

Budget Implementation and Rural Infrastructures in Jos-East Local Government Area of Plateau State, 2013-2018

Dongkek Naanmin Boniface¹, Sampati Umaru Tanimu², Garshiya Kaigama Ando³ & Jonah Daniel Gambo⁴

Department of Political Science, University Of Jos¹
Department of Public Administration, Taraba State Polytechnic, Sunkai^{2,3,4}

Abstract: *The study assessed the impact of budget implementation on rural infrastructure in Jos-East Local Government Area of Plateau State. It is pertinent to note that majority of Nigeria population dwells in the rural areas and infrastructure is absent and where it is present, it is in the state of total decay and comatose. This phenomenon attracts the attention of researchers who may like to know whether the Federal Allocation to Local Government and Internally Generated Revenue (IGR) are not well articulated and utilized by the leadership of councils to finance rural infrastructures in their domain. The main objective of the study is to find out whether budget implementation has actually provided rural infrastructures in the study area. In gathering the data for the study, the researcher relied on both primary and secondary sources of information and consequently adopted the Chi-square technique in the analysis. A sample size of 124 was used for the study; the respondents were selected using random sampling technique. The principal finding of the study revealed that budget implementation has improved rural infrastructures in the study area. Hence, this study recommends that Local councils should ensure effective and efficient release of funds to finance infrastructural projects and programmes.*

Keywords: Budget Implementation, Rural Infrastructure, Rural Development, Local Government.

INTRODUCTION

Organizations whether public or private and regardless of its size and complexity depend heavily on budget to achieved strategic goals. Obviously, budget implementation is part of national and management control tool that is used to promote efficient use of resources and to provide supports for other critical functions. The role of budget in any economy cannot be over-emphasized as the formal instrument of government planning and control process for efficient and effective execution (Adakai, 2006).

Infrastructures development is at a crucial stage in the world today. Countries of the World ensure the provision of infrastructure to improve the livelihoods of their citizen and their quality of life (Khoza, 2009). Infrastructure plays a key role in both socio-economic and political development and enrichment of living standards. The shift of focus from construction of infrastructures to the delivery of infrastructure drew the attention of so many countries in Africa, particularly, Nigeria to concentrate on the provision and delivery of infrastructure, especially at the local level. This is because over two thirds of Nigeria's population resides in local areas, where poverty prevails (Udoh, 2005). According to Udoh, over 100 million Nigerians still lack access to electricity, and less than 49% of the population has access to safe drinking water. Infrastructures are mostly concentrated in urban areas. Access to infrastructure such as; safe water supply, electricity and roads are necessary to reduce vulnerability and poverty in rural areas of Nigeria (Udoh, 2005).

However, the establishment of local government in Nigeria arises from the need to facilitate rural development through infrastructure development and delivery (Sehinde, 2008). Section 7 (1) of 1999 constitution empowered local government to construct and maintain rural roads, street light, water and drains and other public highways or such public facilities (FGN, 1999). The recognition and importance of local government in the development process is based on the imperative role it has played on grassroots development through provision of this basic infrastructure (Wunsah, 2001, Anwar and Sana, 2006). Despite these provisions, lack of adequate, affordable and reliable infrastructures services still touches the life of rural Nigerian family every day, water supply is neither safe nor adequate for their needs, local roads are impassable and the potential for agricultural processing, small business development and rural employment is constrained by lack of electricity. Local government contributions to rural infrastructure have been minimal when compared to the amount of resources accrue to it (Schinds, 2008). Local people have become disillusioned as a result of unfulfilled expectation (Aye, 2003). In Nigeria today, the overriding impression today is that local government are weak in responding to the challenges posed by rural infrastructure provision and delivery in the local government system in Nigeria, with specific focus on rural water supplies, roads and electricity.

The bulk of Nigeria's wealth is derived from agriculture and oil resources which lie in abundant quantity in the rural communities. In spite of this, it is said that rural people benefit very little from the bulk of wealth endowed in their communities. Bertolini, Montanari and Peragine (2008) identified main social and economic problems in rural areas as:

- i. Demography: low birth rate, negative natural increase, higher mortality rate depopulation, especially due to out-migration by the young people caused by lack of employment, low population density.
- ii. Labour market, low education status, higher rates of unemployment and long term unemployment
- iii. Spatial dimension of poverty being exacerbated by a poor and deteriorating infrastructure.
- iv. Significant fragmentation of land ownership.
- v. Rural welfare being constrained by low levels of income, driven by low wages in rural areas, high unemployment, and low levels of agricultural productivity..

