

RURAL HOUSEHOLDS' PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS IN AKINYELE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF OYO STATE

¹ADENIRAN A. A. ¹IKUEJAWA, I. I., ²OLUBANWO O. O. AND ¹LADOJA O. M.

¹Department of Agricultural Extension and Management, Federal College of Agriculture, Ibadan, Oyo State

²Department of Cooperative Economics and Management, Federal College of Agriculture, Ibadan, Oyo State

adeniranbayo@yahoo.com +234 806 329 3197

ABSTRACT

Community development is one of the major issues of concern in most rural areas of any developing nations. The study examined the perception of rural households on community development projects in Akinyele Local Government Area of Oyo State. Simple random sampling technique was used to select twenty heads of households from six (6) wards making a total of one hundred and twenty respondents. Primary data were collected using a well-structured and validated interview schedule and analysed with frequency count, percentages and mean while chi square and Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) were used to test the hypothesis. Results shows that the heads of households were predominantly male (78.3%), married (72.5%) mostly with secondary education (60.0%) and engaged in various livelihood activities. Findings also reveal that Health centre (87.0%), block of classrooms (84.0%), rural electrification and rural roads (72.0% each), security post (60.8%) and town hall (60.0%) were some of the development projects executed through community efforts. Results further show that information communication centre ($x = 0.68$), toilet/incinerator ($x = 0.65$) were of low access to members of the community. It was revealed that community members mostly participated in planning of projects ($x = 0.61$), control of traffic ($x = 0.61$), fetching of water ($x = 0.42$) and dissemination of information to members ($x = 0.52$). However, the results of participation index low (53.3%). Lack of time ($x = 1.41$), lack of awareness project ($x = 1.28$) and lack of financial capability ($x = 1.25$) were some of the factors affecting household members participation in community development projects. Sex ($\chi^2 = 0.433$, $df = 4$) and marital status ($\chi^2 = 0.443$, $df = 12$) were significantly related with household participation in community development projects. It is therefore recommended that relevant stakeholders should offer tangible benefits and financial support to motivate household's participation in community development projects.

Keywords: Rural, households, development, projects

INTRODUCTION

Community development is one of the major issues of concern in most rural areas of any developing nations including Nigeria because of the need for social, economic and environmental changes that tends to bring about survival. Every government of any nation craves for development, eradication of poverty and maintenance of satisfying standard of living

(Amakye, 2017). According to Ukaike (2015), development is deeply-rooted in the qualitative transformation of a nation's human resources. This relates to the ability of people to effectively transform natural resources within the environment into useful products and services through imaginative application of creative talents and labour power. Community development as opined by the United Nations

(2014), is a process in which people of a community join together to take collective action and find solutions to common challenges. Also, community development is construed as the process via which members of a community and external bodies work together to find answers to problems or to foster collaboration among individuals in order to obtain common objectives (Agboeze, 2021).

Community development processes and practices entails the inclusion and participation of different interest groups, stakeholders and actors including the people whose livelihood projects are geared at improving, government and non-governmental bodies, funding organizations, project experts and executors (Nseabasi, 2012). Community development therefore is a development strategy which centers on the ability of the people and government support. The strength lies in the people while the aim is to create developmental change and well-being of individuals in the community. Thus, community development is a major approach for rapid development, especially at the grassroot levels. Community development projects such as water facilities, road network system, health, communication network facilities among others is the bedrock for development.

In most rural communities, there seems to be a total neglect by government because of lack of support for infrastructural development. This is evidenced in the efforts of the community members directly engaging in some projects such as roads construction, building of schools, dispensaries, provision of electricity and portable water among others. Many of the communities have remained underdeveloped, neglected, marginalized, volatile and degraded (Orija, 2013). This has become a source of concern because of its great adverse effect on the country. The level of infrastructural development in most rural communities therefore has become worrisome and could probably be responsible for migration of young people from rural areas to urban areas.

Community development projects however, involves provision of community needs, building programmes and necessary activities which are likely lacking in the community with

a view of creating social, political and economic progress. According to Oyebamiji, Olumati and Nwogu (2016), community development project is any planned or deliberate programme of activities which can provide the support base, to complement efforts of individuals to enhance their wellbeing and solve their peculiar problems. A typical community development projects tends to enhance rural awareness, gives information on resources, inputs and infrastructure, deploys technical help and improves literacy and productivity. In addition, community projects, irrespective of the magnitude, is capable of brightening the community and setting off other developmental activities in the community (Hanachor, 2012). Any community development project has the potential to attract other development activities and acts as pointer and a means of assessing the level of development in any given community. From the foregoing, it is clear that community development projects play tremendous roles in making local settlements more conducive for dwellers. It is against this backdrop that the study was conducted to examine the perception of rural households towards community development in Akinyele Local Government Area of Oyo State.

