COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND BENEFICIARIES' PERCEIVED SUSTAINABILITY OF COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS IN IBADAN, OYO STATE, NIGERIA

Obar, E. E., Adekoya, A. E. and Nkwocha, C. A.
Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, University of Ibadan, Nigeria
Correspondence contact details: ukayobar28@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Development interventions are often targeted at alleviating community challenges and enhancing livelihood sustainability. However, most intervention efforts usually have short-lived impacts and the projects often degenerate into nothingness. However, community participation has been fingered as one major tool that can ensure the sustainability of community development projects. This study therefore examined the effects of community participation on the sustainability of Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. Multistage sampling procedure was used to select respondents for the study. Three communities each from the urban, peri-urban and rural areas where CSDP had completed projects were purposively selected for the study. A total of 168 respondents were randomly selected in these communities. Quantitative data on respondents' age, sex, marital status, household size, community and social characteristics were collected using interview schedule. Data were analysed using frequency counts, percentages and mean, as well as PPMC and Chi-square. The mean age of respondents was 52.8±14.0 years; most (69.6%) of the respondents were males..More than one third of the respondents had tertiary education (43.5%). More than half (53.0%) of the respondents spent 2-5 hours in community development, (56.6%) participated in the project, (52.4%) were indigenes and (55.4%) were community project management committee (CPMC) members. The mean number of years spent in the community was 17.7±15.2 years. The area in which respondents participated most was sharing of idea ($\bar{x}$ =2.39). while (55.4%) had high level of participation and (66.1%) indicated that the projects had high sustainability. Significant ($p<0.05$) relationships exist between project sustainability (r=0.415), age (r=0.281), number of years of formal education (r=0.154, number of hours spent in community (r=0.469) and level of community participation in CSDP. Chi-square shows that significant ($p<0.05$) associations exist between sex (χ^2=9.721), type of community participation (χ^2=26.820), status in the community (χ^2=41.985) and level of community participation. It was observed that males participated more in community development than females. Also, technical sustainability of projects was found to be low. Therefore efforts should be made to encourage youths to participate in community development.

Keywords: Community participation, Project sustainability, CSDP

INTRODUCTION

Community development is any concerted action in a locality taken by any agency and/or the local people themselves with the primary aim of bringing some benefit to the locality. It is also a movement to promote better living for the whole community with the active participation and if possible on the initiative of the community itself (Ekong, 2003) as reflected in the translated version of a Tamal proverb which says, 'if a city or place as a whole makes an effort, the goal is achieved'. The idea of community participation cannot be removed from community development (Ofuoku, 2011). When communities are involved in project initiation and implementation, there is the assurance of sustainability unlike when they have no idea about the project or when it is imposed on them (Olukotun, 2008).

The principle of community participation is an essential impetus restricted not only to the assurance of success of the intervention initiative but also the sustainability of such effort and the acquisition of skills for collective action and maintenance (Musa, 2002). It is also an antidote to psychological estrangement and thus creates a sense of belonging and ownership in the outcome of the intervention as seen in the Chinese proverb, 'go to the people, love the people, live with the people, learn with the people, link your knowledge with theirs, start with what they have and when you finish your job, the people will say, we did it all by ourselves'. Abiona and Bello (2013) affirms that projects provided solely by the government without involving the people could not be sustained because there was no commitment on the part of the people. Since development interventions are not eternal or indefinite, it is only imperative that members of the benefiting community are integrated into the programme decision making processing, planning and evaluation for the sustenance of the project and thus the accrual of its long term benefits.

Community-driven or bottom-up approach to development is premised on community ownership and responsibility for the planning, implementation and monitoring of development projects (Gillespie, 2004). Thus, the bottom-up approach ensures that everybody in the community is carried along in community development activities and increases the importance the people attach to the development intervention, leading to the multiplier effect of maintenance and

sustainability of such initiative. The bottom-up approach may be likened to teaching a person to catch fish instead of giving him fish. The Community Driven Development (CDD) approach has become a key strategy used by both government and development assistance programmes (World Bank, 2006).

The Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) is a World Bank Assisted Project for poverty reduction intervention to sustainably increase access of the poor to social infrastructure and natural resources. It employs the Community Driven Development (CDD) approach in its service delivery which is a new initiative in poverty reduction strategy that places the poor on the 'driver's seat in decision making for development activities.

