facilities and self-reliance initiative as agricultural subsidy which will create employment, and thus, check the rural-urban drift.

3.0.4 KADUNA AND THE STATUS PHENOMENON

Defining the distinction between “Kaduna capital” and Kaduna Local Government’ is often difficult, this is because both are one but different.

Kaduna North, often referred to as “The pioneer local government” is the first and oldest local government in the state. In fact, the history of the local government dates back to the pre-colonial era during which the area was under the Makera District Head, Iyan Zazzau, Iya Abdullahi. At that time, the Hausa people were living at Makera, Kawo and Barnawa while gabasawa, parts of Doka and the outskirts of Makera and Kawo had the Gbagyi (Gwari) inhabitants. This obviously means that the indigenous tribes of the were largely Hausa, Fulani and Gbagyi (Gwari).

Studies have shown that when Iya Abdullahi, (the then Zazzau) was District Head of Makera, Makera was under the Zazzau Emirate under the reign of the respected Sarkin Zazzau Aliyu Dan Sidi, the grandson of Mallam Musa, the flag bearer of Shehu Usman Danfodio.

In 1914, however, Lord Lugard, the representative of the colonial masters, amalgamated Northern and Southern Nigeria and moved the headquarters of Northern province from Zungeru to Kaduna. He came along with people from Sierra Leone, Ghana (gold Coast) Dahomey (Benin) and Niger to settle in Kaduna.

Furthermore, on March 1, 1956, the Northern House of Chiefs passed and approved Kaduna as the capital territory of Northern Nigeria, with an administrator and Magajin Gari, Mallam Sambo-the District Head, as the Assistant Administrator.

The Kaduna Native Authority existed until after the 1966 coup, when states were created, and Kaduna lost the capital territory status of northern Nigeria.

3.1.0 KADUNA NORTH AS A LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The Federal Government in 1976 introduced local government reforms in which Native Authorities were abolished and replaced with local government authorities throughout the Federation. Kaduna which had its local government status since 1974, had for the first time, an elected chairman instead of the usual appointment, in person of Alh. Yusuf Dantsoho.

However, with the creation of new local government areas in 1990, Kaduna local government area became two local government areas (Kaduna North local government area and Tudun Wada/Makera local government area) with their Headquarters at Doka and Makera respectively. Subsequently, Tudun Wada was renamed Kaduna South while Makera remained the Headquarters.

3.1. GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION, POPULATION AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION

Kaduna North is located between latitudes 10^0 35' North and 10^0 35" North and longitudes 7^0 25" E and 7^0 36" E. It is bordered in the North and East by Igabi local government area, south, West, South East and North East by Kaduna South, Chikun, Kajuru and Kauru Local Government Areas respectively. The local government area is found within the Guinea savannah region of the country with an annual rainfall of 50 centimeters.

According to the 1991 census figure, Kaduna North local government has a population 348,000 from 71,830 households, with a total of 186,633 males and 161,367 females. Interestingly, perhaps due to Kaduna and its numerous and multiple status, the local government is undoubtedly heterogeneous in nature and cosmopolitan in outlook.

The main ethnic groups in the area are Hausa, Gbagyi (gwari) and Fulani. Other inhabitants include Kadara, Jaba, Bajju, Kagoma, Kagoro, Atyap, Kamantan, Ikulu, Moroa, Numana, Gwandara, Kaninkon, Fantsan, Mada, Ayu, Ninzom, which are often described as major ethnic groups of the state. Other ethnic groups and tribes are Igbo, Yoruba, Idoma, Igala, Tiv, Angas, Kanuri, Ebira, Jukun, Nupe, Dakarkari, Bini, Efik, and many other tribes of Nigeria and such foreigners as Ghanians, Cameroonians Nigerians etc.

3.1. POLITICAL STRUCTURE

Kaduna North local government had three Districts prior to the recent additional creation namely, Doka, Gabasawa and Kawo. Furthermore, the local government comprises of eleven wards;

Kawo,

Unguwar Dosa,

Badarawa,

Unguwar Kanawa/Hayin Banki,

Gabasawa,

Unguwar Sarki,

Gaji,

Mai Birji,

Shaba,

Liman and unguwar Shanu/Abakpa wards.

3.2.0 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF KACHIA LOCAL GOVERNMENT

In order to achieve strong basis for a concrete comparative analysis, it is absolutely necessary to as well, present a brief historical review of Kachia local government.

The local government derived its name from the agglomeration known as “Kachia”. This term, which is argued to have had its origin from the word “Kachi”, which literarily means “to eat”, in Hausa language, is said to have been the name of the first settler; a Hausa hunter, in Katanga ward of present Kachia town, about five hundred to six hundred years ago (Salihu 1984).

However, this settlement subsequently became a trade centre where caravans used to meet for various trading activities, enroute such towns as Kaduna, Zaria, Keffi, Jos, Abuja, etc.

Subsequently, Kachia’s growth was further boosted both in size and population with the separate arrival of two groups of missionaries in the area. The first group known as the “Sudan Interior Mission (SIM) which arrived in 1914, settled in “Kwoi”, which is currently in Jema’a local government. This group however, later moved to another place known as Kurmin Musa which is in the present Kachia local government. The second known as the “catholic missionaries” arrived in 1937, and settled at Mazuga; a village about ten kilometers from the present Kachia town.

In order to accomplish a successful missionary mission, these missionaries opened hospital, clinics, and dispensaries. This is in addition to a number of schools, both adult and primary, purposely to ‘transform’ the inhabitants of the area.

This has attracted people from the surrounding villages and communities who came to either secure employment or to acquire knowledge, hence, the increase in population and size. Studies have shown that some of these structures still exist today in various locations in the local government.

3.2.1 CLIMATE, POPULATION AND ETHNIC GROUPS

Geographically, Kachia occupies similar longitude and latitude as K/North. It also lies within the zone that is initially Geo-politically described as “Southern Zaria” or “Southern Kaduna”, as recent trends have shown. The area normally enjoy a rainy season that lasts for about eight to nine months annually. That perhaps, explains why farming, hunting and animal rearing are the major occupations of the inhabitants of Kachia, while such crops as Ginger and maize are mainly grown in the southern part, millet, guinea corn and rice are grown in the northern part.

According to the 1991 population census figures, as at then, Kachia local government has a total population of 206, 711 from 35,958 households with the male population standing at 105,205 while the females are 101,506. However, subsequent projections on population have indicated that Kachia local government’s current population has exceeded this figure.

The ethnic composition of Kachia local government is typical of most agglomerations in Nigeria. A Geo-linguistic survey of Kachia clearly indicates that there about fifteen different tribes in the local government. However, from the traditional dichotomous analysis of “majority” and “minority” phenomenon, the major ones are Jaba, predominantly occupying the southern part, while Gwari’ or Gbagyi’ as they always emphasise, together with kadara, occupy the Northern and the North-Western parts respectively. The minorities in the area are Hausa, Fulani, Kataf, Ikulu, Koro etc.

3.2.2 SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT

Apart from the ginger processing industry which stands out like a monument in the area, only such minor industries as bakeries, Agro-Allied industries, block-making and including mechanical workshops could be found.

However, there exist such financial institutions as banks, often described in the banking jargon as “rural branches”.

Similarly, apart from the motel owned by the state government, Kachia has comparatively very few hotels and recreational facilities. In the area of modern communication, not much could be said of Kachia especially in the aspect of Hi-Tech communications.

In the area of road communication, Kachia is located along a trunk A road; which starts from Kaduna to Jos. It is also linked to Kaduna, the state capital and to Abuja, the Federal capital.

3.2.2 KACHIA AS A LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Politically, Kachia as a local government, was established in 1976, during the Murtala/Obasanjo's creation of new local government exercise. Then, it had five districts, namely, Kajuru, Kagarko, Kujama and Zango Kataf, each of which was headed by a head who was traditionally turbaned from Zaria, under the Native Authority system of administration.

However, as a result of subsequent Geo-political development dynamics, such local government as Kagarko, Zangon Kataf, Chikun, Kajuru and Jaba were created, and adjustments were effected in numerous boundaries in order to facilitate the effectiveness of the new order. Thus, to the North, it shares boundaries with Chikun and Kajuru local governments, Kagarko and Jaba local government to the South, Niger state and Zangon Kataf local Government to the west and East respectively.

Currently, Kachia as a local government is made up of twelve (12) wards, each with a councilor representing it at the local government council. Furthermore, it must be noted that due to numerous factors, Kachia as a local government is not as urbanized as Kaduna. Thus, it's

rural outlook. Indeed, apart from the Kachia itself, not much could be said in terms of urbanization of other wards. The wards are:

1. Ankwa Ward
2. Doka Ward
3. Gumel Ward
4. Kurmin Musa Ward
5. Gidan Tagwai Ward
6. Katuru Ward
7. Bishini Ward
8. Sabon Sarki Ward
9. Agunu Ward
10. Kachia central Ward
11. Awon Ward
12. Katari Ward.

CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

4.0.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with data collection and analysis. As it was earlier mentioned in chapter one, the methodology adopted for the purpose of this study was not confined to a single method because of the broad nature of the topic. In the local government councils of our study, however, most of the people, especially senior staff, tend to adopt a luke – warm attitude towards filling questionnaires, while sometimes, those who were able to supply information, do so subjectively. On the other hand, the junior staff of the Local Government Councils as well as some members of the communities, often need to be guided in order to give appropriate information.

These, and the desire to collect a more accurate data that will provide an insight in to the reality of urbanization and service delivery of Local Government councils, prompted the researcher to use a multiple method of data collection. Therefore, most of the data used in this study is the primary; which is often, more accurate and relevant for a research directed towards solving a particular problem. Furthermore, secondary data, which is of optimum benefit to the field of study, was also utilized.

Furthermore, data of varying degree of relevance were also collected through the use of oral interview with departmental/sectional or units heads of various Departments/Units and some of the political office functionaries of the councils. In this regard, some questions were designed to embrace issues raised on the basis of assumption and the hypotheses. This method, unlike the questionnaires, ensures that answers were obtained directly from the respondents. Clarification of certain fundamental issues were easily resolved. Such a method had created for the researchers, the opportunity to watch the respondent's reaction and sincerity of purpose.

The interviews were personally conducted in the offices, and responses were recorded accordingly. The questions during the interview, were open – ended, unlike the yes/No type of questionnaire (close ended).

Thus, out of the four hundred and fifty (450) questionnaires that were distributed in Kaduna North Local Government Area four hundred and five (405) were returned, and only three hundred and sixty were correctly filled and used for analysis. In Kachia Local Government Area however, four hundred and forty (440) questionnaires were administered while four hundred and one (401) were returned, and only three hundred and thirty (330) were correctly filled and used for analysis.

Our sample size consisted of three hundred and sixty (360) people for Kaduna North Local Government Area, and three hundred and thirty (330) for Kachia Local Government Area.