Objective of the study

The broad objective of the study was to examine rural households' perception of community development projects in Oyo State.

The specific objectives were to:

- I. describe the socio-economic characteristics of rural households in Oyo state;
- ii. identify available development projects through community efforts in the study area;
- iii. examine the rural households' access to community development projects;
- iv. examine households' contribution to community development projects;
- v. factors affecting household participation in community development projects

Hypothesis of the study

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between socio-economic

characteristics and participation of rural households in community development project.

Methodology

Study area

The study was carried out in Akinyele Local Government Area of Oyo State (Figure 1). The study area lies between the latitude $7^{\circ} 29' 7^{\circ} 40'$ North of the Equator and longitude ranges from $3^{\circ} 45'$ to $4^{\circ} 04'$ East of the Greenwich Meridian. It covers a land mass of 464,892km² with a population density of 516 persons per square kilometer, using 3.2% growth rate from 2006 census figures, the 2010 estimated population for the Local Government is 239,745 (National Population Census, 2006). The study

area shares boundaries with Afijio Local Government Area to the north, Lagelu Local Government Area to the east, Ido Local Government Area to the west and Ibadan north Local Government Area to the south. Akinyele Local Government Area records a mean annual temperature of about 30°C with relative humidity of about 95% and annual mean rainfall of about 1250mm. Akinyele Local Government Area is sub-divided into 12 wards: Ikereku, Olanla/Oboda/Labode, Arulogun/Eniosa/Erero, Olode/Amosun/Onidundun, Ojo-emo/Moniya, Akinyele/Isabiye/Irepodun, Iwokoto/Talonto/Idi-oro, Ojoo/Ajibode/Laniba, Ijaye/Ojedeji, Ajibade/Alabata/Elekuru, Olorisa-oko/Okegbemi/Mele and Iroko (INEC, 2015).



Fig. 1: Map showing the location of Akinyele Local Government Area within Oyo State of Nigeria

Population of study

The population of the study comprises all rural households in Akinyele Local Government Area of Oyo State.

Sampling procedure and sample size

Simple random sampling technique was used to select six (6) wards from the existing twelve wards. This include Ikerekú, Olánlá / Obódá / Labódé, Arulogun/Eniosa/Aroro, Moniya, Olorisa-Oko/Okegbemi/Mele and Iroko. Twenty heads of households were selected from each of the selected wards making a total of one hundred and twenty respondents. Primary data were collected using a well-structured and validated interview schedule. Data were analysed with frequency count, percentages and mean while chi square and Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) were used to test the hypothesis.

Results and Discussion

Results in Table 1 show that most of the respondents (28.3%) were of age 60 years and above. The average age of the respondents was 47years. Age is considered an important variable in rural community development because of its influence on people's attitude, skills and aspiration. This is a clear indication that heads of households were still energetic and could handle the rigorous activities in community development work. Results further show that heads of households were predominantly male (78.3%). Men plays a significant role is determining households' participation in community development projects. Being a decision maker and economic provider for the family, men decides the financial allocation and family labour commitment to CDPs thereby influencing their perception. Results also show that majority (72.5%) of the household heads were married. Marriage confers greater responsibility for commitment to community development projects. This finding is similar to the findings of Oghenekohwo (2014) which reveals that most of the respondents were married and as such have greater responsibility which may

encourage them to be committed towards participation in community development project. Married couples can also pool their income to support community development projects. Less than half of the respondents (48.3%) were of Islamic faith and the average household size was 6 members. This shows that there is considerable low household size. It is likely that the respondents associate large household with poverty. Although, large household is considered as an essential part of the work force to generate household income. Therefore, households with large family size are more likely to be more supportive than household with smaller family sizes (Thathsarania & Gunaratne, 2017). However, large household has an implication on creating much pressure on use of community projects. In addition, large household creates an impending investment in human capital such as education and health, maintaining the low-income status of the household, and creating an extending poverty trap which negatively affects household participation in community development project. The results further show that most of the respondents (60.0%) had secondary education with just 10.8% having no formal education. The result is in tandem with Okereke-Ejiogu et al. (2015) who reported that majority (97.2%) of the respondents had one form of formal education or another. Education is an advantage for participating in developmental programs According to (Ochepo, 2019), community members with formal education are more likely to have access to information, interpret and apply new information to enhance the quality of the project. In terms of source of livelihood, the result shows that 41.7% of the respondents engaged in trading, equal percentage (22.5%) were farmers and skilled workers while 13.3% were civil servant (13.3%). Trading is the predominant occupation in study area although people engaged in other livelihood activities. Financial support for CDPs is not likely a problem among members of the community. Majority (90.0%) of the respondents belong to community groups. This has the advantage of

collective action as membership of the community group provide platforms for collective identification of needs and pooling of resources for community development projects.

