



## **Women's Perception of the Effects of Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) on their Livelihood Activities in Ondo State, Nigeria**

**G. T. Ajayi<sup>1\*</sup> and J. O. Okunlola<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension Services, Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Agricultural Extension and Communication Technology, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria.*

### **Authors' contributions**

*This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Author GTA designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Author JOO managed the analyses of the study. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.*

### **Article Information**

DOI: 10.9734/AJAEES/2020/v38i1130463

Editor(s):

(1) Dr. Roxana Plesa, University of Petrosani, Romania.

Reviewers:

(1) Chidanand U. Dhavaleshwar, Rani Channamma University Belagavi, India.

(2) Md Siddique E Azam, International Institute of Halal Research and Training (INHART), International Islamic University, Malaysia.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/63199>

**Original Research Article**

**Received 25 September 2020**

**Accepted 30 November 2020**

**Published 12 December 2020**

### **ABSTRACT**

The study was carried out to investigate the women's perception of the effects of Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) on their livelihood activities in Ondo State, Nigeria. A multi-stage sampling procedure was used to randomly select 120 respondents from three benefitting Local Government Areas in the state. Primary data were collected with the aid of interview schedule and analyzed using frequency counts, percentages, mean as well as Chi square. The mean age of the respondents was 42 years. Most (70.8%) of the respondents were married with mean household size of 6 persons, were ordinary members of social groups (73.3%) and were farmers (46.7%) with and a mean monthly income of ₦18,000.00. Most (60.2%) of the respondents had agricultural value chain activities as their livelihood activities. The study revealed that the respondents had positive perception of CSDP projects such as construction of; potable water supply project (4.01),

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: [grace.ajayi@eksu.edu.ng](mailto:grace.ajayi@eksu.edu.ng);

road/bridge (4.04), health and maternity centre (4.01), community hall/viewing centre (4.06), skill acquisition centre (4.21), market (4.10). There was a significant association between CSDP micro-projects and selected livelihood activities such as crop production ( $\chi^2$ Cal =13.2), livestock production ( $\chi^2$  Cal =39.8), farm produce processing ( $\chi^2$ Cal =4.3), gathering of wood ( $\chi^2$ Cal =5.4), petty trade ( $\chi^2$ Cal =21.0) and gathering of non-timber products ( $\chi^2$ Cal =4.6). Women's perception of effects of CSDP projects on their livelihood activities was favourable. Therefore, the study recommends that development strategies and plan should be well structured by the government to improve the livelihood activities of women especially agriculture for improved income and livelihoods.

*Keywords: Women; perception; effects; CSDP; livelihood; activities.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In Nigeria, several efforts have been made by the various tiers of government to develop the rural areas. This is because development enhances the livelihood of people and empowers them to be out of the poverty line most especially women. The consequence of such development is increase in agricultural production and food security in the country. It should be noted that every community in Nigeria needs development, especially, in the area of social infrastructures [1].

Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) is a World Bank assisted development in Nigeria targeting solely the rural communities to improve on management of natural resources and social infrastructure service in a sustainable manner using Community-Driven Development (CDD) approach [2]. The cornerstone of Community-Driven Development (CDD) initiatives used in CSDP is the active involvement of members of a defined community in some aspects of project design and implementation which affects their lives [3].

Social inclusiveness is one of the key features of CSDP principle. This is to foster involvement of the poor and marginalized people such as women in project interventions in their communities. Nevertheless, the ability of women to contribute to the development process depends on the extent to which they participate in the decision-making process at all levels [4]. The perception of gender as social problem, especially among women is provoked by a widespread discriminatory philosophies and practices that majority of female population is exposed to in patriarchal social structure globally [5]. However, CSDP project made provision for involvement of women in all aspects of the programme because they are a crucial driving force to community mobilization which targets

project implementation for improved livelihood of the citizens and ultimately poverty reduction.

Livelihood is the process of making a living, during which resources are accessed, used, and transformed [6]. Studies have shown that rural women are involved in livelihood activities to contribute to food security in their households. Women farmers perform about 70% or more of all agricultural production activities, 100% of food processing and utilization activities and over 50% of storage and marketing operations [7]. It is to be noted that most Nigerian women are involved in almost all phases of food production such as cassava, maize and vegetable crop production. They undertake the rearing of small farm animals and execution of certain farm operations. Matthew-Njoku and Adesope [8] posit that the increasing pressure on the income and assets of rural farm families have forced women to diversify into non-agricultural activities as a way of improving livelihood.

