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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study
Despite the efforts made in the past to effect rural development, the conditions of the rural dwellers have not improved; rather they have further deteriorated and have only succeeded in breeding poverty among the population. Chigbo (2001) opined that most of the rural development projects failed because of faulty goal specification, fraud, and inadequate funding. In the same vein, most of these projects were either borrowed or merely forced on the people, without due consideration of the political and cultural norms of the community population, which of course resulted in failure (Adagba, 2002).

The experience of Nigeria in economic and social development, especially at grassroots and community levels has lead to underdevelopment. Nigerian development has been in a bad state because it is not built around the people (Nnoli, 1993: 220). Even government establishments and agencies, as well as foreign donors and funders and non-governmental organizations who took part in the implementation of the programmes have come to realized that the development vision, programmes and strategies pursued, though with good intention, ended up being inappropriate and even irrelevant to the real need of the vast majority of the people. Perhaps, that is why the Agricultural development programmes funded by the World Bank in the 1970s, the River Basin Development Project funded by the Federal
Government, the present sugar cane project in the Jigawa state and five national rural development programmes launched successively by The Federal Government with more than eight supportive schemes, in spite of the huge financial commitment, have failed to transform agriculture into modern mechanized production activity and other areas towards development. The period witnessed deliberate government efforts at mobilizing the people for rural development.

A number of task forces and bodies were set up to oversee, organize and direct partnership with the people on self-help activities. They include: Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural infrastructure (DFRRI), Rural Electrification Schemes; Credit Schemes to small holders through various specialized institutions such as People’s Bank, Agricultural and Cooperative Development Bank(ACDB), Community Banks, NERFUND, SME Credit Schemes, the Family Economic Advancement Programme (FEAP), Universal Primary Education Schemes and Low Cost Housing Schemes, Health Scheme as the Primary Health Care Programme, National Directorate of Employment(NDE), Better Life for Rural Women Programme as well as the Family Support Programme (FSP).

More recent programmes include the National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) as well as the Small and Medium
Industries Equity Investment Schemes (SMIEIS). The various state
governments had also articulated blueprints on rural development,
adopting the Integrated Rural Development Strategy as their strategic
option to carry development to the masses. The low level of
infrastructural and human capital development of these rural areas is
clear signs of the weaknesses and ineffectiveness of these programmes
and schemes. The decay and worsening rural conditions and the
attendant increasing rural-urban migration are evident in the long years
of neglect of these areas (Muoghalu1992).

In the light of rural development, the participation of communities
in resources management has come to be seen as perhaps the only way
to effectively manage resources. With the strategy of development in
Nigeria, the strategy of community participation in rural development is
increasingly as an important instrument for mobilizing resources and
organizing the rural people to take an interest in providing for the well –
being. The Federal, the State, and the local Governments feel that there
is an inherent imperative in traditional democratic theory to warrant the
rural people to participate actively in the decisions that affect and shape
their lives. Because of this feeling, the current government proposals for
rural development contain various forms of statement aimed at maxim
maximizing public participation and initiative that are essential recipes
for sustainable human development (Nwosu et al; 2007). . In Spite of the
official emphasis on community participation in rural development, very few studies have been carried out to probe how actually rural communities perceive community participation and how they go about achieving their objectives in this regard.

This research work attempts to analyze and document the nature of community participation in six rural communities of Anambra state, Nigeria. The study is intends to illustrate how community participation could be a medium for providing the real needs of the rural people with the resources which they can afford.

1.2 Statement of Problem

It has been observed that in spite of abundant natural, physical and human resources that Nigeria is endowed with, there is still high rate of underdevelopment in Nigeria especially in the rural areas. In Anambra State, majority of the people live in the rural areas and they depend mainly on agriculture. They operate fragmented and marginal holdings while some others concentrate on petty trade. Despite the obvious role of farming and trade in the economy of the state, rural people tend to remain poor. In general they share several characteristics such as low levels of educational attainment, a relatively large number of children, relatively low access to material resources, physical and social infrastructures, higher susceptibility to community-wide
exogenous shocks such as weather induced crop losses and natural disasters. However, it must be noted that rural communities also vary greatly with regard to the condition of their rural economies and rural development needs.

Communities in Awka South, Njikoka, Nnewi North, Aguata, Ogbaru and Oyi Local Government Areas of Anambra State, Nigeria have been involved in community development projects over the years, but their participation output seemed not to have yielded any dividends of prosperity. It was further observed that systematic research aimed at understanding factors influencing level of participation status of the above named communities through participation in community development projects seemed to be lacking. These communities need improvement in the quality of their living standards. This, therefore, was of great concern, hence the decision to investigate the status of the six communities in these three Senatorial zones through their participation in development of their rural areas. At this juncture, it became pertinent to see to what extent did the people of selected communities participate in the development of their communities through development activities. The factors influenced people’s participation in community development projects. The ways in participation affect their living standards of people. What were the major obstacles to effective participation in development projects in the study area?.
1.3 Objectives of the Study

The broad objective of the study was to analyze community participation in rural development of the six selected communities in three Senatorial zones of the state. The following are the objectives of this study:

i. To gain an understanding of the level of community participation in community development projects in six selected communities in Anambra state.

ii. To ascertain if the community members are willing and prepared to participate in development programmes in the six selected communities in Anambra State.

iii. To determine if effective community participation in development initiatives (projects) can inform concrete rural development in selected communities.

iv. To establish to what extent the community members have access to information regarding projects or development initiatives in six selected communities in Anambra State.

1.4 Research Questions

The under listed research questions guided this inquiry:

i. What is the level of community participation in community development projects in six selected communities in Anambra state?
ii. Are Community members willing and prepared to participate in development programmes in the six selected communities in Anambra State?

iii. Can effective community participation in development initiatives (projects) inform concrete rural development in selected communities?

iv. To what extent do the community members have access to information regarding projects or development initiatives?

1.5 Research Hypotheses

The researcher has formulated the following hypothesis:

**H₁:** The level of community participation is not properly understood in project implementation.

**H₂:** Community members are not keen to participate in development programmes.

**H₃:** Effective community participation in development initiatives (projects) will not bring concrete rural development.

**H₄:** Community members do not have access to information regarding to projects development initiatives.

1.6 Scope of the Study

Anambra State was created during the State creation exercise of 1991. It is one of the 5 States in the South East Geo-political Zone and represents a strategic access to the rest of the South East and South
The state has a total estimated population of 4,182,032 (2006 Nigeria Population Census). Major towns include: Awka – the State Capital, Nnewi and Onitsha, three major Commercial Centres, Ekwuluobia, Ihiala and Ogidi. The people of the State are reputed to be hard working, resourceful and enterprising and are found all over the country in search of business. The State has one of the highest man power resource and lowest poverty level. Education is a major industry in spite of the male dropout syndrome.

The society is structured along community lines. Self help, individual and community competition for development has made it possible for such facilities as rural roads, post office, library, primary and secondary schools, rural water supply and electricity to be available at community level. Religious bodies, town unions, age grades, women societies and well to do individual provide these facilities where the Government has not been able to. Communities have well structured Organizations which can be exploited in the implementation of various infrastructural and utility projects such as the Water Supply and Sanitation Programme.

In socio-economic and political matters, the Town Union is typically the most prominent of all community-based associations.
(CBAs), as it represents the collective will and aspirations of the community. It also provides an umbrella association for the control and coordination of the various segments of the community association well as other community-based ones. The Town Union liaises with other CBAs such as the women’s association, youths and age grade associations.

The women’s associations are either secular or faith-based, with essentially the same women in both categories. The women’s groups tend to be the best organized of all community-based association, even though they tend to be cut off from the mainstream of socio-economic and political life. The youth and age-grade associations are the main agents of social control and the community security apparatus. They enforce compliance with community policies and programmes and tend to be the defenders of the economic and political programmes of the community.

Anambra State has splendid opportunities for investment, wealth creation, culture, tourism and other socio-economic activities. It citizens are industrious, resourceful and uniquely hospitable and of exotic culture. There exists enough opportunities in the state, which if judiciously exploited, could lead to the development of rural areas among the people in the community.

1.7 Population

The concepts universe and population are used inter-changeably by different authors. De Vos (2005:193) refers to population or universe as a set of entities in which all the measurement of interest to the practitioner or researcher are represented.
The population for this study consisted of residents in rural areas of selected communities, specifically in six communities of our study. This target population is characterised by rural poor who were prohibited an opportunity to express their views and to participate in rural development.

1.8 Limitations of the Study

A study of this magnitude cannot be possible without limitations. There are several limitations to this study which need to be considered when interpreting the results. This work is not exhaustive. It is limited by time, finance, resources and logistics. The problem of relative scarcity of literature on community participations in developing countries such as ours equally affected the smooth execution of this survey.

The scarcity of key informants in the research work and the nonchalant attitude of those who are accepted to participate, in responding to the research questions was another hindrance. Admittedly also, the problem of relative illiteracy and ignorance existed among the people investigated. The opportunity to capture information on vital aspects of community participation therefore has been hampered.

Visiting six communities that cut across the three senatorial districts zones was not an easy task and the researcher was confronted with respondents who insisted on being paid before they can fill the structured questionnaires. In some communities, the researcher had to train some community people on the rudiment of filling the questionnaire. These persons latter assisted as facilitators in the
administration of the questionnaire in the respective communities. This was considered not only a limitation but it also has implications for the sustainability of participation processes.

1.9 Significance of the Study

The outcome of this work will provide workable solutions that will encourage active community participation in the formation, development and improvement in the living conditions of the rural people for whatever project community based associations will embark on in future.

It has been established that popular participation depicts a process by which people play active and influential role in shaping decision that affect their lives. Jewkes and Murcott (1996) capture the rationale for greater levels of community participation. These include the view:

That community participation not only strengthens local communities but that a community’s perspective can also bring local knowledge to bear on problems and solutions. This can lead to an improvement in the coherence of strategies as well as provide feedback to increase the effectiveness of services. The hypothesis then is if communities are involved in the strategies for change and they can establish a sense of ownership, then it is more likely that change will be sustained.

This work will contribute vehemently to the new attempt to beam the searchlight not so much on the concept of popular participation but on the instruments and institutions that facilitate popular participation, democratization of decision-making processes and the empowerment of people (social groups, communities and organizations) through the instrumentality of the Community Based Associations.
The publications stemming from this study would influence future research. It is further hoped that the findings will serve as a frame of reference for the development programmes which are taking place in rural areas.

Lastly, Government/policy makers will equally see in it vital and indispensable guides to be adopted in combating the menace of non-participation of community members at the grassroots development. These done, this effort would have considerably achieved its purpose of community participation in rural development.

1.10 Conceptual and Operational Definitions of Key Concepts

In this section, the researcher provides various scholarly viewpoints of the key concepts in the research topic and indicates how the respective concepts have been used in the study.

In this section, the researcher provides various scholarly viewpoints of the key concepts in the research topic and indicates how the respective concepts have been used in the study.

1.10.1 Community

a. **Conceptual:** Is a structured entity with organizations that help its members to adjust to complexity of changing situation, in which it seeks to satisfy their basic needs. In the above definitions contains two distinct elements, viz., the geographical and social aspects of the community Stroup (1997:27).
b. **Operational:** In this work community shall be seen as an area of common life for a particular group of people sharing similar attitudes to their manner of life and attitudes. This area might be a village, a reserve or any other area viewed as such but satisfies either criteria of geographic; delimitation or social community among its inhabitants. From the researcher’s point of view, the community involves a geographical area occupied by people who are common in various aspects, which share purposes and share characteristics to achieve their goals.

1.10.2. Participation

a. **Conceptual:** The act of taking a part or a share with others in some action.

b. **Operational:** In this work, participation shall be used to denote a condition in which person or group of persons are able to satisfy their most basic elementary requirements of human survival or existence in terms of good nutrition, clothing, shelter, pipe borne water, energy, education, health and recreation. This is seen as the means to achieve some established way of using the economic and social resources of rural people by themselves to achieve predetermined targets to meet their need.

1.10.3. Community Based Association

a. **Conceptual:** An association/club that is concerned with community development.

b. **Operational:** A registered and well structured community based organizations (CBOs) taking the form of traditional Non-Government Organization and acting as an agent or catalyst of development within its community of domicile.