Therefore, it is of importance to note that the product of budget implementation is translated into rural infrastructure. It is against this background that this paper assesses the level of budget implementation on rural infrastructures in Jos-East Local Government in Plateau State.

The following research questions are put in place to guide this study.

- i. What role has local government budget implementation played on rural development in Jos East Local Government of Plateau State
- ii. What are the factors militating against infrastructural facilities in the study area?
- iii. What are the possible suggestions to improve budget implementation and achieve infrastructural development in the study area?

The main objective of the study is to find out whether local government budget Implementation has actually provided rural infrastructures in Jos-East Local Government Area.

The specific objectives are to:

Examine the role of local government budget on rural development in Jos-East Local Government Area.

- i. Examine the role of local government budget on rural development in Jos-East Local Government Area.
- ii. To find out the factors militating against rural infrastructural programmes and policy
- iii. To proffer appropriate solutions that will help to enhance rural development.

In this work, the following hypothesis were formulated and presented to be tested.

Ho Budget implementation has not improved rural infrastructures in Jos-East Local Government Area

H1 Budget implementation has improved rural infrastructures in Jos-East Local Government Area.

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

For better comprehension of the contents of the study, it is noteworthy to conceptualize the various issues raised by this work.

i. Concept of Budget Implementation

According to Adakai (2014), budget implementation or execution refers to the enforcement or execution of the budget after its enactment by the legislature at Federal, State and Local Government levels.

ii. Concept of Rural Area

The concept of rural area has been addressed in various ways by different scholars depending on varying context. It is also conceptualized as it occurs to different countries and nations based on geographical activities and population characteristics. The 1996 census dictionary defines rural areas as “sparsely populated lands lying outside urban areas”. United States Department of Agriculture (2002 Farm bill) defines rural areas as any area other than a city or town that has a population of greater than 50,000 inhabitants, and also the urbanized areas contiguous and adjacent to Such a city or town. Functionally, a rural area is a geographical area characterized by primary activities such as extraction, farming and gathering among others.

iii. Concept of Rural Development

The concept of rural transformation/Development has different interpretation to different people because of its multi-dimensional and multi-disciplinary nature. Hunter (1964) was among the earliest to use the expression Rural Development which he considered as the “starting point of development” characterized by subsistence. According to Mabogunje (1989), rural development implies a broad-based re-organization and mobilization of the rural masses so as to cope effectively with daily tasks of their lives and with changes consequent upon this.

iv. Concept of Rural Infrastructure

According to Olowu (1986), infrastructure is regarded as the basic underlying structure upon which other super-structures are built, that is, economic and institutional infrastructures are basically in the rural context to perform both economic and social function (Oluwayomi, 1986). Infrastructure according to Olaseni and Alade (2012) is an umbrella term for many activities usually referred to as “social overhead capital” by development economists. Rural Infrastructure is associated with rural environment and it’s grouped into three categories-economic, social and institutional infrastructures. Economic infrastructure constitutes “The pre-conditions for industrialization” such as roads, markets, rural-agro-based industries; farm imputes supplies, electricity, telecommunication, water supply, sanitation and sewage, solid waste collection and disposal. Others include postal services, dams and canal works for irrigation and drainage etc. (Yusfu, 2007). Social infrastructure constitutes the basic social services such as: basic health, education, water supplies etc. Institutional infrastructure are governmental institutions that provide credits, farm input supplies, extension services of both the qualitative and quantitative improvement in the description of rural development (Moise, 1970).

POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES OF INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA

Infrastructure is seen as umbrella term for many activities and basic structure and facilities necessary for a country to function efficiently. It is designed as the totality of basic physical facilities upon which all other economic activities in a system depend (African Development Bank, 1999, Geet, 2007). Infrastructure comprises the assets needed to provide people with access to economic and social facilities and services such as: roads, water, drainage, bridges, electricity etc. Rural infrastructure is a broad term covering the basic facilities and services needed for rural communities and rural development. (F.A.O, 2006). Local Government is a government at the grass roads level of administration meant for meeting the peculiar needs of the rural people (Agagu, 2004). It is a third tier of government which in physical terms is closest to the citizenry and is saddled with responsibility of guaranty the political, social and economic development of its area and its people (Enero, Dadoyin and Elumilade, 2004). Appadorai (1975) observed that there are problems that are local in nature and such problems are better handled by local government because they are better understood by the local people themselves. Based on the 1976 guidelines for local government reforms, it is expected that local government should engage in rural infrastructure provision and engender development and good governance at the grass roots. But unfortunately local government still lack behind in the areas of infrastructure, this ugly trend is particular greater in the area of water and sanitation, rural road access and electricity.

