



## LOCALISED INITIATIVES: HOUSEHOLDS' CONTRIBUTION TO INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT IN ONDO STATE, NIGERIA

J.A.B. Olujimi<sup>1</sup>

A.A. Emmanuel<sup>2</sup>

O.O. Simon-Oke<sup>3</sup>

F.C. Arowosafe<sup>4\*</sup>

O.O. Popoola<sup>5</sup>

T. Akinbode<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1,2,5,6</sup>Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Nigeria.

<sup>1</sup>Email: [jabolujimi@futa.edu.ng](mailto:jabolujimi@futa.edu.ng) Tel: +2348034540637

<sup>2</sup>Email: [aaemmanuel@futa.edu.ng](mailto:aaemmanuel@futa.edu.ng) Tel: +2348062461642

<sup>3</sup>Email: [oopopoola@futa.edu.ng](mailto:oopopoola@futa.edu.ng) Tel: +2348177095315

<sup>4</sup>Email: [takinbode@futa.edu.ng](mailto:takinbode@futa.edu.ng) Tel: +2348034334573

<sup>5</sup>Department of Economics, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Nigeria.

<sup>5</sup>Email: [ooosimon-oke@futa.edu.ng](mailto:ooosimon-oke@futa.edu.ng) Tel: +2348037734653

<sup>6</sup>Department of Ecotourism and Wildlife Management, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Nigeria.

<sup>6</sup>Email: [fcarrowosafe@futa.edu.ng](mailto:fcarrowosafe@futa.edu.ng) Tel: +2347066297952



(+ Corresponding author)

### ABSTRACT

#### Article History

Received: 20 July 2021

Revised: 23 August 2021

Accepted: 10 September 2021

Published: 27 September 2021

#### Keywords

Community  
Development  
Households  
Infrastructure  
Ondo State  
Nigeria  
Urban  
Rural  
Organizations.

Community-Driven Development (CDD), as an approach to community development, treats the people and their institutions as assets and partners in the development process. Infrastructure provision is a catalyst to community development as its lack or inefficiency impedes the growth of economic, social and welfare related ventures in both rural and urban communities. This paper explores the contribution of residents/households to communal efforts in the provision and maintenance of community infrastructure in Ondo State, Nigeria. It exposes their connectedness with community associations in the provision and management of identified community infrastructure in order to improve the quality of life in the area. Three hundred and seventy (370) households were selected across the state in a multistage sampling process to administer a well-structured open and close ended questionnaire; using residential buildings as sampling units. Six (6) urban and rural settlements were targeted for the data gathering across the three (3) senatorial districts of the state. Major findings established a high variation in the dominance of approaches to financial contribution espoused by households across the state towards community infrastructure development. A high level of involvement in project identification for CBOs' execution and the dominance of availability as labourers for general infrastructure provision were equally discovered among other findings. Recommendations are targeted towards transparency and accountability on the part of community organizations while International Organizations are encouraged to focus more on road construction in rural community and poorly accessed areas of urban centres in order to achieve sustained community transformation.

**Contribution/Originality:** This study contributes to existing literature by documenting the contributions of households and residents to communal efforts as well as participation in community Associations and groups in the provision and maintenance of identified community infrastructure in order to improve the quality of life in the area for all residents.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In a developing country like Nigeria, prospective political office holders or administrators entice the electorates by using infrastructure provision to strongly canvass for support towards attaining positions of authority. Its influence as a catalyst to economic development and its lack, shortage or inefficiency as an impediment to economic and social welfare makes infrastructure provision a game winner in the political process. Olujimi and Bello (2009) attested to the role of infrastructural development as having a direct bearing on economic growth when they said that 'when infrastructure works, productivity and labour increases; but when it does not work, economic renewal can be postponed or even halted'. The perpetual shortage of such 'essential commodity' not only drives the political process in Nigeria but also pushes for alternative means towards its acquisition in local communities.

At the local level, one of the approaches to Community Development is Community-Driven Development (CDD). This approach, among other initiatives, seeks to provide necessary infrastructure in and for communities using a participatory role that involves concerned communities. Community-driven approaches to development are based on the premise of community ownership and responsibility for planning, implementation and monitoring of development projects (Gillespie, 2004). Along the same line, CDD models are consistent with the theory presented that given the right condition, communities will effectively manage their common pool of resources and avoid the tragedy of the commons (overuse or mismanagement of resources). Proponents of Sustainable Development have come to embrace environment-friendly approaches to technological advancement. This concern equally brings to bear the thoughts around the use of local resources which are environmental friendly in the provision of infrastructure. CDD gives control of development decisions and resources to community groups. Most times such groups (mainly referred to as Community-based Organizations or CBOs), due to shortage of fund; have to rely on local resources and indigenous knowledge to execute infrastructural projects. The CBOs are organizations which are involved in various developmental activities that enhance the living standard of their communities (Nden, 2004). They are non-profit organizations that help to promote economic activities and provide infrastructural facilities.

In addition to CBOs, families or households in communities have also become very helpful in the CDD process. Sometimes, CBOs work with households to promote development in their communities. This increases the level of engagement of the community in the developmental process. As the bottom-up approach becomes more acceptable to complement governments' efforts at various levels, CDD has thrived on community-driven infrastructure provision across the globe. In Nigeria and in Ondo state in particular, local efforts at achieving infrastructure provision has not been without the contributions of households in communities. As communities evolve strategies of self-help in order to provide necessary infrastructure for their residents, there is need to continually assess the efforts of various providers of support in this context. This is with a view to promoting economic and social development of their localities.

This study focuses on five (5) important infrastructure that play significant role in the social and economic development of the people that are provided through communal efforts in the state. These are water, electricity, roads and drainages, health facilities, and markets. This is due to the observed concentration of efforts around these basic needs premised on the importance placed on them.

## 2. ABRIDGED LITERATURE REVIEW

Community-Driven Development (CDD) has its roots in the concept of Community Development (CD) as one of its approaches. There are several overlapping approaches to Community Development. While some of those approaches focus on the objectives, others focus on the processes involved. Community Development, according to UNDP (2014) is a process where community members come together to take collective action and generate solutions to common problems. Community-Driven Development, as an approach to Community Development, rather than treating the poor as targets of poverty reduction efforts, treats them and their institutions as assets and partners in the development process (World Bank, 2004).

