



## Impact of community and social development project (CSDP) on rural communities in southern Taraba state, Nigeria

Adi S S<sup>1</sup>, Daniel R A<sup>2</sup>, Sule H<sup>2</sup>, Samuel H<sup>3</sup>, John M A<sup>1</sup>, Gaisa N J<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Agricultural Extension and Management, College of Agriculture, Jalingo, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup> Department of General Studies, Taraba State Polytechnic, Jalingo, Nigeria

<sup>3</sup> Department of Common Law, Taraba State Polytechnic, Jalingo, Nigeria

### Abstract

This study was conducted on the impact of Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) on rural communities in southern Taraba State, Nigeria. The specific objectives of the study were to; describe the socio-economic characteristics of the rural dwellers, determine the impact of CSDP on rural development and identify problems militating against CSDP project in the study area. Data were collected from 150 respondents randomly selected using structural questionnaire and they were analyzed using frequency, percentage and T – test. The analysis on the socio-economic characteristics shows that majorities 73.3% of the respondents were below the age of 50 years. This implies that youths were more than old people in the study area, majority 60% of the respondents were male than female, most 53.3% of the respondents were married than single, majority 80% has household size more than 5 persons. With this population they involved in agriculture production in order to sustain their selves and family, majority 80% of respondents attended one form of education or the others, most 60% of the respondents occupation were farmers, most of the respondents had farm size less than 5 hectare which means they are small scale farmers or peasant farmers and majority 73.3% of respondents earned less than N40, 000 as their monthly income in the study area.

The result on impact of CSDP on rural development shows that Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) had impacted positively on rural development and their living standard had improved. This also implies that through CSDP the rural communities have access to social infrastructure such as school facilities, health facilities, road network, water supply, market facilities etc. This was based on t – calculated value was (7.54) while the tabulated t – value was (3.73). Since the calculated t – value was greater than tabulated t – value we rejected the null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) which stated that CSDP has no significant impact on rural development and accepted the Alternative (H<sub>a</sub>) hypothesis which stated that CSDP has significant impact on rural development. Recommendations were made based on the findings of this study include; the government should bring lasting solutions to the communal crises in the study Area also the people should accept dialogue and forgive one another for peace to strive. Both the government and communities should pay their counterpart funds on time to enable the commencement of the project in the study area.

**Keywords:** impact, CSDP, rural, communities, southern Taraba state, Nigeria

### Introduction

The Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) is an international intervention for rural communities-based development. It's a World Bank project in partner with federal and state government of Nigeria are in unanimous on the desirability of Community Driver Development (CDD) approach (CSDP, 2011) [2]. The CDD approach enable the rural dwellers to brings out their press needs and involved them from planning stage to the implementation and monitoring stages to maintain Sustainable and socially inclusive multi-sectoral micro projects (Abatcha, 2014) [1].

Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) is a conceived development intervention that is built on two existing poverty reduction oriented programmes namely; Community-based Poverty Reduction Project (CPRP) and the Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project (LEEMP) which came to effect in 2004 (CSDP, 2011) [2]. The areas of linkages between the current Nigeria's development focus and CSDP are those which address Community Driven Developments (CDD) which are socially inclined, engaging 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 (Abatcha, 2014) [1]. CSDP is to ensure improved service delivery to all rural dwellers through training in capacity and utilization as well as participatory budgeting and financial management in key development sectors (CSDP 2011) [2]. The focus of CSDP and the linkages with the national development expectation is however targeted at the rural dwellers where community and social development needs are to be guided by basic underlying principles of CSDP development frameworks. The principles of CSDP are geared towards enhancing accelerated community and social

development at grass root levels where developments have been limited over the years by absence of resources, lack of accountability and transparency in governance among others (CSDP 2011) <sup>[2]</sup>. The overall goal of the project is to improve access to services for Human Development (HD) while the Project Development Objective (PDO) is to support empowerment of communities and Local Government Authorities (LGA) for sustainable increase of poor people to improved social and natural resource, infrastructural services (CSDP, 2011) <sup>[2]</sup>. It is designed as a poverty reduction project which seeks to empower the poor by giving them resources, as grants; to implement and supervise community initiated multi-sectoral projects. It will also improve partnership of Local Government Authority and communities on human development related projects, and build the capacity for effective delivery services to their people and communities.

