AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
http://ageconsearch.umn.edu
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

Asian Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development

journal homepage: http://aessweb.com/journal-detail.php?id=5005

Assessment of Benefits Derived from SACDP/IFAD through Community based Participatory Projects in Bodinga Zone

Attahiru, M.
Department of Agriculture, Sokoto State Polytechnic, Sokoto, Nigeria

B. Z. Abubakar and A. A. Barau
Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, Usmanu Danfodiyo University, Sokoto, Nigeria

Abstract

The study was carried out to assess the benefits derived from SACDP/IFAD through community based participatory projects in Bodinga zone. The zone comprises four villages from two local government areas. All the four villages were purposively selected for the study. Eighty (80) respondents were randomly selected and interviewed using structured questionnaire (60 male and 20 female). Data collected was analyzed using frequency and percentages. Results revealed that majority of the respondents are men, married and within their active productive age. Results further show that majority of the respondents have benefitted from one project or the other and have subsequently replicated similar community based initiatives. It is recommended that vigorous efforts be put in place by both donor agencies and government to enhance rural people derivation of benefits from community based participatory projects and participation in self-help initiatives.

Keywords: Assessment, community, benefits and participatory projects

Introduction

While the past decade has been dominated by efforts to promote a more participatory approach, the concept of participation in development is not entirely new. By the late 1940s, the early initiatives of development assistance and of planned interventions in underdeveloped countries to promote development and change had commenced. However, it was in the 1950s, and particularly in the 1960s, that these initiatives, via the actions of processes of community development, sought to involve local people in efforts to improve their communities. Community development in the 1960s built the infrastructure of rural and urban communities; it also developed local skills and abilities and encouraged local people to play a part in and to take some responsibility for supporting and implementing a range of physical infrastructure works. Community development at that time also sought to build community-based organizations to serve as vehicles through which local people could get actively involved. It promoted literacy campaigns to enable people to better understand and relate to existing administrative bodies. It sought to generate a sense of cohesiveness and solidarity among community members (UNDP, 2005). The 1980s and 1960s saw

Corresponding author's
Name: A. A. Barau
Email address: akilutsafe@yahoo.com

the community development movement flourish and particularly in Africa and Asia, national programmes sought to build community infrastructure and to break down communities' inclusion from development activities (UNDP, 2005). The style was quite generalized (although in West Africa Animation Rural was seen as more instructive), and the community development worker was seen as a government official working at the interface between the outside forces of modernization and the natural conservatism and suspicion of rural communities. Community development did promote communities involvement but it was for an already agreed purpose. Control was usually exercised externally and communities were seen as contributing to and supporting the national development agenda and not necessarily as being instrumental in determining its content or direction (UNDP, 2005). While community development as a basic strategy of community involvement persisted into the 1970s, it has largely lost its predominance. Changing analyses and examination of underdevelopment in the late 1970s and 1980s began to offer different explanations of the causes of people's poverty and to suggest different forms of project design. Poor people were seen as excluded and marginalized both from broader societal participation and also to devise strategies whereby poor people could become more directly involved in development efforts. In development terms the last decade or so has been largely dominated by efforts to promote peoples participation in development, which would involve a fundamental shift - both in attitudes and in methodology – if it was to break decades of top-down non-participatory practice. Since the early 1990s the major donor development agencies here put their weight behind and committed resources to promoting participatory development (UNDP, 2005).

Rural communities are faced with a number of problems. These affect economic growth and well being of the people. In spite of decades of effort and some progress made, as much as one fifth of the world's population still lives in chronic poverty in rural areas (FAO, 1992). And unless the communities are carried along in the process, any project intervention strategy will not stand much chance of success. It is against this background that this study was carried out in order to assess the benefits derived from SACDP/IFAD through community based participatory project in the Bodinga zone of Sokoto state, Nigeria.