CDD gives control of decisions and resources to community groups. The World Bank further emphasizes that these groups often work in partnership with demand-responsive support organizations and service providers including elected local governments, the private sector, NGOs, and central government agencies. CDD is an approach to provide social and infrastructure services, to organize economic activity and resource management, to empower poor people, improve governance, and enhance security of the poorest. Amongst the earliest Community Development approaches were those developed in Kenya and British East Africa during the 1930s.

The use of CDD has been driven by a growing demand from both countries and aid agencies for large-scale, bottom-up, and demand-driven, poverty reduction projects that increase the capacity of communities for self-development and strengthen local institutions (Malombe, 2000). Dongier et al. (2002) opines that CDD provides communities with a voice and control over all project stages, believing it enhances sustainability, improves efficiency and effectiveness, moves poverty reduction efforts to scale and engender inclusive development. It is also believed to empower the people, build social capital, strengthen governance; and complement market and public sector activities (Baird, 2009; Binswanger et al., 2010).

Owing to its many advantages, the World Bank's investment in CDD from 2000 to 2010 has been enormous, averaging almost USD 2 billion a year. In 2008, the International Development Association's (IDA) lending for CDD related programs averaged 17% of its total lending; while the number of CDD programs active at the IDA for the 2007–2009 period averaged over seventy-two (World Bank, 2010). On World Bank's CDD lending, between 2000 and 2005, 25% went to Africa (Asian Development Bank, 2006). Between 2005 and 2011, Ghana benefited from loan facilities from the World Bank's IDA and the Agence Francaise Development to implement Community-Based Rural Development Project (CBRDP) in all its ten regions and 145 area councils (Adusei-Asante & Hancock, 2012; Binswanger-Mkhize, De Regt, & Spector, 2010).

The community groups which are equally referred to as Community-based Organizations (CBOs) are involved in various developmental activities that enhance the living standards of their community (Nden, 2004). They are localized organizations that are rooted in local communities. CBOs exist in form of Community Development Associations (CDAs), Cooperative Societies, User Associations, Workers' Unions or Producers Associations (Bingen, 2003; Helmsing, 2001) intending to reduce poverty and improve the economy and well-being of individuals and households in a local setting. CBOs (most times CDAs) have equally gotten assistance from individuals and families or households within their communities through various means which include levies and donations. Most times, the levies are allotted to residential buildings which may house one or more households while donations come at will from philanthropic individuals who are citizens of the community (though not necessarily resident within the community). These contributions are channeled towards security and infrastructure provision in most cases.

Asian Development Bank (ADB) adopted five elements for defining CDD projects (Asian Development Bank, 2006). First, CDD strategies and infrastructure are community focused because the target beneficiary or implementing agent is always some form of CBO or representative local government. Second, they involve participatory planning and design. Third, the community controls the resources, which ensures that there should be at least some form of resource transfer to the community/CBO. Fourth, the community is involved in implementation through direct supply of inputs, labour, or funds, or indirectly through management and supervision of contractors or operation and maintenance functions. Finally, CDD projects employ community-based participatory monitoring and evaluation to ensure downward accountability to the community.

Inherent in CDD is participation. Blackburn and Holland (1998) described the different interpretations of the concept of participation by the use of four "terms", which are collaboration-input-sponsorship, community development, organization, and empowering. These terms are used to explain the different orientations in the participation, and the different terms represent different intentions or purposes for which participation is adopted by the implementers. In other words, it involves making inputs on any issue by interested members of the public in

order to ensure that plan is made with and not just for the people. Any plan that is not made with the people may not work (Agbola, 2004). Over the years, it has been observed that government's intervention alone would not suffice to achieve an all-round closely knitted development. Hence the need for all other sectors of the society to collaborate in achieving even development (Afolayan, 2012). Participation revolves around various stakeholders in CDD.

According to DFID (2002) a stakeholder is any individual, community, group or organization with an interest in the outcome of a programme, either as a result of being affected by it positively or negatively, or by being able to influence the activity in a positive or negative way. The community is the primary stakeholder group, but other stakeholders with specialized capacities and responsibilities are of essential reference. There is need for identification of relevant stakeholders at the early stage of any project in order to identify the roles of each group and priorities of the consumer group. Stakeholder participation requires commitment, transparency in the process, acknowledgment of alternative views, ideas, time and human resources. Properly handled participation contributes to consensus and acceptance of proposals and will facilitate implementation (DFID, 2002).

The Ontario Healthy Community Coalition (OHCC) (2008) highlights seven major strategies or methods commonly used to for CDD. First is Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD) which is an approach based on the principle of identifying and mobilizing individual and community assets (Frost, 2012). This is followed by Capacity Building which is the development of participatory leadership, skills, knowledge and human resources tools of individuals in communities to address, and have greater control over conditions and factors that affect their quality of life (Ontario Healthy Community Coalition (OHCC), 2008). Also, Community Relations, as a strategy focuses on increasing social integration, improving the social status of minority populations and mediating between various factions of the community. Locality Development is another strategy described by Rotman (1995) as a bottom-up method for community intervention because it is a self-help, participatory model of change. Other strategies are Social Action (more like an advocacy for the overlooked or by-passed), Social Capital Formation (which addresses social networks or connections among individuals and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness) and Social Planning (concerned with the provision of goods and services to members of the community).

Most researches focus on impact of community development on households. For example, Charlery, Qaim, and Smith-Hall (2016) investigated the impact of infrastructure on rural household income and inequality in Nepal. The study contributes to literature by empirically analyzing the effects of rural road construction on household income and income inequality. It was found that new roads significantly impacted positively on mean household income. However, contrary to expectation, there was decreasing inequality with the poorest households gaining most from the road construction, making it a pro-poor development intervention. A few researches have focused on the converse of this scenario, looking into the impact of households' contribution to community development.