The sustainability of any community project, to a large extent depends on the participation of the members (Mahama and Badu-Nyarko, 2014). Sustainability can be defined as the continuation of project benefits beyond the project period, and the continuation of local action stimulated by the project, and the generation of successor services and initiatives as a result of project- built local capacity (Hondale and Vansant, 2001).

Ibadan is a city located in south-western Nigeria in the south-eastern part of Oyo state. More of the CSDP have been implemented in the area through Oyo State Community and Social Development Associations (OYCSDA) and some of them are presently in use. However, some the projects have gone moribund while there are traces of poor maintenance of others.

The USAID and World Bank's post evaluation showed that the majority of development interventions have low levels of sustainability after the completion of the project (Goldsmith and Brinkerhoff, 1992). This defect created the need for governments and donors to finance projects that would help beneficiaries become independent rather than giving them charity which is unsustainable (Bossert, 1990). Project sustainability is a big problem in developing countries including Nigeria, as a result of poor community participation (United Nations Development Programme, 2005).

It is against this background that the study is designed to empirically establish a relationship between community participation and sustainability in CSDP. Specifically, the study addressed the following:

1. describe the socioeconomic characteristics of the CSDP beneficiaries in the study area,
2. identify the areas of participation of community members across the project implementation phases in the study area,
3. ascertain the level of community participation in CSDP in the study area,
4. assess the sustainability of CSDP in the study area.

METHODOLOGY

The study was carried out in Ibadan, Oyo state, Nigeria. Ibadan has 11 Local Government Areas and the OYCSDP has intervened in nine of the Local Government Areas. The population of study includes all community members that are participants/beneficiaries of CSDP in Ibadan, Oyo state.

Multistage sampling method was employed in this study. Firstly, the communities in Ibadan were stratified into urban, rural and peri-urban. Secondly, purposive sampling was used to select nine communities across the strata (3 urban communities, 3 rural communities and 3 peri-urban communities). The sampling frame for the CPMC (Community Project Management Committee) is 17 each from the 9 selected communities. The last stage involved random sampling to select 10 CPMC members from each community and 10 non CPMC members each from the urban, rural and peri-urban communities, making a total of 180 respondents. However, only 168 questionnaires were recovered. Data on respondents' community and social characteristics, areas and level of community participation and level of sustainability of CSDP were analysed.

Respondents' areas and level of community participation in CSDP was measured using a 4-point Likert scale of High (3), Moderate (2), Low (1) and No participation (0). The maximum score obtainable was 69 (sixty-nine) while the minimum score obtainable was 0 (zero). A participation score was obtained and used to categorise participation into high, medium and low participation to indicate the level of community participation. Also, sustainability of Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) was indicated using Yes (1) and No (0). The maximum obtainable score was 26 and the lowest score was 0. Scores of each item was summed up to form a composite sustainability score for each of the respondents. Respondents were categorised into two, using the mean score as the bench mark, such that those whose score falls below the mean score will have low level of sustainability, while those who have scores equal to or greater than the mean score were categorised as having high level of sustainability.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socioeconomic characteristics

The result of the analysis as presented in Table 1 shows the mean age of community members to be 52.8±14.0 years across respondent

categories. This implies that they are matured; more experienced in life and thus may make valuable decisions for the community as well as being able to actively participate in physical work. The results contradict the findings of Kabue (2011) who observed that young people may be receptive to new ideas and innovations and are more likely to try out new initiatives but it is in tandem with Miseda (2014) who asserted from the findings of Checkoway and Richards-Schuster (2003) that youth participation is undefined, underdeveloped and hence requires further exploration in order to educate and encourage youth to participate in community development projects.

The respondents for the study consisted of (69.6%) male and (30.4%) female as shown in Table 1. The implication of this is that both sexes are involved in community participation of CSDP. This finding is in coherence with Sosanya (2013) who documented that in other to allow gender inclusiveness, each of the participating community in CSDP has at least three women in the CPMC; one occupies a signatory position and at least one woman in each of all the three subcommittees in the CPMC or 30% inclusion of women in CPMC.

In addition, majority of the respondents (92.3%) in the study area were married, (4.8%) single, (1.8%) divorced and (1.2%) separated. The fact that majority of the respondents across the communities were married is an indication that they are viewed as responsible and mature adults who are ready to contribute to the development of their communities.