Ekong [9] asserted that infrastructural development is sine-qua-non to improving the living standard of majority of the nation's populace. A number of projects have been executed in Ondo State under CSDP using CDD approach, this includes provision of potable water supply facilities, construction of roads/bridges, health facilities, market facilities, acquisition of skills centers, hall and viewing centers etc., which were assisted by World Bank. One of the objectives of Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) is to empower the marginalized people such as women in order to improve on their standard of living [10]. Women as members of the community give their full support to any project where they are part of decision-making process and results of such projects [3,11]. Women's perceived needs related to improving their livelihoods and economic status were of special interest to community development programme [10].

Development is fast-growing mechanism that builds on the empowerment of the affected population such as women by giving them control over planning decision and investment resources [3]. Women have to be decision-makers in their own situations and to be decision-makers, their perception must be considered to ensure continuous delivery of the intended benefits of the projects on the participants' livelihood and their continuous participation in the programme for project sustainability. In order to enhance programme sustainability, participation by marginalized people such as women in the institutions that make decisions that affect their lives must be encouraged [12]. According to Zwane [13], the young women's perception of the influence of a community development project on their lives presented positive view of themselves and others that community project enable them to develop self-esteem, self-worth, strong personality, effectiveness in their performances as their potential improved and learn practical skills, which became of use to them in everyday lives. The way women perceive the project either favorably (positive) or unfavorably (negative) may determine their level of involvement in the planning and implementation. Empowering women could be realized by understanding the perception of these women on effects of CSDP project on their livelihood activities. However, little empirical information was available on the perception of effects of Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) on the quality of life of women beneficiaries. It is therefore, imperative to study to what extent the CSDP projects have benefitted women and their livelihood activities especially for the purpose of developmental programs to improve the standard of living of women in Ondo State.

Hence, the study on perception of women beneficiaries of effects of Community and Social Development Project implemented through Community-Driven Development (CDD) approach on their livelihood activities needs to be carried out to ascertain their improvement of living standard, hence, ensuring their participation in some Community and Social Development projects like potable water supply facilities, construction of roads/bridges, health facilities, market facilities, acquisition of skills centers, hall and viewing centers etc., which were assisted by World Bank in Ondo State. Therefore, the broad objective of the study was to investigate the perceived effects of Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) on

women's livelihood activities in Ondo State. Specifically, the objectives of this study were to; ascertain the socio-economic characteristics of women who are involved in Community and Social Development Project in the study area; identify livelihood activities of the respondents in the study area; and determine the perception of women on the effects of Community and Social Development Project on their livelihood activities in the study area. Alufohai, Ugolor, Edemhanria [14] reported that community programme beneficiaries had positive perception on their livelihood as programme enhanced their living standards such as farm expansion. Also, Adeleke-Bello and Ashimolowo [15] stated that participants of selected rural women empowerment project had high perception of the effects of the projects on their livelihood. Hence, the hypothesis for this study stated in a null form was;

Ho<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant association between perception of women on the effects of Community and Social Development Project and the selected respondents' livelihood activities.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 The Concept of Community Social Development Project (CSDP)

Community Social Development Project (CSDP) was established in March, 2005 and later reviewed in 2006. The overall goal of CSDP is to improve access of the poor to services for Human Development. CSDP utilizes Community-Driven Development (CDD) approach to carry out its activities in eight sectors namely, water, health, education, transport, electricity, environment and natural resource, socio-economic (market, civic center / skill acquisition center, hall and television viewing center) and gender and vulnerable group. One of the objectives is to empower the communities to plan, part-finance, and monitor and maintain sustainable and social inclusive multi-sectored micro projects [10]. Various stakeholders in the communities are involved at project planning phase, implementation and evaluation to increase their bonds or interest for the project for its participation and sustainability.

CSDP involves the concepts of participatory planning and budgeting in project implementation. Creation of the awareness of the projects is done by the Agency, then, the projects are identified and planned by the communities.

Local Government Review Committees (LGRCs) facilitate the mobilization of the communities to participate in the project and act as clearing house at the Local Government level to review and recommend Communities Development Plans formulated by the communities to the Agency for funding. Prioritization of project choice for vulnerable groups and women groups as first and second projects respectively. Gender and Vulnerable Groups (GVGs) are included as major stakeholders in CSDP. GVGs are involved at every stage of decision making in developmental process. Women are elected as the treasurers of the Community Project Management Committees after the identification of the project by the community groups. Women engage in more activities in the communities than men, this makes women become abreast of more information concerning all issues as it affects the entire population. This implies that women should be equally involved as men at all levels of implementation.

