

# Evaluation of the Potential Effect of Community Participation on Community and Social Development Projects in South West Nigeria

Fasuyi O. A<sup>1</sup>., Ojo O. J<sup>2</sup>. and Lawal A. F<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>\*1</sup>Department of Quantity Surveying, Federal Polytechnic, Ado – Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria

<sup>2 & 3</sup>Department of Project Management, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria

## ABSTRACT

The study examined critically the potential effect of Community Participation (CP) on Community and Social Development Projects (CSDP) in South West Nigeria. The paper further reviewed the activities of community participation in line with CSDP implementation stages and the resultant effect on the project deliverables in three States, South West Nigeria. The study adopted a survey research method; secondary data source was used to generate the required data. Multi – stage sampling technique was employed to select 752 respondents and structured questionnaire was used to elicit data. Data was analysed quantitatively. Ordinary Least Square (OLS) analysis was used to test the hypothesis at 5% level of significance. The result showed that Community Participation has significant effect on CSDP implementation ( $F(59.326) P < 0.05$ ). The findings further showed that CP in project initiation, planning and execution were potent in predicting CSDP implementation  $P < .05$  while CP in monitoring and evaluation is not very potent  $P > .05$ . The study recommended that a well functional guideline should be applied by considering the involvement of all the stakeholders in CSDP implementation process and plans.

**KEYWORDS:** Community Participation, Community Development, Social Development, Projects.

## 1. Introduction

Globally, community participation is one of the key ingredients of an empowered community which entails active citizen involvement in all aspect of strategic plan, development and implementation of project (IGI Global, 2018) [1]. Community participation (CP) is a Rurism strategy which starts with the people, a coherent national and social – value system in which human and material resources are mobilized and allocated from the lower echelon of economic and social strata to the top (Samuel, 2015) [2]. The usefulness of participation in developmental projects as opined by Marsela (2015) [3] are self – reliance, efficiency, effectiveness and coverage, added to usefulness by IGI Global (2018) [1] is that CP motivates people to work together in ensuring opportunities, increase the standard of living and stimulation of economic growth within the respective community. Succinctly, participation is expected to result in better design and execution of projects, better targeted benefits, more cost effective and timely delivery of projects, inputs and equitably distributed of project benefits among the community people (Adesida & Okunlola, 2015) [4]. Hence, community people could have the freedom to participate in actions, process, plans and projects that are significant and at the same time affect their lives.

The period between 1973 - 2007 marked a watershed in rural developmental effort in Nigeria and the period witnessed deliberate government efforts of mobilizing people for developmental projects (Ikechuckwu, Izubundu & Okechuckwu, 2012; Ogo – Oluwa, 2017) [5,6]. Owolabi . Okunola & Mafimisebi (2018) [7] noted that community driven development has emerged as one of the fastest growing investments by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and multi – lateral development banks in the mid 1990. The Federal Government of Nigeria and World Bank (WB) in a collaborative venture initiated and established an autonomous agency under the umbrella of Community and Social Development Projects (CSDP) in some States in Nigeria (CSDP, 2011; Dauda, 2013) [8,9]. The CSDP which was launched in 2009 had given a reasonable protection from political interference, centralised planning, decision-making and implementation of rural

projects. The process of CSDP is a bottom-up community-focused approach that passionately engages community members to develop mechanisms for solving their problems (Dauda, 2013) [9]. The objectives of CSDP are to build on the Community – Based Poverty Reduction Projects (CPRP) through expanded project coverage within the participatory States of the projects and enhanced project integration using broad framework of CPRP strategy in conjunction with the Local Empowerment and Environmental , Management Programme (LEEM) (Owolabi *et al.*, (2018) [7]. CSDP was established to enhance and address the transformation of community people. Hence, contributes to building the capacity of rural communities to articulate their needs and to support a clearer and more constructive dialogue between the various actors (Adesida & Okunlola, 2015) [4]. The trust bestowed in people that advocated changing their environment as a powerful force for development is the bane of CSDP intervention.

However, since CSDP intervention is not eternal and indefinite, it is imperative that members of the decision making, planning and evaluation for the sustenance of the project and the accrual of its long term benefits (Obar, Adekoya & Nwocha, 2007) [10]. Although, no matter the angle from which Community and Social Development Projects are viewed, the basic concern is that most rural areas in Nigeria, like most African countries, are underdeveloped and in dire need of socio – economic infrastructures for an improved standard of living. According to (Ogunleye - Adetona & Oladehinde, 2013; Laah Adefila & Yusuf 2013; Joseph & Nwovu, 2014; Oghenekhowo, 2014 and Usman, Deepali, & Kabiru, 2017) [11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. CSDP is associated with higher project outcomes and improved standard of living. Other studies argued that community participation leads to developmental projects that are more responsible to the needs of the poor, more responsive government, better delivery of projects, better maintained community assets and a more informed and involved citizenry ( Mansuri & Rao, 2003; Samuel, 2015; Adesida & Okunlola, 2015; Larry & Sunday, 2016; Akinwalere & Ajibola, 2015; Leah, 2016) [16, 2, 4, 17, 18, 19]. Udu (2014); Enyi (2014) [20, 21] however, noted that despite the wide use of bottom – up approach in Community and Social Development Projects, disconnection between policy formulation and reality of developmental projects is a major issue truncating the smooth implementation, hence the use of participation to drive community projects is a misnomer. However, there is no record of the structure of community participation in all aspect of project stages, mediating between the agency and socio – economic development of the community members. This necessitates the Study