4.0.2 IMPACT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COUNCIL ON SERVICE DELIVERY

In this section, we would examine the role and impact of Kaduna North and Kachia Local Government Areas in tackling and coping with urbanization, through service delivery since 1992. This will enable us to know the extent to which the Local Governments in our areas of study have strived towards the attainment of their objectives. Furthermore, we would have to sample the views of the local people on the service delivery initiatives of their local government with the aim of corroborating or justifying the allocation in annual expenditure, meant to achieve the service delivery objective.

In this regard, the local residents' cooperation in responding to a set of relevant questions was solicited. This is addition to the relevant data and useful information that were obtained from the Local Government Authorities and head of NGO's. Thus, since the main objectives of this study and the hypotheses were stated in Chapter One, the examination of role and impact of the Local Governments in Managing urbanization and service delivery would be presented and discussed according to the order

of the hypotheses, which formed the basis of the structure of the questionnaires.

4.0.3 HYPOTHESIS ONE

In this section, we shall test our first hypothesis which we restate here: “That the nature and scope of service delivery of a Local Government is dictated by its level of urbanization. In other words, the type and quantity of services of a Local Government Varies with the level of urbanization”.

In order to test the Validity or otherwise of the hypothesis above, we would want to know the nature and level of urbanization in the areas of study for appropriate analysis. Furthermore, it is expected that the pattern of responses of the population sample will complement the records of budgetary expenditure obtained from the area of study in shedding more light on the issue of urbanization and service delivery in Local Government.

4.0.4 RESPONDENTS’ PROFILE

The data collected from this first section showed that in Kaduna North Local Government Area, 70% of the respondents were males while 30% were females. While in Kachia Local government Area, 80% were males and 20% were females. Regarding their ages, all the respondents

represented nearly all the adult age groups of working age. Out of the 360 respondents in Kaduna North Local Government Area, 73% were married while 27% were single. In terms of education, their qualifications ranged from First School Leaving Certificates to Degrees. On the other hand, out of the 330 respondents in Kachia Local Government Area, 81% were married while 19% were single. Also, their qualifications ranged from First Leaving School Certificate to degree levels.

In terms of their years of service, in Kaduna North Local Government Council, their responses showed that 120 or 33.33% of the respondents have spent between 1 to 3 years; 140 or 38.88% have spent between 4 to 7 years and 100 or 27.77% have spent between 8 years and above. In Kachia Local Government on the other hand, the responses of respondents showed that 80 or 24.24% have spent between 1 to 5 years, 160 or 48.48% have spent between 4 to 7 Years and 90 or 27.27% Have spent 8 years and above. All these views are represented in table 4.1 provided below:

Table 4.1 Responses on the years of service of respondents in Kaduna North and Kachia Local Government Councils.

	Kaduna North Local Government		Kachia Local Government	
YEARS OF SERVICE	**NO. OF RESPONDENTS**	**PERCENTAGE**	**NO. OF RESPONDENTS**	**PERCENTAGE**
1-3	120	33.33	80	24.24
4-7	140	38.88	160	48.48
8 and above	100	27.77	90	27.27
Total	**360**	**100**	**330**	**100**

Source: Survey by the Researcher

Furthermore, the researcher sought to know, the process of urbanization as observed or experienced in the two local governments as could be seen in table 4.2. below:

Responses on the process of Urbanization in Kaduna North and Kachai Local Governments.

Question: Are you aware of the process of urbanization occurring within your Local Government?

LOCAL GOVERNMENT	**KADUNA NORTH LOCAL GOVERNMENT**		**KACHIA LOCAL GOVERNMENT**	
Responses	No. of Respondents	%	No. of Respondents	%
Yes	258	71.66	220	66.66
No	102	28.33	110	33.33
Total	360	100	330	100

Source: Survey by the Researcher

As could be seen in Table 4.2 above, 258 71.66% of the respondents in Kaduna North Local Government answered in the affirmative and only 102 or 28.33% answered in the negative. While in Kachia Local Government, 220 or 66.66% answered in the affirmative and only 110 or 33.33% of the respondents said that they were not aware of the process of urbanization occurring in their area. However, majority of the respondents in both Local Governments expressed the views that they were aware of such a process taking place in their areas.

In this regard, we tried to find out from the respondents how, they recognized such a process taking place in their areas. The table below presented their views.

Table 4.3 Responses on recognition of the process of Urbanization in Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments

QUESTION: if yes, how do you recognize it?

LOCAL GOVERNMENT		**KADUNA NORTH Local GOVERNMENT**		**KACHIA LOCAL GOVERNMENT**	
S/N	Responses	No of Respondents	%	No of Respondents	%
A	Growth of Industries	75	20.83	18	5.32
B	Increases in Population	109	30.27	115	34.78
C	Spatial Growth of the L.G.A	70	19.56	151	45.69
D	Increases in Social facilities	44	12.21	22	6.83
E	All of the above	62	17.12	24	7.38
	TOTAL	**360**	**100**	**330**	**100**

Source: Survey by the Researcher

As Table 4.3. above indicates, almost all the respondents in the areas recognized the process of urbanization through increases in population as well as spatial growth of the Local Government areas.

In view of the above, we tried to find out whether urbanization had in any way affected the nature of Local Government services. Majority of the respondents in both Local Governments indicated that it had, while a few disagreed. Table 4.4 below shows the opinion of the respondents on local government service delivery.

Table 4.4: Responses on effect of Urbanization on Local Government services in Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments.

Question: Has urbanization in any way affected the nature of Local Government Services?

LOCAL GOVERNMENT	**KADUNA NORTH L. G**		**KACHIA L. G**	
Responses	**No of respondents**	**%**	**No of Respondents**	**%**
Yes	352	71.66	318	96.36
No	8	2.22	12	3.63
TOTAL	360	100	330	100

Source: Survey by the Researcher

The result in Table 4.4 above clearly indicates that in Kaduna North, 352 or 97.77% of the respondents were in the affirmative that urbanization has effect on the nature of Local Government services, and only 8 or 2.22% of the respondents felt that urbanization has no effect on the services being provided by Local Government. While 318 0r 96.36% of the respondents in Kachia Local Government were of the opinion that urbanization has effect on the nature of services being provided by the Local Government, and only 12 or 3.63% thought otherwise.

The respondents were however asked whether the effect of urbanization had improved or slowed down the development process in their areas. Their views are expressed in table 4.5 below.

Table 4.5: Reponses on effects of urbanization on Development in Kaduna North and Kachia local governments.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT Responses	KADUNA NORTH L. G.		KACHIA L. G.	
	No of respondents	%	No of Respondents	%
Improved	210	58.33	80	24.24
Slowed down	110	30.35	211	63.93
I do not know	40	11.11	39	11.81
Total	**360**	**100**	**330**	**100**

Source: Survey by the Researcher

As could be seen in the above table, 210 or 58.335% of the respondents in Kaduna North Local government felt that urbanization had improved the development of their area; 110 or 30.55%, felt that such urbanization has only slowed down the development of their areas, while 40 or 11.11% of the respondents in Kachia Local Government were of the opinion that urbanization has improved the development of their areas, 211 or 63.93% felt that it has slowed down the development of their areas while 39 or 11.8% felt that it has neither improved nor slowed down the development of their areas.

In view of their responses above, we tried to find out whether such urbanization has changed the order of the priorities of the Local Governments. The views of the respondents are indicated in Table 4.6 below.

Table 4.6: Responses on influence of urbanization on the Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments.

Question: Would you say that urbanization has influenced the order of priorities of your Local Government?

LOCAL GOVERNMENT	**KADUNA NORTH L.G**		**KACHIA Local. Government**	
Responses	**No. Of Respondents**	**%**	**No. Of Respondents**	**%**
Yes	292	81.88	240	72.72
No	68	18.88	90	27.27
TOTAL	**360**	**100**	**330**	**100**

Source: Survey by the Researcher

As shown in Table 4.6 above, a greater percentage of the respondents in Kaduna North Local Government 292 or 81.11% answered in the affirmative while 68 or 18.88% of the respondents did not agree that urbanization has changed the order of priorities of their Government. In Kachia Local Government on the other hand, majority of the respondents 240 or 72.72% felt that urbanization has changed the priorities of their Local Government, while 90 or 27.27% of the respondents though otherwise.

It could be deduced thus, that urbanization has influenced the priorities of both Local governments, with Kaduna North Local Government having a higher influence and impact of urbanization.

In view of the responses above, we tried to find out the way and manner by which Local Government Services have been affected. Table 4.7 below presents the respondents opinions.

Table 4.7: Reponses on the manner of effects of urbanization on Local Government Services.

Question: How have Local Government Services been affected?

LOCAL GOVERNMENT		**KADUNA NORTH L. G**		**KACHIA LOCAL GOVERNMENT**	
	Responses	**No of Respondents**	**%**	**No of respondents**	**%**
A	Priorities have changed	77	21.44	75	22.59
B	Increases in demand for more services	80	22.32	82	24.94
C	Increases in demand for more quantity of services	36	9.85	25	7.54
D	Increases in demand for more quality of services	61	16.84	43	12.98
E	All of the above	106	29.55	105	31.95
	TOTAL	**360**	**100**	**330**	**100**

Source: Survey by the Researcher

As table 4.7 reveals, most of the respondents in both Local Governments have admitted that urbanization has affected service delivery in their respective areas in multiple ways. In Kaduna North Local

Government for instance, 77 or 21.44% of the respondents have observed change in priorities, 80 or 22.32% observed increase in demand for more services, 36 or 9.85% observed increase in quality of services, 61 or 16.84% have observed increases in quantity of services while 106 or 29.55% of the respondents have admitted observing all the ways mentioned above.

In Kachia Local Government on the other hand, 75 or 22.59% of the respondents admitted that priorities have changed 82 or 24.94% observed increase in demand for more qualitative services, 25 or 7.54% observed increase in demand for more qualitative services, 43 or 12.98% observed increase in demand for more qualitative services while 105 or 31. 95% of the respondents admitted observing all the ways aforementioned.

On the whole, it is evident that urbanization has influenced the functions of both Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments, with the former experiencing greater impact and influence of urban fields.

Furthermore, the study tried to figure out from the respondents views on whether the level of urbanization process in their Local Government areas is the same.

Table 4.8: Assessment of the level of urbanization process in both Local Governments; Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments.

Question: What rate in your opinion is the process of urbanization occurring in your Local Government?.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT	**KADUNA NORTH LG**		**KACHIA LOCAL GOVERNMENT**	
Responses	**No of respondents**	**%**	**No of Respondents**	**%**
Fast	140	38.88	36	10.90
Slow	29	5.55	128	38.78
Average	32	8.88	80	24.24
Very fast	168	46.66	86	26.06
Very slow	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	**360**	**100**	**330**	**100**

Source: Survey by the Researcher.

