



*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](mailto: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.*

*No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.*



## **Assessment of Rural and Agricultural Development Projects in Okehi Local Government Area of Kogi State, Nigeria**

**A. I. Age<sup>1\*</sup>, S. K. Vihi<sup>2</sup> and O. D. Adeiza<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agricultural Extension and Communication, University of Agricultural, Makurdi,  
Benue State, Nigeria.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Agricultural Extension and Management, Federal College of Forestry, Jos,  
Plateau State, Nigeria.

### **Authors' contributions**

*This work was carried out in collaboration between all authors. Author AIA designed the study, wrote the protocol and supervised the work. Authors SKV and ODA carried out all laboratories work and performed the statistical analysis. Author AIA managed the analyses of the study. Author AIA wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Author SKV managed the literature searches and edited the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.*

### **Article Information**

DOI: 10.9734/AJAEES/2016/22462

#### Editor(s):

(1) Kwong Fai Andrew Lo, Agronomy and Soil Science, Chinese Culture University,  
Taipei, Taiwan.

#### Reviewers:

(1) Sanjay Kanti Das, Lumding College, Assam, India.

(2) Kabi Prasad Pokhrel, Tribhuvan University, Nepal.

Complete Peer review History: <http://sciencedomain.org/review-history/12606>

**Original Research Article**

**Received 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2015**  
**Accepted 16<sup>th</sup> November 2015**  
**Published 9<sup>th</sup> December 2015**

### **ABSTRACT**

The research study was carried out to assess the present state of the Rural and Agricultural Development Project in Okehi Local Government Area of Kogi State. The population of this study consisted of all the Rural farmers in Okehi Local Government Area of Kogi State. Data for this study were collected from both primary and secondary sources. Primary data were collected using structured questionnaire alongside interview techniques. Secondary data were collected using journals, internet sources, conference papers and text books. Due to the enormity of this population, a sample size of 160 respondents was selected using purposive and simple random sampling techniques. Data for this study were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: akosoiabee@yahoo.com;

distribution tables, percentages as well as inferential statistics such as Factor analysis and Kruskal Wallis (H) test. The result obtained revealed that there was no significant differences ( $P < 0.05$ ) among the five council wards in Okehi Local Government Area in terms of prioritized rural and agricultural development facilities needed by the people. The result showed that the available existing agricultural development facilities in the study area were agricultural extension office (5.35%), fertilizer distribution center (4.29%), poultry farms (4.2%), fish ponds (1.0%), veterinary clinic (0.35%). The existing rural infrastructure include, pipe born water (3.6%), tertiary institutions (3.3%), bridges (3.0%), commercial banks (2.7%), bore holes/wells (2.6%) feeder road (2.5%), electricity supply (2.9%), council hall (2.1%), recreational facilities (1.9%). It was however discovered that even the few existing rural and agricultural infrastructures were either in poor state or dilapidated. And there were two major categories of problems affecting rural and agricultural development in the study area Viz: Socio-cultural cum economic factors (factor1) and politico ecological factors (factor2). It was recommended that Government should always conduct situational analysis of the rural areas so as to have a clear view of the basic needs of the people. Agricultural development projects such as veterinary clinics, agricultural extension offices, fertilizer distribution centres and poverty alleviation programs should be situated in rural areas by government and non-governmental organizations so as to raise the standard of living of the rural people. Rural infrastructural facilities such as feeder roads, bridges, coverts, bore holes/wells, pipe born water, commercial banks, recreational facilities, tertiary institutions, electricity supply etc., should be provided by our well to do individuals, the private sector as well as Government. Government should put in place monitoring and evaluation machinery to ensure proper monitoring and evaluation of rural and agricultural development projects. Integrated Rural and Agricultural Development Approach (IRAD) should be adopted by the government in tackling the problems of rural and agricultural development.

*Keywords: Assessment; rural; agricultural development; projects.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Rural and agricultural development has been the major priority area of the government since independence in 1960 [1]. A lot of attention has been channeled towards rural and agricultural transformation with a view to empowering the rural people politically, socially and economically [1].