### **1.1 Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) in Nigeria**

Community and social development do occur where people in a community believed that working together can make a difference through self - reliance by organising to address their shared needs collectively (Akintayo & Oghenekhowo, 2004) [22]. Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) is an institutionalized World Bank (WB) assisted programme. CSDP is a programme designed to sustainably increase the access of rural people to improve social, physical and natural resources infrastructure, using community development approach. Thus, CSDP as veritable tool for grassroots development started in February 23, 2009 in Nigeria with development credit agreement of US \$380m [IDA - US \$200m (₦31,400,000,000.00), Partners – US \$180m (₦28,260,000,000.00) (Joshua, 2013) [23]. CSDP is a five year project plan (but subject to extension after the closing period) financed through the World Bank International Development Agency (IDA) credit and annual State government contribution of ₦100 million while the benefitting communities pay 10 per cent of the total cost of their identified micro-project in cash, kind, material or any construction thereof and implement the projects (Dauda, 2013) [9].

According to CSDP Manual (CSDP, 2011) [8] ; two Schemes, Community Based Poverty – Reduction Projects (CPRP) and Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Projects (LEEMP) were merged as a socially Community Driven Development Approach. CSDP operated an open menu system which therefore supported social infrastructural provisions. The transition of CPRP and LEEMP metamorphosed to CSDP. Maiwada (2013) [24] gave a brief description of CSDP process and the clear – cut supportive roles and responsibilities that are provided for the key actors in the project cycle. They are as follows: - At the Federal level- The Federal Project Steering Committee (FPSC) and the Federal Projects Support Unit (FPSU), at the State level – State Agency Board, the State Agency (SA), at the local Government level – The Local Government Review Committee (LGRC) and the LGA Desk office (LGDO) while at the Community level: the Community Project Management committee (CPMC) and several sub – Committees are established.

CSDP is aimed at rural transformation by providing social amenities such as health care centres and facilities, water, schools, construction of roads and rehabilitation, rural electrification, construction of stalls and

provision of skill acquisition centres to rural communities through Community Driven Development (CDD) approach. The CDD approach means that communities are put at the driver seat which gives rural communities the opportunity to select and prioritize their needs that will be transformed into plans according to how they are prioritised; this plan is called Community Development Plans (CDPs). The CDPs contains the list of Micro- Projects (MPs) and the Bill of Quantities (BOQ)/Estimates for at least two micro- projects. The focus of CSDP and the linkage with the national development expectation is however targeted at the rural dwellers where community and social development needs respectively are to be guided by the basic underlying principles of CSDP development frameworks (Oghenekohwo, 2014) [14]. Specifically, CSDP involvement is:

- i). Upgrading and Construction of infrastructure in the area of education, health, electricity water, construction of rural feeder and access roads, bridges and multipurpose community infrastructure and,
- ii). Improved delivery and access to social and economic services, improved natural resources management services and provision of safety nets support (CSDP, 2011) [8].

In Nigeria, CSDP has completed over 4,546 micro projects with 1,384 others nearing completion within four years 2009 - 2013 (Joshua, 2013) [23]. Hence, the breakdown of the projects are in this order, out of the seven sectors targeted, water has the highest number of 1,988, followed by education with 1,413 projects, others include health 1,015, rural electrification 649, environment 426, transport 805 and socio-economic facilities 869. The efficiency with which the gains of CSDP can be specifically measured involved beneficiary assessment to determine the extent to which CSDP has been able to increase the access of the people to social services, changes in welfare indicators of beneficiary communities and extent of probability of achievement of achieving the project development objectives (CSDP, 2011) [8].

Meanwhile, some of the works executed by CSDA in most Nigerian rural communities were done through the various State Agencies (SA) ranging from classroom blocks, health centres, motorized borehole and hand pumps, electricity projects, rural roads and bridges, civic centres among others. Sunday (2012) [25] noted that these projects had helped in developing most rural communities and impacted positively on the lives of the rural poor. It is evident that the areas of linkage between the current National development plans and CSDP are those which address Community Driven Development (CDD) which are socially inclined, engendering social inclusion through gender equality and people's participation, creation of job opportunities and wealth through the provision of support for various income generating activities (Oghenekohwo, 2014) [14].