Source: Adapted from ODCSDA [10]

## 2.2 Conceptual Framing

The conceptual framework of the study consists of the independent variables, intervening variables and dependent variables. The dependent variables are increased farm output, improved farm quality, increased income generating activities and enhanced product quality and could be grouped as high or low perception of the CSDP micro-projects on women's livelihood activities which could be influenced by the independent variables like socio-economic characteristics (age, marital status, income, level of education, social status) and intervening variables which were government policy on counterpart funds, cultural values, community law (community work ethics) which could act as intermediaries between the independent and dependent variables because it could affect the participation and implementation of the project. The conceptual framework also, contains project outcome which are the effects of the Community Social Development Project on women livelihood activities and these include; economic change: improved income, improved standard of living; psychological change: improved self-esteem, improved self-worth; social change: increased human capacity, empowerment, and improved social status. This would affect the socio-economic variables like income and social status positively, only when

these projects are in line with the livelihood activities.

## 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### 3.1 Study Area

The study was carried out in Ondo State, Nigeria. The state had a population of 3,460,877. Ondo State is made up of 18 Local Government Areas (LGAs) and bounded on the East by Ogun and Osun States, West by Edo and Delta, North by Ekiti and Kogi States and South by Atlantic Ocean. The climate is tropical with two distinct seasons; the rainy season (April- October) and the dry season (November-March). Temperature throughout the year ranges between 21°C to 29°C and humidity is relatively high. Ondo State is an agrarian state with farmers producing both tree and food crops like Cocoa, oil palm, Cassava, Maize and Yam. The people are also predominantly Yorubas with Ijaws in the Southern part of the state.

### 3.2 Data Collection and Sampling Procedure

The primary data were obtained through the use of pre-tested, validated and reliable interview schedule.

A multi-stage sampling procedure was used for this study. Sixteen benefitting Local Government Areas in Ondo State were purposively selected due to their participation in CSDP, out of which three Local Government Areas (LGAs) were randomly selected. These are Ile-Oluji, Odigbo, and Owo Local Government Areas. From each of the selected Local Government Areas, four communities that have benefitted from Community and Social Development Project were purposively selected. Each community was divided into four geographical wards, out of which two wards were randomly selected. From each ward, five respondents were randomly interviewed, making a total of ten respondents per community and a total sample size of one hundred and twenty respondents.

### 3.3 Analytical Technique

Descriptive statistic such as frequency counts, percentages and mean were used to describe the socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents while chi square was also used to analyze association among some selected variables using SPSS.

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Socioeconomic Characteristics of the Respondents

The result from Table 1 indicated that the mean age of the respondents was 42 years which implies that most of the respondents were in active age bracket. This is in agreement with the study of Mafimisebi [16] that respondents within this age limit (41-50 years) are in the economically active age bracket to undertake various livelihood activities. Also, 70.8% of the respondents were married with mean household size of 6 persons. This would influence their decision positively to participate in CSDP. This finding agrees with Farinde et al. [17] that seventy percent of women who participated in the rural community project were married.

Furthermore, the study showed that 15 percent of the respondents had no formal education while 38.3 percent had primary education. This implies that most of the respondents are educated and this could influence their access to sources of information and participation Community Social Development Project activities. The result further showed that 73.3% of the respondents were ordinary members of the social group or association who did not serve in any position or committee in their various groups. The implication of this is that the most members of the community have not held leadership position or serve as legitimizers to affirm or support the commencement of CSDP projects.

In addition, the findings revealed that 46.7 percent of the respondents were food crop farmers. This finding supports Ogunbameru et al. [18] that majority of women were involved in agricultural activities in the rural areas. This implies that respondents would like to participate in the CSDP micro -projects that are relevant to crop production and processing in order to bring improvement on their livelihoods. Moreover, it was revealed that the mean monthly income was ₦18,000.00. Also, 38.3 percent of the respondents earned between ₦10,001- ₦20,000 as monthly income. This implies that the respondents have relative low income which could affect the level of participation in raising counterpart fund required by their Community to participate in the Community and Social Development Project in the state.

### 4.2 Livelihood Activities

Table 2 revealed the livelihood activities of the respondents. From the table, 17.9% and 11.4% of the respondents were involved in crop production and livestock production respectively. From the study, 11.7% of the respondents were into processing of agricultural produce, gathering of wood for sales (9.1%) and gathering of non-timbers products (10.1%) as their livelihood activities. This means that 60.2% of the respondents participated in agricultural value chain activities for their livelihood. The implication is that since they were involved in agricultural value chain activities as their major livelihood activities, provision of infrastructural facilities by CSDP will enhance their interest in the project as projects such as construction of rural feeder roads marketing facilities, electricity improves their major livelihood activities. This finding is in line with the finding of Oyerinde and Ajayi [19] that 61.0% of women had farming as their major source of livelihood.