According to World Bank (2004) Nigeria’s infrastructure in terms of quality and quantity is grossly inadequate and inferior to that which exists in other parts of the world. Out of 102 countries assessed in the global competitiveness report in 2004, the Nigeria’s quality of infrastructure was ranked 3rd to the last, this is consistent with the World Bank survey results where manufacturing firms listed infrastructure as their most severe business constraint. The Nigeria roads were described as the lowest in density in Africa, where only 31% of the roads are paved as compared to 50% in the middle income countries and even where roads are provided, only 40% of these roads can be said to be in good condition (Alabi and Ocholi, 2010). Currently only 20% Nigeria’s population have access to electricity.

A nationwide survey was conducted by the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) on the state of roads in the country, survey revealed that the road network, as at December 2002, was estimated at 194,000 kilometers, and 67% were constructed by the federal government. It was shown that most of the roads were in bad condition, especially those in rural areas (CBN, 2002). Some of the roads constructed over 30 years ago had not been rehabilitated even once, resulting in major cracks and numerous potholes that make road not drivable. Water is critical to human existence but yet a serious problem of human survivals, health and economic development. Millions of people in developing countries are faced with acute water stress from inadequate supplies. Survey conducted by Hall (2006) revealed insufficient or lack of provision of pipe borne or portable drinking water where 50% of the city dwellers and 99% of rural dwellers lack access, as a result, large proportion of households have resorted to drinking water from unhygienic sources (Tolu, 2014).

Most of the rural areas in Nigeria are in pathetic state of infrastructure delivery; even some of the urban local government areas are also deficient in infrastructure delivery. Local roads are left in bad shape, rural electricity are in the state of dilemma, rural health centers are dilapidated with absence of drugs and necessary health personnel, rural boreholes and water pump has no water, rural water scheme/projects are deserted. The only visible things in the rural areas are the sign post that shows the location,

direction, and physical status of these rural infrastructures. So many of them are not functioning due to long years of existence, lack of quality uncompleted nature of the projects, under-utilization, lack of quality job and absence of community ownership of such project. (Tolu, 2014).

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION AND RURAL INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN JOS-EAST LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF PLATEAU STATE

In Jos-East, a budget undergoes some processes before it becomes a law and economic tool. The preparation of budget in Jos-East Local Government Area involves setting budgetary thrust and policies to prepare and submit the budget to the local government legislative arm. The budget implementation process in Jos-East Local Government commences with a call circular from the executive committee consisting of the chairman, supervisory councilors and other officials, the executive council calls on the relevant department heads to prepare the estimate of expenditure in line with the goals of the Local Government Director of Budget (Adakai, 2006).

There are different and many approaches put in place by various administration of Jos-East Local Government Council both by present and past leaders geared towards achieving infrastructural development in the area. These include the connection of the electricity to the Local Government Secretariat which had been without electricity supply since 2010 when it got burnt; it has now been connected with power thereby creating a more conducive working environment for the staff quarters. The community of Gada had been without electricity for some years due to break down of the transformer which made it difficult for the community to properly utilize its borehole that needed power to pump water to the overhead storage tank. In consideration of the community's plight, the Management Committee Administration (2013 - 2014) released funds for the purchase and installation of a new 200KVA transformer which is now servicing the community comfortably and pumps water for domestic uses. The completion of Sabon Fobur electrification project is one of the outstanding achievements of the council (Jos-East Local Government Project Guide, 2013 – 2014).

On assumption of office, the Interim Administration observed that work on the Sabon Fobur electrification project had reached advanced stage yet the community had remained without electricity due to non-completion of the package of the project, as a growing community and proximity of Jos town which falls under the greater Jos Master Plan to boast economic and social activities, the Administration released huge money for the completion of the project. This development helps in job creation for the youths in different areas such as: welders, artisans, barbers/hair dressers, mechanic etc. In the same vein, the Interim Administration disbursed funds through direct labour by the Works Department of the Local Government for the completion of Maijuju electrification. However, the project has not been completed because it was discovered lately that the World Bank has not completed its bid to enable Power Holding Company of Nigeria (PHCN) complete the process.