1.10.4. Rural Development

a. **Conceptual:** Oakley and Marsden (1991:9) define rural development as the participation of the people in a mutual learning experience involving them, their local external change agents and outside resources.

b. **Operational:** For the purpose of this study, rural development involves a strategy designed to improve the economic and social life of a specific group of people – the rural poor. It involve the extending the benefits of development to the poorest among those who seek a livelihood in the rural area. Rural development strategies can realize their full potential only through the
motivation, active involvement and organisation at the grassroots level of rural people.
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CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction
Chapter two is aimed at conducting a literature review of the previous work done by scholars in the field of study about community participation in sustainable rural development process. It provides the framework whereby the researcher can direct his or her research. This section will discuss the phenomenon and philosophy of community participation. This is followed by the conceptualization of other related key concept of community participation in rural development process in the six selected communities in Anambra State, Nigeria.

2.2. Theoretical Framework of Community Participation

Storey (1991:307-315) asserts that there has been a need to investigate new approaches to rural development as a consequence of the significant and on-going changes occurring in rural areas. Community participation has long been a subject of active discussions in the field of political, administrative sciences and community based activities. One may consider community participation as an action that incorporates the demands and values of citizens into public administration services.

The Working Group on Programme Harmonization, 1978 in Oakley and Marsden (1984:1), indicates that; what gives clear understanding of popular participation is the “collective efforts by the people concerned together their pool their efforts and resources in order
to attain objectives they set for themselves.” Kumar (2002:24) argue that participation in this regard deals with encouraging participants to take initiatives and actions which are stimulated by their own thinking and deliberation and over which they can exert effective control.

Nampila (2005:31) agrees that different individuals in the same community may have different interests and may not necessarily want to participate in development projects. With community participation, the people decide, act and reflect on their actions as conscious subjects. The common belief is that involving citizens in rural programmes and empowering them have the potential to boost their livelihoods and foster development (Kakumba and Nsingo, 2008:107). Such involvement facilitates the reversal of the inequalities that have been developed under colonialism by helping people to engage in the process of identifying problems and acting on them.

In the case of community settlement, the community members should exercise the freedom to decide on issues affecting them and should also realise that it is their constitutional right to participate. For example, communities have to decide on the committee members who will represent them in the development programmes. They also should have the authority to make decisions with regard to their expertise because this affects them directly. The communities should also be able to express their views at meetings without fear, regardless of the
presence of municipal authorities. African Development Bank (2001), indicate that offering citizens more choice would stimulate competition, geared at making the public service more efficient and service oriented by capturing the larger citizens’ public interest (Kakumba and Nsingo, 2008:108).

2.2.1. Background of Community Participation in Local Communities

The notion for participation of people in democratic governance at all the different levels of governance was recognised by the African National Congress (ANC) in its policy document, the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), in 1994. The RDP purports that democracy requires that all rural people have access to power and the right to exercise their power will ensure that all people participate in the process of reconstructing the country (ANC, 1994:120). Tshabalala (2006:46) points out that participation of local communities in rural areas has its unique practice. The policy making in rural development excluded the majority of ordinary people and public policy adopted a minority perspective.

The economy of these circumstances is such that the role of local government now needs to stretch beyond the traditional function associated with infrastructure development to address social and
economic development. Development experts are, therefore, expected to adopt programmes that will not only enhance infrastructure development, but will also strive to bring about social upliftment and contribute positively to the lives of people. Again, communities have to be economically affected by the business of the development experts. Paulo Freire argues that “development can only be achieved when humans are ‘beings for themselves’, when they possess their own decision-making powers, free of oppressive and dehumanizing circumstances” (Bailur, 2007:4). It is argued that one of the things that will enable project initiators to respond to the needs of its people is working closely with its community. This implies that communities should play a role in the planning and functioning of local municipalities so that they can actively influence decisions that will influence decisions that will affect them. This view is echoed by Municipal Systems calls for a government that will respond to the needs of the people and hence, the developmental approach. The goal of the developmental approach is to re-orientate local government to being creative and strategic in developing its local people.

World Bank (1996:145) indicates that reaching the poor requires working with them to learn about their needs, understanding how development decisions are made in their communities, and identifying institutions and mechanisms that acquire opportunities and resources.
Oakley and Marsden (1984:18) state that community participation in the context of rural development is not concerned in the first instance with how to achieve a totally participatory society but are more concerned with how to bring about some meaningful involvement in the development of the rural sector on the part of those who depend on that sector for a livelihood.

2.2.2. Relevance of Community Participation

Community participation is one of the key ingredients of an empowered community (Reid, 2000:1). Community participation occurs when a community organizes itself and takes full responsibility for managing its problems. Taking full responsibility includes identifying the problems, developing actions, putting them to place and following through. Theron (2005:124) pointed out that there are considerable differences of opinion as to what community participation is, and it follows that there will be many arguments about the universal definition. The term citizen or public and participation are often used interchangeably.

The United Nations (1981:5) sees community participation as the creation of opportunities to enable all members of a community to actively contribute to and influence the development process and to share equitably in the fruits of development. Community participation is
a complex mechanism, and in effect there is no single blueprint. Hence, each area is characterised by different dynamics and demographics. This view is held whilst taking cognisance the fact that development does not occur successfully if beneficiaries are not part and parcel of the process of planning and implementation of the process.

Community participation is a continuous two way process which involves the full understanding of processes and mechanisms through which development problems are investigated and solved. It covers a spectrum of activities ranging from passive involvement in community life to intensive action-oriented participation in community development. Community participation provides individual with the opportunity to influence public decisions and has long been a component of the democratic decision making process (Cogan and Shape, 1986:283).

This definition of citizen participation can be further divided into two categories according to the will of the people wishing to influence policy decisions; passive participation which includes simple one-way information delivery or request for information and active participation which includes formation of a consensus on specific issues, monitoring administrative activities and administrative requests.

The methods of community participation play a crucial role in terms of meaningful participation (Nekwaya, 2007:11). Community
participation is rooted in democratic approaches to public policy, community planning and development, which assume that people have a right to make decisions that affect their lives. In short, a community that gives up the ability to make its own decisions loses "some essential humanity". Citizen participation must be understood in relation to local and regional patterns of power and powerlessness, that is, individual and collective experiences of influence, acquiescence, privilege, or exclusion based on membership in dominant or disenfranchised groups.

2.2.3. Implications of Community Participation

There are two broad implications of community participation which are identifiable, those that view community participation as a means and those that view it as an end (Kumar, 2002:25). Community participation as a means or end is an issue which has bothered both development thinkers and workers. Burkey (2000: 58) indicates that the proportion of the second view often maintains that development for the benefit of the poor cannot occur unless the poor themselves control the process through the praxis of participation. Burkey (1993:58) also points out that until recently the notion of participation as a means to achieve effective development still dominate to rural development practice.

Oakley and Marsden (1984:23), state that there are two main vehicles for implementing this notion of participation; (1) community
development programmes which were aimed at preparing the rural population collaborate with government development plans and (2) the establishment of formal organizations (cooperatives, farmers association, etc.) which were to provide the structure through which the rural people could have some contact with, and voice in, development programmes. Burkey (1993:58) provides the evidence which suggests that only a few achieved any meaningful participation and benefit by means. Oakley and Marsden (1984:23) assert that this strategy has not resulted in meaningful participation of the community in rural development. In fact it is the strategy which has resulted in our current situation failing to confront the issue of the lack of meaningful community participation in rural development.

Public participation is an end in itself, and is the unavoidable sequence of the process of empowering and liberating the community to understand the process of development (Oakley and Marsden, 1984:23). Kumar (2002:25) agrees that community participation as an end is self-mobilizing where the local people themselves are in total command. There is no doubt that meaningful participation is about achieving power: which is the power to influence the decisions that affect one’s livelihood. Community participation is viewed as an end if it becomes a long-term process, the purpose of which is to develop and strengthen the
capabilities of people in order to participate directly in development initiatives (Kumar, 2002:26).

This comparative analysis will be presented briefly below:

Table 2.1 comparative analysis: Participation as a means or an end

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation as a means</th>
<th>Participation as an end</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implies the use of participation to achieve some predetermined goal or objective</td>
<td>Attempts to empower people to take part in their own development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts to utilize existing resources in order to achieve the objective of the project/programme</td>
<td>Ensures increased role of people in Development initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common in government programmes, specifically for mobilising community to improve efficiency of delivery system</td>
<td>More favoured by Non-Governmental Organizations than by government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stresses the achievement of the objective rather than the act of participation itself</td>
<td>Focuses on improving the ability of the people to participate rather than just achieve predetermined projects objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation take a more passive form</td>
<td>It is relatively more active and dynamic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kumar (2002:25)

Therefore, the conclusion can be drawn on the fact that meaningful participation of the rural poor in development is concerned with direct access to the resources necessary for development, and some active involvement and influence in the decisions affecting those resources (Burkey, 2000:59). The meaningful participation to
community development implies the ability positively to influence the course of events (Oakley and Marsden, 1984:24).

2.2.4. Levels and Modes of Community Participation

It is important for the development experts to understand the levels and modes of community participation in development process. Theron (2005:126), states that some levels are more relevant than others to ensure authentic public participation. These approaches become more relevant when the impact of participation is assessed in relation to a programme or project, and the degree of participation becomes a central feature in this regard (Fokane, 2008:45).

The seven levels of community participation as highlighted by (Theron, 2005:115) are as follows:

1) **Passive participation.** Passive strategies very often involve a one-way flow of information from the planners to the public (Kumar, 2002:25). People “participate” by being told what is going to happen or has already happened. Participation relates to a unilateral top-down approach by the authorities. The information being shared belongs to outsiders or professionals.

2) **Participation in information giving.** This level does not constitute community participation because they merely require the community to judge a finished or almost finished product. People
participate by answering questions posed in questionnaires or telephone interviews or similar public participation strategies. The public do not have the opportunity to influence proceedings as the findings of the research are neither shared nor evaluated for accuracy.

3) **Participation by consultation.** People participate by being consulted as consultants/professionals/planners and external officials listen to their views. The professionals define both problems and solutions and may modify these in the light of the people’s responses. The process does not include any share in decision-making by the public, nor are the professionals under any obligation to take on board people’s views.

4) **Participation for material incentives.** People participate by providing resources, for example labour, in return for material rewards. This helps to reduce overall costs, and participants in return receive a resource (Nampila, 2005:39). This typology takes place in rural environment, where, for example farmers provide the fields but are not involved in the experiment or learning process. The people have no stake in prolonging the activities when the incentives end.

5) **Functional participation.** People participate in a group context to meet predetermined objectives related to the project, which may
involve the development or promotion of externally initiated social organisations. Such involvement does not tend to occur at the early stages of project cycles or planning, but rather after major decisions have been made. These institutions tend to be dependent on external initiators and facilitators, but may also become self-dependent.

6) **Interaction strategies.** People participate in a joint analysis, the development of action plans and capacity building. Participation is seen as right, not just the means to achieve project goals.

7) **Self-mobilisation strategies.** People participate by taking initiatives independent of external institutions to change systems. This bottom-up approach allows people to develop contacts with external institutions for resources and the technical advice they need, but they themselves retain control over how resources are used. Such self-initiated, bottom-up and self-reliant mobilisation and collective actions may or may not challenge an existing inequitable distribution of wealth and power.

Nekwaya (2007:35) pointed out that the route to effective community participation would depend on selecting the right combination of approaches. However, this would determine whether the community authorities actually allow the community to participate and make its own decisions.
It is also important to understand the modes of participation as, these overlap with the levels of community participation, and are necessary for community participation. Theron (2005:115) highlights these modes as follows:

- **Anti-participatory mode**: Community participation is considered as a voluntary contribution by the community to a programme/project, which will lead to development, but the public is not expected to take part in shaping the programme/project content and outcomes;

- **Manipulation mode**: Community participation includes community involvement in decision making processes, in implementing programmes, sharing in the benefits and involvement in efforts to evaluate such programmes;

- **Incremental mode**: Community participation is concerned with organized efforts to increase control over resources and regulate institutions in given social situations for groups or movements excluded from such control and

- **Authentic public participation mode**: Community participation is an active process by which the community influence the direction and execution of a programme with the view to
enhancing their well-being in terms of income, personal growth, self reliance or other values which they cherish.

The figure below shows how the levels and four modes of community participation discussed above can be combined to view where a “participation process” lies on the continuum and whether it progresses from passive participation where people are “told what to do”, perspective to self-mobilisation, where “people are in control of processes.”