Several government development programmes and policies had evolved over the years and were targeted at rural and agricultural transformation, viz: Operation Feeds the Nation in 1976, Agricultural Development Projects in 1978, the National Accelerated Food Production Programmes (NAFPP) in 1970, Green Revolution Project in 1976, Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI) in 1986, Better Life for Rural Woman in 1987, National Agricultural Land Development Authority (NALDA) IN 1988, National Agriculture Cooperative and Rural Bank (NACRDB) In 1977 and presently the Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project (LEEMP) which has just been reformed in 2009 [2]. Besides, the National Policy on Integrated Rural Development (2001), the National Fadama Development Projects (I, II and III), the ₦200

Billion large scale Agricultural Credit Scheme (2009) and the ₦240 billion Commercial Agricultural programme (2009) etc. had so far been put in place by the past and present governments with a view to promoting agricultural and rural development in this country [2].

All these programmes, projects and policies had been pursued without conscious efforts to integrate the rural people in the planning, implementation and evaluation of such programmes, except LEEMP, thus greater percentage of Nigerians are being marginalized in the scheme of things affecting the dream of sustainable rural development [3]. More so, government officials have been paying lip service to rural development programmes or projects in order to gain cheap political points [2]. The beneficiaries of rural development projects should be involved in the decision making process at all stages of project development. In recent times, it has been found that rural communities have always been neglected and relegated to the background for quite a long time now, for no fault of theirs in Nigeria [1]. As a result, most of the rural development projects embarked upon by external experts had foundered, due to the fact that the rural people

who wear the shoes and know where it pinches were ignored and not recognized. This fact is attributable to the sectoral approach employed by the past successive governments and other development agencies as reflected in inadequate funding of capital projects, corruption, lack of transparency, accountability and inarticulate rural development policies [4]. The fallout of all these is the continued existence of wide gaps between rural and urban areas in terms of development.

The implementation of projects in the public sector has been observed to be plagued with a wide range of problems and issues. Cusworth and Franks [5] described project failure on two levels: failure to implement the project effectively, that is on time, within budgetary year and according to plan; and the inability of the project facilities created to achieve the intended impact. These situations have been associated with weak institutional and financial arrangements within the public sector [5].

### 1.1 Statement of the Problem

In spite of the efforts made by the government and non-governmental organizations to ensure that there are adequate rural and agricultural development infrastructure in Okehi Local Government Area of Kogi state, through enacting of various agricultural policies/programmes and projects by the past and present governments, there is still poor improvement in rural and agricultural development projects in Okehi Local Government Area of Kogi state. This trend is worrisome and all efforts should be made to effect positive changes. The unstable political leadership and poor management of our political office holders, which is more or less undemocratic also denies the people in the study area the opportunity to take part in the decision making process of the government. In this regard, the leadership is no longer attentive to the needs, yearnings and aspirations of the people. This ugly development could perhaps account for rural and agricultural underdevelopment in Kogi State in general and Okehi Local Government Area in particular. Although several research works have been done in other States of the federation towards combating this ugly trend, little or nothing has been done to assess rural and Agricultural Development projects in Okehi Local Government Area of Kogi State. For example, Age et al. [6] worked on situational assessment of rural and agricultural development projects of the University of Agriculture, Makurdi and its host

community, and Anonguku [7] worked on rural and agricultural development projects in Benue and Nasarawa States. There is therefore need to refill this research vacuum.

From the foregoing, the following research questions are pertinent to this study:

1. What are the socio-economic characteristics of the people in the study area?
2. What are the existing rural and agricultural development projects in the study area?
3. What are the prioritized needs of the people in the study area?
4. To what extent have the Rural and Agricultural Development projects been implemented in the study area?
5. What are the problems militating against rural and agricultural development in the study area?

### 1.2 Objectives of Study

The broad objective of this study was to assess the present status of rural and agricultural development projects in Okehi L.G.A, Kogi State. The specific objectives of this study were to:

1. Identify the socio-economic characteristics of respondents in the study area;
2. Identify the existing rural and agricultural development projects in the study area;
3. Determine the prioritized need of the people in the study area;
4. Ascertain the extent to which rural and agricultural development projects have been implemented in the past four years (2010-2014);
5. Determine problems militating against implementation of rural and agricultural development project in the study area.

### 1.3 Statement of Hypotheses

Based on the specific objectives of this study, the following null hypothesis was stated and tested:

1. There is no significant difference in the existing rural and agricultural development projects in the study area.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 The Study Area

This study was carried out in Okehi Local Government Area of Kogi State, which was

carved out of the then Ebiru Division during the administration of General Olusegun Obasanjo in 1976.