### 4.3 Respondents' Perceived Effects of Community Social Development Project (CSDP)

#### 4.3.1 Perceived effects of potable water supply project on the respondents' livelihood activities

The study revealed that a total of 93.3 percent of the respondents agreed that CSDP has improved the level of hygiene among community members ( $\bar{X} = 4.28$ ). It was revealed that 65.8 percent of the respondent agreed that provision of potable water has enhanced the processing and cleanliness of the produce ( $\bar{X} = 4.00$ ). On the negative statement, the results from the table revealed that 59.2 percent disagreed of the respondents that provision of potable water has not reduced water borne disease among the respondents ( $\bar{X} = 4.05$ ). Also, on the statement that it has not led to increase in farm income, 75.0 percent of the respondents disagreed ( $\bar{X} = 4.28$ ). The grand mean score was 4.01. The implication is that the respondents perceived the effect of the provision of the potable water supply projects favourably as the respondents claimed during the Focus Group Discussion (FGD) that it enhanced their livelihood through processing of farm product, enhancing their income level through the use of the water facilities for irrigation especially vegetable production in dry season while it also made production and processing of

farm produce easier most especially women. This finding agrees with the finding of Fakeye [20] who stated that women were satisfied with the water project in that their work load had reduced and there are no issues of water borne disease, thereby improving their living standard.

**Table 1. Distribution of respondents' socioeconomic characteristics**

Variables	Frequency	Percentages	Mean
<b>Age (years)</b>			
≥30	20	16.7	42
31- 40	29	24.2	
41-50	38	31.7	
51- 60	22	18.3	
61 and above	11	9.2	
<b>Marital Status</b>			
Single	25	20.8	
Married	85	70.8	
Divorced	04	3.3	
<b>Household size</b>			
1-5	68	56.7	6
6- 10	32	26.7	
11- 15	15	12.5	
16- 20	5	4.1	
<b>Educational level</b>			
Non formal education	18	15.0	
Primary education	46	38.3	
Secondary education	18	15.0	
Tertiary education	38	31.7	
<b>Social status</b>			
Member	88	73.3	
Committed member	28	23.3	
Leader	04	3.3	
<b>Occupation</b>			
Farming	56	46.7	
Public service	26	21.7	
Trading	21	17.5	
Artisan	11	9.2	
Private service	06	5.0	
<b>Types of farming</b>			
Crop production	45	80.4	
Animal production	01	1.8	
Crop and animal production	10	17.8	
<b>Monthly income</b>			
≤ ₦10,000	41	34.2	₦18,000
₦10,001- ₦20,000	46	38.3	
₦20,001- ₦30,000	14	11.7	
₦30,001- ₦40,000	09	7.5	
₦40,001- ₦50,000	04	3.3	
≥ ₦50,001 and above	06	5.0	

Source: Field survey, 2013

**Table 2. Livelihood activities of the respondents**

Livelihood Activities	Frequency	Percentage
Crop production	55	17.9
Livestock production	35	11.4
Farm produce processing	36	11.7
Gathering of wood for sales	28	9.1
Gathering of non –timber product	31	10.1
Petty trade	17	5.6
Artisan work	13	4.2
Salaried Job	31	10.1
Self employed	61	19.9
Total	307	100.0

\*Multiple responses; Source: Field Survey, 2013

**Table 3. Perceived effects of provision of potable water supply project by the respondents**

Effects of Provision of Potable Water Supply has:	SA	A	U	D	SD	Mean
a. Reduced distance for fetching water	47(39.1)	53(44.2)	14(11.7)	2(1.7)	4(3.3)	4.14
b. Improved the level of hygiene among community members	45(37.5)	67(55.8)	5(4.2)	3(2.5)	0(0.0)	4.28
c. Improved the market value of the produce	28(23.3)	72(60.0)	6(5.0)	12(10.0)	2(1.7)	3.93
d. Enhanced irrigation activities	37(30.8)	53(44.2)	12(10.0)	17(14.2)	1(0.8)	3.90
e. Created adequate clean water supply for livestock	36(30.0)	59(49.2)	5(4.2)	16(13.3)	4(3.3)	3.89
f. Enhanced the processing & cleanliness of the produce	26(21.7)	79(65.8)	6(5.0)	7(5.8)	2(1.7)	4.00
g. Not reduced water borne disease among respondents	0(0.00)	9(7.5)	8(6.7)	71(59.2)	32(26.6)	4.05
h. Not led to increase in farm income	5(4.2)	14(11.7)	11(9.1)	50(41.7)	40(33.3)	3.88
i. Not reduced cost expended on getting potable water	2(1.7)	4(3.3)	9(7.5)	66(55.0)	39(32.5)	4.13
j. Not created an improved self-worth	1(0.8)	10(8.3)	7(5.8)	84(70.0)	18(15.0)	3.90

