

Perceived Effectiveness of Community-driven Development Approach of Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) in Oyo State, Nigeria

¹FADAIRO O.S & I.E. ²OBABIRE

¹Department of Agric. Extension and Rural Development, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria.

²Department of Agricultural Technology, Federal Polytechnic Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria

Email: edwardpel2000b@gmail.com, edwardpel2000@yahoo.com

Abstract

The failure of Top-down approach and Donor-driven development projects in Nigeria had necessitated a new approach that is community driven. This paper reports the perceived effectiveness of Community Driven Development CDD approach to Community and Social Development Projects CSDP execution in Oyo state. The multi stage sampling technique was used to sample 120 respondents out of which 101 respondents were available for interview. Data were collected through interview schedules and analyzed with the aid of frequency count, percentage, mean, Chi-square as well as Pearson Product Moment Correlation. Results showed that majority (68.3%) of the respondents were males, Christians (53.5%), Married (82.2%), with one form of education or the other (96.0%). Majority (71.3%) of the respondents had spent more than 10 years in the community. The extent of respondents' involvement in CSDP was high (56.4%). The CDD was perceived to be highly effective for CSDP (52.5%). This implied that the CDD approach of CSDP was effective. The study revealed that there was no significant relationship between respondents' age ($\chi^2=5.891$, $p>0.05$), sex ($\chi^2=0.589$, $p>0.05$), marital status ($\chi^2=3.469$, $p>0.05$), religion ($\chi^2=0.180$, $p>0.05$), level of education ($\chi^2=0.350$, $p>0.05$), and effectiveness of CDD approach utilized for CSD project implementation.

However, significant relationship existed between extent of involvement in CSDP ($r=0.222, p=0.025$) and effectiveness of the CDD approach of CSDP. It is therefore recommended that CSDP in Oyo state be scaled up and the CDD approach be adopted for rural development.

Keywords: Top-down approach, CDD approach, CSDP

Introduction

Development issues are vital ingredients in the policy of any country. Development is a multidimensional process involving changes in structures, attitudes and institutions as well as acceleration of economic growth, the reduction of inequality and eradication of poverty. According to Agbamu (2006), development is a process of gradual change and planned inducement for progressive improvement. It entails improvement in the socio-economic and technological systems that operate in a given community. It consists of resources generation process, efficient utilization and conservation of resources, which culminate in output increase in all sectors of the economy and the distribution of the output in such a way as to enhance the quality of life of the general population. Development is about people, their quality of life and provision of basic needs including housing, food and shelter.

There is no doubt that the rural areas in Nigeria are seriously facing the challenges of underdevelopment. These are of course, manifested in various ways viz. low investment in rural housing, poor schooling, poor nutrition and hunger. The rural sector is predominantly agriculture based and carries 70% of the 140 million people in the country and the bulk of its resources (CBN, 2006). It also employs about 90% of the country's labour force (directly or indirectly) and contributes about 40% of the Gross Domestic Product (FMA&WR, 2007). In spite of these indicators, rural areas have suffered neglect arising from an urban-based approach to national development adopted over the years.

Considering this in-adequate attention on the development of rural areas, which has the highest population of the nation's citizen, the country is still lagging behind in the area of development. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 2000) revealed a low human development index for Nigeria and other developing countries in Africa.

The identified low human development index is the resultant effect of poor development in agriculture, their major occupation and rural infrastructure for the people. The issue of rural infrastructural development requires urgent attention as it plays a very significant role in enhancing agricultural production and produce marketing (Munonye, 2008) which will in turn improve the socio-economic standard while reducing the poverty level in the country.

Poverty in Nigeria is no longer viewed as a personal or family issue; it is a global issue needing redress. Over decades ago, several efforts have been made by successive governments in Nigeria to address issues relating to the development of the people and meeting their basic needs. These past efforts include: Operation Feed the Nation (OFN), Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP), National Accelerated Food Production (NAFPP), Green Revolution and Go back to Land Programmes as well as Directorate for Food Road and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI) to mention a few (Fadairo and Yahaya, 2005). However, the programmes were not able to achieve as much as targeted (Onuketal. 2009). The reason for the failure of these efforts was the wrong approach to the problem rather than lack of sufficient investment funds.