The Local Government assisted the Nakwang community in Federe District with the completion of two self-help bridges. Fusa and other surrounding communities who had cut-off from some parts of the Fusa Bridge were connected; the work has reach 90% completion. In the area of health, the Administration has procured seven (7) motorcycles attached to the Department of Primary Health Care to facilitate Immunization, monitoring and evaluation of health programmes, to ensure the safety of vaccines and provide a suitable working environment for the staff; a cold chain room was renovated in order to serve the people well. (Jos-East Local Government Project Guide, 2013 – 2014).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The work adopted the survey research design. In designing the study, the researcher identified the variable that seem to be the determinants of the phenomenon being studied, it defined the target group of the study and data gathering exercise

Area and Population Of Study

The study was carried out in Jos-East Local Government Area of Plateau State. Jos-East Local Government Area is located in the plain of the Plateau North geo-political zone and was created in 1996. The Local Government is made up of six districts, namely; Fobur, Maigemu, Majijuju, Fursum, Federe and Shere. The Local Government is populated largely by the Afizere with the land mass of 2,540 square kilometers with the population of 88,301 (National Population Commission, 2006).

Sample Size

The total population size in Jos-East Local Government is given at 88,301 (National Population commission, 2006). A simple random sampling technique was used to select the population for the study. Taro Yamane formula was used to determine the sample size as shown below.

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

Where N = population n = sample size, e = error tolerance, 1 = constant. From the information above therefore, N = 88,301, n = sample size, e = 0.0009 i.e. 90% mention above. Therefore

$$n = \frac{N}{1+88,301(0.09)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{88,301}{1+88,301(0.0081)}$$

$$n = \frac{88,301}{1+715,2381}$$

$$n = \frac{88,301}{716,2381}$$

$$n = 123.28442$$

$$n = 123$$

The sample size of the study is 123

Therefore, the formula to determine the sample size per district is calculated as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Population per district} \times \text{Total sample size}}{\text{total population}} \quad 1$$

Method of Data Collection and Data Analysis

The study utilized both the primary and secondary data. The primary data collected were directly from the original sources through the administration of questionnaire to the respondents in the six districts that constitute the local government area. 123 questionnaires were randomly distributed out of the total, 118 were returned fully completed by the respondents, and the secondary data were collected through reports, publication, and Journals. Descriptive statistical tools such as: tables, numbers, charts and percentage. Pearson Chi-square method was used to test the formulated hypothesis of the study

DATA PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

Question 1: Are you an Indigene of Jos-East Local Government?

Table 4.1: Indigene

Variable	Frequency	Percentage %
Yes	100	84.7
No	18	15.3
Total	118	100.0

Sources: Field Work, 2019

From the statistic above, 84.7% of the respondents answered *yes* while 15.3% of the respondents answered *no*

Question 2: Do you have electricity in your locality?

Table 4.2: Have electricity

Variable	Frequency	Percentage %
Yes	89	75.4

No	29	24.6
Total	118	100.0

From the data gathered above, 75.4% of the respondents answered *yes* while 24.66% answered *no*.

Question 3: Is there power supply in your community?

Table 4.3: Power supply

Variable	Frequency	Percentage %
Yes	39	33.1
No	79	66.9
Total	118	100.0

Sources: Field Work, 2019

The table above shows that 33.1% of the respondents answered *yes*, while 66.9% answered *no*.

Question 4: Are your roads accessible in your locality?

Table 4.4: Roads accessibility

Variable	Frequency	Percentage %
Yes	44	37.3
No	74	62.7
Total	118	100.0

Sources: Field work, 2019

The data presented indicated that 37.3% of the respondents had answered *yes* while 62.7% answered *no*.

Question 5: What are the sources of drinking water in your community?

Table 4.5: Sources of drinking water

Variable	Frequency	Percentage %
Boreholes	50	42.4
Wells	44	37.3
Rivers	13	11.0
Rains water	5	4.2
Pipe borne	6	5.1
Total	118	100.0

Sources: Field work, 2019

The table above shows that 42.4% of the respondents have boreholes, 37.3% have wells, 11.0% rivers, 4.2% rains water and 5.1% pipe borne.

Question 6: Do the Local Government construct a bridge in your locality linking to other communities?

Table 4.6: Bridge Construction

Variable	Frequency	Percentage %
Yes	88	74.6
No	30	25.4
Total	118	100.0

Sources: Field work, 2019

From the statistic above, 74.6% of the respondents answered *yes* while 25.4% of the respondents answered *no*.