Beard (2007) investigated household contributions to community development in Indonesia. She looked into the effects of households and community characteristics on households' contributions of time and money to three types of participatory development efforts namely governance, social welfare and environmental infrastructure. She discovered among other things that households with indicators of lower socio-economic status generally contributed less time and money to community development. Integration into social networks was also a strong predictor of the amount of time a household contributed. Due to the fact that most of the community development efforts analyzed relied on reciprocity, where participants contribute resources in order to receive benefits, the findings raised doubts about the extent to which these efforts help the poor and socially excluded.

Working on household perception on rural development, Barrios (2008) says that public investments in infrastructure and in users' fees can complement each other in the continuous provision of new infrastructure and maintenance of existing ones in the process of sustaining rural development. He sees the socialized users' fees system as a potential tool for preventing widening income disparity in rural areas. It was however strongly

emphasized that there must be a careful selection of a suitable and acceptable socialized fees. This is due to the fact that an incorrect rate could be perceived as a disincentive to access or might stimulate distrust by a segment of the rural society; which will consequently question the sincerity of the government in promoting rural development and might create more social problems instead of bridging inequalities. This paper exposes the contribution of households to infrastructure development in Ondo State, Nigeria.

### 3. METHODOLOGY

As a prelude to the assessment of community-driven infrastructural development in Ondo State, a reconnaissance survey was carried out to familiarize with the available infrastructure provided by CBOs and residents in the study area and to pre-test the four survey questionnaires designed for the study. The pretesting was specifically carried out in Ifedore LGA. Actual survey was conducted with the help of Field Assistants in sampled settlements of selected LGAs in each of the Senatorial districts of Ondo State. Obtained data were processed to provide information on the assessment of community-driven infrastructure provided in the state.

Primary data were obtained from households, town and village heads, registered CBOs in the study area. Complementary or secondary data were obtained from supervisory institutions such as Ministry of Community Development and Cooperative Services, Community Development Units of LGAs, Ondo State Community Development Agency (World Bank Assisted), and Public and Intergovernmental Relations office of the Governor's Office. However this paper focuses mainly on the data obtained from households within the study area as it relates to their contribution to infrastructure provision in their communities. The data obtained from the households included those on their level of involvement in the decision-making process for infrastructure provision, their contribution, cost of provision, maintenance modalities put in place and the benefits they derive from the infrastructure among others.

Multistage sampling technique was employed to select the settlements for data gathering especially for the households and CBOs. All the three Senatorial districts in the state were investigated. These are Ondo North, Ondo Central and Ondo South Senatorial districts. One LGA was purposively selected from the six LGAs in each Senatorial district, namely Akoko North, Akure South and Okitipupa LGAs of Ondo North, Ondo Central and Ondo South Senatorial districts respectively. These three LGAs contain major cities which were former headquarters of the defunct Akoko Division, Ondo Province and Okitipupa Division of the State and these cities still retain same status of headquarters in the selected LGAs. The cities are Ikare, Akure and Okitipupa in Akoko North, Akure South and Okitipupa LGAs respectively. The political status of these LG headquarters allowed for advantageous consideration in the provision of infrastructure as urban centres in the state. In addition, one rural settlement was selected in each of the Akoko North, Akure South and Okitipupa LGA namely Iboropa, Ipinsa, and Igodan-lisa respectively. There a total of 6 settlements were selected for data gathering.

The research focused on six categories of infrastructure namely, water supply, electricity, roads and drainages, educational institutions, health facilities and Commercial/Hall facilities as shown in [Table 1](#).

For the selection of households, the residential buildings were targeted. Each building contained between 1 to 10 households but in each of the selected residential buildings, one (1) household-head was randomly selected for questionnaire administration. In the urban settlements, 2 per cent of the residential buildings (totaling 305 buildings) were randomly selected for the conduct of the household-heads survey (using the questionnaire) while in the selected rural settlements, 10 percent of the residential buildings (totaling 65 buildings) were randomly selected for same survey. This amounted to a total of 370 household-heads being involved in the study. The breakdown of this gives 100, 80 and 125 for Ikare, Okitipupa and Akure respectively in for the urban areas and 20, 20 and 25 for Iboropa, Igodan-lisa and Ipinsa respectively for the rural areas. In view of the unavoidable constraints, this is a reliable number to base the analysis and projections on.



The data obtained were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics using the SPSS software. This aided the presentation of findings in Tables, Charts and with inferences from test statistics.

**Table-1.** Grouping of Community-Driven Infrastructure in Ondo State.

S/N	Infrastructure
1.	Water Supply
	i. Public Water Supply
	ii. Bore hole
	iii. Dug well
2.	Electricity
3.	Roads & Drainages
4.	Educational Institutions
	i. Tertiary Institution
	ii. Secondary schools
	iii. Primary schools
5.	Health facilities
	i. Hospital
	ii. Health centre
	iii. Dispensary/Maternity Home
6.	Commercial/Hall Facilities
	i. Market
	ii. Town/Community Hall

## 4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1. Socio-economic Characteristics of Respondents

Married household-heads dominated all the settlements (66.3%) in the study area while a few Singles (8.4%) are found as household-heads too Table 2. Such Singles include single parents and unmarried individuals with relatives living under their care. Their total percentage does not give a cause for concern except for Okitipupa and Igodan-lisa (under same senatorial district) which have the highest percentages of single household-heads in the study area. This may require a sociological study to determine the composition of such households, what could be responsible for such trend, the effects, preventive measures and remedies for any negative impact. The second largest groups are the widowed, which percentage (17.4%) is not really high but for Iboropa with a settlement percentage of 35%. This is indicative of an ageing population as it was discovered that 55% of household-heads are above 60 years of age, some of which have lost their spouses. Despite this, as will be discussed later, these big time farmers still contribute towards community development especially through payment of membership fees. Divorcees and those separated from their spouses give a total of 3% and 4.9% respectively with a noticeable higher percentage for Ipinsa than other settlements. Inferentially, about two-third of the household-heads in the study area are married which could imply a greater strength to contribute to community development as this implies the likelihood of two individuals contributing to the income of the household.