Figure 2.2 A spectrum of public participation – seven typologies
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**Source:** Kumar (2002:25)

Theron (2005:117) states that development planners should take the context in which community participation takes place into account in order to assess which strategies indicate very good community participation and to determine how these strategies should be applied. It
does not help, for example, if a development planner, on account of a lack of knowledge, thinks that information-sharing represents an effective way of community participation whilst this is not the case (Nampila, 2005:40). For that reason it is crucial to know which combination of community participation strategies works best for a development project. Because, Kumar (2002:25) states that each development project is unique and faces different challenge.

2.2.5. Core Principles and Values of Community Participation

For effective implementation of community participation, it is essential to understand its principles and core values as highlighted/marked as watershed in rural development efforts in Nigeria. This thorough understanding would help to change the perception of the officials towards community participation in terms of development planning and service delivery. The people-centred development seeks to return control over resources to the people and their communities to be used in meeting their own needs. It further calls for active mutual self-help among people, working together in their common struggle to deal with their common problems.

The core values are highlighted as follows:

1) The community should have a say in decisions about actions that affect their lives. The government should identify structures
through which communities can participate in decision making regarding development initiatives.

2) Community participation includes the promise that the community’s contribution will influence the decision. The difficult part is to ensure that all decision is influenced by the input of the community members. The current situation at government is that decisions are manipulated by policies and power of vested in officials.

3) The community participation process communicates the interest and meets the process needs of all participants.

4) The community participation process seeks out and facilitates the engagement of those potentially affected. In every project there is a need to identify those and facilitate their participation.

5) The community participation process entails participation in defining how they participate. The challenge is time constraints as communities do not respond as per the projects schedule.

6) The community participation process communicates to participants how their input affected the decision. Feedback is the essential exercise in this regard. Government municipality should create conducive platform which would enable communities to air their views.
7) The community participation process provides participants with the information they need in order to participate in a meaningful approach.

Community participation in development process can thoroughly be addressed in the six selected communities in Anambra State, if the development planners and any other relevant stakeholders in development would bear in mind these principles and core values in facilitation of development projects.

2.2.6. Strategies for Public Participation

There is a wide spectrum of views and ways of achieving community participation in development. Fokane (2008:60) states that there is no definite method that can be used to come up with a one-size-fits-all combination of strategies, because strategies range widely in complexity, creativity and impact. It is believed that each strategy has its advantages and shortcomings. Their efficiency depends on other factors, such as the competence of the public participation practitioner and the appropriateness of tool in use (Fokane, 2008:60). The various strategies for community participation can be classified into a variety of groups depending on one’s interest. Among the most relevant strategies are those that relate to:
1) Pretty et al., (1995) Typology 7: Self-mobilisation: Self-mobilisation strategy is found where people participate by taking initiatives independently of any external institutions to change systems. The people themselves retain control over how resources are used. This bottom-up approach allows people to develop contacts with external institutions for resources and the technical advice they need.

2) Oakley and Marsden’s mode 4: Authentic public participation: This strategy is seen as an active process by which the community influences the direction and execution of a programme with the view to enhancing their wellbeing in terms of income, personal growth, self-reliance or other values which they cherish.

3) Arnstein’s (1969) level 1: Public control: In this case the public has the degree of power to govern a project, programme or institution without the influence of the government officials. Fokane (2007:60) indicates that these strategies can also be grouped according to the purpose that they serve or intend to achieve, depending on one’s aims in using these Strategies.

Theron (2005:126) classified three levels of influence into strategies to achieve public participation as follows:

Level 1: Public participation through information-sharing strategies: These strategies are referred to as “participation as a means
to an end”, because participation is generally short-term. These strategies basically do not constitute community participation because they merely require the community to judge a finished or almost finished product. The examples of information sharing strategy are information documentation, exhibitions, media coverage and background information material. In information-sharing strategy all projects beneficiaries are viewed as passive respondents in action. Emphasis is placed on achieving the objective and not so much on the act of participation itself. There is no direct channel provided for feedback in this kind of community participation strategy. The primary concern is not about gaining long-term social advantages and sustainable development, but rather what community participation contributes to the end product In this strategy people do not have the opportunity to influence proceedings as the findings of the research are neither shared nor evaluated for accuracy.

**Level 2: Public participation through consultation strategies:**

Kumar (2002:25) states that community can participate by being consulted as consultants and external officials listen to their views. An example of this kind of strategy is referenda, which is relatively inexpensive strategy and which allow democratic community participation, especially between elections. Other examples include questionnaire surveys as well as in-depth and focus group interviews.
The project beneficiaries need to respond to project management at various stages, which is why they should be more reactive in their action (Taylor, 1994:195).

There is no share in decision-making by the community. The professionals are under no obligation to take on board people’s views.

**Level 3: Public participation through empowering strategies:** The unique character of this strategy is that it frequently engaged reciprocal learning relationship between the beneficiaries and the developer. The community members are expected to develop and implement a proposal.

**2.2.7. The Merits of Community Participation**

According to Burkey (1993: 59) citizen participation involves organised efforts to increase control over resources and regulative institutions in a given social situations, on the part of groups and movement of those hitherto excluded from such control. Kakumba and Nsingo (2008:109) institute that community participation lies on the involvement of citizens in a wide range of administrative policy-making activities, including the determination of levels of service, budget priorities, and the acceptability of physical construction projects in order to orient government programmes toward community needs, build the entire public support, and encourage a sense of cohesiveness and humanity within the society.
The common belief is that involving citizens in rural programmes and empowering them have the potential to boost their livelihoods and foster development in their area (Kakumba and Nsingo, 2008:109). The development efforts should start by recognizing people’s potential, and proceeds to their enhancement and growth. Citizen participation can be viewed from the perspective of benefits to be gained and cost to be borne. The implicit to this “proclivity for getting involved” is the notion of the relationship between self and society (Bellah et al, 1985:10). Participation in development is now being sought the world over, not because it is a fad but because there has been a consensus on the useful of participation in development programs.

Community participation empowers the primary beneficiaries of development programmes or project by helping them to break away from a dependency mentality (Burkey, 1993:53). Creighton (2005:19) also state that community participation promotes self-confidence and self-awareness. Nampila (2005:40) agrees that this heightened consciousness makes people continuously aware of the reality about them and of their own capacity to transform it. When people have the freedom to participate in activities, it gives them dignity and self-respect (Ministry of Agriculture,1993:37).

Another advantage of community participation is sustainability (Kumar, 2002:28). Generally, development interventions are funded
either by government, foreign Aid, donor agencies etc. Experience has shown that development interventions from external assistance projects usually fail to sustain the required level of development activity once support or inputs are diminished or withdraw by funding agencies. People’s participation is regarded as an essential prerequisite for the continuity of activities. The involvement of local and utilisation of local resources generates a sense of ownership over development interventions to the community. This sense of ownership is essential for the sustainability of the interventions even after external funds cease to flow (Kumar, 2002:28).

Community participation ensures that projects are developed according to the needs of the people (Raniga and Simpson, 2002:135). This can improve the outcomes of projects through cost sharing, increased efficiency and effectiveness. Through community participation, resources available for development projects will be used more efficiently and fewer costs will be incurred if the people themselves are responsible for the project (Kumar, 2002:27).

Community participation encourages community self-reliance. Many development interventions have been seen to create a kind of dependence syndrome. For instance, in India, there is a widespread government development programmes, people have started looking to
the government for solutions to every problem that they face (Kumar, 2002:27). The ultimate objective embraces all the positive effects of genuine participation by rural people. Self-reliance demolishes their over-dependency attitudes, enhances awareness, confidence and self-initiative. It also increases people's control over resources and development efforts, enables them to plan and implement and also to participate in development efforts at levels beyond their community.

Community participation teaches communities how to resolve conflict and allows for different perspectives to be heard. In this way, learning is promoted and people will be able to help themselves (Baum, 1999 in Nampila, 2005:41). Communities will be able to assess their own situation, organise themselves as a powerful group and work creatively towards changing society and building up a new world Nampila (2005:41). This increased capacity of individuals, allow communities to mobilise and help themselves to minimise dependence on the state and leads to a bottom-up approach (Nampila, 2005:41).

Community participation contributes to the development of appropriate policy, legislation and regulations while at the same time promoting democracy, as is applied through the Batho Pele principles employed in South Africa. When people participate, it assists them in identifying key issues of concern that need to be considered. Due to a diversity of opinions and perspectives from different role players,
community participation helps to obtain a balanced perspective of key issues and to identify creative solutions to problems like, for example, the partnership-in-planning approach.

**2.2.8. Nature of Community Participation**

Community participation takes place in a socio-political context (Kumar, 2002:29). One should realise that implementing community participation in rural development process is not an easy exercise, as the form which participation takes is influenced by the overall circumstances and the unique social context in which action is being taken (Nekwaya, 2005:16). Nampila (2005:42) asserts that community participation does not guarantee success and there is no clear methodology of community participation. This has occurred because community participation does not have clear goals and objectives and it is approached in an ad hoc and unsystematic manner.

Illiteracy is an inhibiting factor in community participation. This is because illiterate people may be marginalised by professional and technical communication during the community-participation process (Theron, 2002:65). Nekwaya (2007:16) points that stakeholders may use community participation as a platform to further their own agendas. It is not clear what constitutes a “good” decision when it comes to community participation. Meyer et al. (2002:66) indicate that there are
attempts to classify a good decision according to the level of satisfaction and willingness to participate, for example, the literature does not state what the criteria for good decisions are. In other words, research on community participation is lacking as to whether there are legitimate factors for a good decision. It can be the case that participants communicate a wrong interpretation because of a diversity of languages in a community. This can be problematic because findings can be interpreted wrongly. Because authentic, empowering community participation can slow down the planning and implementation of a project, local authorities can become impatient. This may prompt them to ignore the processes underlying community participation. Community participation is not a legislated requirement in all countries. Many countries therefore lack supporting legislation and an institutional framework to ensure that stakeholders are effectively and efficiently engaged in the decision-making process.

2.2.9. Encouraging Community Participation

There are many ways of promoting community participation. The activities of the community are not considered to be the special vicinity of a knowledgeable but it is the business of everyone (Raid, 2003:34). Community participation is an essential part of human growth, which is the development of self-confidence, pride, initiative, creativity, responsibility, cooperation (Burkey, 1993:56). Kumar (2002:26) state
that participation is therefore being increasingly viewed as the process of empowering the local people in general. Community participation must be more than a policy statement—there must be genuine commitment to encourage participation in all aspects and at levels of development rather than a policy. The most important action the local authorities can take to encourage community participation is to welcome local people to contribute to the activities which are to be implemented or implemented.

People should feel that they can influence the outcome of the project in order for them to participate (Nampila, 2005:44). United Nations document (1981: 5) state that community participation create opportunities which enables all members of a community to actively contribute to and influence the development process and to share equitably in the fruits of development. Rural development strategies can realise their full potential only through the motivation, active involvement and organisation at the grassroots level of rural people. Citizen participation particularly is the essence of democracy. Burkey (1993:56) assert that people should be informed of their basic human right and also for realignment of political power in favour of disadvantaged groups and for social and economic development about issues affecting them directly. The outcomes of a community participation process cannot be predetermined because people are
unpredictable. The process must be flexible in order to adapt to unforeseen circumstances. It is not always possible to satisfy everyone, which can result in some people not approving of the initiative.

Conditions should be created under which collaborative dialogue can occur around issues that are critical to the community. All viewpoints should be heard and all citizens should have an equal chance to participate in the decision-making process. Community participation should seek to give a “voice” to those normally excluded from the process. At the same time, community participation needs to be an ongoing commitment with preparedness to begin with “where people are at” rather than set aspirations too high – Brown’s slow-fast incremental approach (Nampila, 2005:44). The people should be presented with a clear picture of the work of voluntary institutions (Hendriks, 1968:45). This means that the various types of work carried out by voluntary bodies for the benefits of the public should not only be clearly recognizable but also be readily available to the public.

The normal education system should give more instruction on the social functioning of the community and the responsibility of the individual citizen.

2.2.10. Factors that Lead to Poor Community Participation

Rahman (1993:13) states that people’s participation has often been generated spontaneously. Rural development in this instance deals
with the range of activities, involving the mobilisation of resources (human and material) in order to empower people to break away from all structural disabilities that prevent them from enjoying better living conditions (Kakumba and Nsingo, 2008:110). The rural poor tend to define their plight in terms of lack of basic needs such as food, shelter, clothing, health care and education; powerlessness and inability to influence one’s condition; social exclusion; poor governance; low community status and lack of awareness (Kiyaga-Nsubuga, 2004:8). Challenges facing community participation in rural development processes. In the paragraphs below, these challenges will be discussed more fully.

