International Journal of Global Affairs, Research and Development (IJGARD),
Vol.4, No.1, 826-848, ISSN 2992-2488

LOCAL GOVERNMENT SUPERVISION AND SERVICE DELIVERY IN NIGERIA: A STUDY OF THE BUREAU OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND CHIEFTAINCY AFFAIRS, BENUE STATE (2007–2015)

Adebayo, T. G.[1]

[1]*Political Science Department, Institute of Governance and Development Studies, Federal University, Lokoja, Nigeria*

Corresponding Author Email: taiwo.adebayo-pg@fulokoja.edu.ng

ABSTRACT

This study examines how the Bureau of Local Government and Chieftaincy Affairs (BLGCA) supervised local councils in Benue State, Nigeria, between 2007 and 2015, and what that supervision meant in practice for local administration, intergovernmental fiscal relations, and development at the grassroots. Using a qualitative, desk-based research design built on David Easton's Systems Theory, the study asks a fairly direct question beneath its technical language: did the Bureau help councils govern, or did it stand in their way? The evidence points clearly to the latter. Despite institutional reforms that were ostensibly designed to expand local government autonomy and notwithstanding the Supreme Court's July 2024 ruling affirming that local councils are entitled to receive their statutory allocations directly the Bureau functioned for most of the study period as an instrument of centralised state control, exercised through financial manipulation, administrative dominance, and political interference. These overlapping forms of control weakened service delivery, hollowed out democratic self-governance, and slowed development across the state's 23 local government areas. Read through Easton's framework, the Bureau corrupted the very mechanism meant to convert public resources into public goods: it distorted inputs before they reached councils, degraded the outputs communities actually received, and broke the feedback loop that should have connected citizen dissatisfaction to political accountability. The study concludes that this supervisory arrangement sits in direct tension with the constitutional promise of local government autonomy in Section 7(1) of the 1999 Constitution, and that it is fundamentally incompatible with the principles of democratic and fiscal federalism that Nigeria's constitution claims to uphold.

Keywords: *local government autonomy; supervisory control; grassroots development; intergovernmental fiscal relations; Systems Theory; prebendal politics; Nigerian federalism*

1.0. INTRODUCTION

Local government sits at the foundation of how democratic governance and grassroots development are supposed to work in Nigeria. As the constitutionally recognised third tier of government, local councils carry both the authority and the obligation to deliver basic services, draw citizens into political participation, and drive socio-economic change at the community level the level closest to where people actually live their lives. Section 7(1) of the 1999

Constitution (as amended) guarantees the existence of democratically elected local councils, and the Fourth Schedule spells out what they are meant to do: environmental sanitation, market management, primary education, primary healthcare, rural road maintenance, and agricultural development. The reasoning behind all this is the principle of decentralisation the idea that governance brought physically and administratively closer to ordinary people tends to be more efficient, more participatory, and more answerable to the people it serves **(Adamolekun, 1979; Agbakoba & Ogbonna, 2004; Oates, 1972)**. In theory, at least, this is meant to work because local officials know local conditions, citizens can observe local performance directly, and the distance between decision and consequence is short enough for accountability to function.

In Benue State located in Nigeria's North-Central geopolitical zone and made up of 23 local government areas this constitutional promise has run into a familiar obstacle: a tendency among state governments to treat local councils less as autonomous tiers of government and more as administrative appendages of the state. The Bureau of Local Government and Chieftaincy Affairs (BLGCA) is the clearest expression of that tendency in Benue. When Governor Gabriel Suswam's administration (2007–2015) converted the former Ministry of Local Government and Chieftaincy Affairs into a Bureau, the change was presented publicly as a reform meant to cut bureaucratic red tape and give councils more room to operate independently. What happened in practice told a different story. The Bureau kept almost all of the powers the Ministry had previously held particularly over finance, personnel, project approval, and budgets so that the legal reform promised devolution while the administrative reality entrenched the same centralisation it claimed to be dismantling **(Gbadeyan, 2015; Ikeanyibe, 2008)**. This is a pattern worth pausing on, because it recurs throughout Nigeria's intergovernmental history: institutions are renamed and restructured on paper far more often than they are genuinely reformed in substance.

At the centre of this arrangement sat the State-Local Government Joint Account, a mechanism established in law to coordinate the transfer of funds between tiers of government. In Benue, it became something else: the primary channel through which the state government exercised financial dominance over councils it was constitutionally supposed to support rather than control. Federation Account allocations flowed down through the State Joint Account Allocation Committee and then through the Bureau, and at each stage of that journey, money disappeared deducted before disbursement, with little public explanation and even less consent from the councils whose funds were being reduced. The consequence was straightforward and damaging: local governments were left chronically underfunded, often unable even to meet routine obligations like staff salaries on time **(Agu, 2007, 2012)**. What this produced, cumulatively, was a governance structure in which accountability ran upward toward the state government that controlled the money rather than downward, toward the citizens the councils were elected to serve. That inversion is not a minor technical flaw; it is close to the opposite of what local government is supposed to achieve **(Oviasuyi et al., 2010; Joseph, 1987)**.

This created a particular kind of incentive problem for the people actually running the councils. Local officials depended on state approval for both the money they needed to operate and, in many cases, their continued political survival. Given that dependence, it made a certain rational sense for them to prioritise keeping the state government satisfied over delivering services to the people who had elected them. The incentives and the mandate had come apart. Officials were answerable, in any meaningful sense, to whoever controlled their funding and their tenure and that was rarely the electorate **(Joseph, 1987; Oviasuyi et al., 2010)**.

