

**CONTRIBUTION OF COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (CSDP) TO PROJECT  
IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING IN SELECTED L.G.A ONDO STATE, NIGERIA**

**Sylvester Ohis OGO-OLUWA**

**B.sc Public Administration, M.sc Policy and Development Studies**

**ABSTRACT**

This study examined the contribution of Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) in project implementation and monitoring in selected LGA Ondo State, Nigeria. The objective of the study is to examine the contribution of Community and Social Development Project to Participatory Rural Development in Ondo State. The study adopted survey research method; primary and secondary data sources were used to generate data for this study. Stratified sampling technique was used to draw the 276 questionnaire respondents and purposive sampling technique were used to draw eighteen interview respondents. Questionnaire responses were analysed with table, frequency counts and simple percentage. Data collected from interview, observation and CSDA report was analysed qualitatively. Correlation and regression was used to test the hypothesis through SPSS version 20 at 5% level of significance. The study tested that there is a significant relationship between people participation in project implementation and monitoring with rural development in Ondo State CSDP. The study found out that despite the involvement of people in project implementation projects was abandoned in Akoko South East Local government Area of Ondo State. As a result of weak monitoring system project was not implemented according to Community Development Plans in Aduralere, Okemeji and Epinmi communities in Ondo State. It is recommended that CSDA should be more committed to people participation in project implementation and monitoring team should be more effective by ensuring CDP is implemented.

**KEYWORD: Community participation; social development; implementation & monitoring; and rural development.**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

People participation in projects and program that affect their lives take a swift change in 1970 when there was a paradigm shift from top-down approach to bottom-up approach to rural development programmes. People's participation was refocused in response to the growing awareness that leads significantly to rural development and especially poverty reduction because there was little involvement in development projects and particularly the poor, (Oakley 1995). An important milestone in people's participation in rural development was recorded at the World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (WCARRD – Rome, 1979), which declared that participation by rural people in the institutions that govern their lives is a basic human right. If rural development was to realize its potential, the Conference said, disadvantaged rural people had to be organized and actively involved in designing policies and programmes and in controlling social and economic institutions, (Oakley 1995). Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, participation in rural development as well as in development at large gradually became more established among governments, donors and international organizations, to such an extent that, as (Stirrat,1996) puts it, it is now difficult to find a rurally based development project which does not, in one way or another, claim to adopt a participatory approach involving bottom-up planning, acknowledging the importance of indigenous knowledge and claiming to empower local people (ESCAP, 2009).

The period between 1973 and 2007 marked a watershed in rural development efforts in Nigeria. The period witnessed deliberate government efforts at mobilizing the people for rural development. A number of task forces and bodies were set up to oversee, organize and to direct partnership with the people on self-help activities, (Ikechukwu, 2012). They include: Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural infrastructure (DFRRI), Rural Electrification Schemes; Credit Schemes to small holders through various specialized institutions such as People's Bank, Agricultural and Cooperative Development Bank, Community Banks, NERFUND, SME Credit Schemes, the Family Economic Advancement Programme (FEAP), Universal Primary Education Schemes and Low Cost Housing Schemes, Health Scheme as the Primary Health Care Programme, National Directorate of Employment (NDE), Better Life for Rural Women Programme as well as the Family Support Programme (FSP). More recent programmes include the National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP), the YOUWIN program as well as the Small and Medium Industries Equity Investment Schemes (SMIEIS). (Ikechukwu, 2012). All these programmes were supposed to foster rural development as a result of top-down approach adopted by the programmes, however little success was only recorded from their operation. The people were not fully involved in the formulation process of the programmes and projects.

Mobilization for Mass Participation, DFRRl encouraged and assisted in the formation of community development associations (CDAs) and community banks (which have metamorphosed into microfinance banks). The CDAs became very significant in rural development. They identified projects, assisted DFRRl, and mobilized the rural dwellers to partake in modernizing their domains. Between 1989 and 1991, a total of 8,108 CDAs were registered. Also, community banks were established in almost all the local government areas of the country, (Ekpo and Olaniyi 1995). The National Directorate for Social Mobilization pursued aggressively the mobilization and enlightenment of the people towards their rights and duties. The virile campaign for people participation by non-governmental organizations through their involvement in the community in projects execution helped to increase the growth of Community Based Organization which in turn advocates people participation in rural developmental projects. (Obetta and Okide 2012)

As a result of massive failure of previous government established rural programmes to meet the need of the people, Ondo State Community and Social Development Agency was established on September 19th 2009 with World Bank assistance to provide Community and Social Development Project (CSDP). These were as a result of the identified challenges of poverty and sectoral approach to service delivery despite several efforts of government to tackle it. The communities were said to be actively involved in decision making process in the projects.