Methodology

The study was carried out in Bodinga zone of Sokoto Agricultural and Community Development Project with assistance from International Fund for Agricultural Development (SACDP/IFAD). It comprises Bodinga and Silame Local government areas of Sokoto state. Bodinga zone comprises a number of districts and villages and is located within latitude 12°N to 14°N and longitudes 5°E to 6°E (SACDP/IFAD, 1998). The zone share boarders with Yabo and Shagari local government areas to the west, Dange/Shuni and Tureta local government areas to the East, Wamakko and Binji local government areas and some villages of neighbouring Argungu local government area of Kebbi state to the south. Bodinga zone is blessed with abundant natural resources that include extensive area of fertile upland and lowland for arable crop production. Farming and artisanal fishing are the predominant occupations of the people in the zone. Both rainfed and irrigated crops are well grown in the zone. They include: sorghum, millet, groundnut, including onions, rice, tomatoes, pepper etc. Animals reared in the zone are cattle, sheep, goats, donkeys, horses and poultry.

Vegetation in the zone is typically Sudan savanna type characterized by scarce or sparse grass population, shrubs and scattered trees such as *Acacia albida* (Gawo) and *Acacia nilotica* (Bagaruwa) (SACDP/IFAD, 1998). The population of Bodinga and Silame local government areas is 113,467

and 60,284 respectively. The zone is dominated by the famous Hausa-Fulani of northern Nigeria (Sokoto State Diary, 1995). Bodinga zone is one of the six (6) zones of SACDP/IFAD project in Sokoto state. It was created in the last quarter of 1995, with headquarters at Bodinga and commenced work actively in the first quarter of 1996 (IFAD, 1988).

Primary data was generated through interview of farmers using questionnaire. The secondary sources of data include published and unpublished literature such as textbook, research journals, student's research projects, seminar papers, internet and SACDP/IFAD official documents.

Purposive sampling was used to select the benefiting villages in the local government areas. The villages are Kwacciyar lalle and Mazangari (Bodinga LG), Silame and Labani (Silame LG). Eighty (80) respondents were selected; 20 from each of the four (4) village areas. To ensure representation of the entire population, simple random sampling technique was employed to obtain the needed sample size.

Data collected for this research was subjected to descriptive statistical analysis such as frequency and percentage.

Results and discussion

Table 1 shows that 75 percent of the respondents were male, while 25 percent were female; which implies that men participated more in community development projects. This is in line with Olawoye, (1989) and Abdullahi, (1996) as cited by Yahuza, (2000) who observed that female respondents do not participate actively in community development project, despite the significant role they need to play in community development projects. 55 percent of the respondents fall within the age range of 21-40, 41.25 percent fall within the age range of 41-60, 2.5 percent fall within the age range of 1-20 and 1.25 percent were 61 and above, implying that majority of the respondents were within the active productive age (21-40years), because it is at this age that individuals are found more capable and energetic enough to perform the duties assigned to them effectively, this is in line with Adamu, (1997) as cited by Yahuza, (2000) who observed that majority of the extension workers were within active productive age when they fall within the obtained age range. Majority (91.25 percent) of the respondents were married, 5 percent were divorced, 2.5 percent were single while 1.25 percent was widows. This indicates that marriage is not a barrier to participation which this is in line with Yahuza, (2000) and Igben, (1935) as cited by Isa, (1999) who found that 95.5 percent of Nigerian farmers were married. Most (43.75 percent) of the respondents acquired Qur'anic and adult education, 12.5 percent primary education, 21.25 percent acquired secondary education while 22.5 acquired tertiary education. This result indicates that majority of the respondents do not possess higher educational qualification which might not necessarily be a negative factor to benefit derivation in the zone. Rahman, (1987) as cited by Isa (1999) also said that formal or informal training and conscious raising activities build beneficiaries' capacity. The table further reveals that most of the people that benefitted from community development project have farming (31.25 percent) as their primary occupation, 26.25 percent were traders, 26.25 percent engaged in small scale enterprise, while 16.25 percent were civil servants. This indicates that most of the people that benefitted from community development project in the zone are farmers and traders, even though others engaged in other worthwhile activities.

Table 1: Distribution of respondents according to their socio-economic characteristics

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	60	75
Female	20	25
Total	80	100
Age range		
20-Jan	2	2.5
21-40	44	55
41-60	33	41.25
61 and above	1	1.25
Total	80	100
Marital status		
Single	2	2.5
Married	73	91.25
Divorced	4	5
Widowed	1	1.25
Total	80	100
Level of education		
Qur'anic & adult education	35	43.75
Primary education	10	12.5
Secondary education	17	21.25
Above secondary education	18	22.5
Total	80	100
Primary occupation		
Farming	39	48.75
Trading	9	11.25
Civil servant	20	25
Others	12	15
Total	80	100
Primary occupation		
Farming	25	31.25
Trading	21	26.25
Civil servant	13	16.25
Others	21	26.25
Total	80	100

Table 2 shows that 75 percent of the respondent had benefitted for 1-5 years and 25 percent had benefitted for 6-10 years. This implies that all the respondents had benefitted from the project for more than one year.