## **1.2. Community and Social Development Agencies in South West Nigeria**

Poverty is perceived to be severer in rural communities where up to 80 per cent of the population lives below the poverty line, where social services and infrastructure could be inadequate (Fayemi, 2013) [26]. The case of some South Western States is intense because their poverty level touches every aspect of people's lives (Steve, 2013) [27]. CSDP focus was designed to ensure direct access of communities to the State – level for full participation of beneficiary communities in all stages of projects, identification, development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of community-based plans, provision of financial grants and maintenance. As a result, Ekiti State was created on 1<sup>st</sup> October, 1996 and indeed in a hurry to develop. As one of the formidable CSDA family in Nigeria, Ekiti State Community and Social Development Agency (EKCSDA) was established by an enabling law of the State and signed into law by the State government on the 27<sup>th</sup> February, 2009 and became operational on the 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2009 (CSDP, 2011) [8]. Similarly, in Ondo State, the agency, Ondo State Community and Social Development Agency (ODCSDA) was established as autonomous body under the sponsorship of World Bank assistance scheme in 19<sup>th</sup> September, 2009 (Ogo – Oluwa, 2017) [6] and likewise Osun State government established Osun State Community and Social Development Agency (OSCSDA) through the State Act of Parliament in 2009 with the responsibility of implementing the World Assisted Community and Social Development Project (Alonge & Oladejo, 2019) [28]. One of the cardinal points is to tackle development problems of the rural dwellers since meaningful CD can take place through active participation of the people joined with technical assistance from government or other development agencies. CSDP core objectives in South West are:

- i). Empower communities to plan, part finance, implement, monitor and maintain sustainable and socially inclusive multi-sectoral micro- projects,
- ii). Facilitate and increase the community on human development related projects, increase the capacity of local government areas, State and Federal Agencies to implement and monitor CDD policies and interventions and

iii). Leverage of Federal, State and Local governments resources for increased availability of resources of CDD intervention in communities (CSDP, 2011) [8]. It is obvious that these underlying objectives are geared at enhancing accelerated community and social development at grassroots level where developments have been limited over the years by the absence of resources, lack of accountability and transparency in governance among others (Oghenekohwo, 2014) [14].

The agency is funded through a counterpart arrangement by State government and the Federal Government of Nigeria FGN/ World Bank. Although, provision of micro - projects could be more participatory, effective, efficient and interesting when approached through the CDD where rural communities identify and decide on their prioritising needs, get resources, implement, use and maintain their interventions.

### 1.3 Community Participation

The issue of citizen participation is deeply inherent in the very concept of CSDP which emphasises that whatever is done to improve the welfare of the people must elicit the enthusiasm and wholehearted participation of such people (Akoroda, 2012; Sarah & Targema, 2015) [29,30]. Kumar (2002) [31] opined that participation means different things to different people. It could be fundamental and depend upon the principles, in which participation is applied. It has been variously described as participatory development, public participation, people's participation, community participation, citizen participation and popular participation (Musa, 2005) [32]. It changes the fundamental position of people from being viewers and spectators to that of agents of development and process. Aref and Redzuan (2009) ; Owolabi *et al.*, (2018) [33,7] asserted that participation requires the voluntary and democratic involvement of people in contributing to the developmental effort; sharing equitably in the benefits derived there, decision- making in respect of setting goals, formulating policies and planning and implanting economic and social development programmes. Kumar (2002) [32] cited in Laah, *et al.*, (2013) [12] asserted that people's participation is essential in order to establish economic and political relationship by which rural people are able to organise themselves, ability to identify their own needs, share in design, implement, and evaluate participatory actions. The forms of community participation could be in different forms; consultation, financial contribution by the community, self- help projects involving the whole community, community specialised workers, mass action, collective commitment of behaviour change, endogenous development and autonomous community projects (Samuel, 2015) [2].

### 1.4 Community Participation and CSDP Implementation

The concept of CSDP is designed to increase access of rural dwellers to an improved and quality of physical, social and economic infrastructural projects for their well- being (Fayemi, 2013) [27]. In other words, the cornerstone of community – based development initiatives is the active involvement of members of a defined community in at least some aspects of project design and implementation (Marsela, 2015) [3]. The precise relationship or linkage between CSDP and the community people is always a matter of discourse. In the context of the need for gauging up infrastructural projects implementation; one important component forms the focal point (the people) as development is all about people. Dauda (2013) [9] asserted that there cannot be even development without the involvement of the people who are the direct beneficiaries of the development. However, one of the basic limitations to create adequate infrastructure was lack of resources (Satish, 2007) [34] hence, provision of rural infrastructure is always scarce. Asian Development Bank (2007) [35] averred that rural societies live in a simple environment, yet the structure and dynamics of their day-to-day life is complex. The study of Ibigbemi (2008) [36] confirmed this statement in Amuro district in Kogi State whereby passengers pay three times for kilometre on untarred rural roads compared to tarred roads. He also stressed further that a nationwide survey was conducted by Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) on the state of roads in the country; the survey revealed that the road network as at December, 2002, was estimated at 194,000 kilometres, with Federal government being responsible for 17 per cent, State government 16 per cent and Local government 67 per cent. Consequently, almost all the roads were in a bad condition, especially those in rural communities, water, health centres, classrooms and others are grossly inadequate (CBN, 2002) [37]. It is also sad to note that in the area of government providing infrastructural projects, the urban areas are more favoured than the rural areas (Enyi, 2014) [21]. The author remarked that over the year beneficiaries of government expenditure on education, health, water supply, electricity, industries and road construction are mainly for urban dwellers and that less than 30 per cent of total government development expenditure is designed for the benefit of rural communities. Inadequate infrastructure and underdevelopment are synonymous with rural communities of the developing world, Nigeria is not an exception.

Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) had been executing micro- projects in South West rural communities since 2009. CSDP is operational in most of the Local government areas of the States. Hence, area of activities include capacity building for community Project Management Committee (CPMC) of beneficiary communities, community project launch, and aggressive monitoring, supervision and evaluation of the CDPs being implemented by communities (Cross River State Community and Social Development Agency CRSCSDA, 2012) [38]. Indeed, there can be no meaningful and real development in the rural communities if there is no community knowledge and involvement (Ugwuodo, 2013) [39]. The author stressed further that the need for community knowledge in order to avoid uncompleted and abandoned projects, he thus pointed out three instances where previous rural projects failed to affect the lives of the downtrodden positively because first, project that does not meet the immediate needs of the receiving community dwellers second, community does not know the client and third, contractor or the details of the project being executed and projects are abandoned and nobody to report to. These are traits of the stale top-down approach, but there is the need to embrace the development scheme that change from supply driven to demand driven. There are often good reasons for CSDP involvement in the provision of infrastructural project implementation, however in the production of such facilities there exists a role for other stakeholders to have a distinct existence. In order to raise the social and economic status of rural dwellers, there is the need for CSDP to partner and collaborate with community people to actualize the much expected sustainable programme at the grassroots as partnership ensures quality, speed and accuracy of projects executed by the communities.

Community participation in project implementation and development is an important element and a sure way to the speedy delivery of sustainable projects in rural areas in Nigeria (Steve & Williams, 2012) [40]. Development is not a cluster of benefits given to people in need but a process by which the populace acquires a greater mastery over its own destiny. The philosophy of development is an attempt made to enlist and inspire the people in the determination of desirable change in goals and in the implementation of programmes to bring about the change deemed desirable. The concept of CSDP is result oriented, it involves going to the people, learning from the people, planning and working with the people, to develop systems, procedures and integrated models focusing on rural infrastructural project related issues. Akinola (2017) [41] in his submission emphasised on the issue of community participation that is deeply inherent in the very concept of community infrastructural project implementation and development that whatever is done to improve the welfare of the people must elicit the enthusiasm and whole hearted participation of such people. Laah *et al.*, (2013) [12] investigated community participation strategies on health development among some rural communities in Kogi State. The findings of the result stressed the need for community participation and highlighted the existing participation strategies in the study area to include - provision of free labour for construction and maintenance of health unit, payment for selected services and ad-hoc fund raising respectively. In the same vein, Steve (2013) [28] found a strong determination among the community people in a self- help programme, through such gesture in Orisunmibare settlement in Ekiti State, open market stall was built and mini health centre constructed. Another good example was from the result of the studies in execution of self- help projects in River State of Nigeria. The study showed that the local people can on their own volition initiate and execute programmes aimed at checking the problems of rural backwardness (Tamuno, 2009) [42].

## 2. Methodology

The study used primary source to generate the data required. Primary source of data were collected through questionnaire as major research instrument. Population for the study was 196,907 (NPC, 2006) [43] using the population growth rate of 3.2% per annum (Eze, 2018) [44] and the projected population for 2020 is given as 490,067 people. Multi – stage sampling technique was adopted in this study. Descriptive and inferential statistics were employed in the analysis of data.

### 3. Analysis of Data and Discussion

#### 3.1 Level of Community Participation in CSDP Implementation

**Table 1: Level of Community Participation in CSDP Implementation**

Project Cycle	Items	Mean	Ranking Within Group	Level of Participation within Group	Overall Mean
<b>Project Initiation</b>	Attendance of organisation meeting	3.93	1.00	Participated	3.69
	Identify community needs	3.82	2.00	Participated	
	Assessing community needs	3.72	3.00	Participated	
	Selection and Prioritisation of community projects	3.71	4.00	Participated	
	Development of project proposal	3.63	5.00	Participated	
	Expression of interest by beneficiaries communities	3.53	6.00	Participated	
	Serving in project management committee	3.51	7.00	Participated	
<b>Project Planning</b>	The community participate in meetings for planning CSDP projects	3.68	1.00	Participated	3.46
	Raising community ideas and contributions	3.60	2.00	Participated	
	Deciding project locations/ sites	3.56	3.00	Participated	
	Preparation of cost and budget for CSDP projects	3.57	4.00	Participated	
	Deciding project management team	2.88	5.00	Somehow participated	
<b>Project Execution /Implementation</b>	Mobilisation and contribution of manpower and materials resources	3.63	1.00	Participated	3.08
	Actual involvement in the implementation of CSDP projects	3.52	2.00	Participated	
	Financial contribution	3.12	3.00	Somehow participated	
	Managing work and keeping the budget for the projects	2.62	4.00	Less participated	
	Participate in trainings and workshops on how to operate and maintain the executed projects	2.51	5.00	Somehow participated	
	Maintenance of executed projects	3.01	1.00	Somehow participated	
<b>Project Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</b>	Determining whether projects addresses community's needs	2.84	2.00	Somehow participated	2.71
	Assessing achievement of project deliverables and objectives	2.81	3.00	Somehow participated	
	Review project progress & performance	2.71	4.00	Somehow participated	
	<b>Pooled</b>				