The overall goal of the CSDP is to improve access of the poor to services for Human Development (HD). To achieve this goal, the Project Development Objective (PDO) is to support empowerment of the communities and Local Government Authority (LGAs) for increased access of the poor people to improve social and natural resources infrastructure in a sustainable manner. Specifically, the CSDP hopes to; empower communities to plan, form partnership, implement, monitored and maintain sustainable and social inclusive multi-sectoral micro project, to facilitate and increase community-LGA partnership on development-related project. Increase the capacity of the LGAs, State and Federal Agencies to implement and monitor Community Driven Development policies and interventions as well leverage Federal, State, and Local government resources for greater coverage of community participation intervention in communities (CSDP implementation guideline 2011). This paper examined contribution of Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) in project implementation and monitoring in selected LGA Ondo State.

#### **STATEMENT OF RESEARCH PROBLEM**

EKimani and Kombo (2011), emphasized that participatory development problems in rural areas, is because massive development projects are proposed and introduced in communities with little or no consultation with the people, the lack of community members' or beneficiaries' involvement in

projects initial stage and throughout the project cycle affects the success of development projects. At times individuals, especially politicians, propose massive development projects, which obviously display inadequate needs assessment and planning at completion. At other times, huge national and regional projects are initiated and a lot of emphasis placed on the material aspects of development especially visible and fiscal, without considering the central place of the people as a key resources, which needs to be nurtured and actively involved in shaping their own destiny. The issue of corruption among the project officials was identified as causing laxity in members' participation.

Adeyemo, (2010) Revealed the constraints in the activities of CSDP that they revolved around chains of sequential activities (PIM, 2011). NFDO (2007) stated that community members have to be mobilized and sensitized, groups have to be formed and legally registered, group officers have to be elected and bank account have to be opened if not already in place. Additionally, Participatory Rural Appraisal has to be conducted for need assessment, Local Development Plans have to be drawn, submitted and approved. Counterpart fund of at least 10% also have to be paid before possible disbursement of funds for project implementation (PIM, 2011). These listed conditions require significant time. It is against this background that this study assesses the contribution of CSDP to people participation in project implementation and monitoring in Ondo State.

### **RESEARCH QUESTION**

- i. What is the level of people participation in project implementation and monitoring in CSDP in Ondo State?
- ii. To what extent has people participation in project implementation and monitoring affected rural development in Ondo State?

The objective of the study is to examine the level of people participation and to determine the extent at which people participation in project implementation and monitoring in CSDP affect rural development in Ondo State.

HO. People participation in project implementation and monitoring does not have a significant relationship with rural development in Ondo State.

## **2. CONCEPTUALIZATION**

### **PEOPLE PARTICIPATION**

People participation is used in this study to mean the involvement of members of the public of a particular locality in the process of formulating and implementing projects and decision that affect them. Such involvement includes the following; Needs assessment, planning, training, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

## **PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING**

In this study this means when the people are involved in procurement of materials, hired the contractors, and involved in direct or indirect labour. When the people fully in control of project execution and maintaining transparent activities by involving the general community members. Community members are involved in tracking the progress of project implementation and the observation of the individual community member is listened to. Projects are implemented according to Community Development Plan.

## **PARTICIPATORY RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

In the context of this paper participatory rural development mean when the people participate in the activities that bring about availability and functioning of rural electrification; equipped basic healthcare, schools buildings and furniture with equipped laboratory, provision of borehole water; community hall/TV view centre; market stalls; skill acquisition centre to create employment; transportation through drainage, culvert, bridge and graded roads.