Education is a powerful tool for development of human capital and a major indicator of human welfare. Akure could boast of at least 64.8% of its household-heads as having attained a *minimum* of secondary education (a total for those with secondary and tertiary education) while Okitipupa and Ikare had 57.6% and 49% respectively for those with a *minimum* of secondary education. Secondary education in this study implies the completion of Senior Secondary School or its equivalent. The case of Akure does not come as a surprise due to its state capital status with several tertiary institutions, businesses and jobs. Ikare and Okitipupa can also boast of at least one tertiary institution in proximal town or within same town. The State University is at Akungba which is close to Ikare while Okitipupa has the Ondo State University of Technology. The trend above favours contribution to community development by resident households. Among the rural settlements, each of Igodan-lisa and Ipinsa has a total of 50% of its respondent household-heads with a *minimum* of secondary education. Igodan-lisa is close to Okitipupa while Ipinsa is very close to Akure. Only 10% of Iboropa household-heads could boast of a *minimum* of secondary

education. More than half of the household-heads attended only primary school while 35% did not have any formal education. This is due to its rural nature with an ageing population (55% above age 60 as earlier mentioned), most of which are farmers, retirees or dependants relying on children living in higher order settlements for survival. Earlier in life, most of these household-heads could not access higher education due to affordability issues but later trained their children with proceeds from farming, some of whom now live in big cities within and outside the region. Their households still positively engage in community participation towards infrastructural development. In all a total of 54.2% of household-heads in the study area acquired a minimum of Secondary School education.

On income, the greatest percentage (43.5%) of the household-heads earn in the range of ₦18,000 – ₦50,000 followed by the 29.5% that earn below the ₦18,000 civil service minimum wage. The bulk of those who earn below the minimum wage are private sector workers. There are several businesses which pay their workers below the civil service minimum wage. Some of these workers have tertiary education certification but could not secure jobs with better offers. Iboropa is the only “odd” one out with the greatest percentage of household-heads earning ₦51,000 – ₦100,000 which reveals an interesting scenario for a rural settlement. However, the bulk of the earnings can only come from agricultural pursuits of big time farmers. Iboropa boasts of access to larger agricultural land area than others like Igodan-lisa and does not possess white collar jobs like the cities. In the same vein the 50% of household-heads which fell in the range ₦18,000 – ₦50,000 earning in Igodan-lisa could have come from fish and crop farming which are prevalent in the area, coupled with other businesses and a few civil service jobs in the proximal town of Okitipupa.

Table-2. Socio-economic characteristics.

Characteristics	Study Area												Total	
	Ikare		Iboropa		Okitipupa		Igodan-Lisa		Akure		Ipinsa		f	%
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%		
Marital Status														
Single	8	8.1	0	0.0	8	10.0	3	15.0	11	8.9	1	4.0	31	8.4
Married	67	67.7	13	65.0	48	60.0	13	65.0	90	72.6	13	52.0	244	66.3
Separated	6	6.1	0	0.0	6	7.5	1	5.0	4	3.2	1	4.0	18	4.9
Divorced	2	2.0	0	0.0	4	5.0	0	0.0	1	0.8	4	16.0	11	3.0
Widowed	16	16.2	7	35.0	14	17.5	3	15.0	18	14.5	6	24.0	64	17.4
Total	99	100.0	20	100.0	80	100.0	20	100.0	124	100.0	25	100.0	368	100.0
Educational Status														
No formal education	19	19.0	7	35.0	17	21.3	4	20.0	21	16.8	7	29.2	75	20.3
Primary	32	32.0	11	55.0	16	20.0	6	30.0	18	14.4	5	20.8	88	23.8
Secondary	31	31.0	2	10.0	35	43.8	5	25.0	51	40.8	8	33.3	132	35.8
Tertiary	18	18.0	0	0.0	11	13.8	5	25.0	30	24.0	4	16.7	68	18.4
Others	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.3	0	0.0	5	4.0	0	0.0	6	1.6
Total	100	100.0	20	100.0	80	100.0	20	100.0	125	100.0	24	100.0	369	100.0
Income (₦)														
Under 18,000	36	36.4	5	25.0	19	24.7	4	20.0	35	28.7	8	32.0	107	29.5
18,000 – 50,000	40	40.4	6	30.0	26	33.8	10	50.0	62	50.8	14	56.0	158	43.5
51,000 – 100,000	19	19.2	9	45.0	20	26.0	4	20.0	17	13.9	3	12.0	72	19.8
101,000 – 150,000	2	2.0	0	0.0	6	7.8	2	10.0	5	4.1	0	0.0	15	4.1
151,000 – 200,000	2	2.0	0	0.0	3	3.9	0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0	6	1.7
Above 200,000	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	3.9	0	0.0	2	1.6	0	0.0	5	1.4
Total	99	100.0	20	100.0	77	100.0	20	100.0	122	100.0	25	100.0	363	100.0

Source: Fieldwork, 2018.

#### 4.2. Involvement in Project Identification

Citizens' involvement in project identification is good for sustainability of such projects. It helps to decide on exact needs of the community or the prioritized need in the face of insufficient resources to meet all the needs of such community. In the study area, some of the household-heads were involved in project identification for the projects that were embarked on by their communities Table 3. The data obtained revealed that it was only at

Igodan-lisa that almost three-quarters (73.7%) of the respondent household-heads were not involved in project identification. All the other settlements had at least 65% participation while Ipinsa could boast of as high as 95.7% participation. This implies that the household-heads are highly involved in the decision making process in the settlements, especially at Ipinsa. This builds a sense of ownership in the residents of the community which indirectly implies that projects emanating from such highly participatory process will attract necessary support (financial, material and labour) from households. Such projects will also be sustainable as security and maintenance will be assured by residents who will do their best to maintain and protect facilities which will meet their utmost need.

**Table-3. Involvement in project identification.**

Involvement	Study Area												Total	
	Ikare		Iboropa		Okitipupa		Igodan-lisa		Akure		Ipinsa		f	%
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Yes	41	77.4	14	70.0	51	65.4	5	26.3	70	66.7	22	95.7	203	68.1
No	12	22.6	6	30.0	27	34.6	14	73.7	35	33.3	1	4.3	95	31.9
Total	53	100.0	20	100.0	78	100.0	19	100.0	105	100.0	23	100.0	298	100.0

Source: Fieldwork, 2018.