Question 7: Do the Local Government construct a functional dispensary (ies) in your communities?

Table 4.7: Functional dispensary

Variable	Frequency	Percentage %
Yes	47	39.8
No	71	60.2
Total	118	100.0

Source: Field work, 2018

The table above indicated that 39.8% of the respondents answered Yes While 60.2% answered No.

Question 8: How can you rate budget implementation in Jos-East Local Government?

Variable	Frequency	Percentage %
40%	67	55.8
70%	23	19.5
20%	28	23.7
Total	118	100.0

Sources: Field work, 2019

From the data gathered above, 55.8% of the respondents rate the budget implementation at 40%, while 19.5% at 70% and 23.7% at 20%.

Question 9: Do the Local Government budget improved infrastructural development in your locality?

Table 4.9: Budget and infrastructures

Variable	Frequency	Percentage %
Yes	85	72.0
No	33	28.0
Total	118	100.0

Sources: Field work, 2019

The data presented indicated that 72.0% of the respondents have answered *yes* while 28.0% answered *no*.

TEST OF HYPOTHESIS

H₀ Budget implementation has not improved rural infrastructures in Jos-East Local Government Area

H₁ Budget implementation has improved rural infrastructures in Jos-East Local Government Area.

The statistical technique used is Chi-square Taro, 1967):

The formula is expressed as follows:

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(OF - EF)^2}{EF}$$

Where X² = chi-square

OF = observed frequency

EF = expected frequency

∑ = summation

Chi-square Test

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig (2-sided)
Personal chi-square	17.234	2	.000
Likelihood Ration	21.001	2	.000
Linear-by-linear Association	30.838	1	.000
N of valid cases	118		

Source: (Research computation using SPSS field work, 2019)

Decision Rule

From the statistical table above, the value of chi-square (x^2 cal) is 17.234 and the value of chi-square (x^2 tab) is 5.991. Therefore, H_0 is rejected while H_1 is accepted. Hence the finding revealed that local government budget has significantly improved infrastructural development in Jos-East local government.

6.2 DISCUSSION OF RESULT

The purpose of the study was to assess the impact of budget implementation and rural infrastructural development in the study area. The findings revealed that majority of the respondents agreed that budget implementation had improved infrastructural development in the study area. This is in line with the studies conducted by (Ekpo and Uwatt, 2005), showing that there is significant impact between budget implementation and infrastructural development.

The study shown that majority of the respondents argued that there are insufficient basic amenities in their communities. This is in line with Nwachukwu, (2011), who describes the Nigerian rural setting as being made up of Nigeria's neglected rural majority who lacked all the essential amenities such as: health centres, good access roads, electricity, modern market facilities, banks, well equipped schools, portable water, recreational facilities and good housing, Ekong, (2010), further describes the poor socio-economic conditions of the rural sector by describing it as "the other Nigeria" with the poverty-linked characteristics which include: illiteracy, low income, superstition, poor family planning, high rate of mortality and morbidity as well as certain social norms like the extended family system and the caste system. Often times, these norms have deep-rooted cultural understanding.

The data demonstrates strong support for the population that dwells in rural areas. This is in conjunction with the work of (Ele, 2006; Nwuke, 2004). It state that Nigeria is predominantly a rural society as the vast majority of her population dwells in the rural areas indeed, about 70 percent of Nigeria dwell in rural areas (Aboyade, 1976). Specifically, rural areas refer to the geographical areas that lie outside the densely built-up environment.

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

The following research findings are derived from the data analyzed:

- i. The findings revealed that in the area under study, there are insufficient rural infrastructures in spite of the effort of the local government in the provision of rural infrastructural development facilities.
- ii. Poor budget implementation affects infrastructural facilities, programmes and policies of government at grass-root level.
- iii. The study also shows that there is significant improvement in budget implementation and rural infrastructure in the study area.

CONCLUSION

The work looked at the issue of budget implementation and rural infrastructure in Jos-East Local Government Area of Plateau State. Both primary and secondary sources of data collections were utilized in this work. The result of the study posits that budget implementation has improved rural infrastructures in the study area. Therefore, the study recommends that local councils should ensure effective and efficient release of funds to finance rural infrastructural projects and programmes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the major findings, the following recommendations were provided:

- i. There is the need for effective managing and accounting for inflow and outflow of local government finance
- ii. The shares, of the Federation account should be released fully and directly to the local government to avoid delays in implementation in projects and execution.