Furthermore, the result shows that the mean household size of respondents is 6.6±4.5 persons across all the communities in the study area. This indicates that most of the respondents in the study area have a large household and by implication, more hands will be available for community participation. A large household size could mean over dependency on scarce resources which could stimulate yearning for better conditions of life and thus lead to community participation in development activities.

Table 1 also shows that the mean years of formal education was 11.8±5.3 years. The results suggest that a larger percentage of the respondents had one form of education or the other and this can predispose them to community participation. This assertion is in agreement with Okunlola and Mafimisebi (2013); Adesida and Okunlola (2015) that educational status influences the level of community participation.

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents' Personal characteristics

Variables	Urban (n=58) Percentage	Peri-urban (n=59) Percentage	Rural (n=51) Percentage	Total (n=168) Percentage	Mean
Age					
< 39	1.7	25.4	25.5	17.3	52.8
39-53	20.7	33.9	45.1	32.7	
54-67	44.8	37.3	17.6	33.9	
> 67	32.8	3.4	11.8	16.1	
Sex					
Male	75.9	61.0	72.5	69.6	
Female	24.1	39.0	27.5	30.4	
Marital status					
Single	1.7	5.1	7.8	4.8	
Married	93.1	91.5	92.2	92.3	
Separated	1.7	1.7	0.0	1.2	
Divorced	3.4	1.7	0.0	1.8	
Household size					
< 3	12.1	3.4	0.0	5.4	6.6
3-7	63.8	79.7	72.5	72.0	
8-11	15.5	11.9	17.6	14.9	
> 11	8.6	5.1	9.8	7.7	
Formal education					
Non formal	3.4	0.0	13.7	5.4	11.8
Primary education	22.4	16.9	23.5	20.8	
Secondary education	36.2	20.3	35.3	30.4	
Tertiary education	37.9	62.7	27.5	43.5	

Source: Field survey, 2016

Economic characteristics

In Table 2, the total result shows that the predominant occupations in the study area were

trading (35.1%), civil service (22.0%), retirees (14.3%) and farming (13.7%). This implies that respondents were involved in income generating activities and thus capable of contributing financially to community development activities.

The analysis of results presented in the Table further shows that (68.5%) were not engaged in secondary occupation. This suggests that most of the respondents rely on their primary occupation as their major source of income.

In Table 2, the estimated mean monthly income was N 58, 594.03±50612.38. This implies that a greater number of respondents in the study area can contribute financially to community development activities.

Table 2: Economic characteristics of respondents

Variables	Urban (n=58)	Peri-urban (n=59)	Rural (n=51)	Total (n=168)	Mean
	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage	
Primary occupation					
Farming	1.7	5.1	37.3	13.7	
Craft making	8.6	10.2	2.0	7.1	
Civil service	12.1	35.6	17.6	22.0	
Trading	36.2	33.9	35.3	35.1	
Retiree	32.8	5.1	3.9	14.3	
Clergy	3.4	1.7	0	1.8	
Banking	1.7	0	0	0.6	
Student	0	1.7	0	0.6	
Artisan	3.4	6.8	2.0	4.2	
Teaching	0	0	2.0	0.6	
Secondary occupation					
None	81.0	66.1	56.9	68.5	
Farming	8.6	10.2	13.7	10.7	
Craft making	0	3.4	0	1.2	
Trading	6.9	10.2	21.6	12.5	
Teaching	0	5.1	0	1.8	
Transporting	1.7	1.7	3.9	2.4	
Artisan	1.7	3.4	2.0	2.4	
Clergy	0	0	2.0	0.6	
Estimated monthly income					
< N 8, 000	3.4	8.5	2.0	4.8	58, 594
N 8000 - N 59000	55.2	42.4	72.5	56.0	
N 59001 - N 110000	24.1	37.3	23.5	28.6	
> N 110000	17.2	11.9	2.0	10.7	

Source: Field survey, 2016

Community characteristics of respondents

The results on Table 3 shows that 53.0% of the respondents spent between 2-5 hours in community participation, 20.8% spent between 6-8 hours, 16.7% spent more than 8 hours and 9.5% spent less than 2 hours in community participation. This is an indication that majority of the respondents across the various communities spent appreciable time in community development activities.

In addition, the total results indicates that 56.0% of the respondents had spent between 3-18 years in the community, 24.4% spent between 19-33 years in the community, 13.7% spent more than 33 years and 6.0% had spent less than 3 years in the community.