**4.3. Form of Involvement in Project Identification**

Many respondents did not attend to this enquiry on the form of involvement in project identification, as only 239 (65%) household-heads actually responded to it (Table 4). This is due to the fact that respondents who indicated ‘Yes’ for project identification were only 203 (Table 3). The extra respondents to the enquiry on form of involvement (mainly from Ikare) responded based on their general knowledge and not only on their personal experience. In most settlements, the two major approaches to involvement in project identification are identification during community meetings and through a representative (Table 4). There was hardly any voting on project selection except in less than 5% of the cases in each of Okitipupa and Akure. Representatives do represent quarters within the community; with a mandate from the households or residents of such quarters. Such mandate is indicated at stakeholders meetings in the community. However for all the settlements, the bulk of participation or show of interest in particular projects happened during community meetings. For example, all the participation in project identification which came from Iboropa was expressed during community meetings and 95% of such participation in Ipinsa was equally during community meetings. It was only in Ikare that the participation through community meeting was as low as 56.5%. In total, the study area had 73.6% participation through attendance of community meetings, 24.3% by representatives and just 2.1% by voting. Akure and Okitipupa could afford the process of voting as developed settlements at least in the very few cases that this took place. Most times the community or stakeholders meetings are held in community halls or designated venues which could be recreational centres. There are elected executives members of the CDAs to coordinate such meetings.

**Table-4. Forms of involvement in project identification.**

Involvement	Study Area												Total	
	Ikare		Iboropa		Okitipupa		Igodan-lisa		Akure		Ipinsa		f	%
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
In community Meeting	48	56.5	14	100.0	37	78.7	4	66.7	53	80.3	20	95.2	176	73.6
By Representative	37	43.5	0	0.0	8	17.0	2	33.3	10	15.2	1	4.8	58	24.3
By Voting	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.3	0	0.0	3	4.5	0	0.0	5	2.1
Total	85	100.0	14	100.0	47	100.0	6	100.0	66	100.0	21	100.0	239	100.0

Source: Fieldwork, 2018



#### 4.4. Households' Financial Contribution to Activities of CBOs/CBAs

No particular trend could be established in the financial contribution of households to support the activities of the CBOs or CBAs in the communities investigated in the study area (Table 5). Three main approaches of assistance were identified which include payment of membership levies, fund raising and cash donation. The greatest percentage of contributions in Ikare and Ipinsa come from philanthropic donations by residents or indigenes of the community while the second highest quantum of contribution comes from fund raising. Ikare is an urban settlement in the northern senatorial district while Ipinsa is a rural settlement in the central senatorial district. Akure and Okitipupa have fund raising and payments of membership levies ranking first and second but Akure still has same level of contribution from membership levies and cash donations; implying that the trend between these two urban settlements is not finely established.

The highest contribution in Iboropa is from membership levies followed by donations from individuals while the highest contribution from Igodan-lisa comes from fundraising followed by donations. This establishes peculiarities in the different settlements across the study area in which any of these approaches especially cash donation or fund raising could be responsible for the greatest contribution to CBOs/CBAs. However, there is a general "weakness" in the study area as it relates to the contribution of membership levies to developmental efforts except at Iboropa. Most times, CBOs/CBAs complain of members' inability or refusal to pay levies. It could be noticed that it is only at Iboropa that this approach provides the greatest contribution to developmental activities of CBOs/CBAs. This "weakness" of levies is usually pronounced in associations which usually cut across the community such as residents or landlords' associations. Such problem makes the associations to resort to seeking for donations from wealthy residents or indigenes of the community. At times the donations do not come in form of financial donations but in the form of equipment or facilities such as electricity transformer and boreholes. In total, fund raising contributed most to the activities of community associations, followed by cash donations though this is not a steady trend across the study area.

There is a great divergence the in the dominance of contributions to the general activities of the CBOs. While some households are skeptical about accountability on the part of CBOs as it relates to management of levies generated from members and as such default in such responsibility, they prefer to make once in a while material or monetary donations or support during fund-raising. Only in Iboropa, a rural settlement was payment of levies dominant. In general, levies are collected on monthly basis from residents. Part of this is sometimes used to pay security outfits guarding communities or certain sections of cities. This in a sense may either represent a level of trust in the officials of the organizations or the ease of making such little and regular contributions when compared with the heavy demand of once in a while high donations by low income earners of such community.

**Table-5. Households' financial contribution to activities of CBOs/CBAs.**

Approaches	Study area													
	Ikare		Iboropa		Okitipupa		Igodan-Lisa		Akure		Ipinsa		Total	
	f	%	f	%	freq.	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Payment of Membership fees	16	19	11	42	25	32	3	20	48	29	5	22	108	28
Fund raising	28	34	7	27	36	46	8	53	64	39	8	35	151	39
Donation of money	39	47	8	31	18	22	4	27	47	29	10	43	126	33
Others	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	4	0
Total	83	100	26	100	79	100	15	100	163	100	25	100	389	100

Source: Fieldwork, 2018

Note: Percentages are based on total number of responses; in which case contributions are not mutually exclusive.

#### 4.5. Approaches to Infrastructural Development

It was found that for most of the settlements, the approach to infrastructure development, as adjudged by the households, is mainly in the form of availability as hired labourers, followed by self-help (Table 6). The contribution to hired labourers is prominent due to two major motivations. First the sense of belonging in the participation of

members of a community in the development of their community and second, the little remuneration that *may* come from such hiring of labour. This labour work is to support or execute community development projects by governments, NGOs and Internal Organizations (such as World Bank and United Nations) in particular communities. Contribution of labour to the project may come as the communities' contribution to their own development. The self-help is such that the communities fully execute their own projects by taking care of their material, technical, labour and monetary expenses. This mainly comes from the financial contribution explained earlier on Table 5. There is an inference drawn from the fact that donation or sponsorship of projects attracted a little response. The fact that such usually comes from few philanthropists who are politicians or indigenes of the community is responsible for this.