## **EMPIRICAL STUDIES ON CSDP AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

Oghenekohwo (2014), study revealed that CSDP contributed significantly to the social well-being of the rural dweller. It further revealed that micro project of CSDP intervention impact significantly on community and social development of the rural dweller. Among these projects are health care, water supply, creation of wealth and job among the youth. It also revealed that CSDP intervention in rural communities' impact on rural dwellers capacity building, empowerment of women and leadership training on decision making process. Gambo and Targema (2015), research discovers that community members were actively involved and participated in the planning and execution of the CSDP micro projects in their communities, and that the projects executed have been impacting positively in the lives of community members. To this end, the research concludes that participation, interest and involvement of beneficiaries at the planning and execution stages of poverty alleviation project are central to their success.

Okereke and Asiabaka (2015), study revealed that 11 out of 15 projects was perceived as successful and effective, oil mill (88.4%), water boreholes (88.4%), erosion control (86.6%), drainage systems (86.6%), construction of school blocks (83.3%) and health centres (81.5%) were perceived as effective projects in the area. The results show mobilization of resource (35%) commitment to materials resources (55%), financial contribution (13.4%), and implementation (64%), involvement in actual work (59%) in Imo State. It was recommended that the project should be replicated in other parts of the country since it had bearing on the welfare of the people. Women, youth and the vulnerable should be given an opportunity to participate in similar project in the future. Oladapo

(2014), study showed that more than fifty per cent of the respondents were fully involved and actively participated in project planning and implementation in their respective communities. Test of relationship showed that level of community mobilization and level of involvement/participation in planning and implementation of projects were found to be significantly related. The projects were generally perceived to be the most needed infrastructure by the benefiting communities as at the time of delivery. Level of community mobilization and their participation in project planning and implementation were found to have positively affected their perception of project sustainability and the likelihood of project enhancing cohesiveness in the communities.

Olawepo and Akanbi (2013), study revealed that the project allowed for community mobilization right to the grassroots. This has enlarged participatory development among the people. He furthered state that it was observed that more than 99.9% of the project are being implemented and none thus far has been abandoned because the scheme focused on bottom up approach. In all over 140 communities have benefited from the developmental impact of the 127 community projects supported across the state. Abisoye (2008) study find out that government had not touched on the communities' most pressing needs, regardless of solving the problem. It was, therefore, stressed that many of the development projects being executed by the government are being merely forced on the people. This may therefore, explain why there are many abandoned projects all around because the zeal to supplement government efforts would naturally be lacking in the people who do not count a project to be of relevance to their social life. The study actually point out the important of involving the people on the project and program that concern them. It was revealed that the abandoned rural projects are as a result of people not involved in most case government provide project that of no importance to the people.

In spite of the coverage of the above studies, their limitation is glaring the studies failed to classified the level of people participation and none of them examine the extent at which the project contribute to participatory rural development in Ondo State. The gaps in the above studies will be filled by this study.

Arnstein (1969) ladder of community participation stems from the explicit recognition that there are different levels of participation, from manipulation or therapy of citizens, through to consultation, and to what we might now view as genuine participation, i.e. the levels of partnership and citizen control. This model was used to explain community participation in Community and Social Development Projects implementation and monitoring to participatory rural development in Ondo State. The community's members in Akure south, Okitipupa and Akoko S/E were trained on project implementation and monitoring. The people were manipulated in Okemeji and Epinmi Akoko where

the CDP was not implemented. At the level of information and consultation the people were informed and consulted for project implementation and monitoring. The community elected an 8 members committee of CPMC that oversee implementation and monitoring and operation committee oversee the tracking of progress of the projects. Citizen power, the CSDA and the community formed partnership were the community paid 10% counterpart fund in material, labour and cash. The CPMC were delegated with the power and responsibility to implement and monitored the project. The communities take full control of the project after completion, such as the Borehole in Ire-Akari and Okemeji. Community hall in Igbodan-Lisa where CPMC collect user's charges on the facilities.

### **3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The study used survey research method through the use of questionnaire, interview and observation. Documentary research was also employed to complement the survey research. Stratified sampling technique was used to selected questionnaire respondents from four strata of Akure South, Okitipupa, Akoko South East Local Government and staffs of CSDA in Ondo State. After which the questionnaire was administered randomly to the four strata. Purposive sampling was used to reach the FGD and interview respondents namely; members of Ondo State Community and Social Development Agency (ODCSDA), Local Government Review Committee (LGRC) and Community Project Management Committee (CPMC). The population of the study was 676,949 from NPC (2006). The study selected four communities from Akure South LGA, Olorunsogo, Aduralere, Okemeji and Ire-Kari III. In Okitipupa the study selected two communities Igbodan-Lisa and Igbodigo while Epinmi I & II community was selected from Akoko South East Local Government. The study adopted the Krejcie and Morgan sample table (1970) to arrive at sample size of 384 for the study. Akure South has sample size of 145 respondents (37.8%), Okitipupa Local Government has sample size of 125 respondents (32.5), Akoko S/E has sample size of 84 respondents (21.9%) while CSDA has sample size of 30 respondents (7.8%). A total of 384 questionnaires were administered, 276 were filled and used for analysis.