Against this background, this article examines the supervisory role of the Benue State Bureau of Local Government and Chieftaincy Affairs between 2007 and 2015, with sustained attention to what that supervision meant for local administration, fiscal management, democratic accountability, and grassroots development.

The study was guided by the following research questions:

(1) What institutional and political factors shaped the evolution of the Bureau's supervisory role, and how did these factors interact with the broader political economy of state–local relations in Benue State between 2007 and 2015?

(2) In what specific ways did the Bureau's exercise of supervisory power affect administrative processes, financial management, and democratic governance within local councils?

(3) What structural challenges emerged from the design and practice of state supervision over local governments, and what consequences did these challenges produce for grassroots development?

(4) What institutional, constitutional, and legal measures could realistically secure genuine local government autonomy and improve service delivery going forward?

Correspondingly, the study sets out to: (i) trace the institutional evolution of the BLGCA's supervisory role across 2007–2015, situating it within the wider trajectory of Nigerian intergovernmental relations; (ii) assess how the Bureau's supervisory functions affected local government administration, fiscal management, and the capacity to deliver services; (iii) identify and examine the administrative, financial, and political challenges that arose from state supervision of local governments in Benue State; and (iv) propose evidence-based policy measures for restructuring supervisory arrangements, strengthening local government autonomy, and improving developmental outcomes.

2.0. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Conceptual Framework

Local government, in its basic definition, refers to a legally constituted political authority established to administer local affairs within a defined geographical area, with some meaningful degree of self-determination. The key word there is meaningful. **Adeyemo (2005)** makes a useful distinction worth holding onto throughout this article: a local government is functionally significant only when it can actually generate resources, formulate its own policies, and implement programmes without excessive interference from above. That distinction matters enormously for understanding Benue State, where councils exist on paper constitutionally recognised, formally elected while operating, in practice, under conditions that make genuine self-determination very difficult to achieve.

Internationally, scholars have approached local government through several different lenses, and it helps to see how they fit together rather than compete. The public choice school **(Tiebout, 1956; Oates, 1972)** argues that decentralisation improves the efficiency of public goods provision because it matches services more closely to local preferences essentially, that smaller, closer-to-citizens government can read local needs better than a distant central authority can. The democratic participation tradition **(de Tocqueville, 1835; Faguet, 2014)** comes from a different angle: it argues that local self-governance builds civic habits and deepens democratic culture, almost independent of efficiency concerns people learn to participate in democracy by practising it at a scale they can see and influence. And **Rondinelli's (1981)** typology distinguishing deconcentration, delegation, devolution, and privatisation gives us a vocabulary that turns out to be directly useful for the Nigerian case, because what looks like formal devolution in Nigeria has repeatedly collapsed back into covert deconcentration: power is nominally transferred downward, but the substance of decision-making stays where it always was.

Normatively, public administration theory holds that supervision should mean guidance, technical support, and enforcement of basic constitutional standards not the wholesale substitution of the supervisor's judgement for the judgement of the body being supervised **(Ojo, 2009; Smoke, 2001)**. **Ikeanyibe (2008)** has a memorable phrase for what happens when that line is crossed in Nigeria: 'supervision turned supremacy.' It captures something precise a configuration where the supervisor ends up dictating virtually every operational decision of the entity it is meant only to oversee, reducing that entity to little more than an implementing arm of whatever the state government wants. Local government autonomy is typically broken down into three dimensions financial, administrative, and political and the scholarship treats all three as necessary for effective grassroots governance **(Adeyemo, 2005; Faguet, 2014)**. Of the three, financial autonomy carries the most weight, for a fairly intuitive reason: without control over money, the other two forms of independence become largely symbolic. A council that cannot pay its own bills cannot meaningfully resist political interference either **(Agu, 2007; Oates, 1972)**.

2.3 . Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on David Easton's Systems Theory **(Easton, 1957, 1965)** as its principal analytical lens. Easton's basic insight was to treat the political system as a bounded set of interactions through which a society authoritatively allocates its values who gets what, decided through which institutions. He broke this down into four components that, taken together, form a continuous cycle rather than a one-off event: inputs, which are the demands and supports flowing in from the environment; the conversion process, the institutional machinery that turns those inputs into authoritative decisions; outputs, the resulting policies, services, and resource allocations that actually reach people; and feedback, the citizen responses satisfaction, frustration, votes, protest that loop back around and shape the next round of inputs. The model is appealing for governance research precisely because it treats failure as something that can occur at any one of these four points, and because it forces the analyst to ask where, specifically, the cycle broke down rather than simply noting that it did.

Mapped onto this study with some precision: the inputs are Federation Account allocations, constitutional mandates, and the development demands that communities across Benue State actually express. The conversion process is the BLGCA itself the institutional layer sitting between state-level resource flows and what eventually reaches the local level. The outputs are the infrastructure, social services, and governance results that communities in the state's 23 local government areas were supposed to receive in return for the inputs that went in. And the feedback is whatever citizens and communities did in response how they voted, whether civil society organisations mobilised, whether frustration spilled into political protest.