To correct these anomalies, Community and Social Development Projects CSDP, which was one of the recent developmental programme of Nigerian government in collaboration with World Bank, utilized the community driven development approach (participatory approach) to foster development. The project was a merger of the defunct Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project (L.E.E.M.P) and Community-based Poverty Reduction Project (C.P.R.P).The L.E.E.M.P began in 2004 and ended in 2009 (CSDP, 2011). The project was a response to the global emphasis on achieving the millennium development goals in particular and the target to halve the proportion of people living in extreme poverty by 2015 (Akinwande, 2010). The CSDP recognized the failure of past projects which invested in the top-bottom approach in service delivery and therefore employed the CDD approach to implement its development intervention. The main goal of the CSDP was to harness local resources (human and material) towards reducing poverty and the physical deterioration of the environment (CSDP, 2011) in participating states. A strong link existed across all the levels of government, at the federal level, the supervision of the activities of the CSDP was under the auspices of the ministry of finance while the direct responsibility of implementation rested

on the Federal Support Planning Unit (F.S.P.U). This unit was solely responsible for financial management, gender, environmental capacity issues and it was saddled with the responsibility of providing technical assistance to the state agencies. At the Local government level, a relationship existed between Local government areas and communities within the areas while at the community level, the communities were involved in micro-project identification, human resource provision and monitoring of the projects.

It is a general belief that Community Driven Development approach is highly participatory and has the potential to achieve monumental development of rural communities (Akinwande, 2010). The popularity of the CDD stems from its potential to develop projects and programmes that are sustainable and responsive to local priorities, empower local communities, to manage and govern their own development programmes and more effectively target poor and vulnerable groups (World Bank, 2005). Oyo State as one of the participating states benefited from a series of projects and the agency anchoring the project in the state is referred to as Oyo State Community and Social Development Agency. This agency in Oyo State, just like in other participating states utilized the Community Driven Development approach in service delivery in order to achieve its goals. It is believed that this approach would be able to guarantee sustainable results while at the same time empowering the target communities to take decisions on their own. Although, the CDD approach has been confirmed potent by different donor agencies including international communities, there is a need to examine its perceived effectiveness from the beneficiaries' point of view. It was against this background that this study set out to assess the perceived effectiveness of the CDD approach of CSD projects in selected Local Government Areas of Oyo State.

Methodology

This study was carried out in Oyo state, South Western Nigeria. The state occupies a land area of 28454 sq km, with a total population of 5,591,589 (NPC, 2006). The settlement pattern reveals that there is a variety of ethnic nationalities residing in the state. The study population consisted of members of the Community project management committee, Local government Desk Officers as well as the managing team of the Oyo State Community and Social development Agency in the study area. Multi stage

sampling was used to select respondents for this study. Out of the 33 Local Government Areas present in Oyo State, thirteen (13) Local Government Areas (LGAs) participated in Community and Social Development Projects. Three (3) 25% of Local Government Areas; Egbeda, Ibadan North-West and Ibadan North-East, were randomly selected, out of which eight (8) communities were purposively selected from the three selected LGAs being the communities where the project has been fully implemented. The communities selected from Egbeda include Kajorepo, Oganla-alewe, Ifesowapo; from Ibadan North-East, the communities are Koloko-idiobi, Abayomi Atele and IderaOluwa while in Ibadan North-West, the communities are Isokan and Adedokun. One hundred and twenty (120) respondents were randomly selected from the eight communities to form the sample size for the study.

Data were collected through the use of questionnaires and interview schedules designed to cover information on personal characteristics, benefits derived from CSDP, extent of involvement in CSDP and perceived effectiveness of CDD approach in CSDP. Extent of involvement in CSDP was measured on a four-point-scale of never involved = 0, mildly involved = 1, moderately involved = 2 and fully involved = 3. The highest score, lowest score and the mean were obtained. The mean score was used to categorize the respondents' extent of involvement in CSDP. Respondents with scores below the mean were categorized as having low involvement in CSDP while respondents with mean score and above were grouped as highly involved in CSDP. Perceived effectiveness of the CDD approach of CSDP was measured using a three-point scale of strongly agree, agree and disagree and scores of 3,2,1 were assigned respectively. The highest score, the lowest score and mean were obtained. The mean was used to categorize the respondents based on their perceived effectiveness of the CDD approach of CSDP (Much effective or less effective) based on the deviation of individual scores from the mean.

Out of 120 questionnaires provided for data collection, one hundred and one 101 were retrieved for analysis. Data were analyzed with the aids of mean, frequency count, percentage and Pearson Product Moment Correlation PPMC.