A total of eighteen (18) respondents were interviewed, they were officials of CSDA, LGRC, and members of CPMC. Descriptive tools were used to analyse the responses from the data generated through questionnaire which was also subjected to Cronbach's Alpha reliability test with 0.9 score it is excellent supported by George Mallery (2003) who provided the rules that 0.9 is excellent indicates good internal consistency of the items in the scale. Correlation and regression was used to test the hypothesis at 5% level of significant. Meanwhile data generated through interview, observation and CSDA publication were analysed qualitatively.

#### 4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

##### 4.1 CONTRIBUTION OF CSDP TO PEOPLE PARTICIPATION IN PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

The opinion of respondents across Akure South, Okitipupa and Akoko S/E Local government of the state were sought to determine the extent to which CSDP contributed to people participation in project implementation and monitoring. The response of respondents from the three Local government and CSDA are contained in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: people participation in project implementation and monitoring**

variables	Strongly Agree (SA)		Agree (A)		Undecided (UD)		Disagree (D)		Strongly Disagree (SD)		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Community contributes material, Labour and cash to project implementation.	130	47.1	146	52.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	276	100
Women, youth and vulnerable were mobilized for project implementation.	112	40.6	99	35.9	38	13.8	27	9.7	-	-	276	100
The agency trained the community on how to procure the needed materials for project implementation.	122	44.2	130	47.1	18	6.5	-	-	6	2.2	276	100
The agency involves the people in project monitoring to ensure the plan is adhered to.	115	41.7	104	37.7	19	6.9	22	7.9	16	5.8	276	100
People participate in project monitoring to ensure the operation of the projects.	86	31.2	143	51.8	25	9.1	22	7.9	-	-	276	100
The agency helps the people in implementing the project through financial and technical support.	186	67.4	90	32.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	276	100
The agency trains the community on how to implement and monitor the operation of the project.	106	38.4	147	53.3	16	5.8	7	2.5	-	-	276	100

**Source:** Field Survey, 2016.

Table 1, indicates that majority of the respondents representing 52.9% agreed with the view that Community contributes material, Labour and cash to project implementation. 47.1% of respondents also strongly agreed with this assertion. Ondo state Community and Social Development Agency (2013) reported that more than N79 million in cash and kind as 10% equity contributions were made by communities to further entrench their ownership of the projects. This implies that communities participate in contribution of money, material and Labour to project implementation in Ondo State.

Looking at Women, youth and vulnerable were mobilize for project implementation 40.6% respondents strongly agreed. 35.9% respondents agreed with this claim. 13.8% respondents were undecided on the issue while 9.7% respondents disagreed. It implies that people were mobilized for project implementation including the vulnerable.

Majority of the respondents representing 47.1% agreed that agency trained the community on how to procure the needed materials for project implementation. 44.2% respondents strongly agreed to the claim. 6.5% respondents were undecided while only 2.2% respondents strongly disagree. Ondo state community and social development Agency report (2013) revealed that 95 CPMC comprised of 1,615 committees members were trained on procurement. This implies that CSDA trained the communities and the CPMC on how to procure materials for project implementation.

41.7% respondents strongly agreed that the agency involves the people in project monitoring to ensure the plan is adhered to. 37.7% respondents agreed to the claim. 7.9% respondents disagreed and 6.9% respondents were undecided to the issue while 5.8% respondents strongly disagreed. This implies that the communities were involved in project monitoring of CSDP in Ondo State.

People participate in project monitoring to ensure the operation of the projects. 51.8% respondents agreed to the assertion. 31.2% respondents strongly agreed. 9.1% respondents were undecided while 7.9% disagreed. It implies that people were involved in project monitoring to ensure the operation and success of the project.