2.2.10.1. Inadequate financial capacity

In order for rural communities to play an active role in the community development, it is necessary for their members to have access to resources. The weak financial position of local communities not only reduces the capacity of communities to participate into development projects, but also affect the whole process of rural development (Kakumba and Nsingo, 2008:116). Having inadequate resources negatively impacts a rural community’s ability to effectively influence and develop policy compared to other players in the policymaking process.
2.2.10.2. Lack of general information

Dukeshire and Thurlow (2002:3) have indicated that the rural citizens feel that there is a lack of access to information about government programmes and services. Rural Anambrians have also reported that the information that is available on policy, government programmes and services is difficult to obtain and interpret. There is a desire to learn about and access information about government programmes and services that is understandable, concise and timely.

2.2.10.3. Absence of rural representation in the decision-making process

Dukeshire and Thurlow (2002:4) assert that living in a democratic society means we elect representatives to speak on our behalf at the government level. By virtue of their larger population, urban areas tend to have greater representation in the National parliament and Provincial legislatures than rural communities. The greater number of urban representatives is one factor that can lead these elected bodies to have a more urban focus and reduce the influence rural community members have in the decision making process. Specific communities and groups of community members must also be considered in the rural policy-making process.

2.2.10.4. Socio-economic structure
The pathetic socio-economic position of the rural people obstructs them from meaningful participation (Kakumba and Nsingo, 2008:118). Bear in mind that the rural population is associated with low levels of education, high illiteracy rates, poor infrastructure and communication means obstructing their civic competence.

2.2.10.5. Political patronage

There has been general lack of political commitment on the side of the Federal government of Nigeria towards effective devolution of powers, which is evident in the continued influence and interference in the functioning of local government units (Kakumba and Nsingo, 2008:115).

2.2.11. Community Participation and Sustainable Development

Nekwaya (2007:25) highlighted that community participation has the close link with the buildings blocks of development or rural development generally. Community participation and the building blocks of development are linked in the sense that the building blocks have influence on community participation. These links can be seen in the following concepts:

2.2.11.1. Capacity building

According to Department of Water Affairs and Forestry (2001:19) capacity building is the ongoing process of increasing the ability of individual, groups and organisation to control and manage all important
areas of their lives or operations. It empowers communities as stakeholders because it offers them the opportunity to develop the knowledge, skills and resources necessary to control their own lives and operations. The rural communities need human resource capacity building and institutional strengthening to ensure effective management of sustainable development.

2.2.11.2. Self reliance

According to Burkey (1993:50) self-reliance is about doing things for oneself; maintain one’s own self-confidence and making independent decisions. Rahman (1993:19) argues that self reliance is a state of mind that regards one’s own mental and material resources as the primary stock to draw on in the pursuit of one’s objectives, and finds emotional fulfillment not only in achieving the objectives as such but also in the very fact of having achieved them primarily by using one’s own resources. People must feel and believe that it is their own efforts that are driving the development process.

2.2.11.3. Empowerment

Oakley and Marsden (1991:9) see empowerment as the development of skills and abilities to enable rural people to manage better, have a say in or negotiate with existing development delivery system; others see it as more fundamental and essentially concerned with enabling rural people to decide upon and to take the actions which
they believe are essential to their development. Theron (2005:122) argues that issues of community participation and empowerment in the planning process for service delivery are central to sustainable development. Fitzgerald (1997) as cited in Nekwaya (2007:27) an individual becomes empowered by feeling able to do things not done previously, gaining an ability to do these new things and having opportunities opened up which were previously denied.

Participation as an exercise in empowering local authorities to gained widespread public support in development programmes. For example the United Nations Research Institute for Development during the 1980s took, as its working definition of participation, the empowerment of excluded groups in order to increase their access to and control over development resources. Community participation is power in terms of access to, and control of the resources necessary to protect livelihood (Oakley and Marsden, 1984:25).

An important mechanism to ensure sustainable development and full service delivery is by empowering people to sustain their own development in order to be sustainers of development in their own communities. Oakley and Marsden (1984:25) state the following statements which illustrates the understanding of community participation as empowerment:
I. The promotion of popular implies a redistribution of power and this calls for a scientific analysis which gives due recognition to political factors, social forces and the role of the social change agent.

II. Community participation is concerned with the distribution of power in society, for it is power which enables groups to determine which needs, and whose needs will be met through the distribution of resources.

III. Power is central theme of participation and participatory social action entails widely shared, collective power by those who are considered beneficiaries.

2.2.11.4. Sustainability

According to Theron (2005:123) community participation should lead to sustainable development. Community participation and sustainability involves local choice because people are the local experts, in line with the idea of an indigenous knowledge system. For others, the issue is how to link citizen engagement processes with existing decision making structures, and how to make citizen engagement ‘part of everyone’s day job.’ For yet others, changes in political leadership at the top affected the degree to which commitment to extensive engagement would continue. Most agree, however, that increased citizen engagement is not a ‘quick fix’ and it will still take a great deal of cultural and
institutional change to mainstream the new ways of working. At the same time, others are concerned with how to maintain interest and momentum, and how to manage expectations, given the slow pace of change in many multi-actor processes.

2.2.11.5. Social learning

Theron (2005: 121) assert that social learning process approach extends the principles of bottom-up planning and community participation by arguing that change agents and development organisation should adopt a learning attitude. This calls for an integration of the three elements of social learning. Korten (1983) in Theron (2005:121) highlights these elements into projects design, planning and implementation to create a culture of mutual learning and partnership between the Anambra local municipality and communities. These three are as follows:

- The community and the service delivery system: the capacity of the people and expected output must be integrated.
- The community and the community organisations: the formulation of the needs and demands by the people and the decision-making process of the organization should be integrated.
- The programme/project and the community organisations: the programme/project objectives have to be in keeping with the capacity of the organisation and that of the community.
2.3. Concepts Related to Community Participation

2.3.1. Community Development

The concept and term community development is here described in greater detail as to its meaning, application, and principles. The detailed attention given to the community development approach stems from the belief that any programme related to development, especially in newly developing communities, has little chance of meaningful success if it does not take into account the basic approaches as formulated in the community development method. The important aspects of community development are concisely discussed as follows:

A variety of descriptive terms have been applied to community development each designed to give its substance in encapsulated form. It has been described by Dunham (1970) in Nzimande (1977:24) as a method, a process, a programme and a movement which he further explains as follows:

i. As a method of applying behavioural sciences for human welfare and the entire surroundings;

ii. As a process of community action related to bringing about change, especially socially and psychological;

iii. As a programme of social, economic, and also political development, with emphasis on basic matters such as health education, nutrition education, and agricultural developments; as
movement for progress with rising expectations and how to meet them. All the above terms of course does not constitute what real community development is?

According to an article in United Nations publication (1967:5), the community development can be described in terms of:

i. The close partnership relation it which exist between government and people in a particular community, or

ii. The integrative approach it advocates in dealing with different problems of the community in general, or

iii. The flow of communication it facilitates among those concerned with development at different levels.

Community development focused on the method whereby desired change could be brought about in the communities (Theron, 2005:107). Community development could be regarded as community education in some circles, in others as community organization or community participation”. These diverse terms refer to the active involvement of people at the local community level to either oppose or support a matter, a phenomenon or a programme in which they are interest. Korten (1990:67) argues that development is a process whereby the members of the rural community increase their potential and institutional capacities to mobilise and manage resources to produce sustainable and justly
distributed improvement in their quality of life consistent with their own aspirations.

Lombard (2005:118) also emphasises the empowerment of the community, adding the support of external resources. “Community development is thus regarded as a process, a method, a programme, a movement aimed at enabling and encouraging communities to become involved, with the necessary support from the private and government sectors, in improving and managing their own living conditions in all areas of development” (Lombard, 2005:118).

2.3.2. Rural development

Oakley and Marsden (1991:9) define rural development as the participation of the people in a mutual learning experience involving them, their local external change agents and outside resources. People cannot be developed; they can only develop themselves by participation in decision and co-operation activities which affect their well-being. People are not being developed when they are barded like animals into new ventures. Rural development is clearly designed to increase production and raise productivity. Rural develop recognizes, however, that improved food supplies and nutrition, together with basic service such as health and education, can not only directly improve the physical well-being and quality of life the rural poor, but can also directly
enhance their productivity and their ability to contribute to the national economy Lea and Chaudhri (1983:12).

Lea and Chaudhri (1983:12) view that rural development is a strategy designed to improve the economic and social life of a specific group of people – the rural poor. It involve the extending the benefits of development to the poorest among those who seek a livelihood in the rural area. Rural development strategies can realize their full potential only through the motivation, active involvement and organisation at the grassroots level of rural people (Burkey, 1993:56). Kakumba and Nsing (2008:110) state that rural development is used to refer to schemes aimed at improving the countryside or peripheral areas, with a characteristic agrarian population. It deals with a range of activities, involving the mobilisation of resources in order to empower the people to break away from all structural disabilities that prevent them from enjoying better living conditions. Communities that have a say in the development of policies for their locality are much more likely to be enthusiastic about their implementation (Curry, 1993:33).
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CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0. Introduction

This chapter constitutes an essential part of any research process. Grinnell (1993:49) asserts that the major issue facing all researchers is to select a clear and relevant research method. This chapter provides a
brief overview of the research methodology used to contextualise the practical research of the study. It also explains the procedures utilised in administration of the instruments.

3.1. Research Design

A research design is a plan according to which we collect information (Welman, et al 2006:46). Yin (1994:19) states that the aim of research design is to guide the researcher through the process of collecting, analysing and interpreting data. For the purpose of this research work, the researcher intended to articulate the rudimentary standpoints of this work by employing the survey research method and design as our research methodology.

3.2 The Method of Data Collection

In this study, the researcher extensively utilized both qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection. The qualitative method involved the use of the structured research questionnaire. Maree and Pietersen (2007:145) define quantitative research as a process that is systematic and objective in its ways of using numerical data from only selected subgroup of the universe and to generalise the findings of the universe that is being studied. Quantitative research compresses the research data and applying it to a bigger picture. The quantitative style is believed to be best suited for hypothesis-testing, objectivity and statistical analysis. This was carefully prepared and randomly administered in our sampled communities. The outcome of our calculation for sample size as indicated in 4.2 below depicts that a total of 400 copies of the questionnaire were prepared and administered in 6 communities located in 3 Local Government Areas in 3 Senatorial zones.
of Anambra State. The researcher spent quality time in training some local catalysts who latter assisted her as facilitators in the administration of the structured questionnaire.

Qualitative data were collected through Focus Group Discussion (FGD), Key Informant Interview (KII) and direct observation. In all, FGDs were conducted with executive and non-executive members of four Community Based Associations operating in six of our pilot LGAs. Key Informant Interviews were also conducted on few leaders of the CBAs as well as the Director of Community Development Directorate, Anambra State Ministry of Women Affairs and Development. Anambra State. The interview session was structured in such a way that at least the executives can respond on behalf of the leadership of the CBAs. Additional information was gotten from their report book. Armed with these, we gained an insight into their organizational structure and objectives.

3.2.1. Focus Group Discussion

Focus groups are in-depth exchanges in which groups of participants talk about the topics relevant to a particular set of research objectives (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1981:209). These focus groups discussions consisted of reasonable members who ranged from twelve to fifteen members. Two focus group discussions were conducted in each Senatorial Zones chosen for this study.
3.2.2. Questionnaire

Gee (1993:314) states that a questionnaire is a set of questions to be answered by the respondents without the personal aid of an investigator. Ntsholo (2002:27) also asserts that questionnaire is an instrument of research with a special function of measurement. Questionnaires can be used to discover what experiences have taken place and what is occurring at the present (Zwane, 2003:31).

3.2.3. Administration of Questionnaires

Questionnaires were administered by a researcher in order to explain the purpose of the study to the respondents under study. The researcher used closed-ended in administering the questionnaire to respondents. This is the type of survey method where a questionnaire is handed in to the respondents to fill in. The questionnaire in this study consisted of two sections A and B. The aim of section A was to collect biographic information about each respondent. This data is essential to gain little profile of each respondent. While section B consisted of open-ended questions which were intended to elicit information about participation of community members into development initiatives. According to Neuman (2006:299) the advantage of self-administration of questionnaires is that the survey is by far the cheapest, and it can be conducted by a single researcher. In this study the researcher uses focus groups to distribute questionnaires to the selected group of respondents.
This gives a researcher the adequate probability to observe and identify other factors that obstruct community participation in the area.