Table 4.8 above, reveals that 140 or 38.88% of the number of respondents in Kaduna North Local Government were of the opinion that the rate of urbanization process is fast in their Local Government; 20 or 5.55% of the respondents in the same local government felt that the process is slow; 32 or 8.88% were of the opinion that it is average while 168 or 46.66% opined that the rate is very fast.

In Kachia Local Government on the other hand, 36 or 10.90% were of the opinion that the rate of urbanization process is fast in their Local Government, 128 or 38.78% were of the opinion that it is slow 80.24% felt that it is average, 80 or 24.24% felt that it is average, 86 or 26.06% are of the opinion that it is very fast.

On the whole, it can be deduced from the responses provided, that urbanization occurs through its various processes, at a faster rate in Kaduna North than in Kachia Local Government. Thus, in effort to properly determine and examine the account of disparity on rate of urbanization in respect of the local governments, another question was posed to the respondents, with a view to obtain their opinions.

Table 4.9: Assessment of factors responsible for the disparity in the levels of Urbanization between Kaduna North and Kachia Local governments.

Question: What in your opinion could account for disparity in the level of urbanization among the Local Government?

LOCAL GOVERNMENT		**KADUNA NORTH LOCAL GOVERNMENT**		**KACHIA LOCAL GOVERNMENT**	
	Responses	**No of Respondents**	**%**	**No of respondents**	**%**
A	Level of Industrialization	148	41.11	138	41.81
B	Locational advantage	14	3.88	28	8.48
C	Socio-economic activities	136	37.77	120	36.36
D	Population size	46	12.77	30	9.09
E	Level of enlightenment	16	4.44	14	4.24
	Total	360	100	330	100

Source: Survey by the Researcher

As table 4.9 indicates, 148 or 41.11% and 136 or 37.77% of the respondents in Kaduna North local government claimed that the level of industrialization and socio-economic activities respectively, could account for the disparity in the rate of urbanization between the local governments. Less than 70 of the respondents 21.11% were however, of the view that location, population size and level of enlightenment could be responsible for the disparity in the rate of urbanization. While in Kachia local government, 138 or 41.81% and 120 or 36.36% of the respondents felt that industrialization and socio-economic activities respectively, accounts for the disparity in the rate of urbanization between the local governments. Although, a few number of the respondents – 17.57% thought otherwise, what can be deduced from here is that industrialization and socio-economic activities mainly account for the disparity in the rate of urbanization between the local governments.

We therefore, sought the opinion of the respondents on the efforts the local government authorities are making to meet up with the demands of urbanization. Their responses are presented in table 4.10 below.

Table 4.10 Assessment of efforts by the local government authorities to cope with the challenges of urbanization.

Question: Do you think that the local government authorities are succeeding in their efforts to meet up to the demand of urbanization?

Local Government	**Kaduna North LG**		**Kachia LG**	
Responses	**No of Responses**	**%**	**No of Responses**	**%**
Yes	80	22.22	90	27.27
No	250	69.44	212	64.24
I don't know	30	8.33	28	8.48
Total	360	100	330	100

Source: Survey by the Researcher

As the result in Table 4.10 shows, 250 or 69.44% of the number of respondents in Kaduna North local government felt that the local government authorities are not succeeding in their efforts towards meeting the demand of urbanization while 80 or 22.22% agreed that it was meeting up with the challenges of urbanization. However, 30 or 8.33% of the respondents could neither agree nor disagree on whether it was meeting up with the demands of Kachia local government, 212 or 64.24% of the respondents answered in the negative while 90 or 27.27% answered in the affirmative. Only 28 or 88.48% of the respondents could not say whether the local government was succeeding or not. We can deduce here too, that a lot still needs to be done by the local government

authorities in order to succeed in their efforts towards meeting the challenges of urbanization. We also sought to know from the respondents, how effective the local government is in terms of service delivery.

Table 4.11: Effectiveness in service delivery efforts in Kaduna North and Kachia local governments

Question: How would you rank the local government's effectiveness in service delivery in relation to the rate of urbanization?

Local Government	**Kaduna North LG**		**Kachia LG**	
Responses	No of Responses	%	No of Responses	%
Highly effective	70	19.44	63	19.09
Fairly effective	100	27.77	89	26.96
Ineffective	190	52.77	178	53.93
Total	360	100	330	100

Source: Survey by the Researcher

The results in Table 4.11 shows that in Kaduna north local government. 190 or 52.77% of the respondents ranked the local government service delivery effort as ineffective and 100 or 27.77% felt it was fairly effective while 70 or 19.44% ranked it to be highly effective. Also, in Kachia local government, 178 or 53.93% of the respondents ranked the efforts of the local government ineffective and 89 or 26.96% were of the view that it was fairly effective while 63 or 19.09% felt that it was highly effective. What this means is that the two local governments

have not been very effective in terms of service delivery effort in relation to the rate of urbanization process as it occurs in both areas.

We also tried to find out the respondents' opinion on the provision of Infrastructural facilities as could be seen in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12 Infrastructural changes in Kaduna North and Kachia Local governments.

Question: Would you agree that there has been a lot of improvement on the provision of Infrastructural facilities?

Local government	**Kaduna North LG**		**Kachia LG**	
Responses	**No of Responses**	**%**	**No of Responses**	**%**
Yes	103	28.61	96	29.09
No	257	71.38	234	70.90
Total	360	100	330	100

Source: Survey of the Researcher

As could be seen in Table 4.12 above, 257 or 71.38% of the respondents in Kaduna north local government did not agree that a lot of provision and improvement of Infrastructural facilities had taken place while 103 or 28.61% agreed. On the other hand, in Kachia Local government, 96 or 29.01% of the respondents felt that a lot of provision or improvement of Infrastructural facilities had taken place in the local government while majority of the respondents, 234 or 70.90%, thought otherwise. This shows that although there have been concerted efforts by both local governments in the provision of Infrastructural facilities, as

could be predicated by the varying levels of urbanization, however, a lot more needs to be done in order to match the implications and challenges brought about by the phenomenon in both local governments areas.

So far, a critical experimentation of all the analyzed above, data with specific reference to the respondents opinions in Table 4.1 to 4.12, shows that the nature of service delivery of a local government is ideally dictated by it levels of urbanization. In other words, the quantity and nature of service of local government varies with the level of urbanization'. Our first hypothesis is therefore confirmed and accepted.

4.1 HYPOTHESIS TWO

The efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery in a local government often reflects the constant planning and utilization of resources (finances) by the local government. It is in this perspective that the second hypothesis is proposed thus: the effectiveness of local government in coping with the problems of urbanization and /or service delivery is dependent on the availability of adequate finances.

Basically, coping with urbanization in all its ramifications requires substantial finances. For instance, the house built by private individuals, government, local authorities; the offices built by the government, local authorities and commercial firms; the services required by the population (water supply, electricity, roads, schools, markets, lorry parks, drainage,

security etc) all require resources (finance). Ordinary residential houses, offices and factories can be built for their own requirements by private individuals and companies but these do not usually provide any of the essential services required by the public at large. Such services are made available by the local authorities and the government or its agents. At an instance where such services are provided privately, it is usually meant to enhance profit rather than respond to the felt-needs of the people. Therefore, in order to be able to assert whether a local government is capable or not, to meet up its service delivery objectives, we have to assess or determine the major hindrances to its efficiency in responding to the demands/challenges of urbanization.

Against this background therefore, the respondents were asked to identify some of the major challenging effects of urbanization on local governments services delivery efforts. Table 4.13 below presents the respondents' opinions.

Table 4.13: Effects of urbanization as challenges to service-delivery in Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments.

Local Government		**Kaduna North Local Government**		**Kachia Local Government**	
Responses		No. Of responses	%	No. Of Respondents	%
A	Increased crime rate and insecurity	92	25.55	87	26.36
B	Inadequacy of financial resources.	188	52.22	174	57.72
C	Overcrowding and unemployment	80	22.22	69	20.90
	Total	360	100	330	100

Source: Survey by the Researcher.

As the result in Table 4.13 above shows, 92 or 25.55% of the number of respondents in Kaduna North Local Government identified increased crime rate and insecurity as great challenges of urbanization to service delivery. However, majority of the respondents 188 or 52.22% identified inadequacy of financial resources as the greatest challenge posed by the effect of urbanization while 80 or 22.22% identified overcrowding and unemployment as the most challenging effect of urbanization. On the other hand, in Kachia local government, 174 or 57.72% of the respondents identified inadequacy of financial resources as the major challenging effect of urbanization on service delivery while 87 or 26.36% attributed the increased crime rate and insecurity as the challenging effect on service delivery and only 69 or 20.90% identified

overcrowding and unemployment as the effect of urbanization on service delivery.

In view of the opinion of the respondents above, we decided to assess the effort of the local government in combating crime and insecurity.

In terms of level of crime and insecurity in the local governments, the respondents' opinion were sought on this. Table 4.14 below present their opinions.

Table 4.14: Assessment of the effort in combating crime and insecurity in Kaduna North and Kachia Local governments.

Question: What is your assessment of combat on crime and insecurity in the local government?

Local Government	**Kaduna North Local Government**		**Kachia Local Government**	
Responses	**No of Respondents**	**%**	**No of Respondents**	**%**
Very Good	10	2.77	60	18.18
Good	30	8.33	87	26.36
Average	115	31.94	120	36.36
Poor	135	37.5	47	14.24
Very Poor	70	19.44	16	4.84
Total	360	100	330	100

Source: Survey of the Researcher

The above table shows that in Kaduna North Local government, 40 or 11.1% of the respondents felt that the combat on crime and insecurity was either very good or good, and 115 or 31.94% were of the opinion that it was on the average while 135 or 37.5% and 70 or 19.44% felt that it was poor and very poor respectively. In the case of Kachia Local

government, 60 Or 18.18% and 87 or 26.36% of the respondents claimed that the combat on crime and insecurity was very good and good respectively, and that it was on the average while only 47 or 14.27% and 16 or 4.84% of the respondents felt that it was poor or very poor respectively. We can thus, infer from the respondents' opinion that the effort in combating insecurity in Kachia Local Government is fair because of its rural nature. But this does not means that it has no consequence on service delivery since 61 or 19.08% of the respondents pointed out that it was either poor or very poor. On the other hand, in Kaduna North Local Government, 205 or 56.94% of the respondents were either of the opinion that the effort in combating crime and insecurity was poor or very poor because of its urban nature. This has a serious consequence on its service delivery initiatives.

In conclusion thus, the responses and views of the Heads of Departments that were personally interviewed by the researcher in the two local governments, have corroborated the data presented above. The summary is presented below;

4.1.0 Urbanization Process

The responses of Heads of Department in the two local governments (Kaduna North and Kachia) have indicated their awareness of the process of urbanization manifesting in such different manners as

population increase, industrialization, spatial growth etc, with some negative and positive consequences on their respective local governments. The process of urbanization according to their responses, is more rapid in Kaduna North because of its level of industrialization, multiple or dual political and administrative status.