Table 1: Socio-economic characteristics of respondents (n=120)

Variables	Frequency	Percentage	Mean
Age:			
20 – 29	20	16.7	47years (SD = 6.45)
30 – 39	20	16.7	
40 – 49	23	19.2	
50 – 59	23	19.2	
60 years and above	34	28.3	
Sex			
Male	94	78.3	
Female	26	21.7	
Marital Status			
Single	17	14.2	
Married	87	72.5	
Widowed	11	9.2	
Divorced	5	4.2	
Religion			6 Members
Christianity	56	46.7	
Islam	58	48.3	
Traditional	6	5.0	
Household size			
1-6	58	73.5	
7-12	32	26.5	
Educational Status			
No formal education	13	10.8	
Primary education	9	7.5	
Secondary education	72	60.0	
Tertiary education	25	20.8	
Adult education	1	0.8	
Source of livelihood			
Farming	27	22.5	
Civil Service	16	13.3	
Trading	50	41.7	
Artisan	27	22.5	
Membership of community group			
Yes	108	90.0	
No	12	10.0	

Source: Field survey, 2023

Development projects available through community efforts (n=120)

Results in Table 2 reveal the development projects through community efforts. Health centre (87.0%), block of classrooms (84.0%), rural electrification and rural roads (72.0% each), security post (60.8%) and town hall (60.0%) were some of the development projects executed through community efforts. This is based on the fact that members of the community understand the needs to solve their

own problems without necessarily depending totally on government. Therefore, solving the needs of the community through collective efforts of members implies cooperation and coordination among members of the community. This undoubtedly has implication for support and sustainability of the projects. People therefore, participate in developmental projects if they share in the identification of the development priorities, planning and implementation (Ekong, 2010).

Table 2: Development projects available through community efforts (n=120)

Community development projects	%
Health centre	87.0
Rural electrification	72.0
Information communication centre	35.0
Toilets and incinerator	45.0
Rural roads	72.0
Block of classrooms	84.0
Skill acquisition centre	58.3
Covet and Bridges	41.7
Town hall	60.0
Borehole	53.3
Flood and drainage channel	49.2
Security post	60.8

Source: Field survey, 2023

Household access to community development projects (n=120)

Results on household access to community development projects (Table 3) reveal that health centre (Mean = 1.18), community schools and Borehole ($x = 1.06$ each) were highly accessible to household members in the study area. Results further show that information communication centre ($x = 0.68$), toilet/incinerator ($M = 0.65$) were of low access to members of the community. This result is somehow in tandem with Adesida and Okunlola (2015) who reported low access for rural

electrification ($x = 1.50$), borehole ($x = 2.03$), classroom ($x = 3.40$), bridges ($x = 3.04$) erosion control ($x = 3.38$) and market stalls ($x = 3.15$). The results imply that health center, community schools and boreholes which constitute part of basic amenities needed for survival were not of issues to members of the community because of their collective efforts and maintenance of the projects. On the other hand, low access to information communication centre could be attribute to some factors such as low financial support, erratic power supply and high cost of maintenance.

Table 3: Household access to community development projects (n=120)

Community development projects	Very accessible	Accessible	Not accessible	Mean	SD
Health centre	27(22.5)	87(72.5)	6(5.0)	1.18*	0.50
Rural electrification	23(19.2)	78(65.0)	19(15.8)	1.03	0.60
Information communication centre	13(10.8)	55(45.8)	52(43.3)	0.68	0.66
Toilets and incinerator	22(18.3)	34(28.3)	64(53.3)	0.65	0.77
Rural roads	26(21.7)	65(54.2)	29(24.2)	0.97	0.68
Community schools	33(27.5)	61(50.8)	26(21.7)	1.06*	0.70
Community farm project	18(15.0)	70(58.3)	32(26.7)	0.88	0.64
Skill acquisition centre	15(12.5)	50(41.7)	55(45.8)	0.67	0.69
Covet and Bridges	16(13.3)	72(60.0)	32(26.7)	0.87	0.62
Town hall and civic centre	27(22.5)	59(49.2)	34(28.3)	0.94	0.71
Borehole	29(24.2)	69(57.5)	22(18.3)	1.06*	0.65
Flood and drainage channel	19(15.8)	73(60.8)	28(23.3)	0.93	0.62
Security post	30(25.0)	64(53.3)	26(21.7)	1.03	0.69