**Table-6. Approaches to infrastructural development.**

Approaches	Community													
	Ikare		Iboropa		Okitipupa		Igodan-Lisa		Akure		Ipinsa		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Self-help	29	53	3	15	28	30	9	50	44	26	4	19	117	31
Contribution to hired labourers	10	18	8	40	34	37	5	28	69	42	15	71	141	38
Solicit for government support	9	16	4	20	13	14	3	17	20	12	2	10	51	14
Donation or sponsorship of project	7	13	5	25	17	19	1	5	33	20	0	0	63	17
Total	55	100	20	100	92	100	18	100	166	100	21	100	372	100

Source: Fieldwork, 2018.

#### 4.6. Sole Donation of Facility or Infrastructural Project

In all the settlements, most households have not donated a facility or equipment or solely completed a project in their community (Table 7). In Akure, only 31.2% household-heads indicated that they have donated something to their community while in Iboropa and Igodan-lisa (both of which are rural settlements), only 20% and 15% respectively have done something in same respect. About same percentage, 11.1% and 10% have equally donated at least a project in Ikare and Ipinsa respectively. The opportunities and relatively better economy makes it possible for residents of Akure to contribute to the development of their community in diverse ways.

**Table-7. Sole donation of facility or infrastructural projects.**

Sole Donation	Study Area												Total	
	Ikare		Iboropa		Okitipupa		Igodan-lisa		Akure		Ipinsa			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes	11	11.1	4	20.0	10	12.8	3	15.0	34	31.2	2	10.0	64	18.5
No	88	88.9	16	80.0	68	87.2	17	85.0	75	68.8	18	90.0	282	81.5
Total	99	100.0	20	100.0	78	100.0	20	100.0	109	100.0	20	100.0	346	100.0

Source: Fieldwork, 2018.

#### 4.7. Percentage Contribution to Infrastructural Development

Findings revealed that far greater percentages of households did not contribute to infrastructural development in their community for most of the facilities. Table 8 shows that for the projects or facilities indicated, it was only in the case of electricity that a greater percentage of the households had contributed to its provision in their community. The case of roads and drainages was equally a bit close to average with a total of 45.2% of the respondent household-heads having contributed in one way or the other to its development. In the case of electricity, most times, residents of communities are left with no option than to contribute money to purchase or repair transformers and also run or repair damaged power lines in their communities.

In some instances, communities have to contribute towards purchasing power generators or installing solar power systems to support any other facility provided by them or jointly with other stakeholders in order for such facility to function. The perennial nature of power supply problem in the country is a case in question. According to

findings, contribution to electricity projects was highly pronounced in Akure, the state capital and its nearby settlement, Ipinsa. Same response is experienced with Ikare, another major settlement in the state. Okitipupa and Igodan-lisa revealed a situation of less than 50% respondents as having contributed to electricity project/facility. The fact that for long, the southern senatorial district within the state had not even been connected to the national power grid would have discouraged the people from making such efforts except in few cases when they will need to contribute towards alternative sources such as power generators and solar power systems.

In the case of roads and drainages, the contributions of the people are mostly limited to digging of drainage channels, grading with laterite, filling of pot-holes and construction of culverts across streams. The people lack the resources and capacity to construct new roads or repair old ones to attain required standards such as macadam surfacing or concrete interlocking roads. However, such efforts are repetitive as they are not expected to last for long with the recurrence of the rainy season which does much damage to road, especially the poor quality ones.

For the institutions, the total percentages of 11.5%, 6.7% and 24.6% for tertiary, secondary and primary institutions respectively reveal that residents could not do much in supporting the provision of these facilities. It also shows in relative term that the greatest contribution in this respect is the contribution towards primary school education. Usually, more persons have their wards in the primary school than those who could afford to give them higher education in the secondary and tertiary institutions due to financial constraints. Human mental capacity is equally a determinant of how high individuals or the children can go in attaining academic heights. In this respect, there is more contribution towards the primary school education which most persons are involved in than the secondary or tertiary institutions. The little contribution indicated towards development of tertiary institutions come from the provision of accommodations for several students who could not be housed on campus in the cities due to shortage of hostel accommodation provided by the university. These private hostels are built proximal to campus sometimes at exorbitant rates for students to rent.

**Table-8.** Percentage of household-heads that contributed to infrastructural facilities.

Facility	Contribution	Level of Contribution (by Percentage of Households)												Total	
		Ikare		Iboropa		Okitipupa		Igodan-lisa		Akure		Ipinsa			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Public water supply	Contributed	23	26.4	5	25.0	10	13.5	1	6.3	27	21.6	9	36.0	75	21.6
	No contribution	64	73.6	15	75.0	64	86.5	15	93.8	98	78.4	16	64.0	272	78.4
Borehole	Contributed	13	13.3	14	70.0	39	52.0	12	75.0	20	16.0	10	40.0	108	30.1
	No contribution	85	86.7	6	30.0	36	48.0	4	25.0	105	84.0	15	60.0	251	69.9
Dug well	Contributed	23	23.5	11	55.0	18	23.1	4	25.0	50	40.0	5	20.0	111	30.7
	No contribution	75	76.5	9	45.0	60	76.9	12	75.0	75	60.0	20	80.0	251	69.3
Electricity	Contributed	60	61.2	9	45.0	33	42.3	6	40.0	93	74.4	23	92.0	224	62.0
	No contribution	38	38.8	11	55.0	45	57.7	9	60.0	32	25.6	2	8.0	137	38.0
Roads and Drainages	Contributed	44	44.9	1	55.3	35	44.9	7	43.8	63	50.4	13	52.0	163	45.2
	No contribution	54	55.1	18	94.7	43	55.1	9	56.3	62	49.6	12	48.0	198	54.8
Tertiary Institution	Contributed	27	27.8	0	0.0	12	16.0	1	7.1	0	0.0	1	4.0	41	11.5
	No contribution	70	72.2	19	100.0	63	84.0	13	92.9	125	100.0	24	96.0	314	88.5
Secondary School	Contributed	1	1.0	3	15.0	11	14.7	2	14.3	7	5.6	0	0.0	24	6.7
	No contribution	97	99.0	17	85.0	64	85.3	12	85.7	118	94.4	25	100.0	333	93.3
Primary School	Contributed	9	9.2	7	35.0	14	18.7	5	35.7	38	30.4	15	60.0	88	24.6
	No contribution	89	90.8	13	65.0	61	81.3	9	64.3	87	69.6	10	40.0	269	75.4
Hospital	Contributed	4	4.1	0	0.0	12	16.2	1	7.1	4	3.2	0	0.0	21	5.9
	No contribution	93	95.9	20	100.0	62	83.8	13	92.9	121	96.8	25	100.0	334	94.1
Health Centre	Contributed	2	2.1	7	35.0	18	24.3	7	46.7	9	7.2	10	40.0	53	14.9
	No contribution	95	97.9	13	65.0	56	75.7	8	53.3	116	92.8	15	60.0	303	85.1
Dispensary/ Mat. home	Contributed	8	8.2	3	15.0	5	6.9	1	7.1	2	1.6	3	12.0	22	6.2
	No contribution	89	91.8	17	85.0	67	93.1	13	92.1	123	98.4	22	88.0	331	93.8
Market	Contributed	2	2.1	8	40.0	20	27.8	0	0.0	17	13.6	11	44.0	58	16.6
	No contribution	94	97.9	12	60.0	52	72.2	12	100.0	108	86.4	14	56.0	292	83.4
Community hall	Contributed	22	22.7	0	0.0	15	20.8	3	25.0	2	1.6	4	16.0	46	13.1
	No contribution	75	77.3	20	100.0	57	79.2	9	75.0	123	98.4	21	84.0	305	86.9