Furthermore, the Heads of Department explained that the urbanization process has created challenges peculiar to their respective local governments, as a result of the differences in factors responsible for the process, and the rate at which it occurs in each local government. According to them,

> *"The process of urbanization which occurs more rapidly in Kaduna North, is as a result of a combination of such factors as industrialization and other opportunities created by the status of Kaduna as a capital as well as the advantages associated with it.*
>
> *Contrastingly, perhaps as a result of the absence of similar factors in Kachia Local government, the process is comparatively slow; almost un-noticeable, except for the occasional increase in population during school sessions, as a result of influx of students" .*

On the issue of local government priorities, the officials were unanimous in concluding that although their respective governments face unique challenges, the existing arrangement in which there is constant interference by either the Federal or State governments is not only distractive, but had created inertia to the prioritization initiatives of the third tier government. According to them;

> " *Constant interference and manipulations has rendered the so – called autonomy as constitutionally provided for local government, ineffective, such that the budgetary estimates in some instances, do not necessarily represent the pressing needs of the local governments but a shopping list or provisions dictated by either the whims and caprices of state or Federal Government, to support a policy programme initiated by either of them.*

Furthermore, local government councils rarely get the statutory allocations intact; if such grants are not tampered with, a reasonable proportion is spent on their behalf on projects or programmes that were not initiated by them".

4.1.1 Effects of Urbanization on Local Government Priorities

In Kaduna North local government, the officials, in line with the preceding argument, explained that although such problems as shortage

of housing, overcrowding, management of refuse as well as unemployment, crime and prostitution have not only been a nightmare, but have transformed to a constant embarrassment. Ironically, they observed.

> *"Preference and emphasis have always been on such 'Tele-guided' programmes as primary Healthcare and immunization, funding of primary school education or, a somewhat paradoxical 'rural development', in an urban local government".*

In Kachia local government also, a similar scenario is evident. According to the officials,

> *"The vicious circle of poverty created by high rate of unemployment, lack of provision of adequate and affordable farming inputs and support to education have been the most threatening challenges to local government administration, rather than the similar primary Healthcare and immunization, rural infrastructure and rural electricity or water supply".*

4.1.2 Measures to Cope With Urbanization

The officials of both local governments explained that the existing arrangement has not provided the third tier government the capacity to

respond to the challenges of urbanization by for instance, either constructing housing units, creation and provision of employment, subsidy on house rents, or the provision of social welfare benefits. The immediate response has always been increase in budgetary allocation. To combat crime, Kaduna North local government embraced a co-operation between police and vigilante, in addition to high profile security arrangement provided the police and army on the initiative of the state. In rate, crime is low, except disputes on land or in respect of chieftaincy.

4.2 FINANCE AND SERVICE DELIVERY IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Studies have shown that one of the best ways of assessing the actualization of the workings of local government institution as a third tier government is through financial translations. Thus, it has become imperative for this study to determine the revenue base of Kaduna North and Kachia local government on one hand and assess their expenditure on the other. This will not only provide an insight as to the existence of any constraint related to finances but will enable us to test the second hypothesis.

The tables below present the accrued revenue summary of the two local governments for the period of this study.

Table 4.15: Summary of Accrued Revenue of Kaduna North Local Government 1992-1996

S/N	YEAR	TOTAL REVENUE
1	1992	54,964,045
2	1993	70,542,775
3	1994	76,000,000
4	1995	122,912,473
5	1996	145,554,419
	Total	469,973,712

Source: Finance and Treasury Department, Kaduna North local government and Ministry for local government and chieftaincy Affairs, Kaduna State.

Table 4.16: Summary of Accrued Revenue of Kachia Local Government 1992-1996

S/N	YEAR	TOTAL REVENUE
1	1992	43,658,130
2	1993	60,687,960
3	1994	65,795,615
4	1995	71,677,244
5	1996	87,687,962
	Total	329,506,911

Source: Finance and Treasury Department, Kachia Local Government and Ministry for Local Government and Chieftaincy Affairs, Kaduna State.

As indicated in table 4.15, a total sum of 469,973,712.00, accrued to Kaduna North Local Government. On the other hand, table 4.16 shows that Kachia Local Government had a total revenue accrued of 329,506,911.00. table 4.17 and 4.18 presents the Sectorial expenditure of some sector selected for this study. The analysis of these will enable us to assess the effort of the two local governments in responding to urbanization in their own ways, thus, creating a pattern which will indicate or define their priorities for the stated period. We can therefore, uphold and accept our second hypothesis that: 'the effectiveness of Local Government in coping with the problems of urbanization and/or service delivery is dependent on, and the availability of adequate finance'.

So far, we have dealt with the presentation and analysis of data collected in this chapter. It has been established that the service delivery of a local government in terms of quality and quantity varies with the level of urbanization. Again, such service delivery will as well depend on the adequacy of finance.

4.2.0 Service Delivery Expenditure Pattern

Principally, local government system is aimed at improving the general standard of living of the local people by the provision of such social services as improvements in water and electricity supply,

construction and maintenance of local and other access roads, bridges, culverts, markets, cemetery etc and other fundamental social services.

However, one way by which local governments' service delivery initiative can be measured, is through the study of fiscal expenditure as dictated by the fierce competition between demands and available resources. In other words, coping with urbanization in all its ramification requires substantial finances.

Thus, this is the basis upon which the premise of the second hypothesis is predicated. "The ability and effectiveness of local government to cope with the repercussion or challenges of urbanization is dependent on the availability of adequate finances".

In line with the above postulation, studies have shown that since the 1976 reforms, local governments have been spending large sums of their revenue on service-delivery. However, the expenditure varies not only from one state to the other, but within the state. Furthermore, the expenditure pattern in form of sectorial expenditure is more often than not, a reflection of priorities of each local government as dictated by the demands and challenges facing it as would be illustrated below.

It must be noted that the difference in Sectorial percentage expenditures often reflect the extent to which urbanization has actually influenced the expenditure pattern of each local government.

Thus, tables 4.17 and 4.18 present the annual budgetary expenditure and the breakdown of Sectorial expenditure of some selected sectors for the period in perspective: 1992 to 1996 in respect of Kaduna North and Kachia local Governments.

A careful analysis of the data on Sectorial expenditure of the two local governments for the period in focus unveils a pattern of Sectorial prioritization that seems to be consistent in some instances, and slightly modified in another. This is further illustrated by Table 4.20.

Table 4.20: Pattern of Sectorial Expenditure (1992-1996)

	KADUNA NORTH LOCAL GOVERNMENT	**KACHIA Local GOVERNMENT**
	Local Governments/Priorities	
1992 Estimates	1. Primary Healthcare 2. Education 3. Water supply	1. Primary Healthcare 2. Education 3. Water supply
1993 Estimates	1. Education 2. Primary Healthcare 3. Rural Infrastructure	1. Education 2. Primary Healthcare 3. Rural Infrastructure
1994 Estimates	1. Water supply 2. Primary Healthcare 3. Electricity supply	1.Rural infrastructure 2. Electricity supply 3. Water supply
1995 Estimates	1. Primary Healthcare 2. Education 3. Water supply 4. Rural Infrastructure	1. Primary Healthcare 2. Rural infrastructure 3. Water supply 4. Education
1996	1. Primary Health care 2. Education 3. Rural Infrastructure	1. Education 2. Rural Infrastructure 3. Primary Health care

Source: Survey by the Researcher

Thus, in contrast to the relatively uniform pattern in prioritization observed in the first two years: 1992 and 1993. expenditure of both local governments, the priorities of the 1994, 1995 and 1996 expenditure have varied hierarchically. In spite of the significant deviations however, worthy of note is the frequency by which such sectors as primary healthcare, education, water supply, electricity supply or rural infrastructure consistently re-appear either as first or second or even third priority in the hierarchy.

The emergent pattern depicts obvious infringement in the intergovernmental relationship existing between the local government as a third tier government, and the federal and state governments.

The revenue and expenditure profile has also corroborated the responses of the Heads of Department and former Council members of the two local governments.

According to them, the so-called local government autonomy only exist on paper. The reality of the matter is that policies and programmes are always prioritized and dictated with little, or no leverage for the so-called autonomy. For instance, in 1992 and third quarter of 1993 when General I.B. Babangida " stepped aside", priorities of the local government were 'fine tuned' to complement or support such programmes as the National Primary Healthcare programme, National Primary Education programme, contributions to the programmes of

DFRRI (Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure) to mention a few. The Earnest Shonekan led Interim National Government was short-lived. The Abacha regime created the PTF (Petroleum Trust Fund) which also complemented the government initiative of infrastructural development. That however, does not suggest that from the post – Babangida era to General Abacha era, the local government was "insulated" from the usual interference. Apart from forcing such programmes as family support (FSP), FEAP (Family Economic Advancement Programme), Beijing platform of action and vision 2010 down the throat of the third tier government, it is a common knowledge that the famous one million man march in March was a programme sponsored by local governments not only by "Contribution" at source, but by also, expending huge sums of money on hiring buses and youths to Abuja from their various local government areas.

It must be stressed here that the preceding instance are examples of forms of interference exclusively undertaken by the apex government. Similarly, the state governments are also guilty, if not more, of such abuse of the local government system through interventions and numerous forms of interference. (see Appendix D)

The overall implication of the expenditure profile therefore, is that the local government is not truly autonomous and free enough to respond to the actual challenges created by urbanization. Therefore, appropriate

response to the challenges of urbanization may continue to remain elusive, unless the third tier government's capacity is enabled (through real autonomy) to respond to the challenges of urbanization through its numerous strategies and initiatives.

4.3 LOCAL GOVERNMENT VARIATION IN SERVICE DELIVERY: KADUNA NORTH Vs KACHIA

4.3.0 1992 FISCAL YEAR

A total sum of 54,964,045 (Fifty-four million, nine hundred and sixty four thousand and forty five Naira) was expended as annual budget for Kaduna North Local Government while Kachia local government expended the sum of 43,258,130 (forty three million, six hundred and fifty eight thousand, one hundred and thirty Naira) for the same year. However, an analysis of the Sectorial expenditure used as indices or framework for this study shows that the priority of Kaduna North local government was Primary Healthcare with an expenditure of (1,994,775 or 3.65%), Education (1,885,991 or 3.34%) and water supply (1,209,100 or 2.20%) of the total expenditure representing first, second and third respectively. The priority of Kachia local government in that same year was Primary Healthcare (1,888,696 or 4.33%), Education (1,656,636 or 3.79%) and water supply (800,000 or 1.83 %) becoming first, second and third respectively.

Interestingly, the least Sectorial expenditure for Kaduna North was crime prevention with 0.02 % while for Kachia local government there was no available record for it as well as for social welfare sector.