Majority of the respondents representing 67.4% strongly agreed that the agency helps the people in implementing the project through financial and technical support. While 32.6% respondents agreed. Ondo state community and social development agency report (2013) revealed that the CSDP disbursed the sum of N658,328,006.84 to CPMC of 92 benefitted communities for the execution of their approved CDP of 222 micro-projects implemented under seven sectors of Education, Rural Electrification, Health, Social Economic, Transportation, Water, Environment and Natural Resources, and Capacity Building. This implies that CSDA help the communities to implement project through financial and technical support.

However, 53.3% respondents agreed that the agency trained the community on how to implement and monitor the operation of the project. 38.4% respondents strongly agreed. 5.8% respondent's undecided while 2.5% respondents disagreed with the claim. This implies that CSDA trained the communities on how to implement and monitored the project to ensure project operation.

From the questionnaire analysis above, it revealed that communities contribute money, materials and Labour for project implementation. It also shown that people were mobilized for project implementation. Community's members and committees were trained on materials procurement and people were involved in project monitoring to ensure CDP is implemented. CSDA rendered a financial and technical support to the community's and they were trained on project implementation and monitoring. The interview from Okitipupa Local government Areas, Olorunsogo community and Ire-Akari community supported the questionnaire report that people participate in CSDP implementation and monitoring.

Contrary to this is the interview report from Okemeji community, it was revealed that the CPMC was not allowed to procure the materials for implementations against what was in the project implementation guideline. It was reported that the constructed bridge and rural electrification was poorly implemented. Substandard materials were used for the project instead of what was in the community development plan and the estimated expenditure was overrated. The monitoring teams could not ensure the implementation of the CDP. In the same vein, interview report from Aduralere community revealed that the CDP was not fully implemented, the CSDA operation officer control every decision concerning the project implementation instead of the community. The report from Epinmi community revealed that project was not implemented according to the CDP and the monitoring teams could not ensure implementation is done in line with the project implementation guideline. Hence the people refused to accept the project, the skill acquisition centre; market stall and Borehole have been abandoned.

From our observation in the field we discovered that the bridge in Okemeji community was poorly implemented and it has start collapsing after three years of construction. The constructed acquisition centre, market stall and the Borehole in Epinmi community was not functioning when we visited the site. Based on the collected data from both the questionnaire and interview we conclude that CSDP contribute to people participation in project implementation and monitoring in Okitipupa Local government Areas, Olorunsogo and Ire-Akari communities in Ondo State. There were problems of non-implementation of CDP in Epinmi, Aduralere and Okemeji communities in Ondo State.

## **CONTRIBUTION OF CSDP TO PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION IN PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING**

The communities Project Management Committees' were directly in charge of the Administration and Financial Management of the Community self-help projects to establish the ownership concepts. The Agency thus builds capacity of Communities to drive the projects and not involved in the procurement activities of the communities but provides adequate facilitation of projects identification, Community Development Plan (CDP) formulation, funding, trainings, supervision, monitoring and evaluation aimed at ensuring that all state activities in the CDPs are strictly adhered to for effective and efficient projects implementations. 1,494 CPMCs' members have been trained on Basic Project Management, simple Book Keeping, Community contracting/procurement, participatory monitoring and evaluation, conflict resolution, team building, to further enhance their capacity to manage their projects. 18 Local Government Review Committees (LGRCs) and LGRC Desk Offices are specifically set up by each Local Government in the State to facilitate mobilization of communities to participate in the project and also act as clearing house at the Local Government level to review and recommend Communities to the Agency for funding. The LGRCs have also been trained on CDD concept and principles, participatory planning and budgeting, monitoring and Evaluation. The project places emphasis on capacity building and empowerment of our people, especially in rural communities, to unleash their potentials in taking full charge of their projects by giving them resources and authority to drive their own projects. (ODCSDA publication 2013)

The above report show that CSDP has empowered the community's to be able to implement and monitored their own projects. This is evidence by training on how to manage the project and keep records. The CSDP also enable the community's to procure the needed materials for project implementation. Participatory monitoring mechanism was put place to enable the community to track the process of project implementation and ensure community development plan is implemented.