- iii. It is advisable for local councils to look inwards to increase and improved their Internally Generated Revenue (IGR). This will help them to be financially buoyant.
- iv. The workers in the local government councils should be trained and retrained to implement developmental projects.

REFERENCES

- Aboyade, O. (1976). *Local government reforms in Nigeria*: Ibadan University Press.
- Adakai, F.A. (2006). *Towards effective application of fundamental principles in budgeting*. Seminar Paper presented on 20-23 October, 2006, Department of Political Science, University of Jos.
- Agagu, A. (2004). "Continuity and change in local government administration and the Politics of Underdevelopment" in *Agagu, A. and Ola, R (Eds) Development Ageda of Nigerian State*. Ibadan: Fiag Publisher.
- Ale, M.O, Abisuwa, T.A., Olagunagba, F.O. and Ijorotimi, O. (2011). Rural infrastructural development, food security and city Congestion in Nigeria. *Journal of Research in National Development (JORIND)*. 1 (9)
- Appadorai, R. (1975). *The substances of politics*. New Delhi, Oxford University Press.
- Aye, J. (2003). *Towards effective and accountable local government in Ghana*. Ghana Centre for Democratic Development.
- Bertolini, P., Montanari, M. & Peragine, U. (2008). *Poverty and social exclusion in rural areas. Final Report*. Bulgaria: European Commission Annex I country studies
- Central Bank of Nigeria (2002). *Highway maintenance in Nigeria: Lessons from other counties*, Abuja CBN
- Enero, J., Oladoyin, A. and Elumilade (2004) "Accountancy and transparency in revenue Generation. The case of local government in Nigeria". *International Review of Politics and Development*, 2 (2) Pg 1-3
- Federal Government of Nigeria (1999). *The constitution of Nigeria*. Government Press, Abuja.
- Jos-East Local Government Project Guide (2013-2014).
- Kahn, A. (1979). *Social Policy and Social Services*, (2nd ed.) New York: Random House
- Khoza, R. (2009). "Sustainable Infrastructure Delivery Through Regional Cooperation". A paper presented at the 4th Environmental Conference, Zambia, May 18, 2009.
- Mabogunje, A.L. (1980). *The Development Process: A Spatial Perspective*, Hutchinson University Library.
- Moise, M. (1970). Definitions and Objectives of Rural Development" in Colin, I and John, D. (Ed), *Africa Contemporary Record Annual Survey and Documents*, PP. 308 – 9
- National Population Commission (2006 Census).
- Nwachukwu, I. and Ekwe, K.C. (2011). *Globalization and rural development in Nigeria*. Extension Centre Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umukike.
- Nwuke, K. (2004). "Poverty reduction strategies Towards the Millennium Development Goals: Africa's Experience and Lessons for Nigeria". Paper delivery at the Enugu Policy Forum organized by Africa Institute for Applied Economic, Enugu.
- Olanrewaju, S.A. (1986). "The Challenges of rural transportation in Nigeria. *The quarterly Journal of Administration*. 20 (384) 180
- Olaseni, M. and Alade, W. (2012). "Vision 20:2020 and the challenges of infrastructure development in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development* .5 (2) 63-66
- Olatunbasum, D. (1975). *Nigeria's Neglected Rural Majority*. Ibadan: Oxford University Press African Development Bank (1999) *Infrastructure Development in Africa. African Development Report 1999*. Oxford University Press.
- Oluwa, D. (1986). "Institutional approach to rural infrastructure development in Nigeria". *The Quarterly Journal of Admiration*. 20 (234) 153 -8
- Oluwayomi, D.A. (1986). "Overcoming Rural Under Development in Nigeria. *The Quarterly Journal of Administration*. 20 (384) 137 -9.
- Sehinde, B. (2008). "Need for a Review of Statutory Roles of Local Government for Effective Service. *Journal of Contemporary politics*. (1). p. 102
- Tolu, L. (2014). Local government and rural infrastructural delivery in Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*. 4 (4). 139
- United Nations (2011). *Study on Infrastructure for Economic Development and Poverty Reduction in Africa*. Narobi. UN-Habitat.
- Wunsch, J. (2001). "Decentralization, local governance and recentralization in Africa". *Public Administration and Development*. 21 (4) p. 277.
- Yusuf, M.O. (2007). *Private Sector Initiatives and Infrastructural Development in Nigeria*.