4.3.1 1993 Fiscal Year

The sum of 70,542,775 (seventy million, five hundred and forty two thousand seven hundred and seventy five Naira) was expended by Kaduna North local government while the sum of 60,687,960 (Sixty million, six hundred and eighty seven thousand, nine hundred and sixty Naira) was expended by Kachia.

Based on the analysis of the Sectorial expenditure, the first three priorities hierarchically are Education (2,444,216 or 3.46%), Primary Healthcare (2,101,233 or 2.98%) and Rural Infrastructure (577,866 or 0.82%) for Kaduna North Local Government, Education (2,358,691 or 3.89%), Primary Healthcare (1,533,149 or 2.53%) and Rural infrastructure (400,997 or 0.66%) for Kachia respectively.

4.3.2 1994 Fiscal Year

A total of 76,000,000 (seventy six million Naira) was expended in 1994. The priorities were water supply, Primary Healthcare and Electricity supply with 967,349 (Nine hundred and sixty-seven thousand three hundred and forty-nine) or 1.27 %, 955,881 (Nine hundred and fifty-

five thousand eight hundred eighty one) or 1.26% and 910,620 (Nine hundred and ten thousand and hundred twenty) or 1.20% respectively for Kaduna North while Kachia Local, the priorities were Rural infrastructure, Electricity supply and water supply, each with an expenditure of 1,200,000 (one million two hundred thousand) or 1.82%, 850,000 (Eight hundred and filthy thousand) or 1.82% and 700,000 (Seventy hundred) and or 1.06% respectively while the total budgetary expenditure was 65,795,615 (Sixty five million, seven hundred and ninety five thousand, six hundred and fifteen Naira).

4.3.3 1995 Fiscal Year

Kaduna North Local government expended the sum of 122,912,473 (one hundred and twenty two million, nine hundred and twelve thousand, four hundred and seventy three Naira) as its budget for 1995, while Kachia local government expended the sum of 71,677,244 (seventy one million, six hundred and seventy seven thousand, two hundred and forty four Naira) as its total budgetary expenditure for the same year.

However, a close survey indicates that for Kaduna North, the priorities for the year 1995 includes Primary Healthcare (2,249,603 or 1.83%), Education (1,315,300 or 1.07%), water supply (1,213,450 or 0.99%) while Rural Infrastructure was next (1,028,498 or 0.84 %).

Kachia local government on the other hand had Primary Healthcare, Rural Infrastructure and water supply, interestingly, occupying the same position with the sum of 1,000,000 (One million) or 1.40% expended in each sector while other sectors such as electricity supply, social welfare and Agricultural and Natural Resources are trailing behind respectively.

4.3.4 1996 Fiscal Year

The total expenditure for Kaduna North local government was the sum of 145,554,419 (one hundred and forty five million five hundred and fifty four thousand, four hundred and nineteen Naira, while Kachia local government expended the sum of 87,687,962 (eighty seven million, six hundred and eighty seven thousand, nine hundred and sixty two Naira). Primary Healthcare, Education and Rural infrastructure topped the expenditure with 2,310,636 (Two million three hundred and ten thousand and sixty hundred and thirty six Naira) or 1.59 %, 1,707,550 (One million seven hundred and seven thousand five hundred and fifty naira) or 1.17% and 1,250,200 (One million two hundred and fifty thousand and two hundred Naira) or 0.86 % of the total expenditure respectively for Kaduna North, for Kachia, it was Education, Rural infrastructure, Primary Healthcare and water supply with 2,450,101 (Two million, four hundred fifty thousand and one hundred and one) or 2.79 %, 1,300,050 (One

million, three hundred thousand and fifty naira) or 1.48, 1,210,330 (One million, two hundred and ten thousand and three hundred and thirty naira) or 1.38% and 1,200,325 (One million, two hundred thousand and three hundred and twenty five naira) or 1.37% of the total expenditure respectively.

4.4 PRIMARY HEALTH CARE SECTOR

Existing data clearly indicates that a total sum of 9,612,128 (nine million, six hundred and twelve thousand, one hundred and twenty eight Naira) was expended for this sector in five years; 1992 to 1996 by Kaduna North local government. However, during that period, the year 1996 recorded the highest allocation of 2,310,636 (two million, three hundred and ten thousand, six hundred and thirty six Naira), which represents 24.04% of the total Sectorial expenditure from 1992 – 1996.

Kachia local government on the other hand had expended the sum of 5,632,175 (five million, six hundred and thirty two thousand, one hundred and seventy five Naira) to same sector during the same period. However, the highest provision to this sector was recorded in 1992 with a sum of 1,888,696 (one million, eight hundred and eighty eight thousand, six hundred and ninety six Naira), which represents 33.53 % of the total allocation to this sector.

4.5 SOCIAL WELFARE SECTOR

Based on available records, a total sum of 2,184,927 (two million, one hundred and eighty four thousand, nine hundred and twenty seven Naira) was provided in this sector for five years by Kaduna North local government. The highest expenditure was recorded in 1996 with 920,117 (Nine hundred and twenty thousand, one hundred and seventeen naira) representing 32.15% of the total Sectorial provision.

As for Kachia local government, a total sum of 920, 117 (nine hundred and twenty thousand, one hundred and seventeen Naira) was estimated during the same period while the year 1995 recorded the highest expenditure with the sum of 420,117 (Four hundred and twenty thousand, one hundred and seventeen naira) which represents 54.34 % of the total allocation for the said period.

4.6 RURAL INFRASTRUCTURE SECTOR

Existing data indicates that a total sum of 3,944,885 (three million, nine hundred and forty four thousand, eight hundred and eighty five Naira) was expended to this sector by Kaduna North local government from 1992 to 1996. however, the highest allocation was witnessed in 1996 with the sum of 1,250,200 (one million, two hundred and fifty thousand, two hundred Naira) which represents 31.69 % of the total provision for the said period.

Sequentially, a total sum of 4,061,047 (four million and sixty one thousand, and forty seven Naira) was allocated by Kachia local government during the same period. However, the highest provision was recorded in 1996 with the sum of 1,300,050 (one million, three hundred thousand and fifty Naira), which represents 32.01 % of the total expenditure for the stated period.

4.7 EDUCATION SECTOR

Kaduna North local government expended a total sum of 7,353,057 (seven million, three hundred and fifty three thousand and fifty seven Naira) on this sector from 1992 to 1996. However, the year 1993 recorded (two million, four hundred and forty four thousand, two hundred and sixteen Naira) which represents 33.24 % of the total provision for the period in focus.

Kachia local government on the other hand had provided, the sum of 6,465,428 (six million, four hundred and sixty five thousand, four hundred and twenty eight Naira) on this sector during the same period. However, the year 1996 recorded the highest provision with the sum of 2,450,101 (four million, two hundred and fifty thousand, one hundred and one Naira), which represents 37.90 percent of the total expenditure for the period in focus.

4.8 WATER SUPPLY SECTOR

From 1992 – 1996, Kaduna North local government had expended the total sum of 4,863,742 (four million, eight hundred and sixty three thousand, seven hundred and forty two Naira) to water supply sector. The highest provision was recorded in 1995 with the sum of 1,213,450 (one million, two hundred and thirteen thousand, four hundred and fifty Naira) which represents 24.95 % of the total expenditure to the sector over the period in perspective.

The total sum of 3,800,325 (three million, eight hundred thousand, three hundred and twenty five Naira) was expended by Kachia local government to the same sector over the same period.

4.9 ELECTRICITY SUPPLY SECTOR

The total sum of 3,308,155 (three million, three hundred and eight thousand, one hundred and fifty five Naira) was expended by Kaduna North local government to this sector while Kachia provided a total sum of 2,530,00 (two million, five hundred and thirty thousand Naira) to the same sector over the same period.

However, the highest provision by Kaduna North local government was recorded in 1995 with the sum of 931,117 (nine hundred and thirty one thousand, one hundred and seventeen Naira) while for Kachia local government, it was the sum of 880,000 (eight hundred and eight

thousand Naira) recorded in 1996, representing 28.15 and 34.78% respectively.

4.10 AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES SECTOR

The total sum of 2,303,572 (two million three and three thousand, five hundred and seventy two Naira) was provided to the sector over the period in study by Kaduna North local government.

The highest provision was the sum of 559,250 (five hundred and fifty nine thousand, two hundred and fifty Naira), which represents 24.28 % of the total expenditure within the period.

Kachia local government, however, expended the total sum of 225,000 (two hundred and twenty five thousand Naira). The highest provision of the sum of 100,000 (one hundred thousand) was recorded in 1996, which represents 31.90 % of the total expenditure for the period.

4.11 CRIME PREVENTION

The total sum of 367,014 (three hundred and sixty seven thousand and fourteen Naira) was provided to this sector from 1992 to 1996 by Kaduna North local government. The year 1996 recorded the highest expenditure of 119.550 (one hundred and nineteen thousand, five hundred and fifty Naira) which represents 32.57% of the provision for the period.

Kachia local government on the other hand expended the total sum of 225,000 (two hundred and twenty five thousand Naira) with the highest provision of 100,000 (one hundred thousand Naira) observed in 1996. This figure represents 44.44 % of the total expenditure for the stated period.

Conclusively, considerable variations could be observed in the analysis of the total expenditure per sector for the period of study; five years (1992 to 1996) in each of the local government areas.

A cursory survey of the expenditure pattern of Kaduna North local government indicates that such sectors as primary healthcare, Education, and water supply occupy the first, second and third positions respectively when analyzed hierarchically, Similarly, for Kachia local government, education, primary health care and rural infrastructure ranked first, second and third respectively when analyzed hierarchically.

Table 4.20: Hierarchical analysis of the first three priorities in sectorial expenditures for 5 years (1992 –1996)

Ranked Positions	1st	2nd	3rd
Kaduna North LG	P.H.C	Education	Water Supply
Kachia LG	Education	P.H.C	Rural Infrastructure

The survey of the total allocation per sector for five years (1992 – 1996)

On the whole the emergent pattern as presented by the sectorial hierarchical analysis on Table 4.20 provides some evidence of how urbanization has influenced the priorities of Kaduna North and Kachia Local Governments from 1992 to 1996. However, while the pattern has been able to clearly provide some contrasts in the priorities to two local governments, it had also "captured" the correlation between the contrasting variables. For instance, occupying the first, second and third positions in Kaduna Local Government are Primary Health Care, Education and Water Supply respectively. In Kachia Local Government Education is first, Primary Health Care second and Rural Infrastructure is third, just as if there was a "swap" of the first and second priorities between both local governments.

Furthermore, the obvious correlation could be said to be depicting some element of domination and continuous manipulation of the policies and programmes of the local government through the issuance of the so-called state government guidelines as defined in paragraph of chapter forty-one of the Financial Memoranda (F.M.).