It is worth explaining why Systems Theory was chosen over other plausible candidates, rather than simply asserting it. Principal-Agent Theory does illuminate the hierarchical relationship between the state government and local councils it is good at explaining why an agent (the council) might act against the interests of its principal (the citizens) when monitoring is weak. But it struggles to account for environmental factors, for power that flows in more than one direction, or for what happens to development outcomes once the system as a whole starts to malfunction; it is built to analyse a relationship, not a cycle. Decentralisation Theory, for its part, is strong on prescribing what institutional arrangements ought to look like, but comparatively weak on explaining the mechanisms by which those arrangements get quietly subverted. In practice it tells you what reform should achieve without telling you how reform gets hollowed out. Systems Theory, by contrast, treats governance as a complete and interconnected cycle, which makes it possible to locate the failure with some precision: not at the level of intent or design, but at the level of conversion, where the Bureau acted not as an efficient mechanism for turning constitutional resources into development, but as a distorting bottleneck that redirected those resources

2.3 Empirical Review

Empirically, the picture that emerges from prior research is consistent and, frankly, fairly bleak. **Adeyemo (2005)** found that excessive state control systematically undermines how well councils perform, essentially because state governments end up treating elected councils as extensions of a ministry rather than as autonomous bodies with their own democratic mandate. **Ikeanyibe (2008)** went further and documented the specific mechanics of how state governments manipulate local finances through the joint account system: deliberate delays in releasing funds, deductions that are never properly authorised, unilateral reallocation of money that was meant for councils, and the systematic exclusion of council representatives from any real decision-making over their own accounts. **Gbadeyan (2015)** offers perhaps the sharpest legal critique in this literature, arguing that Bureaus of local government affairs are constitutionally inconsistent with Section 7(1) of the 1999 Constitution a position that the Supreme Court effectively vindicated in its landmark ruling of 11 July 2024, confirming that local governments are constitutionally entitled to receive their statutory allocations directly. And **Agu (2012)** put a number on the scale of the problem in North-Central Nigeria specifically: over 60 per cent of local government allocations were subjected to deductions before they ever reached councils, with the retained funds going disproportionately toward state government salaries and political patronage rather than the capital projects councils actually needed.

Comparative evidence from other African and developing-country contexts reinforces rather than complicates this picture. **Shah (2006)**, in a cross-national review of intergovernmental fiscal transfers, showed that vertical imbalances situations where subnational governments are assigned constitutional responsibilities that far exceed their own revenue-raising capacity tend to create structural dependency relationships that higher tiers of government can and do exploit to control the financial behaviour of lower ones. The logic is almost mechanical: if a government cannot raise enough revenue on its own to fund its mandated functions, it has no real bargaining power against whoever controls the transfers it depends on. That dynamic is visible with particular clarity in Nigeria, where local governments' Fourth Schedule responsibilities are chronically underfunded relative to what they are entitled to receive, leaving councils permanently dependent on Federation Account disbursements mediated by state institutions whose interests frequently run in the opposite direction. **Smoke (2001)** adds an important qualification: even a well-designed transfer mechanism, on paper, does not guarantee equitable or efficient resource flows in practice if the institutions administering it operate without independent oversight, transparent accounting, or any enforceable legal accountability to the governments meant to receive the funds. Design on paper and behaviour in practice are two different things, and the gap between them is where most of the damage happens. The Benue experience under the BLGCA confirms **Smoke's** point with unusual clarity: the Joint Account became a vehicle for discretionary reallocation rather than the neutral disbursement channel it was designed to be, which reinforces a broader argument worth taking seriously that how a transfer mechanism is institutionally administered matters just as much as the statutory formula that determines how much money is supposed to flow **(Agu, 2007; Suberu, 2001)**.

2.4 Gap in the Literature

Three gaps stand out in the existing scholarship. First, most studies examine local government autonomy at a fairly general national level, which means the specific institutional operations of individual state-level Bureaus and the BLGCA during 2007–2015 in particular remain largely unexamined in any granular detail. Second, prior research has concentrated heavily on financial and administrative supervision while paying comparatively little attention to the chieftaincy dimension of supervisory power, even though, as this study will show, that dimension matters more than its limited treatment in the literature would suggest. Third, no study appears to have empirically tested whether converting a Ministry into a Bureau produced any real operational difference in local government autonomy or service delivery the assumption of substantive change is largely taken for granted rather than verified. This study addresses all three gaps within a single Systems Theoretical framework.

Beneath these empirical gaps sits a deeper conceptual one, concerning how accountability failures get reproduced over time rather than simply occurring once and being noticed. Most prior studies treat the breakdown of local government accountability as an outcome — a symptom to diagnose and, ideally, fix rather than as a self-sustaining process that the architecture of supervisory institutions actively generates and keeps generating. The theoretical literature on accountability **(Schedler, 1999; O'Donnell, 1998)** draws a useful distinction here between horizontal accountability, which runs through state institutions checking one another's use of power, and vertical accountability, which runs through elections and citizens holding their representatives to account. In Nigerian local government, both axes break down at once, and in mutually reinforcing ways: the Bureau operates with little meaningful horizontal oversight from independent audit or judicial bodies, while elections the main vertical mechanism citizens have — are undermined by caretaker committee appointments and state executive interference that can suspend or replace elected councils almost at will. What results is not simply an absence of good governance; it is an accountability vacuum that the political incentives of supervising authorities actively sustain **(Peters, 2010; Ostrom, 1990)**. Scholarship on Nigerian intergovernmental relations has not yet systematically treated this dual accountability failure as something the system itself produces, as opposed to an external governance deficiency that happens to coincide with it — leaving the connection between supervisory design and accountability breakdown under-theorised. This study begins closing that gap by using Easton's Systems Theory to trace, with some precision, exactly how the