The Local Government Area is made up of two districts-Erika and Ihima. Ihima district is made up of seven council wards; Obeiba II, Ikuehi, Ohuete, Oboroke-eba, Oboroke-uvete I and Oborokeuvete II. Eika district comprises four wards; Obangede/ Uhuodo, Eika-Ohi zenyi Okaito/Usungwe, and Uboro/ Omavi/ ohuepewards (Ogunjumo, 2002). The local Government Area has its administrative headquarters located at Obangede, the topography of Okehi LGA is characterized by hills with intervening valleys. The Local Government Area is bounded in the North by Adavi and Lokoja LGAs, to the west by Akoko Edo LGA and Kabba-Bunnu Local Government Area. The local Government is situated in the tropical zone and is influenced by two climatic conditions namely; dry and wet seasons. The wet season starts from May to October, while the dry season starts from November to April. The Local Government Area has a population of 199,999 people [8]. The topography of the area, which is characterized by hills and interwoven valleys is rich in mineral resources such as Iron ore, Gemstone, clay etc. and these provides opportunity to investors. The major economic activities of the people in this study area include farming, fishing, crafting, trading and food processing. The population of this study consisted of all the inhabitants of the eleven council wards in Okehi Local Government Area. And due to the enormity of this population, a sample size of 160 respondents was selected using purposive, stratified and simple random sampling techniques. Five [5] council wards were purposively selected and stratified. To do this, a sample frame was developed and using proportional allocation, 20% was allocated across board after which members of each of these council wards were identified by labeling on pieces of paper. These pieces of paper were thoroughly mixed and placed in 5 containers and after closing my eyes, dipped my hand into these containers and scooped out 24, 34, 38, 30, 34 without biasness respectively from each of the five containers. This gave a sample size of 160 respondents ( $\sum X=24+34+38+30+34=160$ ).

Data for this study were collected from both primary and secondary sources. The primary data were collected with the help of a well-structured questionnaire and interview techniques. The questionnaire comprises five [5]

sections: A, B, C, D. and E. Section A deals with socio-economic characteristic of the people, section B deals with the rural and agricultural development projects, section C deals with the prioritized needs of the people, section D deals with the problems militating against rural and agricultural development and section E deals with annual budgetary allocations and disbursement. Secondary data was collected from internet, textbooks, journal articles etc.

Data for this study were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency distribution tables, and percentages as well as inferential statistics such as Factor Analysis, Kruskal Wallis (H) test and product moment correlation coefficient (r).

**Table 1a. Sample size selection plan**

S/N	Council wards	Sample frame	Sample size (0.2)
1	Ikuehi	120	24
2	Obeiba	168	34
3	Oboroke I	192	38.0
4	Eika	159	30
5	Obangede	172	34.0
Total		802	160

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 3.1 Socio-economic Characteristics of Respondents

Table 1(b) reveals that 73.8% of the respondents were males, while 26.2% were females. This implies that more men are involved in the development of rural and agricultural development project than women. This is contrary to the views of Ogunlela and Aisha (9) who concluded that women are more involved in rural and agricultural activities than men especially in sub-Saharan Africa and provide most labour for a number of agricultural activities.

The result also shows that most (51.2%) of the respondents fall within the age range of 31-40years. This presupposes that most of the respondents are youths who are energetic enough to contribute actively in executing rural and agricultural development projects. This is in support of Akinbode [10] and Ekong [11] who opined that youth serve as channels for the transmission of culture and the perpetuation of recognizable identity. They also provide the manpower for the socio-economic development of the society.

About 15.6% of the respondents had primary education, 31.9% had secondary education, 13.8% had adult education, and 18.8% had tertiary education while 20.0% had non-formal education. This implies that majority of the respondents were poorly educated. This could be due to the fact that this local Government has little access to tertiary institutions due to their low level of income.