Results and Discussion

Personal characteristics of the respondents

Findings from the study (Table 1) showed that majority (68.3%) of the respondents were males. This implies that women were not highly represented in the Community Project Management Committee. This might be due to the multiple roles created for females within the household as opined by (Akinbile *et. al*, 2006). Most (53.5%) were Christians, Married (82.2%), with one form of education or the other (96.0%). Majority (56.6%) of the respondents were between ages 51 years and 60 years.

Table 1: Distribution of respondents based on their personal characteristics

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Age range in years		
31-40	10	9.9
41-50	25	24.8
51-60	37	36.6
61-70	22	21.8
Greater than 70	7	6.9
Sex		
Male	69	68.3
Female	32	31.7
Marital status		
Single	2	2.0
Married	83	82.2
Separated	5	5.0
Divorced	1	1.0
Widowed	10	9.9
Religion		
Christianity	54	53.5
Islam	47	46.5
Level of education		
No formal education	4	4.0
Primary	10	9.9
Secondary	30	29.7
Tertiary	50	49.5
Adult education	7	6.9
Years of stay in the community		
1-10	29	28.7
11-20	25	24.8
21-30	17	16.8
31-40	17	16.8
41-50	8	7.9
Greater than 50 years	5	5.0
Total	101	100

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Majority (71.3%) of the respondents had spent more than 10 years in the community. This implies that respondents have stayed long enough in the community to understand the institutions operating in the community participate in development activities in the community as well as understand the local needs of residents in the community.

Projects that communities benefited from

The survey (Table 2) revealed that the respondents' communities benefited series of projects such as borehole water, well, classrooms, health centers, market stalls, road construction, drainage construction among others. From the identified projects, electricity, health centre and borehole were found to be mostly benefited by the respondents' communities with percentages of 83.2%, 52.5% and 52.3% respectively. This is a clear indication that facilities such as electricity, health centre and borehole water constituted the greatest need of majority of the communities covered. It further implies that the project implemented was based on local needs. This is in line with the assertion of (Araral, 2009) that local needs inform the basis of projects implementation in CSDP.

Table 2: Projects respondents' communities benefited from

S/N	Project benefited	Frequency (%)
1	Bore hole Water	53(52.5)
2	Well	11(10.9)
3	Classroom Block	26(25.7)
4	Health Centre	53(52.5)
5	Market Stalls	0(0)
6	Road construction	42(41.6)
7	Drainage Construction	48(47.5)
8	Electricity extension	84(83.2)
9	Culvert	30(29.7)
10	Bridge Construction	14(13.9)
11	Toilet	12(11.9)
12	Transformer	5(5.0)

Source: Field survey, 2012.

Figures in the parentheses are percentages.

Extent of involvement in the CSDP projects

The findings from the study (Table 3) revealed that majority (93.1%) of the respondents were fully involved in CSDP implementation. While

(85.2%) were of the opinion that only committee members were fully involved in Project implementation, (69.3%) of the respondents confirmed the entire Communities' involvement. Over (60.0%) of the respondents indicated that they were fully involved at the various stages of CSD project implementation. In addition, about 80.0% of the respondents were either fully involved or moderately involved at the various stages of CSD project implementation. This implies that majority of the respondents embraced the CSDP and participated in the various stages of the project.

Table 3: Distribution of respondents based on their extent of involvement in the CSDP project

S/N	Involvement in CSDP	Fully involved	Moderately involved	Mildly involved	Never involved
1	Individual involvement in CSDP project implementation	94(93.1)	4(4.0)	2(2.0)	1(1.0)
2	Committee members involvement in Project implementation	86(85.2)	13(12.9)	2(2.0)	1(1.0)
3	Community involvement in project implementation activities	70(69.3)	28(27.7)	2(2.0)	1(1.0)
4	Community Sensitization and awareness	92(91.1)	7(6.9)	-	2(2.0)
5	Election of community project implementation committee	95(94.1)	4(4.0)	-	2(2.0)
6	Project identification /prioritization	90(89.1)	9(8.9)	-	2(2.0)
7	Formulation of project development plan	86(85.1)	10(9.9)	1(1.0)	4(4.0)
8	Procurement of goods and services for project execution	62(61.4)	19(18.8)	9(8.9)	11(10.9)
9	Project execution /implementation	86(85.2)	8(7.9)	2(2.0)	5(5.0)

Source: Field survey, 2012

Figures in parentheses are percentages

Categorization of respondents based on their extent of involvement in CSDP

The result of analysis (Table 4) showed that 56.4% of the respondents were fully involved in the CSDP project. This implies that the respondents have a high sense of Ownership of the project hence sustainability of the projects.