This result implies that majority of the respondents across the communities have spent an appreciable number of years in their communities and are conversant with the community members and the community itself and thus can identify the needs of the community and give other details about the community.

Furthermore, the number of projects participated in. Overall, 1.2% of the respondents participated in less than 1 project, 42.3% participated in 1-2 projects and 56.5% participated in more than 3 projects. This implies that majority of the respondents across the communities participated in more than 1 projects and are thus familiar with the projects and have an idea about the operation and maintenance of the project facility.

Also, 47.6% of the respondents were non-indigenes while 52.4% were indigenes. This implies that community participation of CSDP covered both indigenes and non-indigenes in its activities.

The analysis of the result presented in Table 3 shows that on the overall, 11.3% of the respondents were community leaders, 55.4% were CPMC members and 33.3% were non CPMC members. This result suggests that every category in the community was involved in CSDP.

Table 3: Distribution of Respondents' Community participation characteristics

Variables	Urban (n=58) Percentage	Peri-urban (n=59) Percentage	Rural (n=51) Percentage	Total (n=168) %	Mean
Hours spent in participation					
< 2	12.1	6.8	9.8	9.5	5.0
2-5	43.1	44.1	74.5	53.0	
6-8	25.9	22.0	13.7	20.8	
> 8	19.0	27.1	2.0	16.7	
Years spent in community					
< 3	1.7	6.8	9.8	6.0	17.7
3-18	41.4	76.3	49.0	56.0	
19-33	29.3	13.6	31.4	24.4	
> 33	27.6	3.4	9.8	13.7	
Number of projects participated in					
< 1	3.4	0.0	0.0	1.2	2.4
1-2	44.8	27.1	56.9	42.3	
> 3	51.7	72.9	43.1	56.5	
Ethnicity					
Non-indigene	48.3	55.9	37.3	47.6	
Indigene	51.7	44.1	62.7	52.4	
Status in community					
Community leader	10.3	13.6	9.8	11.3	
CPMC	51.7	55.9	58.8	55.4	
Non CPMC	37.9	30.5	31.4	33.3	

Source: Field survey, 2016

Areas of participation by community members across the project implementation phases

There were several areas in which respondents participated in community activities. The areas of participation by community members across the project implementation phases were project identification, prioritisation of needs, sharing of ideas, leadership roles in project, decision making, assuming control, information sharing, volunteering in terms of skills and labour, financial contributions, consultations, mobilisation, monitoring, evaluation, implementation, attending meetings, supply of needed materials and organisation of fund raising. The analysis of results as shown in Table 4 shows that most of the respondents participated in sharing of ideas ($\overline{X}$ =2.39), project planning ($\overline{X}$ =2.38), attendance at meeting ($\overline{X}$ =2.38) and prioritisation of needs ($\overline{X}$ =2.34). The respondents rated lowest was in the area of supply of needed materials ($\overline{X}$ =1.05). This implies that majority of the respondents did not participate in the supply of needed materials.

Table 4: Distribution of Respondents' Areas of community participation

Areas of participation in project	**Urban**		**Peri-urban**		**Rural**		**Total**	
	Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**
Project identification and planning								
Need analysis	2.31	0.922	2.39	0.720	2.23	0.764	2.32	0.805
Project planning	2.38	0.914	2.39	0.810	2.35	0.716	2.38	0.817

Areas of participation in project	Urban		Peri-urban		Rural		Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Prioritisation of needs	2.40	0.897	2.46	0.837	2.14	0.749	2.34	0.840
Sharing of idea	2.57	0.728	2.47	0.679	2.08	0.796	2.39	0.758
Leadership role in project	2.02	1.304	2.08	1.164	1.71	1.238	1.95	1.239
Decision making								
Selecting projects	2.34	0.965	2.34	0.958	2.04	0.774	2.25	0.914
Deciding project scale (length)	1.69	1.063	1.73	1.031	1.88	0.765	1.76	0.968
Deciding project scale (capacity)	1.67	1.049	1.71	0.984	1.86	0.749	1.74	0.941
Deciding project design	1.43	1.244	1.20	1.126	1.78	0.783	1.46	1.099
Deciding the time frame for project construction	1.55	1.142	1.54	0.971	1.71	0.855	1.60	0.998
Deciding project location	2.28	1.056	2.12	0.930	2.10	0.671	2.17	0.907
Assume control	1.95	1.206	2.05	0.972	1.92	0.744	1.98	0.997
Information sharing	2.24	1.081	2.42	0.792	2.04	0.747	2.24	0.899
Volunteering in terms of skills and labour	2.05	1.176	2.29	0.911	1.92	0.744	2.10	0.974
Financial contribution	2.69	0.754	1.98	1.137	2.02	0.787	2.24	0.968
Consultation	2.09	1.189	2.05	0.972	2.00	0.825	2.05	1.008
Mobilisation	2.16	1.121	2.37	0.828	2.22	0.783	2.25	0.927
Monitoring	2.10	1.209	2.39	0.766	2.35	0.688	2.28	0.928
Evaluation	2.05	1.220	2.34	0.822	2.35	0.688	2.24	0.951
Implementation	2.12	1.156	2.34	0.883	2.41	0.638	2.29	0.930
Attendance at meeting	2.38	0.970	2.41	0.873	2.35	0.744	2.38	0.867
Supply of needed materials	0.66	1.101	0.86	1.152	1.73	1.266	1.05	1.249
Organisation of fund raising	1.98	1.221	2.00	1.067	1.71	1.119	1.90	1.139