**Table 1b. Distribution of respondent according to socio-economic characteristics (N=160)**

Variable	Frequency (F)	Percentage (%)
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	118	73.8
Female	42	26.2
<b>Sub-total (a)</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Age (years)</b>		
Below 20	16	10
20-30	14	8.8
31-40	82	51.2
41-50	25	5.2
51-60	16	10
Above 60	7	4.4
<b>Sub-total (b)</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Educational status (years)</b>		
Non-formal education	32	20
Primary	25	15.6
Secondary	51	31.9
Adult education	22	13.8
Tertiary	30	18.8
<b>Sub-total(c)</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Occupation</b>		
Farming	75	46.9
Trading	11	6.9
Hunting	11	6.9
Teaching	26	16.2
Civil services	31	19.4
Others	6	3.8
<b>Sub-total (d)</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Social status</b>		
Ordinary member	100	62.5
Official of association	10	6.2
Local leader	16	10.6
Traditional rural	11	6.9
Women leader	23	14.4
Church leader	6	3.8
<b>Sub-total (e)</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>100</b>

Majority of the population (46.9%) engaged themselves in subsistence farming, 35.6% were civil servants, hunting/ fishing had 6. 9% and trading had 6. 9%. From the results, people who had other occupation were (3.8%), they involved themselves in vocational job as means of their livelihood. This is in support of Olurode, (12) who asserted that Nigeria's rural population is about

65 percent and the rural dwellers directly or indirectly earn their living from farming occupation.

Table 1 also shows that 62.5% were ordinary members in the society and 6.2% were official of associations, 10.6% were local leader heading one association or the other while 6.9% were traditional rural of their various communities, 14.4% were women leaders and 3.8% were church leaders. This implies that there is social stratification in Okehi Local Government Area of Kogi State.

### 3.2 Existing Rural and Agricultural Development Projects and their Present State

Table 2 shows the existing rural and agricultural development projects in the Study area. It reveals that the available agricultural development projects in the study area were piggery farm (6.5%), poultry farm (4.2%), fish pond (1.0%), veterinary clinic (0.35%), cattle ranch (2.47%), agricultural extension office (4.26%), FADAMA 1 (5.4%), FADAMA 11(4.4%), FADAMA 111 (4.5%). Table 2 also shows the existing rural infrastructure in the study area. It reveals that the available physical infrastructure were feeder roads (2.5%), bridges/culverts (3.0%), bore holes/well (2.6%), pipe born water (3.6%). Institutional infrastructure was markets (1.6%), commercials banks (2.7%), recreational facilities (1.9%), agro-service centres (1.6%), police stations (2.9%), mosques (4.7%), churches (4.7%) and council halls (2.1%).

Table 2 also reveals that only few of the existing rural and agriculture development project in the study area are in good state. The agricultural projects include piggery farm (6.5%), FADAMA I (5.4%), agricultural extension office (5.35%), FADAMA111 (4.5%), FADAMA11 (4.4%), poultry farm (4.2%). The rural infrastructure found in a good state include secondary school (5.6%), primary schools (4.8%), mosques (4.7%), churches (4.6%), telephone (4.2%) and post office/postal agencies (2.4%). Those in poor state were commercials banks (3.8%), electricity supply (3.4%), tertiary institution (3.0%), feeder roads (2.9%), council halls (2.8%), recreational facilities (2.8%), bore hole/wells (2.6%), cattle ranch (2.5%), fish ponds (2.0%), veterinary clinic (0.1%), bridges\culverts (1.7%) and markets (1.8%). For a rural community to be considered as been developed, it must have improved fish ponds, veterinary clinic, cattle ranch, feeder