3.3 Sources of Data Collection

The following research instruments were used to collect information at the different levels and stages of this study:

**Primary Sources**

The primary sources of information are the research respondents, as most of the practical data was obtained from them. The information was gathered by means of empirical methods and was obtained from participants, who comprised community members who are permanent residents of selected communities. The community members provided information regarding their views, feelings and opinion about their participation in development programmes that intend to enhance service delivery and satisfaction of basic needs. The researcher thus used questionnaire and personal interview for the purpose of primary data collection since according to Nwodu(2006) is the most frequently and most conveniently used in social science research in Nigeria.

**Secondary Sources**

Data was also gathered from the published sources such as textbooks, journal, legislation, policies, previous research papers, magazines, newspaper, and data from unpublished sources such as
theses, dissertation, reports and written materials about community participation. This information was accessed from different places, such as the University of Nigeria, the internet and the Anambra local municipality archives registry.

3.4 Sample Size Determination and Selection

De Vos (2005:193) state that sampling is a process of using portion of a population or universe in research, and studying it as representation of that population or universe.

For the selection of respondents in this study the researcher used stratified sampling. In stratified random sampling, the whole population is divided into a number of homogeneous, non-overlapping groups, called strata (Maree and Pietersen, 2007:174). Maree and Pietersen (2007:174) assert that within each stratum, independent sampling is then conducted. Stratified sampling is used to ensure that the different groups or segment of a population acquire sufficient representation in the sample.

The sample determination was done using the Taro Yamane’s formula

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + N \cdot e^2} \]

Where:

- \( e \) = 0.05 level of significance
- \( N \) = Total population
- \( n \) = Desired sample (Yamane, 1962)
The stratified random sampling technique was used in selecting communities of study. This was done by stratifying all the zones in, Anambra North, Anambra Central and Anambra South Senatorial District in Rural areas and numbered serially. From this list of Senatorial zone, two rural communities each were selected from the three Senatorial districts. Guided by the list of the communities, Local Government Areas, Senatorial Zones in the State which the researcher got from the State National Population Commission, 2006. Communities were given distinct numbers after which selection of the community of study was done randomly.

In all the three Senatorial Zones: Anambra North, Anambra Central and Anambra South, 6 rural communities were selected from Rural areas

### Table 3.4.1: Selected Communities/Senatorial Zones for the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government Area</th>
<th>Selected Communities</th>
<th>Senatorial Zone</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nnewi North</td>
<td>Umudim</td>
<td>Anambra South Senatorial zone</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguata</td>
<td>Igboukwu</td>
<td>Anambra South Senatorial zone</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogbaru</td>
<td>Okpoko</td>
<td>Anambra North Senatorial zone</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyi</td>
<td>Nkwelle Ezunaka</td>
<td>Anambra North Senatoral zone</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awka South</td>
<td>Isiagu</td>
<td>Anambra Central Senatoral Zone</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Njikoka</td>
<td>Abagana</td>
<td>Anambra Central Senatoral zone</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** National Population Commission, 2006

### 3.4.1 Sample Size

Based on the 2006 Census, figures of the respective communities sample size was selected (see table 3.4.2.)

### Table 3.4.2: Population of Selected Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Selected Communities</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Umudim</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Igboukwu</td>
<td>75,224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above table, the total population of our study communities is 310832 from this figure; we calculated the percentage of each of the communities against the total population in order to scientifically allocate the structured questionnaire. The result of the calculation is as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Selected Communities</th>
<th>Local Government Area</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Umudim</td>
<td>Nnewi North</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Igboukwu</td>
<td>Aguata</td>
<td>75224</td>
<td>24.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Okpoko</td>
<td>Ogbaru</td>
<td>177,608</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nkwelle Ezunaka</td>
<td>Oyi</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>3.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Isiagu</td>
<td>Awka South</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>2.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Abagana</td>
<td>Njikoka</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>11.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>310832</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** field survey 2011

Armed with the above data, the simple size for the study was calculated using Taro Yamani, formula for sample size determination as demonstrated below.

\[
n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}
\]

Where:

- \( e = 0.05 \) level of significance
- \( N = \) Total population
Substituting

\[ n = ? \]

\[ N = 310832 \]

\[ e = 0.05 \]

\[ l = \text{Constant} \]

\[ n = \frac{310832}{1 + 310832 (0.05)^2} \]

\[ = \frac{310832}{1 + 310832 (0.0025)} \]

\[ = \frac{310832}{1 + 777} \]

\[ = \frac{310832}{778.} \]

\[ = 399.53 \approx 400 = \text{Sample size} \]

The above necessitated the preparation of 400 copies of a structured research questionnaire, which were administered in the 6 communities.

**Sample Size Distribution**

The sample size for each community was determined through the following calculations;

\[ x = \frac{nc}{N} \]

Where \( x \) = Simple Size for Communities

\( n \) = Total Sample size

\( c \) = No. of Workers in the department

\( n \) = Population size

**Umudim**

\[ x = \frac{nc}{N} \]

\[ x = ? \]

\( n = 400 \)

\( c = 5000 \)
\[ N = 310832 \]

Therefore

\[ x = \frac{400 \times 5000}{310832} \]

\[ x = \frac{2000000}{310832} \]

\[ x = 6.36 \approx 6 = \text{Sample size for Umudim} \]

**Igboukwu**

\[ x = \frac{400 \times 75224}{310832} \]

\[ x = \frac{30089600}{310832} \]

\[ x = 97.80 \approx 97 = \text{Sample size for Igboukwu} \]

**Okpoko**

\[ x = \frac{400 \times 177,608}{310832} \]

\[ x = \frac{71043200}{310832} \]

\[ x = 228.56 \approx 229 = \text{Sample size for Okpoko} \]

**Nkwele Ezunaka**

\[ x = \frac{400 \times 10,000}{310832} \]

\[ x = 400000 \]
3.5. Procedure of Data Presentation and Analysis

Simple frequency tables are used in presenting the number of questionnaire administered as well as those collected and utilized in the analysis. Simple percentage (%) ratios are also used in presenting the results of data collected.

From the above table, 400 copies of the questionnaire were administered within the sampled communities. Out of these, 386 were completed and returned. During the process of quality control (data cleaning), the researcher discarded 9 copies of the questionnaire due to observed numerous anomalies in the filling process. Consequently, the number of returned questionnaire that were used in the final analysis was 377, which represented 94.25 percents of the expected responses.
The various data obtained in the study were processed and tabulated to bring out the desired variables. Tables and percentages were used as basic statistical technique employed to analyze the raw data collected. The raw data was subsequently subjected Chi-Square test which was used as a major tool for testing hypothesis and analyzing data. The work was calculated manually to reach admissible conclusion. In this study, the chi-square method of analysis is applied to test the statistics in order to see if there is an agreement between what is expected and what is observed/calculated; and determine the significance of such disagreement or agreement.

The chi-square is statistically denoted as:

\[ X^2 = \sum (O - E)^2 / E \]

Where \( O \) = Observed frequency in each cell

\( E \) = the expected frequency in each cell

\( \sum \) = Summing over all cells.

\( Df \) = Degree of Freedom

Formula for \( df = (r-1) (c-1) \)

Where \( r \) = number of rows in the frequency table

\( c \) = number of columns in the frequency table.

The test will be carried out as a 0.05% level of significance. These take care of our quantitative data.

The qualitative data is analyzed manually by looking at issues relevant to this study. We attempt to identify common issues identified and highlighted by all groups by looking out for homogeneity and dissent.

The issues involved are critically examined, sorted out manually, categorized (look at in order of priority) and evaluated based on responses from our raw data. Again, the research compares various case studies we intended to look at. In doing these, we did not seek universal laws but regularities within a social (community) context. Armed with these, the researcher was able to filter data and prioritize the needs and aspiration of the people in order to advance an admissible conclusion.
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CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

4.1: Introduction

The purpose of the study is to assess the extent to which Community participation in sustainable rural development; a study of selected communities in Anambra state. The research data are presented and analyzed manually using chi square. This chapter presents and discusses the results based on the data collected from respondents’ responses to
questions asked in the questionnaire, during FGDs and interview sessions. The responses yielded by questionnaires are discussed and presented in the context of the theoretical approach to community participation.

However, the researcher presented frequency tables, which are followed by the researcher’s explanations and discussions of key findings or results to facilitate proper understanding. The first frequency table in this chapter is table 4.2.1 on the pattern of distribution of the questionnaire, which now follows.

### 4.2: Data Presentation

**Table 2: Distribution of Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communities</th>
<th>Local Government Areas</th>
<th>No. Distributed</th>
<th>No. Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Umudim</td>
<td>Nnewi North</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igboukwu</td>
<td>Aguata</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okpoko</td>
<td>Ogbaru</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above table, 400 copies of the questionnaire were administered within the sampled communities. Out of these, 386 were completed and returned. During the process of quality control, the researcher discarded 9 copies of the questionnaire that were not properly filled. Consequently, the number of returned questionnaire that were used in the final analysis was 377, which represented 94.25 percent of the expected responses.

Section A.

Analysis of Biographical Information

Table 3: Sex of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work 2011

The table 2 above illustrates that 132 or 35% of the respondents were male while 245 representing 65% were female. This shows that more female were given the questionnaire.
Table 3: Age of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24yrs</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30yrs</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35yrs</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 and above</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>377</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field work 2011

Table 3 shows the four age categories were used by the researcher to gather information from respondents. The age distribution of community respondents varied between 18 and 36+ years. Of these respondents, only 26 percent of community members fell between the ages of 18 to 24 years, 190 respondents representing 50% of the respondents were between the ages of 25 to 30 years, 15 respondents was between the 31 to 35 years while those on 36 years and above made up the remaining 32 respondents representing 9%. The finding
indicates that those respondents whose ages were from 36 and above were least while those between 25-30 were the highest respondents.

Table 4: Marital status of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>377</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work 2011

Table 4 shows the marital status of the community respondents. As reflected in table 4 that 165 respondents of the total sample reported that they single while120 respondents were married. Divorced persons were 23 or 6% while the widowed were 69 or 18% respectively.

Table 5: Educational qualification of respondents
The above table indicates the various educational level of respondents. 33 respondent representing 9% were illiterate, 18 respondent representing 5% attended primary education, 120 respondents representing 31% attended Secondary education while the remaining 55% were people with other qualifications. It can therefore be concluded that most of the respondents attended tertiary institutions to acquire certificates, diplomas and degrees secondary while the least were people with primary education and illiterate.

**Table 6: Length of period lived in the area of study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>377</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field work 2011
Table 6 shows that out of 377 community members, 123 respondents representing 33 percent reported that they had been in the area for 10 or less years while 254 respondents representing 67% they had been in the area for almost eleven years and above

Section B

This section shall analyze the responses of the communities to the questions posed to them and the information collected to test the hypothesis and answer the research questions.

Table 7: Research Question One

What is your understanding of community participation in development projects?

Distribution on Whether Community Members Understands Community Participation in Development (see Questionnaire, Section2 Question No. 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision making process</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in community</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table 7 above indicates that 67 respondents, representing 18 percent stated that community participation is the process whereby community members are part of decision-making process in development programmes or projects, 298 respondents 79% view community participation as involving in projects while 12 respondents representing 3% reported that they don’t know. This shows that community members in selected areas do understand what community participation is or means while the least were people that reported they don’t know.

Table.8. Do you participate in development programmes which are taking place in your community?

Distribution On Whether Community Participate In Projects/Development Programmes. (see Questionnaire , Section2 Question No. 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>No of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work 2011
The table 8 above demonstrates that only 230 respondents representing 61 percent of the total sample partake in development initiatives while 147 respondents representing 39 percent of the total sample do not participate in development projects.

Table 9: Do your community benefit from participating in the projected projects.

Distribution on whether community members benefit from participating in community programm/projects. (see Questionnaire, Section2 Question No. 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>377</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field work 2011

Table 9 indicates that 315 respondent representing 83% benefit from community participation, 56 respondent representing 15% do not benefit from community involvement while 6 respondent representing 2% said they don’t know. Based on this, we can therefore conclude that
most of the respondents reported that they benefit while the least were not benefiting.

Table 10: Can community participation engender development in your community?

Distribution On Whether Community Participation Can Engender Development (see Questionnaire, Section2 Question No. 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>377</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work 2011

Table 10 shows that 345(92%) of the respondents agree that community participation can engender development while 32(8%) disagree with the fact that community participation cannot engender development in the selected area.
Table 11: What are the ways of encouraging communities to participate in development projects?