**Table 2: Level of Community Participation in CSDP Implementation from States**

Project Cycle	Items	Ekiti		Osun		Ondo	
		Mean	O'all Mean	Mean	O'all Mean	Mean	O'all Mean
Project Initiation	Attendance of organisation meeting	3.60		4.22		4.10	
	Identify community needs	3.62		3.96		3.98	
	Assessing community needs	3.63	3.49	3.54	3.83	3.91	3.84
	Selection and Prioritisation of community projects	3.54		3.89		3.77	
	Development of project proposal	3.46		3.74		3.76	
	Expression of interest by beneficiaries communities	3.30		3.70		3.65	
Project Planning	Serving in project management committee	3.27		3.77		3.68	
	The community participate in meetings for planning CSDP projects	3.42		3.88		3.86	
	Raising community ideas and contributions	3.41		3.56		3.83	
	Deciding project locations/ sites	3.39	3.32	3.64	3.82	3.67	3.74
	Preparation of cost and budget for CSDP projects	3.20		3.95		3.71	
	Deciding project management team	3.17		4.07		3.64	
Project Execution /Implementation	Mobilisation and contribution of manpower and materials resources	3.34		3.91		3.80	
	Actual involvement in the implementation of CSDP projects	3.22		3.64		3.67	
	Financial contribution	3.09	3.13	4.03	3.71	3.61	3.63
	Managing work and keeping the budget for the projects	3.01		3.30		3.52	
	Participate in trainings and workshops on how to operate and maintain the executed projects	3.00		3.68		3.55	
	Maintenance of executed projects	3.17		3.53		3.69	
Project Monitoring & Evaluation	Determining whether projects addresses community's needs	3.09	3.13	3.80	3.66	3.60	
	Assessing achievement of project deliverables and objectives	3.17		3.63		3.61	3.60
	Review project progress & performance	3.10		3.66		3.49	
<b>Pooled</b>			<b>3.27</b>		<b>3.75</b>		<b>3.70</b>

**Table 3: Least Significant Difference (LSD) Post Hoc Test on the State Level of Community Participation in CSDP Implementation**

(I) State	(J) State	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Ekiti	Ondo	-2.4131*	.37328	.000	-3.1461	-1.6801

	Osun	-2.3886*	.37276	.000	-3.1206	-1.6566
Ondo	Ekiti	2.4131*	.37328	.000	1.6801	3.1461
	Osun	.0245	.38961	.950	-.7406	.7896
Osun	Ekiti	2.3886*	.37276	.000	1.6566	3.1206
	Ondo	-.0245	.38961	.950	-.7896	.7406

Community participation is a very important tool for developmental process in any country Hashim *et al.*, (2020) [45]. It was observed that CSDP beneficiaries in the study area participated in all the four stages of the CSDP cycle. The distribution of beneficiaries according to the stages of CSDP cycle was shown in Table 1. In project initiation stage, attendance of organisation meeting had the highest participation rate with a mean score of 3.93 followed by identification of community needs with a mean score of 3.82, assessing community needs 3.72, selection and prioritisation of community projects 3.71, development of project proposal 3.63, expression of interest by beneficiaries communities 3.53 and serving in project management committee with mean score of 3.51. Items that are in the range of  $4.21 \leq \bar{x} \leq 5.0$  were regarded of having a high level of participation; none of the item were within this range in project initiation stages while item that are in the range of  $3.41 \leq \bar{x} \leq 4.20$  were regarded as participated. All the seven project initiation stages were within this range. This analysis implied that the communities participated in project initiation across the sampled States in South West Nigeria. This is in line with Okereke *et al.*, (2015) [46] that community members take bulk of the decisions regarding the choice of projects to be executed, manage and exercise their maintenance for sustainable use by the community. The high participation in project initiation stage could be attributed to the channel of awareness created and carried out by the Community and Social Development Project agencies in the study area and also the Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) method employed in assessing the needs of the communities. From the result, project decisions could be minimised, thereby removing a number of redundant and irrelevant projects that have no direct impact on community members. Similarly, on project planning stage in Table 2 identified community participated in meetings for planning CSDP projects with a mean score of 3.68, raising community ideas and contribution with mean score of 3.60, deciding project locations/ sites with mean score of 3.56 and preparation of cost and budget for CSDP with mean score of 3.57 in order of preference were within the range of participated  $3.41 \leq \bar{x} \leq 4.20$  while deciding project management team with mean score of 2.88 were in the range of somehow participated  $2.61 \leq \bar{x} \leq 3.40$ . This result can be linked to the fact that in planning stage, the interest of the different sections of the communities (men, women, youth, elderly and vulnerable persons) were taken into consideration before embarking on the project.

In project execution /implementation stage, mobilisation and contribution of manpower and materials resources with a mean score of 3.63 was ranked first followed by actual involvement in the implementation of CSDP with mean score of 3.52 were within the range of participated ( $3.41 \leq \bar{x} \leq 4.20$ ), financial contribution and managing work and keeping the budget for the projects with mean scores of 3.12 and 2.62 respectively were found to be somehow participated in the region of  $2.61 \leq \bar{x} \leq 3.40$  while participation in trainings and workshops on how to operate and maintain the executed projects with a mean score of 2.51 was less participated since it was in the region of  $1.81 \leq \bar{x} \leq 2.60$ . This implied that the beneficiary communities are responsible for financial management, procurement and other implementation aspects of the projects, and they are only supported by the CSDA staff and other relevant experts where the communities deem it necessary in ensuring the proper implementation of the projects, the result is supported to the findings of Olawepo and Akanbi (2013) [47] and Ogo-Oluwa (2017) [6] that community members having realised the benefits of the projects were zealous and showed high level of commitment to the project. In project monitoring and evaluation stage, maintenance of executed projects were ranked first with mean score of 3.01 followed by determining whether projects addresses community's needs with mean score of 2.84, assessing achievement of project deliverables and objectives had a mean score of 2.81 and review project progress & performance with mean of 2.71 were all somehow participated. Table 1 further revealed that project initiation stage had highest participation rate with a mean score of 3.69. Project planning was ranked second with a mean score of 3.46 followed by project execution/implementation with a mean score of 3.08, while project