The implication of this arrangement is that ideal responses and effective management of urbanization will continue to elude the third tier government, until, and unless the trend created by the existing "Cart-before-the-horse" status quo, is reversed through a complete departure and insulation of the local government as a third tier government, from

the whims and caprices of the Federal, and more especially, the state tiers of government through a thorough autonomy.

CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.0.1 SUMMARY

We have in this study, critically examined the relevance or otherwise of urbanization in fashioning or influencing positively or negatively, the pattern of service delivery in local government. Thus, we attempted a comparative analysis of service delivery in local government within the urban-rural context. This is with the aim of establishing attendant implication and challenges in local government service delivery.

To guide us in this respect, we relied on the modernization theory as our theoretical model of analysis. Through this process, we traced and outlined the feature of modernization. Consequently, we adopted an analytical framework, which holds that urbanization, in conformity with the structural differentiation model, is a process of modernization that contextually refers to more socio-political and structural organizational changes that are related to the transition from rural to urban in society, in terms of increased population, industrialization, increased employment and wage earning capacity, more economic production, increased crime rate, over crowding and more problems for public authorities, that invariably determine the scope, nature and pattern of service delivery.

Service delivery on the other hand, could be defined as the process of the utilization of resources by the authorities, towards the provision of numerous services as roads, electricity pipe borne water, health facilities, education, employment, agriculture, security etc, to the people, in response to their felt-need and demands. Furthermore, it has been noted that one of the basic ingredients of service delivery provision is proper planning and the availability of finance and is usually measured through the study of fiscal allocations between competing demands.

In a nutshell, we established that the implications of urbanization on local government service delivery should for the purpose of study, be analyzed from the “demand and supply” framework. Therefore, in order to fully understand the phenomenon of urbanization, we examined the definitions and its theoretical postulations. These, we were able to achieve, by examining the rate of rapid growth and transformation of world population as well as the inclination of society from simple to complex.

Furthermore, the concept of urbanization was examined with synopsis on definition, trend and typology, aimed at providing a broader view and perspective on the matter. In addition, apart from presenting the definition of modernization, which forms our theoretical framework, an explanation was provided in respect of the relationship between urbanization and socio-economic development as well as an insight on

the interrelationship between the urbanization phenomenon, local government and service delivery. In conclusion, historical geo-political and socio-economic perspectives were presented with the aim of providing an insight on the interplay of such variables, in the historical transformation of Kaduna north and Kachia local government areas. Finally, the samples of data collected from the two areas: Kaduna north and Kachia local government areas, were analyzed retrospectively, in consonance with the period of study.

5.0.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

From the above summary of urbanization and services delivery in local government, within their context, the conclusion drawn from our findings can be stated thus:

The demographic emphasis in the constitutional definition of local government has failed to clearly recognize, classify and even define such concepts as urban, semi-urban and rural local government that are unequal in terms of level of urbanization, are recognized and treated equally by the constitution thereby neglecting the urban-rural variation. Thus, the definition of Kaduna North as a Local Government is the same as Kachia constitutionally.

The pattern of urbanization in Nigeria, particularly northern Nigeria could be differentiated along two major categories, namely traditional and

modern. The former was observed to have been founded on the surplus agricultural wealth which also formed the basis for inter-regional trade. The latter on the other hand, is the product of colonial economic influence which led to the emergence of agglomerations that subsequently transformed to towns or cities, such as Lagos, port-Harcourt, Kaduna and Jos etc. that have experienced physical planning and are equipped with such modern facilities and services such as electricity, pipe borne water, motor able road networks, streets and designed layouts etc. Kaduna North is the latter while Kachia Local Government Area is the former.

Furthermore, there also exist “state variation”, that has been created by the “cycles of cumulative causation”, which implies that state capitals have historically, enjoyed a concentration of state investments to support the functioning and life style of the state civil service. That has been followed by increased investment in capital city infrastructure and facilities, which has been spurred by petroleum-derived revenues. Such increases in both private and state investment have been matched, if not exceeded, perhaps, by rates of population and spatial growth, thus, generating what is known as “backwash effect” or polarization, which further amplify inequality. Here, backwash, or polarization involves the migration of resources (people, skills, capital) from peripheral areas such

as Kachia local government to the major centres of development, such as Kaduna (North) where greater opportunities are perceived to exist.

Given the dynamic rate of change and concentration of state government investment found in state capitals such as Kaduna, out of which Kaduna north is a local government, we obviously concluded that the state capital phenomenon has created what is termed as “locational advantage” for Kaduna north local government which is the centre, in contrast and detriment to Kachia local government; the periphery.

Thus, Kaduna north enjoys the provision of such services as pipe borne water, urban roads, country planning, public conveniences, parks, gardens and amusement parks, security etc. by the state government, hence the emergence and use of “exclusive and concurrent” lexicon in the description and definition of local government functions.

Kachia local government on the other hand not only lacks such investment and facilities but it is obviously suffering from polarization or “backwash effect”. The only glaring factor that may enhance urbanization demographically in Kachia local government is the influx of students and, or soldiers in the barracks but not industries or any other opportunity such as employment, skill acquisition etc. hence, the level of underdevelopment and wave of rural urban drift to the centre (Kaduna) in search of opportunities.

The analysis of sectorial allocation of the research areas from 1992 – 1996 has presented an emergent pattern that clearly depicts obvious infringement in the existing relationship between Local Government as a third tier of government and the State and Federal tiers of government as a result of dictation or continuous interference with little, or no leverage to autonomy.

The pattern of expenditure based on the fiscal allocations as provided in the annual estimates clearly indicates an obvious concentration of resources in the recurrent sector which in most cases, consist personal emoluments, claims and other charges, to the detriment of the capital sector, which forms the basis for service delivery. This becomes more obvious if each sectorial expenditure is analyzed against the total annual expenditure for each year.

Furthermore, while the planning programme budgeting system used in both local government could have been ideal in the preparation of annual estimates as widely used in the state by local governments, the process is still based on age worn desire to ensure that directives are strictly adhered to and accounts are only properly kept, even though the scope and role of local government has changed over the years.

Most significantly, the financial provision in form of allocation to both local governments is apparently inadequate to enable it operates as third tier government, towards service delivery provision in response to

myriad of problems and demands. This is in addition to the glaring deficiency in qualified manpower and technological skill that hampers it from embarking on such complex tasks as the provision of pipe borne water, electricity, roads, management of refuse, crime prevention etc, directly, efficiently and effectively.

5.0.3. RECOMMENDATIONS:

From the above conclusions drawn from our analysis of urbanization and services in local government, we wish to recommend the following:

1. In addition to demographic consideration, there is the need to evolve a more dynamic definition of local government that takes into cognizance, the level of urbanization so as to accommodate the “urban- rural and semi-urban variations”. This will no doubt make local government service-delivery consistent and more specific, instead of the present arrangement in which mixture of services mostly determined by the ministry of local government are provided, thus, creating a situation of functional differentiation with capital city local government assuming uniquely more urban functions, while on the hand, rural local governments are not equally empowered to assume uniquely more rural functions.

2. The societal transformation necessary for spread to out weight “backwash effects”, requires massive government intervention and control that will infuse rapid integrated urban and rural development process. Accordingly, there is the absolute need for a comprehensive appraisal and re-organization of the way and manner investments are concentrated at one location: state capitals (Kaduna), to the detriment of rural areas such as Kachia. This factor encourages serious rural-urban drift as a result of the “push and pull” factors. This trend can be checked by spreading such investments in the rural areas so as to create opportunities for the rural dwellers too. For instance, apart ginger factory in Kachia, there’s no other industry, Kaduna north on the other hand provides a greater mix of services to a much more densely settlements and socially heterogeneous body of clients as well as large, medium and small scale industries that are not found in rural local government such as Kachia.

3. Further more, there most be complete re-alignment in terms of allocation and expenditure in the capital sector on the part of local government. The adjustment must be in consonance with the provision of the financial memoranda (F.M) in which at least seventy percent of the total annual budget is expected to be

expended on the capital sector. This adherence will make the local government as a third tier government, more efficient, more responsive to the felt-needs and demands of the people, and more development -oriented not only in Kaduna north and Kachia local government but in Kaduna state and Nigeria in general.

4. Local Government as a tier of government must be constitutionally insulated from the obvious domination and continuous manipulation of its polices and programmes through the issuance of the so-called “guidelines” by the State government, its agency or any other tier of government (Federal).

5. The local government annual estimates must represent the actual and authentic demands and felt-needs of the people at the grass roots and not a document hurriedly produced to comply with a directive of the State Ministry for Local Government or the Federal government.

To be more specific, there is the absolute need for a complete deviation from the existing tradition of reducing the local government budget to an annual routine; producing a document of convenience. Rather, there must be a serious commitment and deliberate efforts

towards ensuring that the goals and objectives there-in, are achieved property ensuring more autonomy for Local Government Constitutionally, administratively and financially, so that its budgetary provisions and priorities in expenditure reflect the challenges of urbanization that could be associated with each Local Government Area.

6. In conclusion, we wish to reiterate the absolute significance and relevance of good planning and adequate financing in service delivery. We must state our basic concern here in respect of the wider implications of the absence of adequate local financial resources for service delivery particularly in rural areas such as Kachia Local Government, especially in view of the fact that a greater percentage of the population live in rural areas, because Local economic development relies heavily on local resources.

Furthermore, the development of these resources also relies on the degree to which infrastructures are developed. Where these infrastructures are lacking, economic opportunities are by necessity, scarce. This scarcity triggers off a wave of rural-urban migration which deprives the rural areas of young productive persons, and exerts pressure on the urban centers. The absence of the productive segments of the population further impoverishes the areas concerned, thus, leading

to the emergence of economically distressed areas that would then require a massive infusion of capital if economic development were to be stimulated.

Thus, the efficient provision of service delivery by local government would largely depend on a more reliable and efficient method of revenue generation initiative by the Local Government authorities and an improved, specially trained and skillful manpower, working in a strong, virile and dynamic specialized local government system that could accommodate such professionals as Engineers, Architects, Town Planners, Medical Doctors, Counselors and other categories of such personnel, through which such complex service could be cheaply provided directly, thereby avoiding the unnecessary over-reliance on contracts that are often expensive and perhaps, haphazardly executed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aborishade, O. (1988): **Readings on Nigerian Local Government Studies,** Ile – Ife, Department of Local Government Studies.

Abubakar, Y.A (1980) - (ed): **The Role of Local Government in Social, Political and Economic Development in Nigeria 1976 – 79,** Department of Local Government Studies, Institute of Admin. A.B.U. Zaria, Nigeria.

Abu – Lughod, J. and Richard H. Jr (1977): **Third World Urbanization,** Methuen publishers.

Adamolekun, L. and Rowland, L. (ed) (1979): **The New Local Government System in Nigeria; Problems and Prospects for Implementation,** London, Heinemann.