**Table 2. Distribution of respondent according to existing rural infrastructure/present state (N=160)**

Variables	Available		Not available		Functioning	Present	Partially functioning		Moribund	
Agricultural development projects	Frequency	Percentage %	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
i. Piggery farms	110	6.5	17	1.3	17	1.3	16	3.9	0	0.0
ii. Poultry	71	4.2	17	1.3	64	6.2	8	2.0	0	0.0
iii. Fish ponds	17	1.0	141	9.4	2	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
iv. Veterinary clinic	6	0.35	154	10.3	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
v. Cattle ranch	42	2.4	71	4.7	26	2.5	21	5.1	0	0.0
vi. Agricultural extension office	91	5.35	26	1.7	12	1.2	31	7.6	0	0.0
vii. Fertilizer /other inpute	73	4.29	12	0.8	56	5.4	19	4.6	0	0.0
vii. FFADAMA I	92	5.4	7	0.5	56	5.4	5	1.2	0	0.0
viii. ADAMA II	75	4.4	81	5.4	3	0.3	1	0.2	0	0.0
ix. FADAMA III	77	4.5	11	0.7	69	6.7	3	0.7	0	0.0
	654	38.49	537	36.1	306	29.3	104	25.3	0	0.0
<b>Physical</b>										
i. Feeder roads	43		2.5	78	52	18	1.7		21	5.1
ii. Bridge/culvert	51		3.0	73	4.9	30	2.9		6	1.5
iii. Bore hole/well	45		2.6	81	5.4	18	1.7		16	4.9
iv. Pipe born water	62		3.6	57	3.8	27	2.6		14	3.4
	201		11.7	289	19.3	93	8.9		57	14.7
<b>Institutional infrastructure</b>										
Markets	27		1.6	102	6.8	19	1.8		12	2.9
Commercial banks	46		2.7	61	4.1	39	3.8		12	2.9
Recreational facilities	32		1.9	93	6.2	29	2.8		6	1.5
Agro-service Center	28		1.6	106	7.1	26	2.5		0	0.0
Police station	61		3.6	36	2.4	49	4.8		14	3.4
<b>Social infrastructure</b>										
Primary schools	82		4.8	8	0.5	67	6.5		3	0.7
Secondary schools	95		5.6	6	0.4	53	5.2		6	1.5
Tertiary institutions	56		3.3	45	3.0	33	3.2		26	6.3
Hospitals/clinics	61		3.6	42	2.8	40	3.9		17	4.1
Post office/ postal agencies	40		2.4	51	3.4	37	3.6		32	7.8
Telephones	73		4.4	9	0.6	44	4.3		34	8.3
Electricity supply	449		2.9	20	1.3	35	3.4		56	13.7
Mosques	80		4.7	3	0.2	57	5.5		20	4.9
Churches	79		4.6	8	0.5	73	7.1		0	0.0
Council hall	36		2.1	86	5.7	29	2.8		9	2.2
Total	651		33.7	278	18.4	468	45.5		203	49.5

Source: Field Survey, 2015

roads, bridges/culverts, bore holes/wells, markets, commercial banks, recreational facilities, tertiary institution, electricity supply and council halls. Lack of these rural and agricultural infrastructural facilities could bring about high rural-urban migration of the youths, thereby leaving behind the aged and less productive labour force that can hardly produce enough food for household consumption, talk less of producing enough marketable surplus for commercial purposes. Besides, the deplorable conditions of rural roads could affect evacuation of farm produce from rural to urban centres where majority of the consumers are found.

### 3.3 Prioritized Rural and Agricultural Development Project in Okhehi Local Government Area

The result from Table 4 shows there is no significant difference among the five council wards in Okhehi Local Government Area in terms of prioritized rural and agricultural development facilities needed by the ruralites. The agricultural projects that are highly prioritized among the five council wards are poultry farms, fish ponds, veterinary clinic, agricultural extension office, fertilizer distribution centres, poverty alleviation projects. The Kruskal Wallis test (H) conducted shows that  $H$  –calculated ( $H=4.80 < X^2$  tabulated (9.5) at 0.05 level of significance. This implies that all these agricultural development projects are highly needed in the study area.

Table 4 also shows that there is no significant difference among the five council wards in the

study area in terms of prioritized physical rural infrastructural projects ( $H$ -calculated  $5.25 < X^2$  -tabulated-9.5). The highly prioritized among the five council wards area feeder roads, bridges/coverts, boreholes/well, pipe born water.

Table 4 also shows that there is no significant difference among the five council wards in the study area in terms of prioritized institutional infrastructures ( $H$ -calculated  $2.45 < X^2$  -tabulated - 9.5). The highly prioritized institutional rural infrastructural facilities include markets, local banks, commercial banks and cooperatives while the highly prioritized social rural infrastructural facilities include tertiary institutions, electricity, recreational facilities.

The implication of this finding is that there can be no true agricultural development in any social system without provision of physical, institutional and social rural infrastructural facilities. This is in support of these scholars view: According to the Human Development Model, development is the qualitative transformation of the socio economic living standard of the generality of the citizenry of any country. In concrete terms, development connotes maximum and adequate satisfaction of the basic human needs such as food, water, shelter, clothing, education and good health. Development generally connotes progress, improvement, and transformation in the totality of human life, be it economic, social, political or otherwise. That means that for any rural area to be considered as being developed, it must possess the above mentioned attributes [2].