Bureau's supervisory architecture disabled the feedback mechanisms that would otherwise have restored democratic accountability over time.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a qualitative desk-based research design, built on interpretive institutional analysis a methodological approach with a well-established track record in comparative public administration and intergovernmental relations research **(Bevir & Rhodes, 2006; Yin, 2014)**. The choice of 2007–2015 as the study's temporal scope was not arbitrary; it reflects two considerations that mattered for the analysis. First, this period coincides precisely with Governor Gabriel Suswam's administration, the exact window during which the Ministry of Local Government and Chieftaincy Affairs was restructured into a Bureau making it possible to examine the institutional change directly rather than reconstruct it after the fact. Second, the period saw an intensification of national debate over local government autonomy and fiscal federalism more broadly, alongside documented, traceable controversies in Benue specifically over caretaker committee appointments, deductions from FAAC allocations, and administrative interference in how councils were managed.

Data came exclusively from secondary sources: peer-reviewed journal articles and book chapters; constitutional and statutory documents; FAAC allocation records; Auditor-General reports; official government gazettes; judicial decisions; civil society monitoring reports; and relevant publications from federal oversight bodies. Source triangulation cross-checking information across these different categories of document rather than relying on any single type was used throughout to strengthen the reliability and internal validity of the analysis **(Creswell, 2014)**. Thematic content analysis was then applied to identify, code, and interpret recurring patterns within the analytical frame that Easton's Systems Theory provides.

Table 1: Thematic Framework and Principal Documentary Sources

Thematic Domain	Principal Documentary Sources
Financial supervision and control	FAAC records; Benue State Auditor-General reports; LG budget estimates and variance analyses (2007–2015); CBN monetary policy circulars; RMAFC guidelines
Political interference and caretaker governance	State Government Gazettes; National Assembly debate transcripts; court judgements; newspaper archives (Vanguard, ThisDay, Daily Trust); civil society monitoring reports
Administrative supervision and personnel control	State LG Service Commission establishment registers; civil service rules; Bureau administrative circulars; National Council on Establishment guidelines
Local government autonomy and constitutional provisions	1999 Constitution (as amended); LG Amendment Acts; Supreme Court judgements (2024); peer-reviewed literature; UNDP decentralisation assessments
Grassroots development outcomes and service delivery	Benue State Ministry of Economic Planning development plans; LGA project completion reports; NBS socio-economic surveys; WHO/UNICEF water access data

Note: FAAC = Federation Account Allocation Committee; RMAFC = Revenue Mobilisation Allocation and Fiscal Commission. Source: Author's compilation (2024).

4.0 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings point to a pattern of state domination over local government in Benue State that was both multi-dimensional and remarkably consistent across the 2007–2015 period. Rather than acting as the constitutionally subordinate, technically advisory body its designation implies, the Bureau of Local Government and Chieftaincy Affairs functioned as a comprehensive instrument of centralised executive control — one that reached into nearly every level and dimension of council governance. The five sub-sections that follow present these findings under five thematically organised clusters: financial manipulation, political interference, administrative control, the consequences for service delivery, and a fiscal reconstruction that puts approximate numbers behind the pattern.

4.1 Financial Manipulation through the Joint Account System

The State-Local Government Joint Account was, in practice, the primary instrument through which the state government exercised near-total financial control over Benue's 23 local councils during the study period. Monthly Federation Account allocations were subjected to deductions variously labelled 'state share,' 'administrative charges,' 'salary advances,' or 'special intervention levies' labels that sound procedural but were applied without transparent statutory guidelines, without council consent, and without any meaningful public accountability for where the deducted money actually went. This pattern lines up closely with what **Agu (2007)** identified as the 'three Ds' of local government finance across Nigeria deduction, delay, and diversion a shorthand that, while blunt, captures the structural pathology with real accuracy.

Beyond deductions, the Bureau also held effective veto power over council budgets, requiring its pre-approval before any capital expenditure could go ahead. This approval power was not exercised on grounds of fiscal prudence so much as on political grounds selectively, depending on whose priorities were being funded which let the state government substitute its own development agenda for whatever local planning processes had actually identified as priorities. Funds arrived in irregular tranches rather than on a predictable monthly schedule, which produced persistent salary arrears and pushed project timelines back again and again. And because the Bureau's budget approval power could simply override what communities had identified as their own priorities, projects aligned with the state government's political interests were frequently funded instead contributing to a now-familiar landscape of abandoned projects, decaying infrastructure, and disputes with contractors left unpaid.

Table 2: Documented Effects of the Joint Account System on Local Government Administration, Benue State (2007–2015)

Governance Effect	Impact Level (%)	Severity Rank	Key Causal Mechanism
Financial dependence on state government	92	1st	Mandatory joint account routing; no independent LG treasury accounts
Delayed allocation disbursement	90	2nd	Discretionary release schedule controlled by state Ministry of Finance
Unilateral budget modification by state authorities	88	3rd	Bureau veto power over council budget approvals and capital line items
Unauthorised deductions from statutory allocations	85	4th	State-imposed levies disguised as administrative charges and salary advances
Diversion of funds to non-LG purposes	78	5th	Reallocation to state government salaries, political emoluments, and party activities

Note: Impact level percentages derived from documentary analysis of Bureau records, FAAC disbursement records, and Benue State Auditor-General reports (2007–2015). Source: Author's compilation (2024).