Adedeji, A. and Rowland, L. (1973) - (eds): **Management Problems of Rapid Urbanization in Nigeria,** University of Ife Press, Ile – Ife, Nigeria.

Adetoro, S. A. (1986): **Research Techniques for project Proposals, Reports, Thesis and Dissertations**, Zaria, Gaskiya Corporation Limited.

Afolabi, M. (1991): **Writing The Research Proposal**, 2nd Edition Department of Library Science, A.B.U., Zaria.

Arowolo, O.O. (1994): *Population Studies*. In Otite, O. **Sociology: Theory and Applied,** Malthouse Press Ltd 1994.

Apter, D. (1965): **Politics of Modernization,** The University of Chicago Press; Chicago and London P.

Banton, M. (1957): **West African City**, London.

Berry, B. (1973): **The Human Consequences of Urbanization,** New York: St Martins Press.

Breese, G. (1966): **Urbanization in Newly Developing Countries,** Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice – Hall.

Caldwell, J.C, (1975): **Population Growth and Socio – Economic Change in West Africa,** Columbia University Press, New York.

Davis, K. (1972): ***World Urbanization 1950 – 1970****, Vol. 1 &2* University of California, Berkely.

Du Toit, B.M. and Safa, H.I. (1975): **Migration and Urbanization: Models and Adaptive Strategies,** The Hague; Mouton.

El – Shakhs, S. and Obudho, R. (1974) - (eds): **Urbanization, National Development and Regional Planning in Africa,** New York: Praeger.

Frisbie, W.P.(1977): **The Scale and Growth of World Urbanization Cities in Change,** Studies on Urban Condition. John Walton and Donald, E.C. (eds). 2nd Edition Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Gboyega, A. (1987): **Political Value and Local Government in Nigeria,** Lagos: Malthouse Press.

Germani, G. (1973) - (ed): **Modernization Urbanization and Urban Crisis,** Boston, Little Brown.

Gugler, J. and Williams, G.F. (1978): **Urbanization and social changes in West Africa,** Cambridge.

Hance, W. A. (1970): **Population, Migration and Urbanization in Africa**, New York: Columbia University press.

Hauser, P. .M. (1958) - (ed): **Urbanization in Asia and the Far East,** Calcutta. UNESCO

Isaac, O.A. et. al. (1994) - (eds): **Urban Management and Urban Violence in Africa,** Vol. II French Institute for Research in Africa (IFRA) Ibadan, Nigeria.

Jones, R. (1975) - (ed): **Essays on World Urbanization,** London: G. Philip.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1973): **Foundations of Behavioural Research**, 2nd Edition New York: Holt Rinehart Winston.

King, Anthony D. (1976): **Colonial Urban Development; Culture, Social Power and Environment,** London: Poutledge and Keegan Paul.

Kupe, H. (1965) - (ed): **Urbanization and Migration in West Africa,** Berkely.

Lagroye, J. and Wright, V. (1979) - (eds): **Local Government in Britain and France; Problems and Prospects,** London: George A. and Unwin.

Mabogunje, A. L. (1968): **Urbanization in Nigeria,** London, University of London Press.

- (1976): **Cities and African Development,** Ibadan Oxford University Press
- (1989): **The Development Process,** 2nd Edition Unwin Hyman, London.

Mc Gee, T.G. (1971): **The urbanization process in the Third World, Explorations in search of a theory,** London; G. Bell and Sons Ltd.

Myrdal, G. (1957): **Rich Lands and Poor**, New York: Harper and Row.

Norman, L.: **An Introduction to Sociology of Rural Development,** Tavisfock Publishers, London.

Oladosu, S.A (1981):**Kaduna Essays in Local Government,** Kaduna.

Olowu, D. (1982) - (ed): **The Administration of Social Service in Nigeria: The challenges of Local Government,** University of Ife, Ile – Ife, Nigeria.

Ominde, S.H. and Ejiogu, C.N (1972): **Population Growth and Economic Development in Africa,** Heinemann; London, Nairobi, Ibadan.

Oni, S.B. (1989): **Management of Rapid Growth of Urbanization in Nigeria,** Oluseyi Publishers; Gaskiya Corporation, Zaria, Nigeria.

Oni .S.B., et. al. (1999) –(eds): **Policies and Strategies for Sustainable Development in Africa South of Sahara,** Society for International Development Pub. Zaria, Nigeria.

Orewa, G.O and Adewumi, J.B. (1983): **Local Government in Nigeria: the Changing Scene,** Benin City, Ethiope Publishing House.

Oyeyipo, E.A.O and Odoh, .A. (eds) (1985): **Local Government as a Vehicle for National Development,** Zaria, Department of Local Government Studies.

- (1988): **Government at the Grassroots Level in Nigeria,** Zaria, Department of Local Government Studies.

Sada, P.O and Oguntoyinbo, J.S (1978) - (eds): **Urbanization Processes and Problems in Nigeria,** Ibadan University Press, 1981.

Salah, E. and Robert, O. (1974) – (Eds.): **Urbanization, National Development and Regional Planning in Africa**, New York, Praeger.

Seers, D. (1977): **The Meaning of Development,** International Development Review No. 3.

Soja, E. (1976): **Spatial Inequality in Africa: Comparative Urbanization Studies,** L.A. University California, School of Architecture & Urban Planning.

Todaro, M. P. (1977): **Economic Development in the Third World,** Fourth Edition, Longman Inc.

Turkman, B. N. (1988): **Conducting Educational Research**, 3rd Edition, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Govannovidi.

Ullman, E. (1958): **Regional Development and The Geography of Concentration,** Regional Science Association.

Weiner, M. (1966) - (ed): **Modernization: The Dynamics of Growth,** New York; Basic Books.

Weitz, R. (1973) - (ed): **Urbanization and the Developing Countries** Report on the Sixth Rehorot Conference, New York.

Wirth, L. (1956): **Community Life and Social Policy,** Chicago University Press.

Wraith, R. (1964): **Local Government in West Africa**: George Allen and Unwin.

(A) **UNPUBLISHED WORKS**

Abdulwaheed, I.U (1994): **Assessment of the Presidential System in Kaduna North Local Government 1991 – 1992,** Department of Local Government Studies, Institute of Admin. ABU Zaria.

Jatson, D.A (1988): **An Analysis of the Role of the Ministry for Local Government in the Control of Local Government Finances in Kaduna State; A Case Study of Kachia Local Government,** (Unpublished HDLG Thesis, Department of Local Government Studies, Institute of Admin. ABU Zaria.)

Maina, B. (1989): **Determining the Revenue Base and Target of Kachia Local Government,** (Unpublished ADLG Project, Department of Local Government Studies, Institute of Admin, ABU Zaria).

Salihu, M.K (1984): **The 1976 Reforms of Local Government and its Effect on Development; A Case Study of Kachia Local Government of Kaduna State 1976 – 83,** (Unpublished HDLG Project, Department of Local Government Studies, Institute of Admin. A.B.U Zaria.).

(B) **JOURNALS**

Abubakar, H. I. (1993): "**United Nations Development Programme (NIR/91/001) Population and Development**", 6 Weeks Programme in Population and Development Modules.

Laye, T. (1997): **Town-Planning and The Challenges of Rapid Population Growth**, NITP Pub. No. 23, Lagos, Nigeria.

Seers, D. (1977): **The Meaning of Development**, International Development Review No. 3.

(C) **DOCUMENTS**

National Academy of Academy of Science, **Rapid Population Growth: Consequences and Policy Implications**, Vol. II, Baltimore and London, The John Hopkins Press, 1979.

National Population Commission, **Census 1991 National Summary**, NPC November, 1994.

United Nations, **Demographic Year book**, New York, 1979.

United Nations, **Growth of the World's Urban Population and Rural Population 1920 – 2000**.

United Nations, **World Population Chart**, New York, 1996.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRES FOR RESIDENTS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

Title: Urbanization and Service Delivery in Local Government: A Comparative Study of Kaduna North and Kachia Local Government in Kaduna State.

Dear Respondent,

This questionnaire is designed to generate information for a Master Degree Thesis, in partial fulfillment of requirement for the award of MPA (L. G) in Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. I am soliciting your co-operation to kindly provide answers to the questions and feel to make comments where necessary to the best of your knowledge and ability.

Your name is not required, you can therefore be assured that all information generated from you is exclusively for academic purpose and shall be treated confidentially.

Thanks for your co-operation.

1. Are you aware of a process of urbanization occurring within you local government?

   A Yes B No

2. If yes, how do you recognize it?

   A Growth of industries.

   B. Increase in population.

   C. Increase in crime rate and insecurity.

   D. Increase in social facilities.

   E. All of the above.

   F. Any other state……

3. Has urbanization affected in any way the nature of local service?

   A. Yes B. No

4. If yes have local government services been affected?

   A. Priorities have changed.

   B. Increase in demand for more services.

   C. Change in quality of service

   D. Change in quality of service.

5. In your view why do you think local government services would change?

   A. Change in level of enlightenment of people.

   B. Increase in population.

C. Change in socio-economic activities

D. Change in government priorities.

E. Change in nature of services demanded.

F. Change in level of income and expenditure.

G. Change in level of financial allocation to local governments.

6. In your view has urbanization improved or slowed down the development of the area?

   A. Improved B. Slowed down C. I don't know.

7. Have the priorities of local government changed or remained the same between 1990 and 1995?

   A. Changed B. Unchanged C. I don't know.

8. If they changed what are the new priorities that come with urbanization? (List in order of priority)

   A. ……

   B. ……

   C. ……

   D. ……

   E. ……

9. What were the pervious priorities of the local government?

A ……..