**Table 3. Factor analysis of problems affecting development of rural infrastructure in Okehi local government area**

Variables	Factor 1	Factor 2
PI	1.218E-02	0.6310**
LIHC	0.2600E-02	1.1938**
PPPE	1.6170E-02	3.2757**
PTES	2.590*	1.6140E-02
IIENVHC	3.126*	1.6200E-02
LB	2.790*	1.6150E-02
LETB	2.6230*	4.7950E-20
N-ITBRAP	1.2460E-02	0.3750**
N-CAHC	1.2560E-02	1.2561**
ED	3.2310*	0.1970E-02
LEPSPBW	0.478E-02	1.2150**
RR	0.2340E-02	2.681**
LOF	2.1260*	0.128E-02
DP	1.6130E-02	3.697**
IBA	2.6190*	1.6190E-02
UDF	3.608*	1.5290E-02
LCG	1.2309E-02	2.331**

Source: Field Survey 2015; \*-Socio economic cum cultural factors (factor 1); \*\*-politico-ecological factors (factor 2); Method: Varimax Rotation



**Table 4. Kruskal wallis analysis of s the prioritized agricultural and rural projects in the locality (N=160)**

S/N	Variables	Council wards									
		Ikuehi		Obeiba I		Oboroke II		Eika		Obangede	
	agric. projects	Freq	R1	Freq	R2	Freq	R3	Freq	R4	Freq	R5
1.	Piggery farms	5	2.0	8	5.5	6	3.0	7	4.0	4	1.0
2.	Poultry farms	25	39.5*	29	51.5*	24	36.0*	28	47.5*	23	32.5*
3.	Fish ponds	21	28.5*	24	36.0*	26	43.0*	23	32.5*	25	39.5*
4.	Veterinary clinic	30	55.0*	31	57.5*	32	59.0*	30	55.0*	29	51.5*
5.	Cattle ranch	10	7.0	8	5.5	14	17.5	12	11.5	11	8.5
6.	Agric. extension office	29	51.5*	25	39.5*	29	47.5*	24	36.0*	26	43.0*
7.	Fertilizer distribution centre	26	43.0*	23	32.5*	25	39.5*	28	47.5*	22	30.0
8.	FADAMA I	15	21.0	13	14.5	16	24.0	14	17.5	12	11.5
9.	FADAMA II	11	8.5	14	17.5	12	11.5	16	24.0	15	21.0
10.	FADAMA III	16	24.0	12	11.5	15	21.0	13	14.5	14	17.5
11.	Poverty alleviation	31	57.5*	28	47.5*	30	55.0*	29	51.5*	27	45.0*
	H=4.80, X <sup>2</sup> =9.5	ΣR1= 337.5		ΣR2= 319		ΣR3= 416.5		ΣR4= 341.5		ΣR5= 301	
	Rural Infrastructure										
	Physical										
12.	Feeder road	12	8.5	20	5.5	17	3.5	28	16.5*	25	12.5*
13.	Bridges/culverts	15	1.0	21	7.0	20	5.5	17	3.5	16	2.0
14.	Borehole/wells	25	12.5*	22	8.5	27	15.0*	25	12.5	24	10.0
15.	Pipe born water	30	19.5*	29	18.5*	30	19.5*	28	16.5*	25	12.5*
	H=5.25 X <sup>2</sup> =9.5	ΣR1= 41.5		ΣR2= 39.5		ΣR3= 43.5		ΣR4= 49.0		ΣR5= 37.0	
	Institutional										
16.	Market	18	8.0	19	11.0	28	21.5*	25	19.5*	30	24.5*
17.	Local banks	29	23.0*	30	24.5*	25	19.5*	23	18.0*	19	11.0*
18.	Commercial bank	17	6.0	22	17.0*	20	14.0*	28	21.5*	18	8.0
19.	Co-operatives	20	14.0*	18	8.0	19	11.0*	21	16.0*	20	14.0*
20.	Police stations	5	2.0	7	4.0	4	1.0	6	3.0	8	5.0
	H=2.45, X <sup>2</sup> =9.5	ΣR1= 53		ΣR2= 64.5		ΣR3= 67.0		ΣR4= 78.0		ΣR5= 54.5	
	Social										
21.	Primary school	10	14.5	8	7.5	11	18.0	0	0.0	12	21.0
22.	Secondary school	7	4.0	9	11.0	10	14.5	8	7.5	5	1.0
23.	Tertiary institution	25	38.0*	27	41.5*	24	37.0*	30	47.5*	26	39.5*
24.	Hospital/clinic	14	26.0*	10	14.5	16	32.5*	15	29.5	13	23.5
25.	Post officer	6	2.0	9	11.0	7	4.0	11	18.0	8	7.5
26.	Telephone	11	18.0	14	26.0	10	14.5	8	7.5	15	29.5
27.	Electricity	23	36.0*	20	35.0*	30	47.5*	28	43.5*	30	47.5*
28.	Mosque	12	21.0	7	4.0	14	26.0	13	23.5	15	29.5*
29.	Church	19	34.0	15	29.5	9	11.0	12	21.0	16	32.5
30.	Recreational facilities	40	47.5*	28	43.5*	26	39.5*	29	45.0*	27	41.5*
	H=6.23, X <sup>2</sup> tab=9.5	ΣR1= 241.0		ΣR2= 209		ΣR3= 244.5		ΣR4= 266.5		ΣR5= 277.5	