Grand mean= 4.01; Total decision = Agreed; Source: Field Survey, 2013

#### 4.3.2 Perceived effects of construction and rehabilitation of road/bridge on the respondents' livelihood activities

The study revealed that a total of 79.2 percent of the respondents agreed that construction and rehabilitation of road/bridge has increased income earning from livelihood activities ( $\bar{X}$  =3.81). During the FGD some of the women stated that the road/ bridge consumption enabled them to start marketing and take their products to other communities and also has enabled them to

enlarge their livelihood activities. On the statement that CSDP project has enhanced easy conveyance of farm produce to the market, 67.5 percent of the respondents agreed with statement ( $\bar{X}$  = 4.08). On the negative statements, 59.2 percent of respondents disagreed that construction and rehabilitation of road/bridge has not created easy access to the market ( $\bar{X}$  =4.29). As shown in Table 4, it was revealed that 59.2 percent of the respondents disagreed that construction and rehabilitation has not reduced cost of transportation ( $\bar{X}$  =4.28). The

grand mean was 4.04. It means that most of the respondents agreed and had positive perception of the contributions of the construction and rehabilitation of road/bridge to their livelihood and access and links to the market and improved transportation. This finding agrees with Organization for Economic Co-operation Development [21] that improving rural roads, transportation facilities and services increases rural women's mobility and can increase their productivity and income by easing access to markets, reducing post-harvest loss of perishable goods.

#### 4.3.3 Perceived effects of construction of health and maternity centre on the respondents' livelihood activities

The study revealed that 70.0 percent of the respondents in Table 5 agreed that construction of health and maternity centre has improved health status in the community ( $\bar{X} = 4.23$ ). Also, 67.5 percent of the respondents agreed that this project has provided health education on disease prevention ( $\bar{X} = 4.18$ ). Furthermore, on the negative statement a total of 90.0 percent of the respondents disagreed that construction of health and maternity centre has not enhanced livelihood activities' performance ( $\bar{X} = 4.28$ ). The grand mean was 4.01. This implies that respondents perceived the effects of the construction of health and maternity centre projects positively; this is because it could have improved the health status of the respondents in the community and enhanced the livelihood

activities performance of the respondents. This finding is in agreement with Agenor [22] who asserted that lack of access to family planning and maternal health services, combined with persistence of certain traditional practices, not only endangers the lives and health of women and girls but also has serious negative intergenerational impacts on livelihoods.

#### 4.3.4 Perceived effects of construction of community hall / viewing centre on the respondents' livelihood activities

The results from Table 6 revealed that 75.0 percent agreed that construction of community hall / viewing centre has enhanced group meeting by the respondents ( $\bar{X} = 4.01$ ) and 62.5 percent of the respondents agreed that the community hall / viewing centre has created an improved source of information on various activities ( $\bar{X} = 4.0$ ). Also, the study revealed that 65.8 percent disagreed that the project did not enhance the level of awareness of innovation and 25.0 percent strongly disagreed with this statement ( $\bar{X} = 4.15$ ). The grand mean was 4.06. This implies that respondents perceived the effects of the construction of community hall / viewing centre projects as favourable; this could be because it has made availability of information and innovation on various livelihood activities better. This finding supports Ochepe, Ejembi, Agada, Jiriko [23] that the beneficiaries perceived the effect of CSDP favourably due to increase in social events such as community meetings.

**Table 4. Perceived effects of construction and rehabilitation of road/bridge by the respondents**

Effects of Construction and Rehabilitation of Road/Bridge has:	SA	A	U	D	SD	Mean
a. Increased access to the community	53(44.2)	49(40.8)	15(12.5)	2(1.7)	1(0.8)	4.26
b. Increased income earning from livelihood activities	27(22.5)	68(56.7)	9(7.5)	7(5.8)	6(7.5)	3.81
c. Reduced travel time	35(29.2)	63(52.5)	10(8.3)	4(3.3)	8(6.7)	3.94
d. Enhanced easy conveyance of farm produce to the market	26(21.7)	81(67.5)	11(9.1)	0(0.0)	2(1.7)	4.08
e. Created an improved self- worth	31(25.9)	70(58.3)	13(10.8)	4(3.3)	2(1.7)	4.03
f. Not created easy access to the market	1(0.8)	0(0.0)	5(4.2)	71(59.2)	43(35.8)	4.29
g. Not reduced farm wastage	4(3.3)	5(4.2)	12(10.0)	67(55.8)	32(26.7)	3.98
h. Not reduced cost of transportation	5(4.2)	4(3.3)	12(10.0)	71(59.2)	28(23.3)	3.94