monitoring and evaluation had the least participation rate with mean scores of 2.71. This is in agreement with Hashim *et al.*, (2020) [45] that the beneficiary communities participated more in project planning stage, project implementation stage than in project preparation and monitoring and evaluation stages.

Implicitly, the level of community participation in CSDP on the degree of participation according to stages of project cycle rate was somehow participated with a pooled mean of 3.24 while none of the items in each stage of project cycle were found within the range of not participation  $1 \leq \bar{x} \leq 1.80$ . This analysis showed an active participation in CSDP by the community members in all stages of project cycle in South West Nigeria. The results of the research indicated that the community members were supposed to benefit from the CSDP. This concurs with Hashim *et al.*, (2020) and Owolabi *et al.*, (2019) [45, 7] that beneficiaries of CSDP initiatives were found to have high participation in CSDP; hence, have positively affected their perception of developmental projects. However, Table 2 further depicted the State by State analysis on the level of community participation in CSDP project implementation. Osun State has the highest community participation rate in CSDP implementation with an overall mean item score of 3.75 followed by the Ondo State with a mean score of 3.70 while Ekiti State had the least with a mean score of 3.27. Table 2 also showed that the community members in Ondo State had the highest participation rate in project initiation with mean score of 3.84 closely followed by Osun with mean score of 3.84 and Ekiti had the least also with mean score of 3.49. In the same vein, community participation was also high in Osun State in project planning, execution and monitoring with mean score of 3.82, 3.71 and 3.66 respectively. Ekiti State had the least community participation rate in all the identified project life cycle. Generally, the rate of community participation in Ekiti State was somehow participated since the mean score of 3.27 was in the region of  $2.61 \leq \bar{x} \leq 3.40$ , Ondo and Osun States with mean score of 3.75 and 3.70 respectively were within the range of participated ( $3.41 \leq \bar{x} \leq 4.20$ ).

However, multi-comparison Post-Hoc investigation was then conducted so as to determine the State(s) that is/are significantly different in the comparison with level of community participation in CSDP implementation, and this is contained in the Table 3. Table 3 depicted that there is no significant difference in the level of community participation in CSDP implementation between community members in Ondo and Osun States with the mean difference of .0245 and a significant probability of .950, while the level of community participation is significantly different in Ekiti and Ondo States with a mean difference of -2.4131 and .000 significant probability as well as Ekiti and Osun States with mean difference of -2.3886 and probability of .000.

### 3.2 Model Summary of the Effect of Community Participation on CSDP Implementation in South West Nigeria

**Table 4: Model Summary of the Effect of Community Participation on CSDP Implementation in South West Nigeria**

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	7538.099	4	1884.525	59.326	.000
Residual	19916.962	627	31.765		
Total	27455.062	631			

  

R=.524a, R <sup>2</sup> =.275, Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> =.270, Error of the Estimate=5.63609 (Constant)	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
	17.363	1.556		11.155	.000
Project initiation	.525	.068	.321	7.674	.000
Project Planning	.243	.101	.128	2.418	.016

Execution	.276	.097	.145	2.846	.005
Monitoring	.047	.110	.021	.430	.667

Indicate significance F at  $\alpha=0.05$

The predictive influence of the effect of community participation on CSDP implementation was tested using Ordinary Least Square regression analysis. The independent or exogenous variables (community participation in project initiation, planning, execution/ implementation as well as monitoring and evaluation) were regressed on the dependent variables or endogenous variables CSDP implementation. The result of the regression model in Table 4 showed a significant outcome (F (59.326)  $P < 0.05$ ). This implies that the exogenous variables (community participation in project initiation, planning, execution/ implementation as well as monitoring and Evaluation) had significant effect on CSDP implementation. Table 4 also showed that the predictor variables accounted for 28% ( $R^2 = .275$ ) to the variance in the endogenous variable (CSDP implementation). As a result, the null hypothesis that community participation has no significant effect on CSDP project implementation is rejected. Table 4 revealed the individual effect of community participation in each of the project cycle (project initiation, planning and monitoring and evaluation) that significantly contributed to CSDP implementation with an estimate  $\beta_1 = .525$ ,  $\beta_2 = .243$  and  $\beta_3 = .276$  respectively and  $P < 0.05$  while with an estimate of  $\beta_4 = .047$  and  $P > 0.05$  in monitoring and evaluation cycle was not significant to CSDP implementation in the study area.

Table 4 further depicted that community participation in project initiation, planning and execution/ implementation were potent in predicting CSDP implementation while community participation in monitoring and evaluation as indicated by the community members is not very potent in predicting CSDP implementation in South Western, Nigeria with values ( $\beta = .021$ ,  $t = .430$ ,  $P = .667$ ).