### 3.4 Problems Affecting Rural Development

Table 3 (above) shows Factor analysis of problem affecting rural and agricultural development in Okehi Local Government area. Table 3 shows that there are two major

problems affecting rural and agricultural development in the study area, which include: socio-economic cum cultural factors such as poor training of extension staff (PTES=2.590), incompatibility of innovation with the existing norms and values of the host community (IENVHC=3.216), lack of education of the target beneficiaries (LETB=2.790),

environmental degradation (ED=3.2310), lack of operational fund (LOF=2.2160), inadequate budgetary allocations (IBA=2.6190), untimely disbursement of funds(UDF=3.608).

The politico ecological factors include political instability (PI=1.2180), poor projects planning and evaluation (PPPE=3.2757), lack of the involvement of the host community (LIHC=1.193), non implementation of rural and agricultural policies (N-ITBRAP=0.3750), non cooperative attitudes of the host community (1.2561), lack of electricity power supply and pipe born water (0.478), rural roads (BRR=2.681), lack of commitment by the government (LCG=2.331). The implication of these findings is that socio-culture cum economic factors as well as the political-ecological factors can either make or mar successful execution of rural and agricultural development projects in any social system. For instance, no meaningful development can take place where there is political and ethnic instability. Again, no meaningful development can take place where there is high level of ethnocentrism. According to Age et al. [13], most of technical solutions proposed to address the problems of agriculture in less developed countries in Africa particularly in Nigeria were foundered because these solutions had not taken into consideration the culture and the indigenous knowledge system of the local people. It is against this backdrop that Christoffel [14] reported that “no new approach to rural and agricultural development will succeed unless it clearly manifest a thorough understanding of traditional and human ecosystem which it intends to change the clients” values, aspirations, mores and the perceptions of the bio-physical environment, particularly, as the latter pertains to renewable natural resources.

### **3.4.1 Testing of hypothesis**

The null hypothesis state that there is no significant difference in the existing rural and agricultural development projects among the five council wards of Okehi Local Government Area, Kogi State in terms of prioritized rural and agricultural development projects. It was found that there was no significant difference among the five council wards in terms of prioritized agricultural and rural development projects,

physical, institutional and social infrastructural facilities.

Since H - calculated for agricultural development projects ( $4.80 < X^2$  Tab (9.5) at 0.05 level of significance, (H- calculated for physical infrastructure ( $5.25 < X^2$  Tabulated (9.5), (H - calculated for institutional infrastructure ( $2.45 < X^2$  tabulated (9.5) and social infrastructure H - calculated for social infrastructure ( $6.23 < X^2$  tabulated ( 9.5) at 0.05 level of significance, we accept the null hypothesis. This implies that all these agricultural, physical, institutional and social infrastructural facilities are highly or equally needed in the study area.

## **4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

### **4.1 Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to assess the present status of rural and agricultural development projects among the five council wards in Okehi Local Government Area of Kogi State.

It was discovered from the study that majority of the respondents were males and most of them fell under the age range of 41-50 years. The results showed that the study area has little rural and agricultural development project and hence there is low standard of living as even the few existing rural and agricultural development projects were mostly dysfunctional.

It can be concluded from the study that there is absence of agricultural development projects and rural infrastructure which can improve the quality of life of the rural dwellers. Generally, there seems to be little or no poultry farms, fish ponds, veterinary clinic, agricultural extension office, fertilizer distribution Centre, poverty alleviation in terms of agricultural development project and no feeder road, bridges/coverts, bore hole/well, pipe born water, commercial banks, recreational facilities, tertiary institution, electricity supply and council hall in terms of rural infrastructural facilities etc. in the five among the council wards of Okehi Local Government Area and hence the people have low purchasing power and standard of living. However, a strategic measure should be put in place to improve the socio-economic life of the rural poor by extending the benefits of development to the poorest among those who seek a livelihood in the rural areas.