According to Oyesola (2013) <sup>[9]</sup> a rural is an open swath of land that has few home or building scatter and not very many people. Agriculture is the primary industry in most rural area. However, over 80% of the population of developing countries resides in the rural community and agriculture is there main source of their income (Udu and Onwe, 2016) <sup>[10]</sup>. According to IFAD (2012) <sup>[4]</sup>, developing countries and their rural areas in particular are characterized by poverty, unemployment, unequal distribution of resources, acute shortage of social, physical institutional infrastructure and increasing rural-urban drift. Nigeria's rural population accounts for over 70 percent of poor households (more than 98 million people, and about 17 million households). The 2003-2004 Nigeria living standard survey indicated that States in the Sahel region recorded the highest incidence of poverty, with about 80 per cent of the population described as poor (IFAD 2012) <sup>[4]</sup>. Nigeria's rural people are the most deprived of all Nigerians, having least access to services such as health, educational facilities, and access to modern agricultural input. In essence, infrastructural and institutional arrangements are deficient at the local level where most people who need them live. For this reason, community development efforts ought to be geared towards improving the living standard of the mass of the low-income population residing in rural areas and making the process of their development self-sustaining (Udu and Onwe 2016) <sup>[10]</sup>.

A community can be described as all the people who live in a particular area (Hornby 2004) <sup>[3]</sup>. It could be a group of people who have things in common because of their vocation, job, trade and even religion or sports. According to Nwizu, (2001) <sup>[7]</sup> a community is a group of people with socio-cultural, political or economic background who live together and do things together. Lemu, (2006) <sup>[5]</sup> Defined community in the most simple and comprehensive way as a collection of definable groups of people living together in one geographical location bound by a shared set of values, expectations, aspiration, identity and destiny, pursuing common political, social, economic and related goals in a context of collaboration, cooperation and team work irrespective of observable differences.

However, majority of the projects and services embarked upon by government of Nigeria in the past and present to alleviate poverty and brings development in the rural communities do not yield result due to top – down approaches and non-participatory mode of delivering service to communities. However this study is imperative to investigate the impact of CSDP on rural communities in southern Taraba state.

The specific objectives of the study were to;

1. describe the socio-economic characteristics of the rural dwellers,
2. determine the impact of CSDP on rural development and
3. Identify problems militating against CSDP in the study area.

## **Methodology**

### **Study area**

The study was conducted in southern part of Taraba state. Taraba state is located at the North eastern part of Nigeria. It lies between 6<sup>o</sup> 25' North and between longitude 9<sup>o</sup> 30' and 11<sup>o</sup> 45' east of Greenwich meridian. The state shares boundaries with Bauchi and Gombe state to the North, Adamawa state to the East and Cameroon Republic to the south. The state is bounded along its western side by Plateaus, Nassarawa and Benue states. The state has land mass of 60, 291km<sup>2</sup>, with a population of about 2.5 million people (projected from 2006 National Population Census). The state has 16 local government areas with Jalingo as the state capital. The state has an average annual rainfall of 1766mm with a temperature of about 30<sup>o</sup>c – 40<sup>o</sup>c. It is characterized by dry and rainy season common to tropical region. The major occupation of the people of the state is Agriculture. Cash crops produce include coffee, tea, Palm oil, groundnut and cotton. Crops such as maize, yam, rice, millet, sorghum bean and cassava also produced in commercial quantity. Farming, Fishing and hunting are some of the occupation of the people in the study Area. Major tribes are jukum, chamba and Hausa among others.

### **Method of Data collection**

Both primary and secondary sources of data were employed for this study.