Source: Fieldwork, 2018.

In the area of water supply, the contribution is lower than expected as lesser percentage of persons contributes towards to such project with greater contribution in favour of dug-well and boreholes than public water. In most cases, the public water supply is not available at all and repair of burst pipes and bad taps may represent the little that were done in favour of public water supply for the fewer cases. Recently, government has done so much in the area of health care in the state. It is no surprise that the people's contribution in this respect is very minimal. Also, open markets are common in the rural areas while the cities have also experienced support from the government in the construction of several markets stalls in addition to the open markets across the city.

#### 4.8. Effect of Facilities

For the response on the effect of facilities on communities, the weighted averages for the different facilities in the communities were calculated. In the urban settlements, it could be observed that water facilities ranked very high (Table 9). For example the highest weighted average for Ikare is dug-well (2.9) while it is Borehole in Okitipupa (2.6) and in Akure, Borehole ranked second (3.3) after Primary School. This implies the effort of CBOs in the area of water provision is highly valued by residents. The lack of pipe borne water in most cities of Nigeria is a long standing problem which has necessitated the need for alternatives as water is very important to life and the survival of other living organisms. The use of water as raw material for small scale businesses and other activities definitely contribute to the value placed by households on any effort put into the provision of water. It was observed that the weighted averages for electricity were very low in these urban centres especially in Ikare and Okitipupa, affirming low efforts of community organizations in these areas. However, the little effort is still an indication of some move to facilitate the functionality of pipe borne water from boreholes where they are available.

In the rural settlements, Iboropa placed much value on dug well after roads/drainage while Igodan-lisa places so much value on electricity provision by community organizations. This comes in different forms which include provision of transformers, repair of damaged electric facilities and replacement of vandalized cables and other electricity facilities. Settlements in this part of the state lacked power supply for years due to the fact that they were not connected to the national grid. As such the efforts especially in their rural settlements towards electricity provision attract a high weighted average. Ipinsa also ranks borehole as highest followed by dispensary. The reason for this is similar to what has led to such ranking in the other settlements. In summary, water provision's weighted average is ranked highest or second highest in five of the six settlements investigated, implying a high contribution to community development. Only Igodan-Lisa placed much importance on electricity instead of water provision. The highest sum of weighted average is found in Akure the state capital which implies that communal efforts are stronger in this city than in all other settlements. It reveals a better understanding of the approach coupled with some capacity to drive the process.

Table-9. Weighted Average for rate of effect of facilities.

Community	Public water supply	Borehole	Dug well	Electricity	Roads and drainage	Secondary schools	Primary schools	Hospital	Health centre	Dispensary	Market	Town hall	SWA
Ikare	2.3	1.9	2.9	1.9	2.4	2.2	2.6	1.9	2.6	2.6	1.6	2.5	27.4
Iboropa	1.7	2.3	2.8	1.3	3.2	1.9	2.3	2.0	1.5	2.4	2.1	2.0	25.5
Okitipupa	2.3	2.6	2.1	1.8	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.4	28.1
Igodan-Lisa	1.3	2.6	2.0	5.0	1.3	2.9	2.3	2.3	2.8	2.0	1.6	3.3	29.4
Akure	2.2	3.3	3.1	2.8	2.6	3.2	3.7	2.9	2.4	2.1	2.8	3.1	34.2
Ipinsa	2.1	3.1	1.9	1.4	1.6	2.0	2.8	2.0	2.5	3.0	2.1	2.4	26.9

Source: Fieldwork, 2018.

## 5. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

This study aimed at exploring the contribution of households to communal efforts in the provision and maintenance of community infrastructure. It was discovered that household-heads were highly involved in the decision-making process in their settlements, mainly through community meetings. The residents also contributed financially to infrastructural development dominantly through fundraising and financial donations while they were also available as hired labourers and through engagement in community self-help activities. Such self-help activities are similar to hired labourers' work which comes to external bodies executing developmental projects. On specific projects, only water provision has received much attention from the households since water is very important to life and sustenance. The economic limitations of the people were however responsible for this. In this vein necessary recommendations for the improvement of household support to communal efforts will include the following.