Source: Field survey, 2016

Level of community participation of CSDP

Table 5 shows that more of the respondents (55.4%) had a high level of participation in CSDP, (26.8%) participated moderately while (17.9%) had low participation. The implication of this is that there is likely to be sustainability of the project since they would see the project as 'our own' instead of 'their own'. As Abiona (2009) puts it, participation yields greater interest in sustainability. The respondents in the urban area (60.0%), peri-urban area (55.9%) and rural area (49.0%) had high level of participation in CSDP.

Table 5: Level of community participation in CSDP

Levels	Scores range	Urban Percentage	Peri-urban Percentage	Rural Percentage	Total Percentage
Low	≤31.90	31.0	16.9	3.9	17.9
Medium	≥32.0≤47.30	8.6	27.1	47.1	26.8
High	≥47.31	60.3	55.9	49.0	55.4

Source: Field survey, 2016
Mean=47.3, SD±15.3

Sustainability of CSDP

Economic sustainability of CSDP - Table 6 shows the economic sustainability of CSDP. In total, majority (68.5%) of the respondents indicated that the projects had high economic sustainability. Furthermore, majority of the respondents in the urban (76.3%), peri-urban (54.2%) and rural (72.5%) areas indicated that the projects had high economic sustainability.

Technical sustainability - The technical sustainability as indicated by respondents is shown in Table 6. In total, (47%) of the respondents indicated that the projects had high technical sustainability. In the urban, peri-urban and rural areas, 34.5%, 62.7% and 44.1% of the respondents indicated that the CSDPs had high technical sustainability in the study area respectively.

Social sustainability of CSDP - The result from the survey as shown in Table 6 shows that in total, more than half of the respondents (51.2%) indicated that the projects had high social sustainability. In the urban communities, (43.1%) of the respondents indicated that the projects had high sustainability while (45.1%) of the respondents indicated that the projects had high social sustainability in the rural communities.

Environmental sustainability - The result of Table 6 in total shows that majority (81.5%) of the respondents indicated that the projects were environmentally sustainable. In the urban (81.0%), peri-urban (88.1%) and rural (74.5%) communities, majority of the respondents indicated that the projects were environmentally sustainable. This implies that the projects do not pose a threat to the environment. This result is in tandem with Ojerinde (2014) that CSDP considers the environmental appropriateness of projects.

Table 6 Economic sustainability of CSDP

Category	Scores range	Urban Percentage	Peri-urban Percentage	Rural Percentage	Total Percentage
Low	≤3.48	20.7	45.8	27.5	31.5
High	≥3.49	79.3	54.2	72.5	68.5
				Mean=3.49, SD±0.869	
Technical sustainability of CSDP					
Low	≤9.03	65.5	37.3	56.9	53
High	≥9.04	34.5	62.7	43.1	47
				Mean=9.04, SD±1.301	
Social sustainability of CSDP					
Low	≤10.28	56.9	35.6	54.9	48.8
High	≥10.29	43.1	64.4	45.1	51.2
				Mean=10.29, SD±0.885	
Environmental sustainability of CSDP					
Low	≤0.81	19.0	11.9	25.5	18.5
High	≥0.82	81.0	88.1	74.5	81.5
				Mean=0.82, SD±0.389	

Source: Field survey, 2016

Results from the survey as shown in Table 7 reveal that majority (66.1%) of the respondents indicated that Community and Social Development Projects had high level of sustainability. Also in the urban (70.7%), peri-urban (57.6%) and rural areas (70.6%), majority of the respondents indicated that the projects had high sustainability. This implies that the project facility has long life span probably because of their level of participation in CSDP. This result meets the criteria for Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD operations (ARRI) (2015), that sustainability must pass the economic, technical, social and environmental aspects.