**Table 2: Rural development**

Items These have increased the level of development in the community.	Strongly Agree (SA)		Agree (A)		Undecided (UD)		Disagree (D)		Strongly Disagree (SD)		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Rural electrifications	135	48.9	110	39.9	16	5.8	15	5.4	-	-	276	100
Boreholes	103	37.3	114	41.3	-	-	21	7.6	38	13.8	276	100
Skills acquisition centre	99	35.9	114	41.3	4	1.4	39	14.1	20	7.2	276	100
Equipped Basic Health Centre	117	42.4	126	45.7	23	8.3	10	3.6	-	-	276	100
Community hall/ TV view centre	112	40.6	135	48.9	16	5.8	13	4.7	-	-	276	100
Market stalls	114	41.3	69	25.0	34	12.3	19	6.9	40	14.5	276	100
Drainage, culvert, bridges and graded roads.	135	48.9	112	40.6	18	6.5	11	4.0	-	-	276	100
School building & rehabilitation, furniture and equipped laboratory.	124	44.9	123	44.6	19	6.9	10	3.6	-	-	276	100

**Source:** Field Survey, 2016.

Table 2, shows the result of rural development projects that have increased the level of development in the community. 48.9% respondents strongly agreed that rural electrification has increased the level of development while 39.9% agreed, 5.8% undecided and 5.4% disagreed with the view. ODCSDA report (2013) revealed that Rural Electrification established 18MPs in 15 Communities comprising 1,051 households with estimated population of 26,904 connected to electricity. An average of 234 houses was connected to electricity in the selected communities. Average of 22 new micro-businesses was established as a result of the electrification project in these communities.

37.3% respondents strongly agreed while 41.3% agreed that borehole projects have increased the level of development in the community. 7.6% disagreed while 13.8% strongly disagreed with the view. ODCSDA report (2013), revealed that water was established in 57 Communities, 17 Motorized

Boreholes with 2,120m reticulation and 124 water fetching points, 17 Hand-pumped Boreholes and 67 Open Concrete wells were constructed. A total population of 38,500 benefitted.

35.9% respondents strongly agreed while 41.3% agreed that Skills acquisition centre have increased the level of development of the community. 1.4% undecided, 14.1% disagreed with the view while 7.2% strongly disagreed. ODCSDA report (2013) revealed that 10 Skills Acquisition Centres was established and equipped. Forty five people have been trained in various skills such as tailoring, shoe making, barbing, tie and dye, and hair dressing.

Meanwhile 42.4% respondents strongly agreed while 45.7% agreed that Equipped Basic Health Centre have increased the level of development in the community. 8.3% undecided and 3.6% disagreed with the view. ODCSDA report (2013) revealed that 29 MPs Health Centres was established and 4 Health Centres rehabilitated, 23 Health Centres equipped, 6 Health staff Residential units constructed. 33 communities with a total population of 41,500 are direct beneficiaries. Prior to health centre intervention community members have access to health facilities this has increased patronage of health centres and children immunization.

40.6% respondents strongly agreed while 48.9% agreed that Community hall/ TV view centre has increased the level of development in the community. 5.8% undecided while 4.7% disagreed with this assertion. ODCSDA report (2013) revealed that 15 Civic Centres/Community Halls was established and Revenue was generated by the communities from the multipurpose halls.

In respect to Market stalls, 41.3% respondents strongly agreed while 25% respondents agreed that it has increased the level of community development. 12.3% undecided, 6.9% disagreed while 14.5% strongly disagreed. ODCSDA report (2013) revealed that 140 Open Stalls and 64 Lock-up Stalls was established, 53 Communities with a total population of 30,018 benefitted. Revenue was generated by the communities from the market stalls.

48.9% respondents strongly agreed, while 40.6% agreed that drainage, culvert, bridges and graded roads have increased the level of community development. 6.5% undecided and 4.0% disagreed with the claim. ODCSDA report (2013) revealed that 21 rural roads of total length of 31km were constructed, 12 roads of total length of 113km were rehabilitated, 17 bridges, 770m drainage and 56 culverts were constructed in 42 Communities. A total population of 50, 556 people in these communities benefitted.

44.9% respondents strongly agreed while 44.6% respondents agreed that School building & rehabilitation, furniture and equipped laboratory has increased the level of development in the community. 6.9% undecided while 3.6% disagreed with this claim. ODCSDA report (2013) revealed that in 34 Communities, 84 classrooms were constructed, 24 classrooms rehabilitated, 58 Tables and

58 complementary chairs were provided for teachers, 724 students/pupils desks and chairs provided, 7 and 2 Science Laboratories were constructed and rehabilitated respectively, 10 Laboratories equipped and 21 VIP Toilets constructed. 50.58% increase in the number of school children enrolment due to the facilities in the new classrooms.