Bottom-up approach should be adopted with the engagement of all stakeholders in the community including various interest groups and the youths to sustain self-help and labour availability. The weakness of levy contribution towards development in communities requires that a high level of transparency and accountability be espoused to engender trust in the people at the local level. This will remove the suspicion of corrupt tendencies by administrative officers of community organizations. This requires regular detailed presentation of financial statements of the community associations with good response to ensuing queries. Furthermore, the dominance of availability as hired labourers as an approach to infrastructural development could be complemented, where possible and applicable, by provision of available natural resources to the development of community or execution of community project. Such that in addition to hired labour, raw materials could be added to what external development agencies can use or contribute to project execution. On specific projects it was only in the case of electricity that a greater percentage of the households had contributed to infrastructural provision in their community. Since communities are incapacitated in the provision of such things as roads due to the high cost of macadam surfacing, International Organizations and NGOs need to focus more on road construction in communities especially in the rural settlements and the poorly accessed areas of cities. The cost of such project coupled with the benefits that it brings to the society in economic and physical terms justifies the need for its prioritization by International Organizations and NGOs among other infrastructure.

The high ranking of water provision by the weighted averages drives home the importance of water to life. Water security is very germane to human survival and it is one of the Sustainable Development Goals. In order to sustain the several water projects such as community borehole, there will be need for harnessing solar-power installations to maintain the flow of water from such boreholes. Electricity is required to power boreholes, hence the importance of this initiative. Solar-power installations will equally require regular maintenance in order to achieve sustainability of the system which is lacking in many similar installations across the country. This could be taken up by community associations through funding of regular checks and maintenance by qualified personnel. The cost is reduced if such personnel happen to be members of the community.

It is hoped that households' efforts will continue to improve as the suggestions above are imbibed by the relevant stakeholders in the provision of infrastructure in various communities across the state and in Nigeria at large.

**Funding:** This study received no specific financial support.

**Competing Interests:** The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

**Acknowledgement:** All authors contributed equally to the conception and design of the study.

## REFERENCES

Adusei-Asante, K., & Hancock, P. (2012). When empowerment disempowers: A case study of Ghana's community-based rural development projects. *Ghana Journal of Development Studies*, 9(2), 43-62. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4314/gjds.v9i2.3>.

- Afolayan, I. J. (2012). *An assessment of rural development strategies and rural infrastructure on rural sustainability*. Unpublished Undergraduate Thesis, Urban and Regional Planning Department, Federal Polytechnic, Offa.
- Agbola, T. (2004). *The Nigerian urban development policy: If the past be prologue*. Paper presented at the 34th Annual Conference of the Nigeria Institute of Town Planners. Held in Abeokuta, Nigeria October 22-24.
- Asian Development Bank. (2006). *A review of community - driven development and its application to the Asian development bank*. Manila: Asian Development Bank.
- Baird, A. (2009). Methodological dilemmas: Researching violent young men in Medellín, Colombia. *IDS Bulletin*, 40(3), 72-77. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-5436.2009.00041.x>.
- Barrios, E. B. (2008). Infrastructure and rural development: Household perceptions on rural development. *Progress in Planning*, 70(1), 1-44. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.progress.2008.04.001>.
- Beard, V. A. (2007). Household contributions to community development in Indonesia. *World Development*, 35(4), 607-625. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2006.06.006>.
- Bingen, J. (2003). *Community-based producer organisations: A contribution to the West African regional action plan for the initiative to end hunger in Africa. Agricultural Policy Development Programme*. Bethesda: Abt Associations Incorporated.
- Binswanger-Mkhize, H. P., De Regt, J. P., & Spector, S. (2010). *Local and community-driven development*. Washington D.C: The World Bank.
- Binswanger, I. A., Merrill, J. O., Krueger, P. M., White, M. C., Booth, R. E., & Elmore, J. G. (2010). Gender differences in chronic medical, psychiatric, and substance-dependence disorders among jail inmates. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100(3), 476-482. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2008.149591>.
- Blackburn, J., & Holland, J. (1998). *Who changes? Institutionalizing participation in development*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Charlery, L. C., Qaim, M., & Smith-Hall, C. (2016). Impact of infrastructure on rural household income and inequality in Nepal. *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, 8(2), 266-286. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19439342.2015.1079794>.
- DFID. (2002). *DFID social exclusion review. London school of economics and political science*. London: Stationery Office.
- Dongier, P., Van Domelen, J., Ostrom, E., Rizvi, A., Wakeman, W., Bebbington, A., . . . Polski, M. (2002). Community-driven development. In: J.Klugman (Ed.), *A Sourcebook for Poverty Reduction Strategies* (Vol. 1, pp. 315-331). Washington DC: World Bank.
- Frost, S. E. (2012). *Community engagement initiatives to improve well-being and build social capital. A Report for the Winston Churchill Memorial Trust*. London: Winston Churchill Memorial Trust.
- Gillespie, S. (2004). *Scaling up community-driven development: A synthesis of experience*. FCNDP No. 181. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI).
- Helmsing, A. H. J. (2001). *Local economic development - new generations of actors, Policies and instruments. A Summary Report Prepared for The UNCDF Symposium on Decentralization Local Governance in Africa Institute of Social Studies, The Hague*.
- Malombe, J. (2000). *Community development foundations: Emerging partnerships to support sustainable community development. Draft in progress*. Washington D.C: World Bank.
- Nden, S. J. (2004). *The assessment of community-based organizations in poverty alleviation in Okene, Kogi State*. PGD Thesis. Federal University of Technology, Akure.
- Olujimi, J., & Bello, M. (2009). Effects of infrastructural facilities on the rental values of residential property. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(4), 332-341. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3844/jssp.2009.332.341>.
- Ontario Healthy Community Coalition (OHCC). (2008). *Community development strategies*. Retrieved from <http://www.ohcc-ccso.ca/en/book/export/html/380>.
- Rotman, J. (1995). *Approaches of community intervention*. Itasca IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers.



UNDP. (2014). Community development. UNTERM. Retrieved from: <http://unterm.un.org/DGAACS/unterm.nsf/8fa942046ff7601c85256983007ca4d8/526c2eaba978f007852569fd00036819?OpenDocument>.

World Bank. (2004). What is community-driven development. Retrieved from <http://web.worldbank.org/archive/>.

World Bank. (2010). The world bank annual report 2010: Year in review. World Bank Annual Report. Washington, DC.

*Views and opinions expressed in this article are the views and opinions of the author(s), International Journal of Public Policy and Administration Research shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability etc. caused in relation to/arising out of the use of the content.*