Table 7: Level of Sustainability of CSDP

Category	Scores range	Urban Percentage	Peri-urban Percentage	Rural Percentage	Total Percentage
Low	≤23.63	29.3	42.4	29.4	33.9
High	≥23.64	70.7	57.6	70.6	66.1

Source: Field survey, 2016
Mean=23.64, SD=2.275

Test of hypotheses

Relationship between level of community participation and sustainability of CSDP

Results from Table 8 shows that there is a significant relationship between the level of community participation and the sustainability of CSDP ($r=0.415$; $p<0.05$). The null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that the higher the level of community participation, the higher the sustainability of projects. This result corroborates the findings of Cheetham (2002), Akoroda (2012), Abiona (2009), Steve and Olufemi (2011), Olaleye (2010) and Olukosi (2002) that a positive relationship exists between participation and sustainability and that the higher the level of community participation, the higher the sustainability of projects.

Table 8: Relationship between level of participation and sustainability

Variable	r	P	Decision
Level of participation	0.415	0.000	S

Source: Field survey, 2016

Relationship between selected socioeconomic characteristics and community participation

Results from Table 9 shows that significant relationships exist between age (r=0.281), number of years of formal education (r=0.154), number of hours spent in community participation (r=0.469) and community participation. The null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that the higher the age, the higher the level of community participation. This finding is in agreement with the assertion of Miseda (2014) that youth participation is undefined, underdeveloped and hence requires further exploration in order to educate and encourage youth to participate in community development projects.

Table 9: Relationship between selected socioeconomic characteristics and level of community participation

Variable	r	p	Decision
Age	0.281	0.005	S
Household size	0.123	0.114	NS
Number of years of formal education	0.154	0.047	S
Number of hours spent in community participation	0.469	0.000	S
Number of years spent in the community	0.095	0.220	NS
Estimated monthly income	0.012	0.878	NS

Source: Field survey, 2016

Relationship between selected variables and community participation

Table 10 shows the relationship between sex, religion, ethnicity, type of community of the respondents and status in the community with level of community participation. The table indicates that was a significant relationship between sex (χ^2=9.721, p<0.05), type of community (χ^2=26.820, p<0.05) and status in the community (χ^2=41.985, p<0.05) with level of community participation. The null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that level of community participation is a function of sex as more males participated in community development than their female counterpart in the study area. The result also shows that ethnicity (χ^2=0.444, p<0.05) is not significantly related to level of community participation. The implication of this is that participation in community development is not inhibited by ethnicity.

Table 10: Relationship between selected socioeconomic characteristics and level of community participation

Variable	χ2	df	P	Decision
Sex	9.721	2	0.008	S
Ethnicity	0.444	2	0.801	NS
Type of community	26.820	4	0.000	S
Status in the community	41.985	4	0.000	S

Source: Field survey, 2016

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study concluded that there was minimum youth participation in community development. It was observed that males participated more in community development than females. Also, technical sustainability of projects was found to be low.

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made to improve the effect of community participation on sustainability of CSDP:

- Efforts should be made to encourage youth in community development
- Efforts should be made to encourage women to participate more in community development
- More training in operation and maintenance of projects should be conducted in order to increase the technical sustainability of projects.

REFERENCES

Abiona, I. A. (2009). Principles and Practice of Community Development (pp. 17-81). Ibadan University Press.

Abiona, L. A., and Bello, N. W. (2013) Grassroots Participation in Decision-Making Process and Development Programmes as Correlate of Sustainability of Community Development Programmes in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development, 6*(3), pp. 47.

Adesida, I. E. and Okunlola, J. O. (2015). Effects of community participation on the sustainability of rural infrastructure in Ondo State, Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Agriculture Extension, Economics and*

Sociology, *7*(1), 2. DOI: 10.9734/AJAEES/2015/15756.

Akoroda, O. (2012). Citizen Participation in Self–Help Projects and Socio- Economic Development in Communities in Delta and Oyo State. (Unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of Ibadan, Nigeria).

Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD operations (ARRI) 2015. Accessed on April 15 2017, from https://www.ifad.org/documents/10180/a54c0bd8-02ed-45ba-9339-31d6d75716e4

Bossert, T. J. (1990). Can they get along without us? Sustainability of donor supported health projects in Central America and Africa. *Social science and medicine Journal, 30*, 1051-1023.

Checkoway, B. and Richards-schuster, K. (2003). Youth Participation in Community Evaluation Research. *Am JEval,* 24 (1): 21-33.

Cheetham, N. (2002). Community participation: What is it? Transitions, 14(3), 4.

Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) (2011a). Final Project Implementation Manual at State and Community Levels

Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) (2011b). The Community and Social Development Projects. http://www/csdp/org/html

Ekong, E. E. (2003). *Community Development in Nigeria*. An introduction to rural sociology (pp. 309 and 320).

Gillespie, S. (2004). Scaling up community-driven development: A synthesis of experience. International Food Policy Research Institute, Food Consumption and Nutrition Division, FCND, Discussion Papers, pp. 181.

Goldsmith, A. A. and Brinkerhoff, D. W. (1992). Promoting the sustainability of development institutions: A framework for strategy. World Development 20(3), pp. 369-383.

Hondale, G. and Vansant, J. (2001). Organising and managing integrated rural development: Lessons from experience. Washington, D.C: Development Alternatives.

Kabue, M. N. (2011).Factors influencing women involvement in implementation of Community Development Projects. A case of Wanyororo Intergrated Sustainable Development Unit. (Unpublished M.A project). University of Nairobi

Mahama, A. V. and Badu-Nyarko, S. K. (2014). Community participation in water delivery services and sustainability in the Savelugu/Nanton Municipality, Ghana. *African Educational Research Journal, 2*(2), pp. 54-60.

Miseda, B.A. (2014). Influence of community participation on sustainability of selected njaa marufuku Kenya food security projects in Kisumu west, Kisumu county, Kenya. University of Nairobi, Kenya.

Musa, S.M.E. (2002). Feeder roads and food security in balancing the load: women, gender and transport. UK: Zed Books Ltd., pp 79-94

Ofuoku, A. U. (2011). Effect of community participation on sustainability of rural water projects in Delta Central agricultural zone of Delta State, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development,* *3*(7), pp. 130. http://academic journals.org/JAERD.

Ojerinde, A. G. (2014). Oyo CSDP: Keying into guidelines for ensuring micro-projects sustainability. Oyo CSDP Newsletter, 3(1), pp. 14.

Okunlola, J. O. and Mafimisebi, T. E. (2013). Sociology of use of medicinal plants and plant medicines for sustainable agricultural developments in Nigeria in Miracles of Ethno-Botany; Socioeconomic Aspects *eds*. Hosamai P.A and Sandeepkumar K. Published by Bio Science Prakashan, Karnataka, India. 14-140.

Olaleye, Y. L. (2010). The contributions of the doctrine of citizens' participation in organisation and implementation of community development project. *European Journal of Scientific Research*. http://www.eurojournal.com/ejsr.htm/.

Olukosi, J. O. (2002). The application of community driven development approach in Nigeria. Lead paper sensitization, mobilization workshop for Federal, State and Local Government Staff in FGN/IFAD community based agricultural and rural development.

Olukotun, G. A. (2008). Achieving project sustainability through community participation. *Journal of social science, 17*(1), 21-29.

Sosanya, J. O. (2013). Gender and vulnerable groups: Essential impetus for community development. Oyo CSDP Newsletter, 2(2), 13.

Steve, M. and Olufemi, A. (2011). Implementations of the ranking of community participation strategies in health development. *Bangladesh e-Journal of Sociology*, 8(2), pp 69-86

UNDP Human Development Report (2005). Beyond Scarcity: Power, poverty and the

global water crisis. Accessed on April 12 2017, source http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/HDR/2006%20Global%20HDR/HDR-2006-Beyond%20scarcity-Power-poverty-and-the-global-water-crisis.pdf

World Bank (2004). World development report: Making services work for poor people. Source: https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/5986/WDR%202004%20-%20English.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

World Bank (2006). Community-Driven Development in the context of conflict-affected countries: challenges and opportunities. Source: http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/497351468137707391/CDD-in-the-context-of-conflict-affected-countries-challenges-and-opportunities