Table 4: Category of respondents based on the extent of involvement in CSDP

Extent of involvement	Series	F	%
Low	16-38	44	43.6
High	39-45	57	56.4

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Perceived effectiveness of Community Driven Development approach of CSDP

Results (Table 5) showed that over 80.0 % of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed with positive statements related to effectiveness of the CDD approach of CSDP, such as: the benefit of the project was open to all members of the community, the community would make arrangements to protect the community from damage, community would not mind spending their money to fix any repairs when necessary, the benefit derived from the project was never biased in terms of being in favour of men more than women while only 4.0% indicated that there had being instances of sabotage of the project since its completion. This implies that the respondents positively perceived the effectiveness of the CDD approach of CSDP in the study area. It also implies that the continuity of the project might be ensured with full commitment of the participating communities.

Table 5: Respondents' perceived effectiveness of Community Driven Development approach of the CSDP

S/n	Statements	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree
1	The project implemented by CSDP is a dire need of the community	82(81.2)	18(17.8)	1(1.0)
2	The decision on the choice of project was not choice of majority of community members	8(7.9)	11(10.9)	82(81.2)
3	Problem need analysis was conducted before particular project was identified	64(63.4)	23(22.8)	14(13.9)
4	The benefit derived from the project is more in favour of men than women in the community	6(5.9)	22(21.8)	73(72.3)
5	We will not mind spending our money to fix any repair on the project in case of any future damage	71(70.3)	27(26.7)	3(3.0)
6	There has being instances of sabotage since the completion of the project	4(4.0)	27(26.7)	3(3.0)
7	Everyone in the community contributed in one way or the other to the project development	72(71.3)	29(28.7)	-
8	We have the community arrangements /measures to protect the project from damage /misuse	82(81.2)	17(16.8)	2(2.0)
9	The benefit of the project is open to all members of the community irrespective social status	92(91.1)	8(7.9)	1(1.0)
10	The rich had better say and input in all aspects of the project than the poor	7(6.9)	31(30.7)	63(62.4)
11	The composition of Community project management committee was influenced by some majority.	17(16.8)	16(15.8)	68(67.3)

Source: Field survey, 2012

Figures in parentheses are percentages

Categorization of respondents based on perceived effectiveness of Community Driven Development approach of CSDP

The result (Table 6) revealed that majority 52.5% of the respondents perceived the CDD approach of CSDP to be highly effective. It implies that increased participation of the respondents in CSDP as well as its success was as a result of the CDD approach utilized in the project. It further implies that sustainability of CSDP can be ensured through the CDD approach. This agrees with the opinion of (Padawangi, 2009) who opined that the Project operations and management would be sustainable. Therefore, the effectiveness of the CDD approach to any developmental project cannot be over emphasized.

Table 6: Category of respondents by perceived effectiveness of CDD approach of CSDP

Perceived effectiveness	Scores	Frequency	%
Much effective	29-33	53	52.5
Less effective	21-28	48	47.5

Source: Field survey, 2012

Association between personal characteristics of the respondents and perceived effectiveness of CDD approach of CSDP

The selected personal characteristics tested include age, sex, marital status, religion, education and years of stay in the community. Findings from the study (Table 7) revealed that there was no significant relationship between respondents' age ($\chi^2 = 5.891$, $p > 0.05$), years of stay in the community ($\chi^2 = 8.741$, $p > 0.05$), sex ($\chi^2 = 0.589$, $p > 0.05$), marital status ($\chi^2 = 3.469$, $p > 0.05$), religion ($\chi^2 = 0.180$, $p > 0.05$), level of education ($\chi^2 = 0.350$, $p > 0.05$), native of the community ($\chi^2 = 0.151$, $p > 0.05$) and effectiveness of the CDD approach utilized for CSD project implementation. This implies that the perceived effectiveness of the community driven development approach of the Community and Social development project was not influenced by the personal characteristics of the respondents.

Table 7: Chi-square tests of relationship between respondents' characteristics and effectiveness of the CDD approach of CSDP

Variables	Df	χ^2 value	p - value	Decision
Age	4	5.891	0.207	Not significant
Length of stay in the Community	5	8.741	0.120	Not significant
Sex	1	0.589	0.443	Not significant
Marital status	4	3.469	0.483	Not significant
Religion	1	0.180	0.893	Not Significant
Level of education	4	0.350	0.986	Not Significant
Native of the Community	1	0.151	0.698	Not Significant

Source: Field survey 2012

Relationship between extent of involvement of respondents in project implementation and perceived effectiveness of CDD approach utilized for Project implementation

The result of correlation analysis (Table 8) showed that there was a significant relationship between extent of involvement of respondents and perceived effectiveness of CDD approach of CSDP ($r = 0.222$, $p = 0.025$). The correlation was positive. This implies that respondents' extent of involvement in CSDP has influenced the perceived effectiveness of the CDD approach of the CSDP, i.e the higher the level of involvement, the more effective the CDD approach of CSDP was perceived to be.