Table 2: Distribution of respondents according to period (years) of benefits

Years Range	Frequency	Percentage
5-Jan	60	75
10-Jun	20	25
15-Nov	0	0
16 and above	0	0
Total	80	100

Table 3 shows that 50 percent of the respondents had benefitted through provision of infrastructure, 33.75 percent through credit facilities, while 16.25 percent through provision of Para-veterinary clinics. This implies that all the respondents had benefitted from one or the other of community development projects.

Table 3: Distribution of respondents based on type of benefits they derived from SACDP/IFAD project

Types of projects	Frequency	Percentage
Provision of	40	50

infrastructure		
Access to loan	27	33.75
Para-veterinary clinics	13	16.25
Total	80	100

Table 4 shows that 33.75 percent of the respondents had participated in school construction, 11.25 percent had partake in road rehabilitation while 55 percent had participated in other forms of community development projects before SACDP/IFAD intervention. This attest to the fact that the rural dwellers in the zone are knowledgeable of the relevance of community based participatory projects before the SACDP/IFAD intervention.

Table 4: Distribution of respondents based on type of Community development projects executed in their communities before the intervention of SACDP/ IFAD project

Types of projects	Frequency	Percentage
School	27	11.25
Road construction & rehabilitation	9	33.75
Others	44	55
Total	80	100

Table 5 shows that the entire respondent had embarked on one project or another after SACDP/IFAD intervention projects. This indicates that SACDP/IFAD project had stimulated and encouraged the benefitting communities to initiate self-help community development projects in their areas. This further proves the propensity of extension workers to motivate self-help initiatives. Moussa (2002) asserted that extension agents are very active in awakening farmers for sustainable natural resources management.

Table 5: Distribution of respondents based on whether they embark on similar project after SACDP/IFAD project

Responds	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	80	100
No	0	0
Total	80	100

Table 6 shows that 47.5 percent of the respondents had participated in road rehabilitation, 27.5 percent participated in schools construction, and 25 percent had partaken in Mosque constructions. This indicates that all the respondents have participated in one form of community development project or the other after SACDP/IFAD intervention. It is line with Paul, (1987) as cited by Isa, (1999) that the most essential organizational groups used, or the "instruments" for active community participation are existing self-help groups.

Table 6: Distribution of respondents based on the type of project executed after SACDP/IFAD intervention

Types of project	Frequency	Frequency
Road construction & rehab	38	47.05
School	22	27.5
Mosque	20	25
Total	80	100

Table 7 shows that 53.75 percent of the respondents contributed labour, 36.25 percent contributed financially while 10 percent contributed through provision of food, water and other incentives to encourage the people that supplied labour during the community development projects. This indicates that labour is the major contribution of the people in community development projects in the area. This goes a long way to confirm the findings of Isa, (1999) who observed that rural people are ready to contribute money, labour and materials resources to improve their living condition.

Table 7: Distribution of respondents based on the contributions they gave in the execution of any community development projects in their respective areas

Types of project	Frequency	Percentage
Labour	43	53.75
Materials	0	0
Financial	29	36.25
Others	8	10
Total	80	100

Table 8 shows that all the respondents in the area contribute towards sustaining the facilities put in place for them through community labour. This indicates that respondents in the area are ever ready to sustain any community development project executed in their communities. This is in line with Moussa (2002) who observed in his area of study that from the assistance given by the government, farmers participate more in natural resources management and increased their production, soil quality and keep the soil good for all.

Table 8: Distribution of respondents based on contribution given towards sustaining the facilities put in place for them by SACDP/IFAD in their areas

Ways of sustainability	Frequency	Percentage
Community labor	80	100
Community taxation	0	0
Local government	0	0
None substance	0	0
Total	80	100

Table 9 shows that 56.25 percent of the respondent had attributed their problems to little support from the government, 28.75 percent attributed it to lack of adequate awareness and 15 percent linked it to leadership problem. This indicates that rural people are ready to initiate community development projects and derive its benefits, but hindered from full satisfaction by certain problems.