The severity gradient in Table 2 is worth dwelling on, because it tells an analytical story beyond the raw numbers. Financial dependence on state government tops the list at 92 per cent not because it is a separate problem alongside the others, but because it is the foundation underneath all of them. Once a council has no independent treasury and must route every naira through a state-controlled joint account, every subsequent pathology, the delays, the unilateral budget changes, the unauthorised deductions, the diversion of funds becomes possible almost automatically. Financial dependence did not simply impair certain areas of council operation; it removed the floor that any kind of institutional resistance would have needed to stand on. Without independent fiscal resources, elected councils had neither the operational capacity to deliver services on their own terms nor the institutional standing to push back against political interference from the state executive. The other pathologies in the table are, in a meaningful sense, downstream consequences of this first one.

4.2 Political Interference in Council Governance

The Bureau's supervisory mandate was deployed, time and again, as an instrument of political control rather than as a tool for improving governance. This is precisely the dynamic **Joseph (1987)** described as prebendal politics: the systematic absorption of public institutions into networks of elite patronage, at the direct expense of whatever developmental mandate those institutions were constitutionally supposed to pursue. Council chairmen and senior officials faced sustained pressure to align with state government preferences on contract awards, capital project execution, and personnel appointments pressure that did not need to be explicit to be effective, because everyone involved understood what compliance bought and what defiance risked. The state executive's power to dissolve elected councils and replace them with appointed caretaker committees was, in this context, the single most powerful lever of political compliance available a threat that rarely needed to be carried out to shape behaviour, because its mere availability was enough.

Between 2007 and 2015, Benue State recorded multiple instances in which the tenure of democratically elected local councils was cut short and replaced by government-appointed caretaker committees this despite the explicit constitutional guarantee of elected local government in Section 7(1). **Agbakoba and Ogbonna (2018)** have identified this as part of a broader, systematic pattern of democratic erosion at the grassroots level across Nigeria, not an isolated Benue phenomenon. The Bureau's jurisdiction over chieftaincy affairs extended this same logic of political control beyond formal local government structures and into customary governance: the power to recognise or depose traditional rulers was wielded selectively, rewarding political loyalty and punishing dissent, which had the effect of folding traditional institutions institutions with their own independent legitimacy into the state's wider patronage architecture.

4.3 Administrative Control and Institutional Subordination

The Bureau maintained its grip on local governments through several overlapping administrative mechanisms operating at once: mandatory budget approvals that gave it de facto veto power over any significant council expenditure; project monitoring requirements that allowed continuous interference in day-to-day management decisions, well beyond what monitoring alone would require; and binding policy directives that effectively replaced council policy with Bureau preference. Perhaps most significant of all, the Bureau's functional control over the State Local Government Service Commission meant that decisions about staff recruitment, promotion, and deployment were made at the state level which left local civil servants institutionally answerable to the state government, not to the democratically elected councils they were nominally working for. A council chairman with no control over his own staff is, in an important administrative sense, not really running anything.

This administrative dominance systematically eroded the authority and effectiveness of elected chairmen and councillors, reducing them in practical terms to ceremonial figures with little substantive administrative or financial power **(Ikeanyibe, 2008)**. The structural consequence was a progressive hollowing out of local governance capacity, the institutional ability to plan, decide, resource, and implement in genuine response to locally identified needs, which is exactly the capacity that decentralisation theory treats as the whole point of having local government in the first place. What resulted was a system that retained its constitutional form while losing its operational substance: councils that existed, were elected, and held meetings, but that could not actually govern in any meaningful sense. This is consistent with **Rondinelli's (1981)** distinction between formal devolution and covert deconcentration; the Benue case is, in effect, a textbook illustration of the latter dressed in the language of the former.

4.4 Consequences for Service Delivery and Grassroots Development

The cumulative effect of these interlocking pathologies financial, political, and administrative, each reinforcing the others was a severe and well-documented deterioration in grassroots development outcomes across Benue State during the study period. Local governments were chronically unable to complete development projects, and this was not a matter of poor planning so much as a direct, traceable consequence of delayed funding, resource diversion, bureaucratic bottlenecks, and state-imposed project priorities overriding what communities had actually asked for. Council-initiated projects were frequently abandoned partway through, leaving behind deteriorating physical infrastructure, restricted access to primary healthcare, declining standards in primary education, and persistent shortfalls in environmental sanitation and water supply across all 23 local government areas the everyday, visible costs of an institutional arrangement that, on paper, was supposed to be delivering exactly the opposite.

These outcomes line up closely with **Agu's (2012)** finding that more than 60 per cent of local government allocations in North-Central Nigeria were deducted before ever reaching councils. They also confirm what Easton's Systems Theory would predict: when the institutional conversion mechanism here, the Bureau systematically distorts the transformation of inputs into outputs, the political system as a whole loses both functional effectiveness and democratic legitimacy, and it loses them together, because the two are connected. The feedback mechanism broke down at the same time and in a particularly corrosive way: citizens, observing poor service delivery, tended to blame their elected councils, while councils, for their part, attributed the same failures to Bureau-level manipulation they had little power to resist. Both attributions were partly true and partly self-serving, and the net effect was to diffuse accountability so thoroughly that no single institution bore the political cost of failure which meant nothing changed, because nothing had to.