#### 4. Conclusion and Recommendations

The study concludes that community members affirmed they actively participated in all stages of CSDP implementation processes and plans. Involving community members at the initial stage to partake and participate in areas such as project locations, preparation of cost and budget, selection of project management team, financial contribution and others cannot be overemphasized. It is recommended that:

- A well functional community participation guideline should be applied by considering the involvement of all the stakeholders in CSDP implementation processes and plans.
- There is need to dignify the roles and responsibilities of community members participating in CSDP.
- Community participation is learning and continuous process, hence, the need for training and workshops of community members are required and consistent.

#### References

1. IGI (2018). What Is Socio – Economic Development?. IGI Global in Publisher Of Timely Knowledge. <https://www.igi.global.com>
2. Samuel, S. O. (2015). Community Participation in Rural Development, Catalyst for Sustainable Development Efforts. *Proceedings of INTCESS 15-2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference of Education and Social Science*, Istanbul, Turkey.
3. Marsela, N. Mwiru. (2015). The Importance of Community Participation in Development Projects at Local Level. A Case of Dodoma Municipal Council. A Dissertation Submitted in Partial of the Requirement for the Degree of Master Local Government (LGM) of Mbumbwe University, Tanzania, 1-64
4. Adesida, I.E., & Okunola, J.O. (2015). Effect of Community Participation on the Sustainability of Rural Infrastructure in Ondo State. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics and Sociology*. ScienceDominion International, 7(1), 1-9
5. Ikechuckwu, Izubundu and Okechuckwu (2012). Rural Community Development in Nigeria; A Group Dynamics Perspective. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*.
6. Ogo – Oluwa, Sylvester, Ohis (2017). Contribution of Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) to Project Implementation and Monitoring in Selected L.G.A Ondo State, Nigeria. *ECONSPEAK : A Journal of Advances in Management IT and Social Sciences*. 7(7) 27 – 44.

7. Owolabi K. E., Okunlola J. O. and Mafimisebi T. E. (2018). Influence of Participation in Community and Social Development Projects on Beneficiaries' Income in Ondo and Kwara States, Nigeria. *International Journal of Agricultural Extension* 2311-8547
8. Community and Social Development Projects (CSDP) (2011). Project Implementation Manual at State and Community Levels.
9. Dauda, Lawal. (2013). "Not Relief But Release". *The Journey News*. A Publication of Ekiti State Community and Social Development Agency (EKCSDA), 1(2).
10. Obar, E. E., Adekoya, A. E. And Nkwocha, C. A. (2017). Community Participation and Beneficiaries' Perceived Sustainability of Community and Social Development Projects in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Rural Sociology* 17(1).
11. Ogunleye – Adetona, C. I., & Oladehinde, C. (2013). The Role of Community Self – Help Projects in Rural Development of Kwara State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability* 2 (1).
12. Laah, E.D., Adefila, J.O. & Yusuf, R.O. (2013). Community Participation in Sustainable Rural Infrastructural Development in Riyom Area, Plateau State of Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*. 4(19).
13. Joseph, Okwesili Nkwede & Nwovu, Arinze Samuel (2014). World Bank Assisted Community Development Programme: A Study of Rural Areas in Ebonyi State, Nigeria. *Journal of Political Sciences and Public Affairs*
14. Oghenekohwo, J. E. (2014). Empirical Evidences of the Impact of Community Education and Social Development Project on Rural Bayelsa, Nigeria. *British Journal of Education*, 2(3) 65-74. Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK ([www.eajournals.org](http://www.eajournals.org)).
15. Usman, Bappi., Deepali, Singh & Kabiru, Dahiru (2017). Issues and Challenges of Community Development in Nigeria: An Assessment of Gombe State Agency for Community and Social Development Project (GSA - CSDP). *AUG International Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities* 5 408 – 423.
16. Mausuri, G., & Rao, V. (2004). Community Based and Driven Development: A Critical Review. *The World Bank Research Observer* 19(1) 6-13
17. Larry, E.Udu & Sunday, O. Onwe (2016). Approaches to Community Development in Nigeria, Issues and Challenges; A Study of Ebonyi State Community and Social Development Agency (EB-CSDA). *Journal of Sustainable Development*. 9 (1). Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education.
18. Akinwalere, B.O. & Ajibola, M.O. (2016). Assessment of Rural Infrastructural Development Projects in Ondo State: Case Study of Ondo State Community and Social Development Agency. *American Journal of Experimental Agriculture, Science Domain International*, 10(2), 1-8.
19. Leah, A. W. (2016). Influence of Community Participation on Sustainability of Community- Based Projects: A Case of Kiambu Water and Sanitation Slum Project, Nairobi County, Kenya. An Unpublished Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Award of the Degree of Master of Arts in Project Planning and Management of University of Nairobi.
20. Udu, L. E. (2014). Human Capacity Building in Selected Local Government Areas of Ebonyi State – The Role of Non – Government Organisation (NGOs) and Development Agencies (2000 - 2008). *Journal of Business and Management* 3(1) 25 – 41. Retrieved from <http://www.todayscience.org> EB-CPRP
21. Enyi, J.E. (2014). Rural Community Development in Nigeria, An Assessment. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review* (Nigeria chapter) 2 (2).
22. Akintayo, M. O. & Oghenekohwo, J. E. (2004). *Developing Adult Education and Community Development*. New Paradigms, Ibadan. Educational Research and Study Group.
23. Joshua, S. E. (2013). CSDP Adjudged Best World Bank Project. *Development News*. CSDP: Promoting Community Driven Development CDD 2(3) 1-2 <http://revisesociology.com>>2015/09/17
24. Maiwada Shawal (2013). CDD and its Challenges. CSDP Promoting Community Driven Development (CDD). *Development News* 2 (3)50.
25. Sunday, E.J. (2012). CSDP Adjudged Best World Bank Project. CSDP: Promoting Community Driven Development CDD. *Development News* 2 (3).
26. Fayemi, Kayode. (2013). The Stings of Rural Poverty has Reduced in Ekiti. *The Journey News*. A Publication of Ekiti State Community and Social Development Agency EKCSDA, 1(2).
27. Steve, Bamisaye. (2013). Rural Infrastructural Development: CSDP to Rescue in Ekiti State. *The Journey News*. Publication of Ekiti State Community and Social Development Agency (EKCSDA).