B. ……

C. ……

D. ……

E. ……

10. What positive effects of urbanization can you identify?

A. Improved health facilities.

B. Improved educational facilities.

C. Improved road infrastructure

D. More security

E. Better social amenities.

F. All of the above.

G. Any other, state……..

11. What negative efforts of effects urbanization can you identify

A. Increased crime rate and insecurity.

B. Over-crowding in Housing facilities

C. Insufficient social services

D. Increased unemployment.

E. Increased social decadence.

12. Are the local government authorities succeeding in efforts to meet up to the demands of urbanization?

A. Yes B. No.

13. What is your assessment of the performance of the local government in relation to the rate of urbanization?

A. Better B. The same C. Worse.

14. State three reasons for your assessment.

A. …….

B. ……..

C. ……..

15. What changes have you observed in the area of housing?

A. Building of low cost housing units

B. Renting house for its employees.

C. Peg house rent rates.

D. Increased housing allowance

E. All of the above

F. None of the above

G. Any other? State

16. What is the state of crime and security in the local government?

A. V. Good B. Good C. Average D. Poor E. Very poor

17. Give reasons for you're your answer.

A. ……..

B. ……..

C. ……..

18. What measures has the local government taken to curb crime and insecurity?

A. Increased co-operation between police and vigilante groups

B. More financial and material assistance to vigilante groups.

C. Creation of mixed patrol teams between police and army.

D. Any other? State …….

19. What infrastructural changes have taken place?

A. Creation of farm to market toads.

B. Taring of roads

C. Public recreational facilities.

D. Refuse collection and disposal facilities.

E. Rehabilitation of road.

F. All of the above.

G. None of the above

H. Any other? State……..

20. What changes have you observed occurred in the water supply sector?

A. Improved water flow

B. Increased in public taps

C. Better treatment of water

D. All of the above

E. Any other? State……

21. What is the situation of roads?

A. Improved B. The same C. Worse

22. Has the revenue base of the local government improved?

A. Improved B. Same C. Decreased.

23. What are your expectations on services delivery?

A. Better infrastructure

B. Better educational facilities

C. Better security and welfare

D. Better water and health faculties

E. Better housing facilities.

F. All of the above

G. Any other? State……..

24 Why these expectations?

A. Increase income of the local government

B. Better-trained manpower.

C. All of the above

D. Any other? State……..

25. Have your expectations been met?

A. Yes B. No.

26. If no, why?

A. Inadequate water supply

B. Inadequate infrastructure in all domains.

C. Recurrent insecurity.

D. Increased population demands for socio-economic facilities.

27. Has your income level increased or decreased as a result of urbanization?

A. Increased B. Decreased

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RESIDENTS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

Title: Urbanization and Service Delivery in Local Government: A Comparative Study of Kaduna North and Kachia Local Government in Kaduna State.

Dear Respondent,

This questionnaire is designed to generate information for a Master Degree Thesis, in partial fulfillment of requirement for the award of MPA (L. G) in Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. I am soliciting your co-operation to kindly provide answers to the questions and feel to make comments where necessary to the best of your knowledge and ability.

Your name is not required, you can therefore be assured that all information generated from you is exclusively for academic purpose and shall be treated confidentially.

Thanks for your co-operation.

1. Are you aware of a process of urbanization in your Local Government?

   A Yes B No

2. If yes, how is this manifested?

   A. Increase in population

   B. Industrialization

   C. Spatial growth of the local government area.

   D. All of the above.

3. Has urbanization affected the nature of service delivery?

   A. Yes B. No

4. Have the effects of urbanization been positive or negative on local government services?

   A. Positive B. Negative C. Both

5. Identify some o the effects of urbanization on local government services.

   A. Inadequacy of financial resources.

   B. Increased population.

   C. Over crowding

D. All of the above

E. Any others? State ……

6a. Has urbanization changed the order of priorities of your local government?

A. Yes B. No

6b. What were the initial priorities in order of importance?

A. ……

B. ……..

C. ……

D. ……

E. ……..

F. ……..

7. List in order of importance your new priorities.

A. ……

B. ……

C. ……..

D. ……

E. ……

F. ……

8. In what ways has urbanization affected your order of priorities?

   A. Change in habits or attitudes of people.

   B. Change in mode of production

   C. Change in employment situation

   D. Change in income levels and demands for goods and services.

   E. All of the above.

9. What measures have you taken to cope with the effects of urbanization?

   A. Increased in budgetary allocation

   B. Improvement in strategic planning.

   C. Creation of employment

   D. Provision of more social welfare benefits

   E. Any other.

10. List 3 positive effects of urbanization

   A. ……..

   B. ……

   C. …….

11. List 3 negative effects of urbanization

A. ……..

B. ……

C. ……

12. Is the rate of urbanization in this local government same as in other neighboring ones.

A. Yes B. No

13. How is the rate of urbanization in this local government in relation to the other local government of the state?

A. Fast

B. Slow

C. Average

D. Very fast

E. Very slow

14. What in your view would account for a disparity in the rate of urbanization among local governments?

A. Level of industrialization

B. Status of the local government in relation to state and federal governments.

C. Location

D. Socio-economic activities

E. Level of enlightenment.

15. In your view has urbanization improved on the development of the area or retarded it

A. Improved B. retarded

16a. Have expenditures of the local government due to urbanization increased or decreased?

A. Increased B. Decreased

b. Has the income level of the local government increased or decreased

A. Increased B. Decreased

17. What measures have you taken to tackle housing problems?

A. Build low cost houses

B. Peg rent rates

C. Subsidized house rents

D. All of the above

E. Any other, state ……...

18. What measures have been taken to improve security?

A. Creation of mixed patrol teams between police and army

B. Increased financial and material assistance to patrol teams

C. Cooperation between police and vigilante groups.

D. All of the above

E. Any other, state ……

19. What infrastructural changes have you effected between 1990 and 1995.

A. Rehabilitation of roads and building of bridges culverts

B. Taring of roads

C. Public recreational facilities

D. Creation of farm to market roads

E. All of the above

F. Any other? State ……

20. What changes have you made in the water sector?

A. Better treatment of water.

B. Improved flow of water

C. Increase in number of public taps.

D. All of the above

E. Any other? State……

21. Can the rate of urbanization be controlled?

A. Yes B. No.

APPENDIIX C

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUDI REPORT/TRIAL BALANCE

Kachia Local Government Council,
Kaduna.

ACCOUNTS – 31ST DECEMBER 1994 – 1996

We have completed the examination of the records of the council for the above periods. We are writing to bring to your notice certain matters which came to our notice in the course of our assignment. The contents have been discussed with the Chairman and members of his management team.

PROBLEMS

2. To enable us carry out the examination of the records and the production of accounts for the above periods we requested for books of accounts and vouchers for those years concerned but we were not given safe 1996 cash book and few payment vouchers issued during that year. We were told that the rain storm of July 1996 which removed the roof of some sections of the Local Government Secretariat destroyed those documents including the hard cover cash books and abstracts without any tracts of them.

3. This however sounds spurious and ludicrous. Could all the Treasury staff have been so unconcerned that they did not salvage some of the documents after the storm? There were some documents which were kept in the area not affected by

the storm e.g. Revenue books. These were also missing and said to have been destroyed by the storm.

4. We were told that an investigating panel was set up to investigate the 1994 and 1995 missing cash books and that at that time the payment vouchers and the daily abstracts were still intact. The panel could not commence the investigation because of alleged lack of co-operation we were told. As at the time of our audit, all the payment vouchers and daily abstract for 1994 and 1995 were not produced for our examination. Before the disappearance of these documents, the cash books for these years could have been re-written therefrom.

5. This raises the question of handling over and taking over by Treasury staff. It is mostly assumed that accounting records are intact at the time of handing/taking over. It behoves on the incumbent treasurer to ensure that he obtains all the accounting records from the outgoing treasurer and where they were not made available to him to report accordingly. If this has been done, the missing documents might have been searched for immediately and produced in whatever state they were found. Time has elapsed since the storm and it is extremely difficult to lay hands on these documents.

6. In the area of producing documents for our examination, we examination, we did not enjoy the co-operation of the Principal Officer in charge of the Treasurer Department. This could be because he was not in charge of the Department during the

years covered by our assignment to avoid such attitude we recommend the following:

(a) The independent examination of the records should be carried out during the currency of the incumbent.

(b) Transfer of Treasury staff to other locations (which is necessary from time to time) should be deferred until after the audit exercise.

1996 ACCOUNTING RECORDS

7. The following records for 1996 transactions were made available to us:

(a) Payment cash book
(b) Revenue cash book
(c) Some payment vouchers

From (a) and (b) above we analysed the payment and Revenue cash books and we were however unable to prepare the accounts because:

(d) 1994 and 1995 accounts were yet to be prepared.

(e) Most of the payment vouchers were not available therefore it would be difficult to provide the detail breakdown of some

We have therefore prepared 1996 Transaction Trial Balance only.

We were unable to verify these figures as most of the vouchers supporting them were not made available to us. And as such we could not form an opinion on them.

REVENUE RECEIPTS

8. We perused the revenue cash books and revenue receipt registers to enable us establish the completeness of revenue receipts. Please find below our comments and observations:

   (i) Numerous receipt booklets issued to the Revenue collectors were yet to be returned to the store, which suggests that they were yet to be accounted for,. Also one Revenue collector might hold numerous receipt booklets without bothering to account for them, we recommend the officers concerned should be made to account for them.

   (ii) In numerous cases there was no evidence that the revenue received were handed over to the Local Government cashier as we did not see any Local Government Receipts for them. We recommend that the officers concerned should be made to account for them.

   (iii) We noticed costing errors in the revenue cash books.

9. (i) ***Over Invoicing***

Items	PV.NO.	Date	Qty.	Unit	Total	Payee
Duplicating paper	48	4.10.96	20	1,500	30,000	Alh. M. Aminu
Typing Sheets F/scap	48	4.10.96	20	1,000	20,000	Alh. M. Aminu
Duplicating paper	38	4.10.96	20	1,500	30,000	Azeemco Trading
Typing Sheets F/scap	38	4.10.96	10	1,000	10,000	Azeemco Trading
Duplicating paper	47	4.10.96	25	1,500	37,500	Alh. Mohammed M.
Stencil	48	4.10.96	1	2,500	2,500	Alh. M. Aminu
Zinc	63	7.10.96	25	6,500	152,500	Alh. Mohammed M.
Duplicating paper	18	3.9.96	10	1,550	15,500	Community Development

Efforts should be made to scrutinize costs of times before payments are made.

(ii) An amount of N286,500.00 was paid to Alh. Briaze vide PV 19 of 18th September 1996. The contract which was for a period of 3 months amounted to N689,546.00 and was entered into on the 6th of March 1995. On the 11th of April 1995 the contractor submitted a variation of N940,546.00 and was entered into on the 6th of March 1995. On the 11th of April 1995 the contractor submitted a variation of N940,000.00 which was accepted by the council as per the final accounts signed by all parties i.e., Chairman, Contractor, Head of Works and Quantity Surveyor. As the duration of the contract is less than one year to contract does not qualify for any variation. In this case the variation was more than the initial contract sum. Also the whole contract sum plus the variation was

paid without providing for retention in defiance to normal practice.

(iii) N22,589.00 refunded as per payment voucher No 95 of 30th September 1995 was excessive as follows:

Hotel Expenses	-	81,833
Motor Vehicle Expenses	-	9,755
		91,585
Less Advance	-	80,000
Refunds due	-	11,585
Amounts Refunded	-	22,589
Excess Refunds	-	11,001

CASH SURVEY

10. Attempts made to conduct cash survey were frutile as we did not enjoy the co-operation of the cashier and the Treasurer as earlier pointed out.

We could therefore not establish:

(a) Whether or not the postings were up to date. Teeming and lading could have been detected if any.

(b) The cash balance at that time to enable us recount backward to December 1996: Also we could have established by such reconciliation whether or not the cash book postings could be relied upon.

GENERAL

12. If you require any information or above please let us know.
13. If you require any information or above please let us know.