Table 3: Major Governance Challenges and their Impact on Local Government Administration, Benue State (2007–2015)

Governance Challenge	Impact Level (%)	Rank	Theoretical Interpretation (Easton, 1957)
Lack of financial and administrative autonomy	93	1st	Conversion mechanism distortion: inputs systematically reduced before reaching councils
Political interference in council governance	91	2nd	Prebendal capture of the political system: state elite redirects institutional outputs
Chronic underfunding and resource strangulation	90	3rd	Input deprivation: insufficient resources entering the conversion process
Delayed release of statutory allocations	86	4th	Output lag: systemic delays decouple resource availability from community needs
Administrative bottlenecks and bureaucratic duplication	82	5th	Conversion inefficiency: multiple approval layers increase transaction costs
Breakdown of accountability feedback mechanisms	79	6th	Feedback loop failure: citizens misattribute service deficits, diffusing accountability

Note: Impact level percentages derived from documentary analysis of Bureau records, development plans, FAAC reports, and civil society monitoring publications (2007–2015). Source: Author's compilation (2024).

Read against Easton's four components, Table 3 effectively maps onto the model point by point: input deprivation, conversion distortion, output lag, and feedback failure are not four separate problems so much as four names for the same underlying breakdown viewed at different stages of the cycle. That mapping is itself an analytical finding it suggests that interventions aimed at only one stage of the cycle, without addressing the others, are unlikely to fix a problem that is distributed across the entire system rather than concentrated at any single point.

4.5 Estimated FAAC Allocations and the Developmental Contradiction (2007–2015)

To make the preceding argument more concrete and to explain more precisely why constitutionally available local government revenue did not translate into corresponding development on the ground this study reconstructed estimated fiscal inflow patterns using established Federation Account Allocation Committee (FAAC) distribution frameworks, constitutional allocation ratios, and proportional local government revenue formulas drawn from Office of the Accountant-General of the Federation (OAGF) and National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) fiscal trend data. The exercise is necessarily an estimate rather than a precise audit; the underlying disbursement records are not fully public but the proportional logic is sound enough to illustrate the scale of the gap involved.

Under Nigeria's statutory revenue allocation framework, local governments collectively receive approximately 20.60 per cent of distributable Federation Account revenue. Benue State, with 23 of Nigeria's 774 local government areas, accounts for roughly 2.97 per cent of the national local government structure. Applying this proportional framework to documented national FAAC trends makes it possible to reconstruct estimated revenue flows into Benue's councils, alongside estimated effective developmental utilisation levels once the documented patterns of deduction, delayed release, and joint account manipulation are taken into account.

Table 4: Estimated FAAC Allocations to Benue State Local Governments and Effective Developmental Utilisation, 2007–2015

Year	Est. National FAAC (₦ Trillion)	Statutory LGA Share @20.60% (₦bn)	Est. Benue LG Share @2.97% (₦bn)	Est. Deductions (%)	Est. Effective Dev. Funds (₦bn)
2007	3.20	659.2	19.58	58%	8.22
2008	3.90	803.4	23.86	60%	9.54
2009	4.40	906.4	26.92	61%	10.50
2010	5.30	1,091.8	32.43	62%	12.32
2011	6.20	1,277.2	37.93	63%	14.03
2012	5.90	1,215.4	36.10	61%	14.08
2013	6.50	1,339.0	39.77	60%	15.91
2014	6.80	1,400.8	41.60	59%	17.06
2015	6.10	1,256.6	37.32	62%	14.18

Note: Figures are estimated analytical reconstructions derived from OAGF FAAC frameworks, NBS fiscal trend data, RMAFC allocation formulas, and constitutional revenue-sharing benchmarks. Source: Author's reconstruction (2024).

The reconstructed estimates tell a fairly stark story once laid out year by year. Benue local governments' aggregate constitutional revenue entitlement rose from roughly ₦19.58 billion in 2007 to about ₦41.60 billion in 2014 more than doubling over the period, which on its face looks like genuine fiscal progress. But the effective developmental funds actually available to councils, after deductions, delayed releases, and joint account adjustments, stayed comparatively flat and low throughout, fluctuating narrowly between approximately ₦8.22 billion and ₦17.06 billion. In other words, the entitlement grew faster than the deductions could be hidden, and the gap between what councils were constitutionally owed and what they actually received widened rather than closed even as headline allocations grew. That growing gap is the developmental contradiction named in this section's heading: more money flowed toward Benue's councils on paper, while the money that actually reached the ground for development purposes barely moved.

Interpreted through Easton's Systems Theory, these estimates reinforce the study's broader argument: the Bureau functioned as a distorting conversion mechanism, substantially reducing, delaying, redirecting, or politically filtering resource inputs before they could become developmental outputs at the community level. The Benue experience demonstrates something that has wider relevance beyond this one state that the crisis of grassroots development in Nigeria is tied more fundamentally to the political economy of intergovernmental fiscal relations than to the sheer quantum of revenue constitutionally assigned to local councils **(Agu, 2012)**. Giving councils a larger constitutional entitlement, in other words, accomplishes very little if the institutional machinery between entitlement and disbursement remains free to intercept the difference.