Grand mean = 4.04; Total decision = Agreed; Source: Field Survey, 2013

**Table 5. Perceived effects of construction of health and maternity centre by the respondents**

<b>Effects of Construction of Health and Maternity Centre has:</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Mean</b>
a. Reduced distance to health facilities	35(29.2)	74(61.7)	9(7.5)	1(0.8)	1(0.8)	4.18
b. Enhanced level of immunization	33(27.5)	75(62.5)	11(9.3)	1(0.8)	0(0.0)	4.17
c. Enhanced improved health status in the community	32(26.7)	84(70.0)	4(3.3)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4.23
d. Provided health education on disease prevention	34(28.3)	81(67.5)	4(3.3)	1(0.8)	0(0.0)	4.23
e. Created an improved self-worth	30(25.0)	72(60.0)	9(7.5)	4(3.3)	5(4.2)	3.98
f. Not reduced rate of pre-natal and post-natal death	0(0.0)	2(1.7)	13(10.8)	70(58.3)	35(29.2)))))8	4.15
g. Not reduced cost for treatment of diseases	3(2.5)	1(0.8)	14(11.8)	80(67.2)	22(17.6)	3.98
h. Not enhanced livelihood activities performance	2(1.7)	3(2.5)	7(5.8)	71(59.2)	37(30.8)	4.15

*Grand mean = 4.01; Total decision = Agreed; Source: Field Survey, 2013*

**Table 6. Perceived effects of construction of community hall / viewing centre by the respondents**

<b>Effects of Construction of Health and Maternity Centre has:</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Mean</b>
a. Reduced distance to health facilities	35(29.2)	74(61.7)	9(7.5)	1(0.8)	1(0.8)	4.18
b. Created an improved source of information on various activities	33(27.5)	75(62.5)	9(7.5)	2(1.7)	1(0.8)	4.14
c. Reduced distance to group meeting center	30(25.0)	73(60.8)	11(9.2)	2(1.7)	4(3.3)	4.03
d. Created better group interaction and intimacy	45(37.5)	62(51.7)	8(6.7)	2(1.7)	3(2.5)	4.20
e. Not enhanced access to group meeting by members	2(1.7)	1(0.8)	9(7.5)	90(75.0)	18(15.0)	4.01
f. Not created an improved self – worth among farmers	2(1.7)	5(4.2)	18(15.0)	76(63.3)	19(15.8)	3.88
g. Not enhanced the level of awareness of innovation	0(0.0)	1(0.8)	10(8.3)	79(65.8)	30(25.0)	4.15

*Grand mean= 4.06; Total decision = Agreed; Source: Field Survey, 2013*

#### **4.3.5 Perceived effects of construction of skill acquisition centre on the respondents' activities**

From the study 64.2 percent of the respondents agreed that construction of skill acquisition project has increased access to various skills and 30.8 percent strongly agreed with the statement ( $\bar{X}$  = 4.24) as shown in Table 7. About 71.7 percent of the respondents ( $\bar{X}$  = 4.40) agreed that the level of innovativeness among producers improved with the project while on the negative statements, it was revealed that 65.8

percent of the respondents disagreed that construction of skill acquisition centre has not improved the level of creativity ( $\bar{X}$  = 4.19). The grand mean was 4.21. This implies that the respondents perceived the effects of CSDP positively and this could be because their skills and innovativeness were improved on their livelihood activities through this project. This finding agrees with Zwane [13] who stated that the young women's perception was positive as their potential and practical skills improved after participation in the community development programme.

**Table 7. Perceived effects of construction of skill acquisition centre by women**

Perceived effects of Construction of Skill Acquisition Centre has:	SA	A	U	D	SD	Mean
a. Created an improved self-worth	31(25.8)	82(68.3)	5(4.2)	1(0.8)	1(0.8)	4.18
b. Increased access to various skills	37(30.8)	77(64.2)	4(3.3)	2(1.7)	0(0.0)	4.24
c. Improved the level of innovativeness among producers	22(18.3)	86(71.7)	7(5.8)	5(4.2)	0(0.0)	4.40
d. Increased level of employment	51(42.5)	61(50.8)	7(5.8)	1(0.8)	0(0.0)	4.35
e. Enhanced the vocational knowledge of salaried workers	41(34.2)	62(51.7)	10(8.3)	3(2.5)	4(3.3)	4.11
f. Not improved the level of creativity	1(0.8)	0(0.0)	7(5.8)	79(65.8)	33(27.5)	4.19
g. Not enhanced increase in income earning	0(0.0)	4(3.3)	10(8.3)	76(63.3)	30(25.0)	4.10
h. Not improved the knowledge on processing of farm produce	1(0.8)	5(4.2)	10(8.3)	67(55.8)	37(30.8)	4.12