Table 8: Pearson product moment correlation analysis between extent of involvement of respondents and perceived effectiveness of CDD

Variable	r- value	p-value	Decision
Extent of involvement and effectiveness of CDD	0.222	0.025	Significant

Conclusion

The top-bottom approach to development often viewed poor people as the target of poverty reduction efforts, unlike the CDD approach that considers people and their institutions as assets and partners in the development process. The CSDP realized significant impacts on community potential to organize their resources in order to meet their local needs

despite observable constraints. The communities also had a strong sense of ownership of the identified Projects and fully took charge of the operation and management of the project hence, sustainability of the project. Based on the findings of the study, it could be concluded that different communities benefited from different projects based on their need assessment. It was also clear that CSDP enjoyed full participation of the beneficiaries. The CDD approach of CSDP was perceived to be very effective due to the meaningful impact it had on the participating communities. It should be noted that perceived effectiveness of the CDD approach of CSDP was not determined by the respondents' personal characteristics. However, the extent of involvement had influence on perceived effectiveness of the CDD approach of CSDP in the study area.

Based on this conclusion, it is recommended that: There should be scaling up of the OYSDA project in geographical, organizational and functional dimensions so as to accommodate expansion of service delivery coverage. Government at the various levels should adopt the CDD approach as a development strategy for developmental projects intended for beneficiaries at the grassroots.

References

- Agbamu, J.U. (2006). *Essential of agricultural communication in Nigeria*. Lagos, Maltouse Press Limited.
- Akinbile, L.A., O.R. Ashimolowo and M.A, Oladoja (2006). Rural Youth Participation in Infrastructural Development of Ibarapa East Local Government Area of Oyo state. *Nigeria Journal of Rural Sociology*. Vol 6 Nos 1 and 2, p.42.
- Akinwande, O.O. (2010). *Effectiveness of the Community Driven Development in Fadama II project among Fadama User Groups in Oyo State*. B.Sc thesis, unpublished. p.9.
- Araral, E. (2009). *Water governance: Critique Theory and Evidence*. Retrieved November 17, <http://www/spp/nus/edu/sg/docs/fac/araral/html>.
- CBN (2006). Central Bank of Nigeria Statistical Bulletin vol. 17, Central Bank of Nigeria
- CSDP (2011). *The Community and Social Development Projects*. Retrieved November 17, 2012 from <http://www/csdp.org/html>.

- Fadairo, O.S. and M.K. Yahaya (2005). Effectiveness of the Community Driven development approach for facilitating grassroots developments: Lessons from the Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project in Nigeria, *Nigeria Journal of Rural Extension and Development* Vol 3.
- FMA & WR (2007). *Blue print on establishment and operation of agriculture and rural development consultative committee*. Partnership for sustainable rural development, Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources p 1-28.
- Munonye, J.O. (2008). Infrastructural development for agricultural growth in Nigeria. *Proceedings of the 10th Annual Conference of Nigerian Association of Agricultural Economist (NAAE) held at Abuja*. October 7th – 10th, 2008: 528 – 533.
- NPC (2006). *Report of National Population Census*. National Population commission. 2006.
- Onuk, E.G., H. Ibrahim, M. Bello, O. Patrick and H. Ibrahim (2009). Adoption of strigahermonthica-Tolerant maize varieties among farmers in Panda Development Area of Karu Local Government Area, Nasarawa State. *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Conference of Agricultural Society of Nigeria (ASN) held at National University Commission and Raw Materials Research and Development Council, Abuja, Nigeria*. October 20 – 23, 2009: 376 – 379.
- Padawangi, R. (2009). Community Driven Development as Drivers of Change Water Supply and Sanitation Projects in Rural Pakitan. <http://www/Kyspp.nsu.edu.sg/ug.html>.
- United Nations Development Programme (2000). *Human Development Report 2000*. New York, UNDP.
- World Bank (2005). *Community Driven Development in the Context of conflict – Affected Environment Resource Guide*.