From the questionnaire analysis above, it was revealed that CSDP provided rural infrastructural facilities that have increased rural development in Ondo State this was supported by the CSDA official report. The interview revealed that rural electrification has increased the level of business activities in the community. The equipped BHC and the rehabilitation of staff quarter has increased and improved the service rendered by the Basic Healthcare centre. In general, the projects have increased the level of rural development. Our observation correlates with these findings.

Contrary to the above report is the interview from Akoko South East Local government Area where the executed projects are not functioning. From our observations we discovered that the implemented skill acquisition centre, the constructed Borehole and Market stall have been abandoned in Epinmi community.

#### **4.2 TEST OF HYPOTHESIS**

**HO.** People participation in project implementation and monitoring does not have a significant relationship with rural development in Ondo State.

#### **Pearson correlation result**

**Table 3: Correlation result**

Variable	RURALDEV	IMPMON
RURALDEV	1.000	0.976
IMPMON	0.976	1.000

Source: SPSS output (2016)

#### **RURALDEV= rural development; IMPMON= implementation and monitoring**

From table 3, rural development is the dependent variable; while implementation and monitoring is the independent variable. The table shows the relationship between the rural development and implementation and monitoring in CSDP. Implementation and monitoring have a positive relationship with rural development with 98%, the relationship is positive and high. These implied that the higher the level of people participation project implementation and monitoring the higher the level of rural development in Ondo State.

#### **REGRESSION RESULT**

$$\text{RURALDEV} = -0.862 + (1.185) \text{IMPMON} + 0.016$$

**Table 4: Regression Result**

Model	Coefficient	t-statistic	Sig.
(Constants)	-0.862	-12.560	0.000
IMPMON	1.185	73.509	0.000
R square	0.976		
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.952		
F-value	5403.6		

Sources: SPSS output 2016.

From our analysis in Table 4, the result show that the  $R^2$  of 0.952 means that the variables in Implementation and monitoring explained about 95% of rural development through people participation in CSDP implementation and monitoring in Ondo State. This means there were still others factors influencing rural development but were not included in the model. The F-value of 5403.6 revealed that the entire model is fit given a significant level of 5%. The results further revealed that implementation and monitoring in CSDP have a significant relationship with rural development at 5% level of significant. Consequently, alternative hypothesis is formulated. This means that when the data was subjected to regression test, it shows that there is a positive relationship between people participation in implementation and monitoring with rural development in Ondo State. These finding is supported by Gambo and Targema (2015), Fadairo and Obabire (2014), Adesida and Okunlola (2015), Okereke and Asiabaka (2015) and Oladapo (2014). It was also revealed from the interview and observation that the community was involved in project implementation and monitoring. The descriptive analyses from questionnaire respondents revealed a high level of participation in project implementation and monitoring with a mean score of 4.17 and standard deviation of 0.87.

Contrary to the above findings is the report from the interview from Ira-Akari III, revealed that implementation was carried out by the CSDA staff and implementation of the motorized borehole was poorly implemented. It was also revealed that the budgeted money used for procurement of material for rural electrification in Okemeji community was less value to what was on the CDP. The construction of culvert was poorly implemented; the size agreed on, in CDP was not implemented. In Aduralere community it was revealed that the transformer that was installed was not the one on the community development plan. In Epinmi Akoko the skill acquisition, Motorized Borehole, central market and the stalls was implemented by the contractor hired by the operational team of the CSDA, the implementation was carried out contrary to the community development plan. These projects are not functioning as a result of non-implementation of the CDP. These findings contradict Olawepo and Akanbi (2013) that reported more than 99.9% of CSDP are implemented and none is

abandoned. It also contradicts the findings of Abisoye (2008) that projects are abandoned as a result of non-involvement of beneficiaries in the process.