## 4.2 Recommendations

In order to ensure rapid and accelerated rural and agricultural development in Kogi State in general and Okehi Local Government Area in particular, the following recommendations are made based on the findings of this study:

1. Government should always conduct situational analysis of the rural areas so as to obtain a clear view of the prioritized needs of the people.
2. Agricultural development projects such as poultry farms, fish ponds, veterinary clinics, agricultural extension offices, fertilizer distribution Centres, and poverty alleviation offices should be sited in rural areas by our political elite or well to do individuals so as to raise their standard of living.
3. Rural infrastructural facilities such as feeder roads, bridges, culverts, bore hole/well, pipe born water, commercial banks, recreational facilities, tertiary institutions, electricity supply and council halls etc. should be provided by our well to do individuals, the private sector as well as the Federal, State and Local Governments.
4. Government should put in place monitoring and evaluation machinery to ensure proper monitoring and evaluation of rural and agricultural development projects.
5. Government should show more commitment by increasing annual budgetary allocations for rural and agricultural development projects, and should always ensure timely release of funds for execution of rural and agricultural development projects.
6. Integrated Rural and Agricultural Development Approach (IRAD) should be adopted by the government in tackling the problem of rural and agricultural underdevelopment. In other words, multi-sectoral or multi-disciplinary approach where by rural and agricultural development projects are embarked upon at the same time is recommended.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

1. Agama MI. The role of community organizations in rural development. A case

- study of Otukpo Community Development Association in Otukpo L.G.A. of Benue State. Undergraduate Project, Benue State University, Makurdi. 2007;120. (Unpublished).
2. Age AI, Igbashal AA, Shaakaa C. Sustainable agricultural and natural resources development in contemporary Nigeria. In: Modo IVO (Ed.). Sustainable Development in Africa. A book of Readings. Cultural Research Publishers, Uyo, Nigeria. 2009;550.
3. Adedire SA. Government and the challenges of rural development in Nigeria (1999 to date). IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science. 2014;19(4 Ver. I):98-107.
4. Omenka JI. NGOs and socio economic development in Oju local government Area of Benue State. MPA thesis, Benue State University, Makurdi. 1991;150. (Unpublished).
5. Cusworth J, Franks T. Managing projects in developing countries. Essex: Longman Scientific and Technical; 1993.
6. Age AI, Demenongu TS, Bello M. Situational assessment of rural and agricultural development projects of the University of Agriculture, Makurdi and its host community. Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development. 2013;5(4):83-88.
7. Anonguku OI. Problems militating against rural and agricultural development in Benue and Nasarawa States, Nigeria. Journal of Agricultural Sciences and Policy Research. 2013;3(1):87-92.
8. NPC. National Population and Housing Census Report. National Population Commission, Abuja. 2006;1-10.
9. Ogunlela Yemisi I, Aisha A. Mukhtar. gender issues in agriculture and rural development in Nigeria: The role of women. Humanity & Social Sciences Journal. 2009;4(1):19-30.
10. Akinbode IA. Women's participation in agriculture in Nigeria: A case study of Ogun, Gangola, Cross River, Kano and Niger States. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations/Federal Department of Agriculture, Nigeria; 1991.
11. Ekong E. Poverty and rural development in Nigeria: An introduction to rural sociology, Uyo. Nigeria: Dove Educational Publishers. 2003;340-371.
12. Olurode L. Current themes in population in Olurode L and Soyombo O. (Eds):

- Sociology for Beginners. Lagos, John West Publications; 2001.
13. Age AI, Igbashal AA, Shaakaa C. Sustainable agricultural and natural resources development in contemporary Nigeria. In: Modo IVO (Ed.). Sustainable Development in Africa. A book of Readings. Cultural Research Publishers, Uyo, Nigeria. 2005;550.
14. Christoffel DB. Farming system development: Synthesizing indigenous and scientific knowledge systems and development. Agriculture and Human Values. 1989;9(2):101-120.

© 2016 Age et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Peer-review history:*

*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:  
<http://sciencedomain.org/review-history/12606>*