Distribution On how Communities Can Be Encouraged To Participate In Development (see Questionnaire, Section2 Question No. 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective communication</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement in planning of the project</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict implementation of decisions</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of open platform for discussion</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compiling community profile</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>377</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work 2011
Table 11 above illustrates that respondents suggested different ways of encouraging community participation in their area. 98 respondents reported that effective communication between local community and project initiators could improve community participation in their community, 79 respondents representing 21% reported that engaging local community in planning and development of projects can also ensure their participation, 12% indicated that community leaders should adhere to the proper implementation of decisions (people’s first), 15 respondents stated that community leaders should create platforms for open discussions, 39 respondents reported that a detailed community profile should be compiled in order to gather the desired needs of the community, while 15 respondents said that they don’t know if encouraging community participation can increase development.

Table 12: Research question 3

Do you think effective community participation can boost rural development?

Distribution On Whether Effective Community Participation Can Boost Rural Development (see Questionnaire, Section2 Question No.6 )
Table 12 shows that 309 (82%) of the respondents said effective community participation can boost rural development while 68 (18%) of the respondent do not see effective community participation as what can boost rural development in their community.

**Table 13:** Is your community given the chance to identify and priorities the projects which should be implemented?

**Distribution On Whether The Community Is Given The Chance To Indentify And Prioritize The Projects Which Should Be Implemented (see questionnaire, section2 question no.7)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field work 2011
Table 13 illustrates that 86 respondent representing 23% indicated that community members are given the chance to identity and prioritize the projects which should be implemented while 291 % respondents representing 77% reported that community members are given the chance to identity and prioritize the projects which should be implemented.

Table 14: Are you aware of the on-going development project in your community?

Distribution on whether the community members are aware of any on-going development programme/ projects in their community.
(see Questionnaire , Section2 Question No.8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work 2011

Table 14 above indicates that 220 respondents reported that community members are aware of the on-going programme in their community while 157 respondent representing 42% reported that community members are not aware of the on-going development programmes/ projects. It implies most community members in selected
areas are directly and indirectly aware of the on-going development projects in their community.

Table 15: Identify the most project executed by government through community participation?

Distribution On Whether The Community Members Can Identify The Most Important Project Executed By Government Through Community Participation (see Questionnaire , Section2 Question No.9 )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>377</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field work 2011

As reflected in table 15, 104 respondents representing 28% reported education project, 27 respondents representing 7% road
project, 41 respondents representing 11% reported water project, 173 respondents representing 46% stated health project while 32 respondents representing 8% of the total sample reported that government has carried out electricity project.

Table 16: Research question 4

How can you rate information regarding projects or development initiatives in your community?

Distribution on whether the community can rate information regarding projects or development initiatives. (see Questionnaire, Section2 Question No.10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work 2011

Table 16 indicates that 162 respondents representing 43% of the total sample reported that community can rate information regarding projects or development initiatives while 215 respondent representing
57% of the total sample agreed that community cannot rate information regarding projects or development initiatives.

Table 17: Do you attend community meetings?

Distribution on whether the community members attend community meetings. (See Questionnaire, Section2 Question No.11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work 2011

Table 17 above indicates that 286 respondent representing 76% attend community meetings while 91 representing 24% of respondents do not attend community meetings.
Table 18: What is your reason for not attending community meetings?

Distribution For Respondents Why They Do Not Attend Community Meetings (see Questionnaire, Section2 Question No.11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No set agenda</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal commitment</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlooking of community views</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top-down approaches</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>377</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field work 2011

Table 18 indicates that 87 respondents representing 23% reported no set agenda, 19 respondents representing 5% reported personal commitment, 203 respondent representing 54% reported overlooking of
community views while 68 respondent representing 18% reported the top-down approach as they reason for not attending community meetings.

Table 19: At what level does involvement of the community in development programmes takes place?

Distribution on respondent level of community involvement in development programmes. (See Questionnaire, Section2 Question No.12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning level</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making process</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation process</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>377</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work 2011

According to table 19 the majority of respondents 252 respondent representing 67% reported that they were not involved in any level of
development, 69 respondent reported that they participated in implementation process, 41 respondents representing 11% reported that they had participated in the planning process of development projects while 15 respondent representing 4% reported that they have participated in decision-making process.

**Table 20: What should be done to improve community participation in rural development process in your community?**

**Distribution on what can be done to improve community participation in rural development process.** (see Questionnaire, Section2 Question No.13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating awareness</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of decisions</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>377</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field work 2011

Table 20 above illustrates that respondents suggested what can be done to improve community participation in their community. 203 respondents representing 54% stated creating awareness, 19 respondents
representing 5% reported transparency, 87 respondents representing 23% reported that implementation of decisions while 68 respondents representing 18% reported that all of the above answer can help to improve the community.

**Table 21: Do you partake in the election of the current leaders of your community?**

**Distribution on community members participation in the election of community leaders. (See Questionnaire, Section2 Question No.14)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>377</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field work 2011*

Table 21 illustrates that 280 respondents representing 74% had participated in the elections of current community leaders while 97 respondents representing 26% reported that they did not participate in elections.
Table 22: What is the benefit of community capacity building towards rural development?

Distribution on whether community members benefit from community capacity building towards rural development. (see Questionnaire, Section2 Question No.15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to spend government money</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable community to rule</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase community participation</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable them to maintain project</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>377</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work 2011

Table 22 indicates that 23 respondents representing 6% reported that they benefit from community capacity building by spending government money. 87 respondents representing 17% reported it enable them to rule their community, 167 respondent representing 44% reported increase community participation while 100 respondents
representing 27% stated clearly that capacity building helps them to maintain project.

Table 23. What is the best mechanism to ensure trust between the community and community leaders?

Distribution on Suggested Mechanisms To Ensure Trust Between The Community And Community Leaders. (See Questionnaire, Section 2, Question No. 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honest with financial affairs</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of community members</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular feedback</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper Corporation</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work 2011

As reflected in table 23, indicates that 52 respondents representing 14% reported that they should be translucent with issues regarding financial affairs of the community, 108 respondents
representing 48% involvement of community members, 28 respondents representing 7% reported regular feedback while 117 respondents representing 31% stated that they should be proper corporation.

**Table 24:** Effective community participation can be achieved through?

**Distribution On Whether Effective Participation In Development Can Be Achieved (see Questionnaire , Section2 Question no.19)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active participation</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial participation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>377</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field work 2011

Table 24 indicates that 377 respondent representing 100% of the total sample reported that effective community participation could enhance community development process in selected areas. These respondents suggested that if the community worked together the development goal could be easily accomplished.
Table 25: Do you think community participation in development programmes/projects is important?

Distribution of Respondents According To The Importance Of Community Participation In Development Process (see Questionnaire, Section 2 Question No.20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment of citizens</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in decision-making</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create local ownership</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of project efficiency</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>377</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work 2011

Table 25 illustrates that 100 respondent representing 27% asserted empowerment of citizens, 196 respondent representing 52% stated involvement of the community in decision making processes, 19
respondent representing 5% stated that community participation creates local ownership and enhance sustainability of development projects and 62 respondent representing 16 % of the total sample reported improving project efficiency is an important part of community participation.

Table 26: Research question 2

Are your community members willing to participate in development programmes?

Distribution On Community Members Willingness To Participate in Development Programmes (see Questionnaire, Section2 Question No.21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work 2011

Table 26 indicates that 287 respondents representing 76% of the total sample reported that they are willing to participate in development, while 90 respondents representing 24% of the total sample agreed that community members are not willing to participate.
Table 27: What are the main problems that prevent involvement of community member into development projects?

**Distribution Of Respondents According To Problems that Prevent Involvement Of Community Member into Development Projects (see Questionnaire, Section2 Question No.22)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of community support</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time constrain</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of general information</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political rivalry</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field work 2011

As reflected in table 27, the above table indicates that 52 respondents representing 14% reported lack of community support, 180 respondents representing 48% viewed time constrain as a challenge, 100 respondent representing 27% indicated that lack of general information, 28 respondent representing 27% that political rivalry while 17 respondents representing 4% stated that all of the problem listed above can prevent community involvement.
Table 28: What is the primary implication of non-participation of communities in rural development?

Distribution on whether the community members knows the primary implications of non-participation in rural development.

(See Questionnaire, Section2 Question No.23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure to attend to peoples priority</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest by the people</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor implementation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>377</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field work 2011

According to table 28, 252 respondents representing 67% reported failure to attend to people, 69 respondent representing 18% reported lack of interest by people can affect the development of the community. 15 respondents representing reported that poor implementation affect the ways of participation while 41 respondents representing 11% asserted all listed above can affect sustainable development.
4.3: Report of Interviews with CBAs

During our interview sessions, each CBA was represented by its Chairman and at least two executive members. However, the researcher was unable to secure an interview with the leadership of the CBAs in Njikoka LGA. The general outcome of our interview sessions were as follows:

i. The goals of the Associations

a. To empower the Rural Community through the use of participatory methods, so that it can be in a position to systematically:

b. encourage self-help projects

c. implement self-help projects

d. monitor and sustain the projects

- To influence the Principles of Participation being applied by the community both in decision making and project execution and monitoring.

- To promote and preserve the people’s cultural heritage.
- To Build the Capacity of Members of Community people so that they can support the pooling of local resources for the benefit of their members.

- To identify and harness local resources and opportunities to improve income generation of the future communities.

- To ensure harmonious coexistence among different members/kindred within the community.

- Motivate the community to look inward for solutions and resources rather than waiting for government to act.

- To guide the community to articulate aspirations and project needs, identify their obstacles and challenges, create a strategic direction for overcoming the challenges, as well as identify priorities and design ways to implement and monitor the projects

**Problems and Challenges of the Studied Communities**

- Conflicts: The respondents protested about conflicts at meetings and the fact that the community members do not listen to each other. It was remarkable that quarrels take place as result of the conflict of interest. They stressed that they did not feel that they could raise their voices freely because if they say something, community members could change their attitude towards them.
Lack of proper implementation of Policy

No attendance to community development meetings.

Lack of requisite support from the government and corporate organizations.

Respondents raised the issue of respect and stated that there were still community members who did not respect each other.

Rural-Urban migration resulting in the depletion of their membership strength.

4.4. Report of Focus Group Discussions

The researcher identifies similar themes from research findings of the community respondent groups. The literally quotations from respective communities Based Associations groups respondents obtain during the focus group discussion will support the findings gathered.

Report of comments arising from the focus group:

Themes

- General understanding of community participation
- Capacity building
- Needs identification
- Decision Making
- **Theme 1: General understanding of community participation**

  The findings indicate that there are mixed feelings and understanding about community participation amongst the people who were part of the focus group. Literate people have better understanding of community participation than people at grass root level. The understanding of community participation by community members in selected areas is reflected by the following quoted common responses:

  “I think community participation is the involvement of community members in activities which seek to improve the standard of living of the entire community.”

  “Is an input by the community in decision making and planning process when there is developmental activity taking place.”

  “Community participation in development is still minimal; there is a lot that needs to be done.”

  The above quotations indicate that most community members in selected areas do understand what community participation is all about. However, it is not being practical implemented. This implies that there is a need to explain more to the community about its participation in rural development process and it’s implication on sustainable development.
They stated that, although the community members have a problem of working together, community participation is still essential, because only when the whole community participates, can the goals of the community be achieved. The community can only develop when people work together.

- **Theme 2: Capacity building for community members**

  All respondents agreed that empowerment of community members to participate in community development process is still lacking. The community expressed the feeling that they are not capacitated to participate fully in development processes due to the inadequate knowledge which should prepare them for their responsibilities.

  They highlighted that there is a need for workshops and training which would intend to educate communities why it is crucial to partake in development programmes taking place in the area. It is, therefore, the burden of the community leaders in selected areas to capacitate and empower communities in order to take part in projects and make informed decisions.

  The respondents claim that they had never been empowered on the development procedures and project processes. This lack of knowledge is reflected in the following quoted common responses:
"We have not been told that our contribution is needed and crucial." "The community needs to be educated about the importance of their involvement in projects taking place in the society."

It is practically impossible for the project initiators to offer training to all community members. They believe that community leaders committees are relevant people who should be capacitated with procedures and process of community development and when is their participation needed. Here it came up from respondents that community leaders committees do exist; however, they do not know their roles and responsibilities.

Community members that were members of the community leaders committees revealed that they did not receive any meaningful training and workshops. They were unaware of their roles and responsibilities as community leaders committees. This means that effective implementation of community leaders committees was lacking. Respondents indicated that at some point they regarded committees as people commission by the community leaders to investigate those who demanded service delivery.