Source: Field survey, 2023

SD= Standard deviation

Figures in parenthesis are the percentages

Households participation in community development projects (n = 120)

Findings in Table 4 show that community members mostly participated in planning of projects ($x = 0.61$), control of traffic ($x = 0.61$), fetching of water ($x = 0.42$) and dissemination of information to members ($x = 0.52$). However, the results of participation index show that participation of members in community development project was low (53.3%). Aga et al. (2017) noted that participation in decision making by intended beneficiaries has been linked to enhanced project outcomes and sustainability which could produce projects that are not only better aligned with the preferences and needs of the beneficiaries, but are also of higher quality and more likely to be sustainable.

Undoubtedly, members will be endowed with sense of responsibility for the projects and ultimately increase the cooperative interaction for more united community. However, some socio-economic variables such as age, sex and level of education were identified by Ochepo (2016) to be responsible for low participation of members in community development projects. This suggest that increase in education, family size, and involvement of male will result to increase in the probability of members of the community in developmental projects. For instance, educated members tend to be more recipient to ideas and embrace change more quickly than the non-educated members.

Table 4: Households participation in community development project (n = 120)

Roles performed	Mean	SD
Planning of project	0.62*	0.49
Packing of sands	0.48	0.50
Clearing of debris	0.47	0.50
Carrying of blocks	0.53	0.50
Supply of food and refreshment	0.48	0.50
Control of traffic	0.61*	0.48
Fetching of water	0.54*	0.50
Dissemination of information to members	0.52*	0.50
Conflict management	0.47	0.50
Monitoring and coordination of activities	0.47	0.50
Procurement of materials	0.43	0.50
Raising of fund	0.40	0.49
Coordination of meetings	0.50	0.50
Evaluation of projects	0.50	0.50
Writing of report	0.30	0.46

Participation index: High participation = 55(46.7%), Low participation = 64(53.3%)

Source: Field survey, 2023

Factors affecting household participation in community development projects

Findings in Table 5 revealed that lack of time ($x = 1.41$), lack of awareness project ($x = 1.28$), lack of financial capability ($x = 1.25$) were some of the factors affecting household participation in community development projects. Other factors include lack of sustainability measures ($x = 1.24$), lack of motivation ($x = 1.21$) and Conflict management ($x = 1.19$). Brahmi and Thakur (2011) in their study reported that 90.0% of community members who were not aware of the project had poor participation. Karunakaran (2019) asserted that economic level of the

community/household is one of the factors that will determine the participation. Participation occupies a central place in development with resultant potential to influence, challenge, change and modifies the state of affairs for the benefit of community members (Barasa & Jelagat, 2013). However, lack of participation of community members will have a resultant effect on decision-making, planning, monitoring and evaluation processes for the success and sustainability of the projects. It is critical to overcome the challenges to promote participation and ensures for more inclusive and impactful community development projects.

Table 5: Factors affecting household participation in community development projects

Factors	Mean (SD \pm)
Lack of time	1.41 (\pm 0.64)
Lack awareness	1.28 (\pm 0.69)
Lack of financial capability	1.25 (\pm 0.69)
Lack of sustainability measures	1.24 (\pm 0.67)
Lack of motivation	1.21 (\pm 0.67)
Conflict management	1.19 (\pm 0.70)
Politicization of activities	1.17 (\pm 0.73)
Lack of special skills	1.13 (\pm 0.70)
Poor planning	1.11 (\pm 0.72)
Religious barrier	1.08 (\pm 0.85)
Mismanagement of project fund	1.08 (\pm 0.82)
Poor leadership style	1.06 (\pm 0.82)
Poor health condition	1.06 (\pm 0.70)
Lack of cooperation	1.05 (\pm 0.74)

Source: Field survey, 2023

Test of relationship between some socio-economic characteristics and participation of rural households in community development projects

Findings in Table 6 indicates that sex ($\chi^2 = 0.433$, $df = 4$) and marital status ($\chi^2 = 0.443$, $df = 12$) were significantly related with household participation in community development projects. Men are more likely to claim sole responsibility for participation and decision making

in community development projects thereby marginalizing women. Culturally, it is believed that men are the head of household and as such, women only give support for any decision made. Married couples tend to participate more in community development. This is connected to the fact that married folks have responsibilities such as health, security, infrastructure among others which are mostly provided through community efforts and participation.