### **Sampling techniques**

A multi-stage random sampling technique was used for this study. In the first stage, three (3) local government areas were randomly selected. These include; Donga, Takum and Wukari LGAs. Second stage fifty (50) respondents were randomly selected from each local government area using balloting method. The sample size of this study was one hundred and fifty (150) respondents.

### Method of Data Analysis

Descriptive and inferential statistics were been used for this study. Descriptive statistic such as percentage and frequency were used to analyzed objectives I and III while inferential statistic such as T-test was used to analyzed objective II respectively.

T-test is expressed mathematically as;

$$t = \frac{X^1 - X^2}{\text{Ste } x}$$

Where

t = T-test

X<sup>1</sup> = access to social infrastructure before the CSDP

X<sup>2</sup> = access to social infrastructure after the CSDP

ste x = Standard error

### Results and Discussion

#### Socio-economic characteristics of the respondents

The result from Table: 1 shows that 20% of the respondents were between the age of 20-29 years old, 13.3% were between the age of 30-39 years old, 40% were between the age of 40-49 years old while 26.7% were between the age of 50 years and above. This revealed that majority 73.3% of the respondents were below the age of 50years. Its implies that youths were more than old people in the study area. Majority 60% of the respondents were male while 40% were female. This implies that majority of the respondents were male than female. Majority 53.3% were married while 46.7% were single. This indicated that most of the respondents were married than single. Furthermore, household size of the respondents 20% has below 5 persons, 53.3% has 6-10 persons while 26.7% has 11 and above persons. This implies that majority 80% has household size more than 5 persons. With this population they involved in agriculture production in order to sustained their selves and family. Education status of the respondents 20% didn't attend formal education, 40% attended primary education, and 26.7% attended secondary education while 13.3% attended tertiary education. This indicated that majority 80% of respondents attended one form of education or the others. Occupation of the respondents 60% were farmers, 13.3% were traders while 26.7% were civil servants. This implies that farming is most occupation in the study area. This finding agreed with that of Oyesola (2013) <sup>[9]</sup> and Udu and Onwe (2016) <sup>[10]</sup>, which said agriculture is main occupation of people living in the rural area. Farm size of the respondents 53.3% has less than 5 hectare, 26.7% has 6-10 hectare while 20% has 11 and above hectare. This indicated that most of the respondents had farm size less than 5 hectare which means they are small scale farmers or peasant farmers. Monthly income of the respondent; 53.3% earned less than N10000, 20% earned between N20000-30000, 16.7% earned between N40000-50000 while 10% earned N60000 and above. This indicated that majority 73.3% of respondents earned less than N40, 000 as their monthly income in the study area.

#### T – Test analysis to determine the impact of CSDP on rural communities.

The result from Table: 2 show that the calculated t – value was (7.54) while the tabulated t – value was (3.73). Since the calculated t – value was greater than tabulated t – value we reject the null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) which stated that CSDP has no significant impact on rural communities and accept the Alternative (H<sub>a</sub>) hypothesis which stated that CSDP has significant impact on rural communities. This indicated that Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) have impacted positively on rural development and their living standard had improved. This also implies that through CSDP the rural communities have access to social infrastructure such as school facilities, health facilities, road network, water supply, market facilities etc. This findings concorderd with that of Ochebo *et al.*, (2018) which stated that CSDP projects had significantly affected the rural communities in north central, Nigeria.

#### Problems militating against CSDP in the study Area

The result from table: 3 shows the various problems associated with CDP in the study area; (80%) opined on communal crises, (74%) opined on delay in payment of counterpart funds from government and the communities, (63.3%) opined on slow in decision making process, (53.3%) opined on poor maintenance culture, (40%) opined on high cost of material while (26.7%) opined on complex protocol. This indicated that communal crises and delay in payment of counterpart funds from both government and the communities were the major problems militating against Community and Social Development project (CSDP) in the Study area. This finding concorderd with that of Sidi *et al.*, (2018) which stated that lack of payment of counterpart fund was one of the major challenges.

#### Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study shown that Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) had impacted positively on rural development and their living standard had improved. This also implies that through CSDP the rural communities have access to social infrastructure such as school facilities, health facilities, road

network, water supply, market facilities and so on. But the major problems militating against Community and Social Development project (CSDP) in the Study area were; communal crises and delay in payment of counterpart funds from both government and the communities. The recommendations that were made include; the government should bring lasting solutions to the communal crises in the study Area also the people should accept dialogue and forgive one another for peace to reign. Both the government and communities should pay their counterpart funds on time to enable the commencement of the project in the study area.

**Table 1:** Socio-economic characteristics of respondents (n=150)

Variables	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age in years		
20-29	30	20
30-39	20	13.3
40-49	60	40
50 and above	40	26.7
Sex		
Male	60	40
Female	90	60
Marital status		
Married	80	53.3
Single	70	46.7
Household size		
< 5	30	20
6-10	80	53.3
11 and above	40	26.7
Educational status		
Non-formal education	30	20
Primary education	60	40
Secondary education	40	26.7
Tertiary education	20	13.3
Main Occupation		
Farming	90	60
Trading	40	26.7
Civil servants	20	13.3
Farm size		
< 5	80	53.3
6-10	40	26.7
11 and above	30	20
Monthly income		
< 10000	80	53.3
20000-30000	30	20
40000-50000	25	16.7
60000 and Above	15	10

Source: Field Survey, 2022.

**Table 2:** Impact of CSDP on rural development in study area

Calculated t- value	Tabulated t-value	DF=at 0.005%	Decision Rule
7.54	3.73	3	Reject the Ho and Accept the Ha

Source: field survey, 2022.

**Table 3:** Problem militating against CSDP in the study area

Variables	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
1. Communal crises	120	80	1
2. Delay in payment of counterpart funds both Community and government	111	74	2
3. Slow in decision making process	95	63.3	3
4. poor maintenance culture	80	53.3	4
5. High cost of materials	60	40	5
6. complex protocol	40	26.7	6
Total	506*		

Source: field survey, 2022

(\*) Multiple responses

**References**

1. Abatcha K. 'CSDP in Yobe: promoting community driven-development.' Paper Presented at the Seminar organized to community members at CSDP office, Damaturu, Nigeria., 2014.
2. Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) manual, 2011, 76.
3. Hornby AS. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary 7th Edition. London: Oxford, 2004.
4. IFAD. International fund for Agriculture, Federal Republic of Nigeria: Country Strategy Opportunity Programme. Report Review of Executive Board Ninety-ninth Session, Rome, 2012.
5. Lemu MI. The Role of the Community in the Implementation of Universal Basic Education (UBE) Programme. In: Ngwu P. N. C. (eds) All Nigerian Conference of Principals of Secondary Schools (ANCOPSS) and the Mandatory Continuing Professional Training (MCPT) Programme, 2006, 74.
6. NPC, National Population Census 2006, 2006.
7. Nwizu SC. Economics of Adult Education. (ADE 322). Unpublished Notes. Adult Education Department University of Nigeria Nsukka, 2001.
8. Ochepe CO, Ejembi EP, Agada MO, Jiriko RK. Effect of Community and Social Development Project on rural communities in North Central Nigeria. International Journal of Innovation and Research in Educational Sciences, ISSN (Online), 2018;5(6):2349–5219.
9. Oyesola OB. Rural Dwellers perception on Effect of Infrastructural Facilities on Livelihood activities in Akinyele Local Government Area of Oyo State, Nigeria. Journal of economics and rural development, 2013;16(1):83.
10. Udu LE, Onwe SO. 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., 2016;9(1):296-307.
11. Sidi SH, Hashim A, Abubakar BZ, Ladebo OJ, Uthman AA, Yelwa FJ. 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). ISSN: 2456-1878, 2020, 5(1).<https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijeab.51.5>
12. ADI SS *et al*, Impact of Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) on rural communities in Southern Taraba State, Nigeria., 2022.