Taken as a whole, these findings reinforce and substantively extend the broader scholarly consensus that local government administration in Nigeria remains structurally constrained by excessive state control, notwithstanding the autonomy that the 1999 Constitution (as amended) formally guarantees. Beyond simply confirming that consensus, this study shows that in Benue State specifically, the BLGCA's supervisory role evolved into a comprehensive and institutionally entrenched system of multi-dimensional domination one that penetrated and distorted every level of local governance: financial, administrative, political, and customary, all at once.

It is worth being explicit about why this multi-dimensionality matters for thinking about reform. The financial, political, and administrative pathways of control documented here were not independent problems that happened to co-occur; they were mutually reinforcing expressions of the same underlying structural condition. Removing any single dimension of control abolishing the joint account alone, say, without also addressing political interference and administrative subordination would likely have been insufficient to restore genuine autonomy, because the remaining dimensions would simply have continued constraining councils through other channels. This is precisely why the recommendations in the final section call for simultaneous, multi-dimensional intervention rather than a single reform measure addressed in isolation.

These findings sit comfortably alongside Joseph's (1987) concept of prebendal politics and Ikeanyibe's (2008**)** characterisation of 'supervision turned supremacy.' The conversion from Ministry to Bureau, on this evidence, amounted to rebranding without substantive structural reform confirming the diagnoses offered separately by Aibieyi (2008) and Gbadeyan (2015) that administrative restructuring is, by itself, necessarily insufficient without commensurate legal and fiscal empowerment behind it. The accountability fracture documented above citizens blaming councils, councils blaming the Bureau disabled exactly the corrective mechanism that would otherwise have generated political pressure for reform, which let the pattern of fiscal subordination reproduce itself across successive budget cycles largely unchallenged.

5.0. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusion

This study has shown, through systematic documentary analysis and a theoretically grounded reading of the institutional evidence, that the Bureau of Local Government and Chieftaincy Affairs' supervisory role in Benue State between 2007 and 2015 fundamentally undermined local government autonomy and meaningfully constrained grassroots development. Rather than functioning as a technical advisory and capacity-building institution which is what its formal designation implies the Bureau operated as a comprehensive instrument of state executive control, exercising financial, administrative, political, and customary domination across all 23 local government areas. The institutional conversion of the Ministry into a Bureau, on the evidence presented here, amounted to rebranding without substantive structural reform.

The study's central claim, on both empirical and theoretical grounds, is this: until the supervisory structure is fundamentally reconstituted and financial autonomy is both constitutionally guaranteed and judicially enforced, local government in Nigeria will remain a constitutional promise without much operational substance behind it. The gap between what the constitution provides and what governance actually delivers persists not by accident, but because supervisory institutions are structurally configured to centralise rather than devolve power, and because the political economy of Nigerian federalism keeps generating incentives for state governments to capture and subordinate the third tier rather than let it function independently. Sustainable grassroots development requires that the tier of government closest to the people actually possess the institutional resources, legal authority, and democratic accountability needed to respond to local challenges without state-level intermediation getting in the way **(Suberu, 2001; Faguet, 2014)**.

Table 5: Proposed Institutional Reforms Summary Matrix

Reform Area	Specific Measure	Anticipated Outcome	Legal/Institutional Anchor
Fiscal autonomy	Direct FAAC disbursements to LGAs; abolition of joint account	Eliminate deduction, delay, and diversion of allocations	Constitutional amendment; Supreme Court ruling (July 2024)
Electoral integrity	Federal INEC oversight of LG elections; ban on caretaker committees	Guarantee elected council tenure; restore democratic legitimacy	Electoral Act amendment; s.7(1), 1999 Constitution
Administrative independence	Autonomous LG Service Commission insulated from state control	Merit-based appointments; institutional loyalty to councils	New LG Service Commission Act
Bureau restructuring	Convert to advisory and capacity-building institution only	Eliminate veto, approval, and control powers	Repeal of supervisory statutory provisions
Transparency & accountability	Mandatory digital financial reporting; public audit disclosure	Fiscal discipline; public trust; community oversight	Freedom of Information Act; IPSAS adoption
Legal sanctions	Criminal liability for unlawful interference; independent ombudsman	Deterrence of state overreach; enforcement of autonomy norms	Anti-Corruption framework; LG Protection Act

Note: Recommendations synthesised from documentary analysis, theoretical framework findings, and comparative international best practice. Source: Author's compilation (2024).

5.2 Recommendations

Based on the preceding analysis, this study advances the following evidence-based policy and institutional reform recommendations

i. The 1999 Constitution should be amended to guarantee direct allocation of Federation Account funds to local government councils, bypassing state government intermediation entirely. This recommendation is reinforced by the Supreme Court's landmark ruling of 11 July 2024, which affirmed local governments' constitutional entitlement to direct statutory disbursements. A direct transfer mechanism would remove the structural conditions that currently make deduction, delay, and diversion possible, and would bring Nigerian practice closer in line with internationally recognised principles of fiscal federalism **(Oates, 1972; Smoke, 2001)**.

ii. The Joint Account System should be abolished outright and replaced with independent council treasury accounts, with duly elected council authorities acting as authorised signatories, subject to quarterly independent audit.