With regard to the level of empowerment of the committees, it was also remarkable that the community respondents had no
understanding of the purpose of community participation. The conclusion is made on saying little community participation would take place, until communities were made aware of their roles and responsibility as stakeholders in the rural development processes.

- **Theme 3: Decision-making**

  The community respondents expressed concerns regarding their participation in decision making phase as they perceived that project initiators was imposing the already made decisions (top-down approach). This element violets the notion of democracy and perpetrates the legacy of the past, where people were deprived of rights to decide on what they want to see happening in the society. Community participation emphasises the point that people at grass-root level should play a central role in addressing their developmental issues.

- **Theme 4: Needs identification**

  However, community respondents recognised the role of community participation in needs identification process as important. Respondents also suggested that projects should be listed according to their order of importance of communities involve.

  Respondents stated that it was their constitutional right to identify needs and problems which they wanted to see being addressed in their area. The respondents reflected on this theme as follows:
“We should identify things that we want to see happening.”

“Community should mention issues that they want to be solved.”

In addressing community needs and problem, community respondents agreed on their role as one of identifying and generating a list of needs in their communities. In conclusion, they suggested that the project initiators should give community members a chance to identify their needs and also be given an opportunity to raise their views freely regarding development.

4.5: Test of Hypotheses

The chi-square statistical test is used to test the four hypotheses formulated for this study. The researcher tested the hypotheses manually with the use of chi-square.

**Hypothesis 1**

H<sub>1</sub>: The level of community participation in selected communities is not properly understood in project implementation.

H<sub>2</sub>: The level of community participation in selected communities is properly understood in project implementation.

**Hypothesis 2**

H<sub>3</sub>: Community members are not adequately willing and prepared to participate in development programmes

H<sub>4</sub>: Community members are adequately willing and prepared to participate in development programmes

**Hypothesis 3**

H<sub>3</sub>: Effective community participation in development initiatives (projects) will not bring concrete rural development.
\( H_3: \) Effective community participation in development initiatives (projects) will bring concrete rural development.

**Hypothesis 4**

\( H_4: \) Community members do not have access to information regarding projects or development initiatives.

\( H_4: \) Community members have access to information regarding projects or development initiatives.

### 4.5.1 Hypotheses Testing using Manual Approach

To test hypothesis 1, we adopted the Chi-Square test. Again, the level of confidence chosen for the test is 95% using the Murray’s formula (Murray, 1992). The said formula is given as follows:

\[
X^2 = \sum \frac{(o - e)^2}{E}
\]

Where

\( X^2 \) = measurement of discrepancy existing between the observed and expected frequencies

\( o \) = observed frequencies

\( e \) = expected frequencies

\( \Sigma \) = Summation
The decision rule with regards to the above statistical formular is, where the computed value of $X^2$ exceeds its critical (or table) value, the NULL HYPOTHESIS is rejected and the ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESIS is accepted. When the computed value of $X^2$ equals or is less than that of the critical (or table) value, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Our hypothesis number one is:

$\textbf{H}_1$: The level of community participation is not properly understood in project implementation.

$\textbf{H}_0$: The level of community participation is proper understood in project implementation.

The data used to test this hypothesis are drawn from our Table 4.2.7 above: \textit{Distribution on Whether Community Members Understands Community Participation In rural Development} (see questionnaire, section2 question no. 1) computed above.

\textit{TEST OF HYPOTHESIS 1}

Calculation of Expected Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>D.M.P</th>
<th>I.N.C.P</th>
<th>I.D.C</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected Frequency $= \frac{\sum o}{n}$

$E = \frac{\sum o}{n} = \frac{67 + 298 + 12}{3}$
\[
E = \frac{377}{3} = 125.67
\]

Table 4.5.1a: Test of Hypothesis I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>0 – E</th>
<th>((0 – E)^2)</th>
<th>(\sum(0 – E)^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision making process</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>125.67</td>
<td>-58.67</td>
<td>3442.1689</td>
<td>27.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in community</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>125.67</td>
<td>172.33</td>
<td>29697.629</td>
<td>236.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>125.67</td>
<td>-113.67</td>
<td>12920.869</td>
<td>102.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summation</td>
<td>377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(X^2)</td>
<td>366.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2011

The Degree of Freedom (DF)

\[
= (R-1)(C-1)
= (2-1) (3-1)
= (1) (2)
= 2
\]

1 df at 0.05 = 5.99

\[5.99 < 366.52\]
Thus, the critical value of Chi-square at 95% confidence level at 2 Degree of Freedom is 5.99

**Decision Rule 1:**

As could be observed from Table 4.5.1a above, the table value (366.52) is greater than the critical value (5.99). Going by the decision rule, we reject the Null Hypothesis and accept the Alternative Hypothesis, which states that:

H$_1$: The level of community participation is properly understood in project implementation.

**Test of Hypothesis II**

To test hypothesis 2, we adopted the Chi-Square test. Again, the level of confidence chosen for the test is 95% using the Murray’s formula (Murray, 1992). The said formula is given as follows:

\[
X^2 = \sum (o-e)^2
\]

Where

\(X^2\) = measurement of discrepancy existing between the observed and expected frequencies

\(o\) = observed frequencies

\(e\) = expected frequencies

\(\Sigma\) = Summation
The decision rule with regards to the above statistical formular is, where the computed value of $X^2$ exceeds its critical (or table) value, the NULL HYPOTHESIS is rejected and the ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESIS is accepted. When the computed value of $X^2$ equals or is less than that of the critical (or table) value, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Our hypothesis number two is:

$H_2$: Community members are not keen to participate to participate in developmental programmes.

$H_2$: Community members are not keen to participate in developmental programmes.

The data used to test this hypothesis are drawn from our

Table 2.4.16 above: Distribution on Whether the Community Members Are Willing To Participate In Development Programmes

(see questionnaire, Section2 Question No.21)computed above.

**TEST OF HYPOTHESIS 2**

Calculation of Expected Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field Survey, 2011

$$E = \sum o = 287 + 90$$
\[ E = \frac{377}{2} = 188.5 \]

Table 4.5.1b: Test of Hypothesis II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>0 – E</th>
<th>(0 – E)^2</th>
<th>(\sum (0 – E)^2 / (E))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>188.5</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>9702.25</td>
<td>51.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>188.5</td>
<td>-98.5</td>
<td>9702.25</td>
<td>51.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summation</td>
<td>377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X^2 102.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2011

The Degree of Freedom (DF)

\[ DF = (R-1)(C-1) \]
\[ = (2-1) (2-1) \]
\[ = (1) (1) \]
\[ DF = 1 \]

1 df at 0.05 = 3.84

3.84 < 102.94

Thus, the critical value of Chi-square at 95% confidence level at 1 Degree of Freedom is 3.84

Decision Rule 2:
As could be observed from Table 4.5.1b above, the table value (102.94) is greater than the critical value (3.84). Going by the decision rule, we reject the **Null Hypothesis** and accept the **Alternative Hypothesis**, which states that:

**H2:** Community members are keen to participate in developmental programmes.

**Test of Hypothesis III**

To test hypothesis 3, we adopted the Chi-Square test. Again, the level of confidence chosen for the test is 95% using the Murray’s formula (Murray, 1992). The said formula is given as follows:

\[
X^2 = \frac{\sum (o-e)^2}{e}
\]

Where

- \( X^2 \) = measurement of discrepancy existing between the observed and expected frequencies
- \( o \) = observed frequencies
- \( e \) = expected frequencies
- \( \Sigma \) = Summation

The decision rule with regards to the above statistical formular is, where the computed value of \( X^2 \) exceeds its critical (or table) value, the **NULL HYPOTHESIS** is rejected and the **ALTERNATIVE**
HYPOTHESIS is accepted. When the computed value of $X^2$ equals or is less than that of the critical (or table) value, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Our hypothesis number three states that:

$H_3$: Effective community participation in development initiative (projects) will not bring concrete rural development.

$H_3$: Effective community participation in development initiative (projects) will bring concrete rural development.

The data used in testing hypothesis three are drawn from our.

**Table 4.2.12 above: Distribution On Whether Effective Community Participation Can Boost Rural Development (see questionnaire , section2 question no.6 )computed above.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field Survey, 2011

Expected Frequency $= \frac{\sum_0}{n}$

$E = \frac{309 + 90}{2} = \frac{188.5}{2}$
E = 188.5

**Table 4.5.1c: Test of Hypothesis III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>0 – E</th>
<th>((0 – E)^2)</th>
<th>(\sum(0 – E)^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>188.5</td>
<td>120.5</td>
<td>14520.25</td>
<td>77.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>188.5</td>
<td>-120.5</td>
<td>14520.25</td>
<td>77.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summation</td>
<td>377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X^2</td>
<td>154.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field Survey, 2011

The Degree of Freedom (DF)

\[
= (R-1)(C-1) \\
= (2-1)(2-1) \\
= (1)(1)
\]

DF = 1

1 df at 0.05 = 3.84

3.84 < 154.06

**Decision Rule 3:**

As could be observed from Table 4.5.1c above, the table value (154.06) is greater than the critical value (3.84). Going by the decision
rule, we reject the **Null Hypothesis** and accept the **Alternative Hypothesis**, which states that: Effective community participation in development initiative (projects) can inform concrete rural development.

**Test of Hypothesis IV**

To test hypothesis 4, we adopted the Chi-Square test. Again, the level of confidence chosen for the test is 95% using the Murray’s formula (Murray, 1992). The said formula is given as follows:

\[ X^2 = \sum (o-e)^2 \]

Where

\[ X^2 = \text{measurement of discrepancy existing between the observed and expected frequencies} \]
\[ o = \text{observed frequencies} \]
\[ e = \text{expected frequencies} \]
\[ \Sigma = \text{Summation} \]

The decision rule with regards to the above statistical formular is, where the computed value of \( X^2 \) exceeds its critical (or table) value, the Null Hypothesis is rejected and the Alternative Hypothesis is accepted. When the computed value of \( X^2 \) equals or is less than that of the critical (or table) value, the null hypothesis is accepted.
Our hypothesis number four states that:

**H₄**: Community members do not have access information regarding projects or development initiatives.

**H₄**: Community members have access information regarding projects or development initiatives.

The data used in testing hypothesis four are drawn from our Table.

### 4.2.16 above: Distribution on whether the community can rate information regarding projects or development initiatives. (see questionnaire, section2 question no.10) computed above

#### TEST OF HYPOTHESIS 4

Calculation of Expected Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field Survey, 2011

Expected Frequency = \( \frac{\sum \alpha}{n} \)

\[
E = \frac{162 + 215}{2} = \frac{377}{2} = 188.5
\]
Table 4.5.1d: Test of Hypothesis IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>0 - E</th>
<th>(0 – E)^2</th>
<th>Σ(0 – E)^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>188.5</td>
<td>-26.5</td>
<td>702.25</td>
<td>3.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>188.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>702.25</td>
<td>3.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summation</td>
<td>377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X^2</td>
<td>7.4575</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2011

The Degree of Freedom (DF)

\[
= (R-1)(C-1) \\
= (2-1) (2-1) \\
= (1) (1) \\
DF = 1
\]

1 df at 0.05 = 3.84

3.84 < 7.458

Decision Rule 4:

As could be observed from Table 4.5.1d above, the table value (7.458) is greater than the critical value (3.84). Going by the decision rule, we reject the Null Hypothesis and accept the Alternative Hypothesis, which states that:

H_4: Community members have adequate information regarding projects or development initiative
4.6: Findings (Conclusion)

From Table 4.5.1 above, we deduce that the p-value is less than 0.01. Therefore, we reject the Null Hypotheses and accept the Alternative Hypotheses, which state thus: The chi-square statistical test is used to test the four hypotheses formulated for this study. The researcher tested the hypotheses manually with the use of chi-square.

**Hypothesis I**

\[ H_1: \] The level of community participation is properly understood in project implementation.

**Hypothesis 2**

\[ H_2: \] Community members are not keen to participate in development programmes.

**Hypothesis 3**

\[ H_3: \] Effective community participation in development initiatives (projects) will not bring concrete rural development.

**Hypothesis 4**

\[ H_4: \] Community members have access to information regarding projects or development initiatives.