*Grand mean= 4.21; Total decision = Agreed; Source: Field Survey, 2013*

#### 4.3.6 Effects of construction of market on the respondents' livelihood activities

The perception of the respondents on the issues relating to construction of markets is stated in Table 8. The Table revealed that 56.7 percent of the respondents agreed that construction of market has increased the level of income from livelihood activities while 27.5 percent strongly agreed with the statement ( $\bar{X}$  = 4.11). About 61.7 percent of the respondents agreed that CSDP market project has increased access to more customers ( $\bar{X}$  = 4.18). Furthermore, on the negative statements that construction of market has not enhanced marketing of products, 66.7 percent disagreed with the statement ( $\bar{X}$  = 4.11). the grand mean of 4.01. This implies that respondents perceived the effects of the construction of market project as improving access to more customers and making sales of produce easier. This finding agrees with International Food Policy Research Institute [24] report that the development of community infrastructure is a critical means of developing physical link between poor rural communities and the outside world with reduction in business transaction costs.

#### 4.3.7 Hypothesis testing

##### 4.3.7.1 $H_{01}$

There is no significant association between the perception of women on the effect of Community

and Social Development Project (CSDP) micro-projects and the selected respondents' livelihood activities.

As results of that there was a significant association between CSDP micro-projects and selected livelihood activities (crop production ( $\chi^2$  = 13.2), livestock production ( $\chi^2$  = 39.8), farm produce processing ( $\chi^2$  = 4.3), gathering of wood ( $\chi^2$  = 5.4), petty trade ( $\chi^2$  = 21.0) and gathering of non-timber products ( $\chi^2$  = 4.6) as indicated in Table 9. This suggests that CSDP had influenced production and processing of food crop and livestock while also assisting farm produce processing, gathering of wood for sales, petty trade and gathering of non-timber products. This finding supports the finding of Fakeye [20] who reported that CSDP has greatly contributed in improving the living standard of rural dwellers with agriculture as their major livelihood activity by increasing their access to infrastructures. This finding further agrees with Ochepe et al. [23] who stated that CSDP projects had significant effect in the various aspects of the beneficiaries who identified agriculture as their major livelihood. However, there was no significant relationship with the Community and Social Development Project and artisan work by the respondents. This finding corroborates with the finding of Alufohai et al. [14] who indicated that most of the activities of community-based programme were agriculture-based.

**Table 8. Perceived effects of construction of market by the respondents**

Perceived effects of Construction of Market has:	SA	A	U	D	SD	Mean
a. Increased the level of income from livelihood activities	33(27.5)	68(56.7)	18(15.8)	1(0.8)	0(0.0)	4.11
b. Increased access to more customers	35(29.2)	74(61.7)	9(7.5)	1(0.8)	1(0.8)	4.18
c. Reduced distance in purchasing of products	15(12.5)	94(78.3)	8(6.7)	1(0.8)	2(1.7)	3.99
d. Created an improved self –worth	24(20.0)	86(69.2)	7(8.3)	3(2.5)	0(0.0)	4.09
e. Created easy exhibition of craftworks	31(25.8)	80(66.7)	4(3.3)	4(3.3)	1(0.8)	4.13
f. Not enhanced marketing of products	1(0.8)	3(2.5)	7(5.8)	80(66.7)	29(24.2)	4.11
g. Not reduced farm wastages	3(2.5)	3(2.5)	11(9.2)	71(59.2)	32(26.7)	4.05
h. Not created better location for keeping of produce	1(0.8)	4(3.3)	7(5.8)	78(65.1)	30(25.0)	4.10

Grand mean= 4.10; Total decision = Agreed; Source: Field Survey, 2013

**Table 9. Chi-square result between community and social development project and the livelihood activities of the respondents**

Livelihood Activities	X <sup>2</sup> Cal	p- value	Decision
Crop production	13.2	0.00	S
Livestock production	39.8	0.00	S
Farm produce processing	4.3	0.04	S
Gathering of wood for sales	5.4	0.02	S
Petty trade	21.0	0.00	S
Gathering of non-timber product	4.6	0.03	S
Artisan work	1.0	0.31	NS

Source: Field Survey 2013

## 5. CONCLUSION

The study revealed that most of the respondents fell within the age of 41-50years, were married with a mean household size of 6 persons. Most were farmers and ordinary members of the social group. It was also, revealed that most (60.2%) of the respondents had agricultural value chain activities as their livelihood activities. The respondents had positive perception of the contributions of CSDP micro-projects such as construction of potable water, construction/rehabilitation of roads/ bridges, construction of health and maternity facilities, construction of hall/viewing centers, skill acquisition centre and construction of market on their livelihood activities. The study further revealed that there was a significant association between CSDP micro-projects and livelihood activities such as crop production, livestock production, farm produce processing, gathering of wood for sales, petty trade and gathering of non-timber products.