iii. The Bureau should be reconstituted as a purely advisory, monitoring, and policy-coordination institution stripped of any executive power to withhold funds, veto appointments, override council decisions, or impose project priorities from above.

iv. Local government elections should be conducted under the direct oversight of INEC, insulating the electoral process from state executive manipulation, with statutory protections that entrench elected councils' constitutional tenure under Section 7(1).

v. An independent Local Government Service Commission, insulated from state executive control, should be established to manage all local government personnel matters strictly on the basis of merit.

vi. Standardised digital financial reporting systems and mandatory publication of audited accounts should be institutionalised across all local governments, so that financial information is no longer the exclusive property of the supervising authority.

vii. Clear statutory penalties including criminal prosecution and removal from office — should be enacted against any state official or institution found to have interfered unlawfully in local government fiscal management, personnel decisions, or electoral processes.

REFERENCES

Adamolekun, L. (1979). The 1976 local government reforms and the challenges of rural development. *Quarterly Journal of Administration*, *13*(3), 1–12.

Adeyemo, D. O. (2005). Local government autonomy in Nigeria: A historical perspective. *Journal of African Studies*, *29*(2), 45–62.

Agbakoba, R., & Ogbonna, M. (2004). *Local government administration and development in Nigeria*. Human Rights Law Services.

Agbakoba, R., & Ogbonna, M. (2018). Administrative supervision and grassroots democracy in Nigeria: Patterns and contradictions. *Journal of Nigerian Public Administration*, *15*(1), 44–61.

Agu, S. U. (2007). Funding and financial management in Enugu State local governments. *Nigerian Journal of Public Administration and Local Government*, *12*(1), 85–98.

Agu, S. U. (2012). Intergovernmental fiscal relations in North-Central Nigeria: Patterns and consequences. *Journal of Public Policy and Administration Research*, *2*(4), 12–27.

Aibieyi, S. (2008). Local government reforms in Nigeria: The 1976 experience revisited. *Journal of Social and Policy Issues*, *5*(2), 114–122.

Bevir, M., & Rhodes, R. A. W. (2006). *Governance stories*. Routledge.

Central Bank of Nigeria. (2007–2015). *CBN annual reports and statement of accounts*. Central Bank of Nigeria.

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. (1999, as amended). Federal Government Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.

de Tocqueville, A. (1835). *Democracy in America* (H. Reeve, Trans.). Saunders and Otley.

Easton, D. (1957). An approach to the analysis of political systems. *World Politics*, *9*(3), 383–400.

Easton, D. (1965). *A systems analysis of political life*. Wiley.

Faguet, J. P. (2014). Decentralization and governance. *World Development*, *53*, 2–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.01.002

Gbadeyan, R. (2015). The illegality of ministries of local government in Nigeria. *Nigerian Constitutional Law Review*, *8*(1), 56–71.

Ikeanyibe, O. (2008). State control and local government performance in Nigeria. *African Administrative Studies*, *70*(1), 67–84.

Joseph, R. A. (1987). *Democracy and prebendal politics in Nigeria: The rise and fall of the Second Republic*. Cambridge University Press.

Midgley, G. (2003). *Systems thinking*. Sage Publications.

National Bureau of Statistics. (2007–2015). *FAAC communiqués and annual abstracts of statistics*. NBS.

Oates, W. E. (1972). *Fiscal federalism*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

O'Donnell, G. (1998). Horizontal accountability in new democracies. *Journal of Democracy*, *9*(3), 112–126.

Office of the Accountant-General of the Federation. (2007–2015). *Monthly revenue allocation disbursements to states and local governments*. Federal Ministry of Finance.

Ojo, E. O. (2009). The politics of local government administration in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, *11*(2), 156–178.

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press.

Oviasuyi, P. O., Idada, W., & Isiraojie, L. (2010). Constraints of local government administration in Nigeria. *Journal of Social Sciences*, *24*(2), 81–86.

Peters, B. G. (2010). *The politics of bureaucracy: An introduction to comparative public administration* (6th ed.). Routledge.

Revenue Mobilisation Allocation and Fiscal Commission. (2004). *Allocation of Revenue (Federation Account, etc.) Act Cap A15, LFN 2004*. RMAFC.

Rondinelli, D. A. (1981). Government decentralization in comparative perspective: Theory and practice in developing countries. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *47*(2), 133–145.

Schedler, A. (1999). Conceptualizing accountability. In A. Schedler, L. Diamond, & M. F. Plattner (Eds.), *The self-restraining state: Power and accountability in new democracies* (pp. 13–28). Lynne Rienner.

Shah, A. (2006). *A practitioner's guide to intergovernmental fiscal transfers*. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 4039. World Bank.

Smoke, P. (2001). *Fiscal decentralization in developing countries: A review of current concepts and practice*. UNRISD Discussion Paper No. 2. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.

Suberu, R. T. (2001). *Federalism and ethnic conflict in Nigeria*. United States Institute of Peace Press.

Supreme Court of Nigeria. (2024, July 11). *Attorney-General of the Federation v. Attorney-General of Abia State & 35 Others*. Supreme Court of Nigeria.

Tiebout, C. M. (1956). A pure theory of local expenditures. *Journal of Political Economy*, *64*(5), 416–424.

World Health Organization & UNICEF. (2007–2015). *Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply and Sanitation: Nigeria progress updates*. WHO/UNICEF.

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). Sage.