**CHAPTER FIVE**

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Summary
The purpose of this study was to assess community participation in sustainable rural development; a study of selected communities in Anambra state. In each of the six communities studied, community participants understood their community as a community of place and their participation in development projects was about collective contributions to a task that was seen as of benefit to the community. Several concepts that are related to this understanding were explored. The aim of the study was achieved through recognition of the following objectives:

**Firstly, to determine the obstacles encountered by citizens which obstruct their participation in development programmes including projects.**

This objective was achieved by means of the literature review in chapter two, limitation to community participation and challenges facing community participation in rural area in particular. The findings of empirical survey study also indicated that community members encountered numerous numbers of problems like conflicts, rural-urban migration and lack of proper implementation of policy etc which hinder their participation in community development processes.
Secondly, to establish to what extent the community members have access to information regarding projects or development initiatives.

This objective was achieved through empirical study where the researcher investigated the involvement of community members in the rural development programmes. However, most respondents indicated that they were not aware of the projects or development programmes contained in the development document. The empirical survey also indicated that communities do not attend meetings that seek to give information regarding community development because of various reasons like personal commitment, no set agenda, top-down approaches.

Thirdly, to suggest the strategies or strategy that the community based associations and other development structures could put into practice to ensure community participation.

This objective was achieved by means of the literature review in chapter two, strategies for community participation in rural communities. Furthermore, the outcomes of the empirical survey indicate that the respondents suggested strategies that can be implemented by the selected local authorities to ensure and improve community participation. The majority of the respondents agreed that
bottom-up approach and other recommended strategies could serve the purpose of achieving meaningful community participation.

Finally, to assess whether community participation is understood and considered in projects implementation or not.

This objective was achieved by both literature reviews in chapter two and by means of survey project. The researcher realises that this objective is addressed by the fact that there are policies formulated by the government, which seek to facilitate effective community participation at local governance level. Nevertheless, community leaders in the selected communities are not doing enough in ensuring that those policies are fully implemented.

The findings of the study indicate that communities have inadequate knowledge of both the concept and practice of community participation. This has been put forward by poor service delivery and lack of empowerment of both municipality officials, community based association and community members. The elements of poor service delivery is created by the fact that community leaders do not make regular reports to the community members about community development processes.

5.2. Conclusion
It is identified that people in selected communities are having inadequate understanding of community participation. This influences the capacity to participate in development programmes. However, community participation in selected rural communities has been measured as a key factor in the success and sustainability of development projects. The literature review in chapter two indicated that community participation has more benefits as opposed to its drawbacks. We could therefore, value community participation and making it a spontaneous activity to do, in order to carry out development initiatives. The findings of the empirical survey showed clearly that the views, feelings and opinions of the community should be heard and implemented by development structures in ensuring public involvement.

In the case of the selected communities, it could be said that there are community members who are trying to avoid conflict by not being artificial. This should not be the case as conflict should not be avoided when it comes to community participation. Discussions could take place, and in the process the stakeholders could have a common vision, but other people’s views could also be appreciated. However, it could be concluded that the success of community meetings should not be measured against the attendance but by its ability to transform needs and wants into tangible solutions.
The findings indicated that there was lack of community participation in development process. Decisions towards community development is taken by only project initiators, without the involvement of community members. It can be concluded that current decision making process does not allow the community an opportunity to inform the development.

The literature and empirical survey show that the first step in achieving authentic community participation contains a process whereby rural communities should become more conscious of their own situation, carefully understand rural socio-economic reality around them, have mutual understanding amongst community members, knowing their problems, the causes of these problems, and what measures they themselves can take to begin changing their situation.

A holistic approach to development at the local, national and international levels should be followed to tackle the challenges of community participation. At the same time there should be continual enhancement of the recognition and promotion of the community. The recognition and mobilisation of the potential of all stakeholders and the people themselves can make a significant contribution to achieving effective community participation.
It is concluded that the project initiators and community leaders should create an enabling environment for participation and this should include addressing the factors influencing community participation as well as the capacity gaps within the community in order to achieve effective community participation.

5.3. Recommendations

These patterns of the problems of community participation in the rural communities are not likely to continue with a well-governed and managed rural development through physical planning process and enabling environment that allows a space for communities to interact with project initiators and community leaders about development processes. The following specific recommendation, among others, should be considered in the efforts to strengthen community participation:

5.3.1. Existing Mechanisms

Guidelines to improve existing public participation mechanisms are required. The selected rural community, more specifically would benefit from the following practice:

➢ Okpoko and Abagana community: the best practice guidelines need to be developed. At the moment there is some real world
success in securing attendance (access) at Okpoko, but more
needs to be done to secure meaningful participation (voice) and
follow-up (impact).

➢ Community leaders: resources are needed for (i) effective
evacuation of community leaders committee and (ii) train
community leader’s members. Perhaps more important though is
(iii) the need to empower community in various development
process.

5.3.2. New Mechanisms

Methods to introduce new public participation mechanisms are
required. Some possibilities include:

➢ Communities have been deprived of information on the role of
their effort in development processes. In this case there is a strong
need for awareness on the role of the communities and their
indigenous knowledge systems in ensuring community
participation. As such there is a need to establish community
based information technological centers (ITC) for the display,
storage and dissemination of community participation related
knowledge to communities. Local government and NGOs should
strengthen community awareness on the value of the role of the rural people by involving people in decision making system,

➢ Creating platforms where communities will be able to express their feelings without fear.

➢ Engaging all relevant stakeholders during the planning stage of the projects.

➢ Integrated development plan meetings should be effectively publicized in order to allow the communities to have an opportunity to identify their needs and problems and device mechanisms to meet such needs;

➢ A holistic approach to development at the local, national and international levels should be followed to tackle the challenges of community participation. At the same time there should be continual enhancement of the recognition and promotion of the community.

➢ The recognition and mobilisation of the potential of all stakeholders and the people themselves can make a significant contribution to achieving effective community participation.

➢ Creating forums for meetings, workshops, and conferences to discuss and debate pertinent issues open.
➢ Project initiators should create an enabling environment for participation and this should include addressing the factors influencing community participation as well as the capacity gaps within the community in order to achieve effective community participation.

➢ Traditional authorities should be included in the development of rural areas;

➢ Rural communities should become more conscious of their own situation, carefully understand rural socio-economic reality around them, have mutual understanding amongst community members, knowing their problems, the causes of these problems, and what measures they themselves can take to begin changing their situation.

➢ Effective implementation of existing policy framework for community participation.

With the fulfillment of the above recommendations, community participation would be accelerated, the community will be empowered and the lives of the community will be improved.
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APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

Institute for Development Studies,
School of Graduates Studies,
University of Nigeria,
Enugu Campus.

Community Based Associations
Okpoko Town,
Anambra State.

Dear Sir,

Request for Permission to Carry Out a Community Research in your Area

I am Okafor Onyinye. J. registered for a Masters in Development Studies in the Institute for Development Studies at the University of Nigeria under the supervision of Prof. Ogbuefi J.U.

I hereby request for a permission to conduct a research on community participation in your Area. The topic for my research study is as follows: community participation in sustainable rural development; a study of selected communities in Anambra state.

The research findings would be made available to you at your request. Furthermore, all data collected from community members would be kept confidential as possible.

I will also administer questionnaires to other community members selected for this study in communities.

The researcher will be delighted if my request will be approved and accepted.

Thanking you in anticipation

Yours sincerely

Okafor Onyinye. J.
Dear Respondent,

This questionnaire is specifically directed to, men, women and youths in your community and is designed to study community participation in sustainable rural development; a study of selected association in Anambra state.

The researcher will appreciate your sincere response as the conclusions drawn from this research work will be directed at improving the capacity of community participation in the rural communities. Participation in this survey is voluntary; though we crave your indulgence to participate actively as your views are important.

Finally, let me quickly add that this work is purely for research purposes and as such, your response will therefore be strictly treated with utmost confidentiality.

Thanks for your Kind Co-operation.

Yours faithfully,

Okafor Onyinye. J.

Appendix III
University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus Institute for Development Studies

Questionnaire on community participation in sustainable rural development; a study of selected communities in Anambra state.

Section A

The goal of the study is to assess community participation in rural development and its implications in selected communities in Anambra State.

Biological information of participants

1. Sex (a) Male [ ] (b) Female [ ]

2. Age (a) 18-24 years [ ] (b) 25-30 [ ]
   (c) 31-35 years [ ] (c) 36+ [ ]

3. Marital status
   (a) Single [ ] (b) Married [ ] (c) Widowed [ ]
   (d) Divorced [ ]

4. Education level
   (a) Illiterate [ ] (b) Primary [ ]
   (c) Secondary [ ] (d) Tertiary [ ]

5. Length of period living in the area
   (a) 1-10 years [ ] (b) Over 10 years [ ]

6. Community of representation
   (a) Umudim [ ] (b) Igboukwu [ ]
Section B

This section consists of questions that seek to collect information about community participation in rural development process.

1) What is your understanding of community participation in development projects?
   (a) Decision making process [ ]
   (b) Involvement in community projects [ ]
   (c) I don’t know [ ]

2) Do you participate in development programmes which are taking place in your community?
   (a) Yes [ ] (b) No [ ]

3) Do your community benefit from participating in the projected projects?
   (a) Yes [ ] (b) No [ ]

4) Do you think community participation can engender development?
   (a) Yes [ ] (b) No [ ]

5) What is the way of encouraging communities to participate in development projects?
   a) Community engagement in planning of the project [ ]
   b) Strict implementation of decisions [ ]
   c) Creation of open platform for discussion [ ]
   d) Compiling community profile [ ]
6) Do you think effective community participation can boost rural development?
   (a) Yes [ ] (b) No [ ]

7) Is your community given a chance to identify and prioritize the projects which should be implemented?
   (a) Yes [ ] (b) No [ ]

8) Are you aware of any on-going development project in your community?
   (a) Yes [ ] (b) No [ ]

9) Identify the most important project executed by government through community participation?
   (a) Education [ ]
   (b) Road [ ]
   (c) Water [ ]
   (d) Health [ ]
   (e) Electricity [ ]

10) How can you rate information regarding projects or development initiatives in your community?
    (a) High [ ] (b) Low [ ]

11) Do you attend community meetings?
    (a) Yes [ ] (b) No [ ]

If the answer to 11 is No, please give reason.
   a) No set agenda [ ]
   b) Personal commitment [ ]
   c) Not interested in public opinion [ ]
   d) Top-down approaches [ ]
12) At what level does involvement of the community in development programmes take place?

(a) Planning level [    ]
(b) Decision making process [    ]
(c) Implementation process [    ]
(d) Not at all [    ]

13) What should be done to improve community participation in rural development process in your community?

(a) Creating awareness [    ]
(b) Transparency [    ]
(c) Implementation of decisions [    ]
(d) All of the above [    ]

14) Do you partake in elections of current leaders of your community?

(a) Yes [    ] (b) No [    ]

If No is the answer to no. 14, what is your reason?

(a) Lack of information [    ]
(b) Time constrain [    ]
(c) Lack of transparency [    ]
(d) Political interference [    ]

15) What is the benefit of community capacity building towards rural development?

(a) Ability to spend government money [    ]
(b) Enable community to rule [    ]
(c) Increase community participation [    ]
(d) Enable them to maintain project [    ]
16) Are opinions of community members sought and considered by the CBAs while making decision on community projects?
   (a) Yes [    ] (b) No [    ]

17) What is the best mechanism to ensure trust between the community and community leaders?
   (a) Regular feedback [    ]
   (b) Involvement of community members [    ]
   (c) Honest with financial affairs [    ]
   (d) Proper Corporation [    ]
   (e) Avoid bad publicity [    ]

18) Have the process of community participation in your community resulted to understanding projects implementation by the people?
   (a) Yes [    ] (b) No [    ]

19) Do you think community members still trust the current authorities in bringing change in the community?
   (a) Yes [    ] (b) No [    ]

20) Effective community participation can be achieved through?
   (a) Active participation [    ]
   (b) Partial participation [    ]

21) Do you think community participation in development programmes/projects is important?
   (a) Yes [    ] (b) No [    ]

If the answer to question 21 is yes, please give reason.
   (a) Empowerment of citizen [    ]
   (b) Involvement in decision making [    ]
(c) Create local ownership [ ]
(d) Improvement of project effectiveness [ ]

22) Are your community members willing to participate in development programmes?
   (a) Yes [ ] (b) No [ ]

23) What are the main problems that prevent involvement of community member into development projects?
   (a) Lack of community support [ ]
   (b) Time constrain [ ]
   (c) Lack of general information [ ]
   (d) Political Rivalry [ ]
   (e) All of the above [ ]

24) What is the primary implication of non-participation of communities in rural development?
   (a) Failure to attend to people’s priority [ ]
   (b) Lack of interest by the people [ ]
   (c) Poor implementation [ ]
   (d) All of the above [ ]