Table 9: Distribution of respondents based on the problems they encountered during execution of any community development project

Responds	Frequency	Percentage
Little govt's support	45	56.25
Inadequate awareness	23	28.75
Poor leadership	12	15
Total	80	100

Table 10 shows that 37.5 percent of the respondents suggested public enlightenment in promoting peoples' participation and full benefit derivation in community development projects, 28.75 percent were of the view that motivation would serve, 23.75 percent were of the view that government support would boost their morale to participate and benefit in community development projects while 10 percent were of the view that trustworthy and dedicated leaders would promote people's participation and benefit derivation in the study area. This implies that benefitting community members are ready to participate in their own development and harness the full benefits of community based projects, but require solution to their faced bottlenecks.

Table 10: Distribution of respondents based on suggestion they made towards promoting people's participation in the execution of any community development project

Responds	Frequency	Percentage
Public enlightenment	30	37.5
Support from the Govt.	19	23.75
Motivation		28.75
Trust & dedicated leaders should	23	
Be appointed to head	8	10

organisation(s)		
Total	80	100

Conclusion

The continuity of any society depends on the survival of its communities, it is therefore paramount, to note that some socio-cultural characteristics influence participation of people in community development programmes. To this effect, to identify constraints to derivation of benefits of any participatory development strategy, it becomes necessary to evaluate beneficiary's socio-cultural characteristics, assess their needs, involve them in activities that are meant for them and mobilize them to take active part in all policies meant for their welfare. Bringing beneficiaries only when such policies had been formulated and everything sealed-up, the project is bound to fail. This could also lead to cynicism and make rural people doubt the veracity of the policy, thus less benefit derivation.

Recommendations

Having examined the benefits derived from community development projects, and contribution of SACDP/1FAD project in stimulating and encouraging rural people in initiating and execution of self-help community development projects. It is essential that the following recommendations are offered with a view to draw the attention of government and donor agencies towards ensuring the realization of community developments in the study area.

- Vigorous efforts are put in place by both donor agencies and government to enhance rural people derivation of benefits from community based participatory projects

- For a successful project implementation and participation, beneficiaries should be fully involved in project design, implementation and maintenance. This is to remove skepticism and inspire, and motivate the spirit of active participation.

- Manpower training and development should be given priority attention to enable the rural people to update their knowledge and acquire technical know-how to perform to expectation even after intervention.

- Adequate working materials should be provided to the rural areas, as these would enable them to realize their needs and their potentials and ways of exploiting those potentials through self-help initiatives.

References

FAO, (1992). *Peoples participation in rural development*. The FAO plan for action

IFAD (1988). *Strategic framework for IFAD 2002-2006 strengthening the capacity of the rural poor and their organization.* http://www.ifad.org/pub/ar.htm.

Isa, M. M. (1999). *Factors affecting participation in community development projects of Sokoto Agricultural and Community development project (SACDP) in Yabo local government area of Sokoto sate*. Unpublished BSc. Project Report, Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Faculty of Agriculture, Usmanu Danfodiyo University Sokoto.

Moussa, T. (2002). *Factors affecting the participation of farmers in natural resources management in Doutchi local government area of Niger Republic*. Unpublished BSc. Project report, department of Agricultural economics and extension, faculty of Agriculture, Usmanu Danfodiyo University, Sokoto.

Rahman, M. A. (1987). Participation of the rural poor in development. *Development*, 1(1), 3-5.

SACDP/IFAD (1998). *A community participatory approach to poverty alleviation and natural resource management in Sokoto state*. A

Review of Project Achievement and Journey to Success. An overview report of SACDP/IFAD head office.

Sokoto State Diary (1995). *Local Government Development in Sokoto State*, p. 8.

UNDP/Sustainable livelihood, (2005). *Empowering people: A guide to participation.* *http://www.Undp.org/sl/documents/manuals/ empowring/chapter l-3.htm*

Yahuza, G. I. (2000). *Assessment of training needs of extension workers in Sokoto Agricultural and Community development project (SACDP/IFAD).* Unpublished BSc Project report, Department of Agricultural Economic and Extension, Faculty of Agriculture, Usmanu Danfodiyo University Sokoto.