### **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

From the analysed data and hypothesis tested, the study concludes that there is a significant relationship between participation in CSDP implementation and monitoring with rural development in Ondo State. Meanwhile, the result revealed that implementation was not carried out in line with the community development plan in Epinmi Akoko and Okemeji communities. The Community Project Management Committee in Epinmi Akoko, Okemeji, Ire-Akari and Aduralere communities was not allowed to procure material and hired contractor as stated in the project implementation guideline. The monitoring team could not point out the lapses in the implementation in the affected community. We then conclude that there is lack of effective participation in project implementation and monitoring in Community and Social Development Project in Akoko South East Local Government of Ondo State.

Community and social development agency should show more commitment to project implementation and ensure community development plans is implemented. Community and Social Development Project monitoring teams should actively involve the community in project monitoring. They should be more effective and ensure project is implemented according to project implementation guideline. Community Social and Development Agency should ensure adequate financial management by putting in place proper monitoring mechanism to ensure that monies budgeted for projects are judiciously utilized. Local Government Authority should partner with Epinmi Akoko community stakeholders to resuscitate the abandoned project.

## REFERENCE

- Abisoye, A. O. (2008). *Participation and Democracy: Implication for Community Development in Oyo State, Nigeria* (Ph. D thesis Department of Sociology, University of Ibadan, Ibadan).
- Adeyemo P.A (2010). *Analysis of farmers' Participation in the Second Fadama Development Project in Oyo State, Nigeria*. Unpublished Msc thesis in the Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, LAUTECH, Ogbomoso.
- Arnstein, S.R. (1969) A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of American Institute of Planners*. 35(4):216-224. July.
- Community and social development project implementation manual and guideline (2011)
- Community impact news a publication of Ondo State community and social development agency (2013)
- Ekpo, A. H. and Olaniyi, O. (1995). *Rural development in Nigeria: analysis of the impact of the Directorate for Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI) 1986 - 1993*. In Eboh, Okoye and Ayichi (Eds.); *Rural Development in Nigeria: Concepts, Processes and Prospects*. Enugu: Auto-Century Publishing Company.
- ESCAP, (2009). *Regional Trends, Issues and Practices in Rural Poverty Reduction*. A Case studies on Community Participation Report to United Nation.
- Gambo S. and Targema T.S. (2015) Participatory communication and poverty alleviation in Nigeria: a review of the Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) in Taraba State 2009-2012. *Proceedings of the Academic Conference of African Scholar Publications and Research International on New Strategies and Approaches Vol. 5 No. 2*.
- George, D. and Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*. 11.0 update (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ikechukwu, Izubundu, and Okechukwu (2012) Rural-community development in Nigeria; A group dynamics perspective. *Interdisciplinary journal of contemporary research in business*.
- Iwala Oladapo Sam (2014). Effects of community participation on perception of sustainability of quick win projects in Ondo State, Nigeria. *Unique journal of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development Vol. 1(1), pp.001-008*.
- Kimani E.N and Kombo D.K (2011). An Investigation of Community Participation in the Development of Schools and Income Generating Projects in Rural Areas in Kenya. *British Journal of Educational Research 1(1): 58-68, 2011*
- Krejcie and Morgan (1970) Article "Determining Sample Size for Research Activities" (*Educational and Psychological Measurement, #30, pp. 607-610*).

NFDO National Fadama Development Office. (2007). *Poverty reduction through increased productivity and empowerment*. NFDO/Project Coordination Unit, Abuja, Nigeria.

Oakley peter (1995) *People's participation in development projects. A critical review of current theory and practice*.

Oghenekohwo Jonathan (2014) Empirical evidences of the impact of community education and social development projects on rural Bayelsa, Nigeria. *British Journal of Education Vol.2, No.3, pp. 65-74*.

Okereke-Ejiogu, Asiabaka, Ani and Umunakwe (2015) Assessment of Households' Participation in Community and Social Development Projects (CSDP): A Case Study of Imo State, Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics and Sociology*.

Olawepo and Akanbi (2013) World Bank Assisted Community Driven Project Implementation in Kwara State, Nigeria: Implication for Sustainable Rural Participatory Development and Community Initiatives. *Abuja Journal of Geography and Development Vol. 3. No.2*.

Ogo-oluwa Sylvester O. (2016) *Contribution of CSDP to Participatory Rural Development in Selected L.G.A Ondo State, Nigeria*. Unpublished M.sc Dissertation submitted to the postgraduate school, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria Nigeria in partial fulfilment for the award of Master of Science in Policy and Development Studies.