28. Alonge, Flourish & Oladejo, Deborah, (2019). 3557 Gender, Vulnerable Benefited from Osun CSDP Projects. Western Post.
29. Akoroda, O. (2012). Citizen Participation in Self – Helps and Socio – Economic Development in Communities in Delta and Oyo States. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
30. Sarah, Gambo and Targema, Tordue Simon (2015). Participatory Communication and Poverty Alleviation in Nigeria: A Review of the Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) in Taraba State 2009 – 2012. A Proceedings of the Academic Conference of African Scholar Publications and Research International on New Strategy and Approaches 5(2) 2-6 August 2015, Federal University, Dutse, Student Centre Hall, Dutse, Jigawa State Nigeria.
31. Kumar, D. (2002). *Methods for Community Participation*. A Complete Guide for Practitioners. London: ITDG
32. Musa, S.D. (2005). Sustainable Grassroots Development: *A Major Challenge of Globalisation*. In A.D. Menegbe (Ed.). *The Humanities and Globalisation – The African Perspective*, Makurdi. Aboki Publishers
33. Aref, F. & Redzuan, M. (2009). Assessing the Level of Community Participation as a Component of Community Capacity Building for Tourism Development. *Journal of Scientific Research*, 28 (3). Available on <http://www.eurojournals.com/ejsri.htm>
34. Satish, P. (2007). Rural Infrastructure and Growth: An Overview. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 62(1).
35. Asian Development Bank Institute (2007). Rural Development, Household Perceptions on Rural Development. Available on <http://www.adbi.org/discussionpaper>
36. Ibigbemi, O. (2008). Exploring Labour-Based Approach for Rural Road Maintenance in Nigeria. *Journal of Social Science* 17(2)108.
37. CBN, 2002, National Financial Inclusion Strategies – Central Bank of Nigeria – How the National Financial Inclusion Strategy Supports CBN Objectives, Lower in Rural Areas. <https://www.cbn.gov.ng>NFIS>.
38. Cross River State Community and Social Development Agency (CRSCSDA) (2012). Cross River CSDP Gains Government Acceptance. CSDP: Promoting Community Driven Development (CDD); *Development News* 1(2).
39. Ugwuodo, Henry. (2013). CSDP: A Panacea for Rural Development. CSDP Promoting Community Driven Development CDD. *Development News* 1(2).
40. Akinola A. A. ( 2017). E- Government and Citizen Participation in Nigeria. the Beam : *Journal of Arts and Science*, 11, 1-8.
41. Steve, O.T. & Williams, O.I. (2012). Community Self-Help Projects and Rural Development in Ohafia Local Government Area, Abia State of Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*.14 (4).
42. Tamuno, S.O. (2009). *Rural Development in Rivers State: An Effective Approach*. Paragraphics, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
43. National Population Commission, (2006). Estimated Population Figures, National Population Commission of Nigeria Abuja.
44. Eze Duruiheoma (2018). Nigeria's Population Records 3.2 Pct Annual Growth Rate: Official – Xinhuanet. <http://www.xinhuanet.com>2018-04>.
45. Hashim. A., Sidi. S. H., Abubakar. B. Z., Ladebo. O. J., Uthman. A. A., and Yelwa, F. J. (2020). Effect of Participation in Community and Social Development Project on Rural Livelihood Enhancement in North West, Nigeria. *International Journal of Environment, Agriculture and Biotechnology (IJEAB)* 5(1)
46. Olawepo, R. and Akanbi, O. (2013). World Bank Assisted Community Driven Project Implementation in Kwara State, Nigeria: Implication for Sustainable Rural Participatory Development and Community Initiatives, Abuja. *Journal of Geography and Development* 3(2).
47. Okereke – Ejiogu, E.N., Asiabaka, C. C., Ani, A. O. & Umunakwe, P.C. (2015). Assessment of Household's Participation in Community and Social Development Projects (CSDP): A Case Study of Imo State, Nigeria. *Advances in Research* 5(2) 1-9. SCIENCEDOMAIN International [www.Sciencedomain](http://www.Sciencedomain)