Table 6: Test of relationship between some socio-economic characteristics and participation of rural households in community development projects

Socio-economic variables	Chi-square	df	p-value	Decision
Sex	3.433	4	0.488	Significant
Marital status	12.015	12	0.444	Significant
Religion	12.200	8	0.142	Not significant
Membership of social group	1.066	4	0.900	Not significant
Education status	33.137	16	0.007	Not significant
Primary occupation	19.244	12	0.083	Not significant

Source: Field Survey, 2023



Conclusion and Recommendation

Rural households' participation is the cornerstone of successful community development projects. The study concludes that rural household members participated in community development projects although their participation was generally low due to lack of time, lack of awareness project and lack of financial capability. However, participation in community development projects were mainly felt in planning of project, traffic control, fetching of water and dissemination of project

information to members. Addressing the challenges and implementing inclusive strategies can create an environment where rural communities actively contribute to their development. Policymakers, NGOs, and community leaders must collaborate to ensure these projects are truly participatory and impactful. Also, relevant stakeholders should offer tangible benefits and financial support to motivate household's participation in community development projects.



REFERENCES

- Adesida, I. E. and Okunlola J. O. (2015). "Effects of Community Participation on the Sustainability of Rural Infrastructure in Ondo State, Nigeria". *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology* 7 (1): 1 - 9 . <https://doi.org/10.9734/AJAEES/2015/15756>.
- Agboeze, M. U., Eze, G. C., Nweke, P. O., Igwe, N. J., Imo, O. C., Okop, E. O. & Otu, M. S. (2021). Role of local government in community development projects in Nsukka Local Government Area of Enugu State, Nigeria: Implication for adult educators. *SAGE Open*, 11(2), 21582440211026634.
- Amakye, K. G. (2017). Understanding community development in Sekyere Central District, Ghana. Bandung: *Journal of the Global South*, 4(5). Available online at <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40728-017-0042-9>
- Aga, D. A., Noorderhaven, N., & Vallejo, B. (2017). Project beneficiary participation and behavioural intentions promoting project sustainability: The mediating role of psychological ownership. *Development Policy Review*, 1-20.
- Barasa, F & Jelagat, T (2013). "Community Participation in Project Planning, Management and Implementation: Building the Foundation for Sustainable Development" *International Journal of Current Research*, 5 (02): 398-401.
- Ekong, E.E. (2010). *Rural Sociology*, 3rd Edition, Dove Educational Publishers, Uyo, Nigeria.
- Hanachor, M. E. (2012). Community Development Project Abandonment in Nigeria: Causes and Effects. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 3(6).
- Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) (2015). Oyo State. List of all local Government Areas and wards in Ibadan, Oyo State.
- Karunakaran R. (2019). Factors Affecting Community Participation in Local Development Programs of Civil Society Organization in Southern Ethiopia. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)* Volume 24, Issue 7, Ser. 1 25-33 www.iosrjournals.org DOI: 10.9790/0837-2407012533
- Nseabasi, A. S. (2012). Rural Development practice in Nigeria: How participatory and what challenges? *Asian Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development*, 2(3), 382-386.
- Ochepo, C. O. (2016). Effects of Community's Participation in Community Development in Nigeria: A Case Study of LEEMP in Benue State. *International Journal of Research in Agricultural Sciences* 3 (1) 2348 – 3997.
- Ochepo C. O. (2019). Rural communities' access to community and social development projects in North Central Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development* Vol.11(9), pp. 149-155 DOI: 10.5897/JAERD2019.1045
- Oghenekohwo J. E. (2014). Adult Learning in the Context of Comparative Higher Education. Paper Present at an International conference on New Horizons in Education. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Science*. Available online at www.sciencedirect.com
- Okereke-Ejiogu, E. N. Asiabaka, C. C. Ani, A. O. and Umunakwe, P.C. (2015). Assessment of Households' Participation in Community and Social Development Projects (CSDP): A Case Study of Imo State, Nigeria. *Advances in Research*. vol, 5(2):1-9.
- Orija, I.O (2013). *Essence of community development: Benefits of participation* Stainless Publishers, Lagos State.
- Oyebamiji, M.A., Olumati, E.S. and Nwogu, G.A. (2016). Community mobilization for proper disposal of solid waste in Rivers State: Implication for environmental adult education in Adekola, G. and Oyebamiji, M.A. (Eds) *Adult Education and the Environmental*. Port Harcourt: Pearl Publishers. P 174-182
- Thathsarania, U.S & Gunaratne, L.H.P (2018). Constructing and index to measure the adaptive capacity to climate change in Sri Lanka. *Procedia engineering*, 212, 278-285. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2018.01.036>
- Ukaike, F. U. (2015). Skills for excellence and employability in the modern world. *International Journal of Vocational and Technical Education Research* 1(1), pp.1-8,