## 6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Due to the above findings, it is therefore, recommended that the government should develop strategies to actively involve the youths and middle aged in decision making in project design, project management and project implementation that would enhance their mobilization in the programme because these categories of people are zealous, energetic and could serve as mobilize for the project. Due to the social status of women as ordinary members, they should be encouraged to take up leadership position by creating more portfolios for them to serve in the Community Project Management Committee since they had positive perception to enable them influencing decisions towards Community and Social Development Project micro-projects that are relevant to their livelihood activities. Also, development strategies and plan should be well structured by the government to improve agriculture as the major livelihood activity of these women. These

recommendations are in line with Fakeye [20] who concluded that the CSDP had greatly contributed to improving the living standard of the community but it had not been able to establish effective strategies that would improve women's participation in projects and Owolabi et al. [25] who stated that CSDP significantly influenced the income of the beneficiaries of which the majority are men and had farming as their major livelihood.

## CONSENT

As per international standard or university standard, respondents' written consent has been collected and preserved by the author(s).

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

1. Adegboye MA. Sources of motivation to rural dwellers participation in self-help projects in Plateau States, Nigeria; PhD Thesis Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, University of Ibadan., Ibadan; 2005.
2. ODCSDA. Brief on Ondo State community and social development agency, Ondo State, Nigeria; 2009. Available:<http://csdpnigeria.org/ondo>
3. Mansuri G, Rao V. Community-based and -driven development: A critical review. World Bank Research Observer. 2004;19(1):1-39.
4. Okunlola JO. Concepts and principles of Community driven development approach; a paper presented at the conference on Participatory Budgeting for Community Development, 12-15th June 2012 at Federal University of Technology Akure. 2012;2-4.
5. Pietila K. Engendering the global agenda: The story of women and the United Nations; Geneva: UNCTAD/UG, LS/191; 2002.
6. De Haan L, Zoomers A. Development geography at the crossroads of livelihood and globalisation. Tijdschriftvoor Economische en SocialeGeografie. 2003; 94(3):350-362.
7. Kawani N, Pernia EM. What is pro-poor growth? Asian Development Review. 2002; 18(1):1-10.
8. Matthews-Njoku EC, Adesope ON. Livelihood diversity strategies of rural women in Imo State Nigeria. Journal of Agricultural Extension. 2007; 10:117- 123.
9. Ekong EE. Rural development in Nigeria: an introduction to rural sociology. Dove Educational Publishers, Uyo, Akwa-Ibom State. 2003;34.
10. ODCSDA. Community and social development project impacting rural communities. Manual on Ondo State Community and Social Development Agency, Ondo State, Nigeria; 2012. Available:<http://csdpnigeria.org/ondo>
11. Toyo N. Why Entrism for Nigerian women in politics?" in E. Bassey, and N. Toyo (eds.), Nigerian Women and Political Entrism: Power, Intrigues and Obstacles around the 2003 Elections. Lagos: Gender and Development Action. 2003;79- 94.
12. Binswanger HP, Swaminathan A. Scaling up community- driven development: Theoretical underpinnings and program design implications. Policy Research Working Paper; No. 3039. Washington DC: World Bank; 2003.
13. Zwane. Participatory development of an extension approach and policy for Limpopo province, South Africa. University of Pretoria; 2009.
14. Alufohai GO, Ugolor D, Edemhanria II. Beneficiaries' perception of community based natural resource management programme on the livelihood in Edo State, Nigeria. Nigeria Journal of Rural Sociology. 2015;15(2):9-12.
15. Adeleke-Bello OO, Ashimolowo OR. Beneficiaries' perception of selected rural women empowerment projects in Ogun State, Nigeria. African Journal of Agricultural Research. 2015;10(44):4108-4116.
16. Mafimisebi TE. A comparative economic analysis of two-cassava based business activities exclusive of the female gender in Oyo State. Nigeria. Journal of Agricultural Extension. 2007; 10:1-8.
17. Farinde AJ, Okunade EO, Laogun EA. Community perception of women occupying leadership position in rural development projects of Osun State, Nigeria; 2004.
18. Ogunbameru BO, Gwary MM, Idrisa YL, Ani AO, Yero AB. Empowerment of women through Urban Agriculture Development in Maiduguri Metropolitan, Borno – State.: Proceedings 11th Annual national

- conference of the Agricultural Extension Society of Nigeria (AESON). 2006;147-156.
19. Oyerinde VO, Ajayi MA. Rural women's access to forest resources and its impact on household food security in Ondo State, Nigeria. *Agenda: Empowering Women for Gender Equity. Journal Storage.* 2010; 86:135-145.
  20. Fakeye OO. Participation of women in the CSDP water project facilitated by the Kwara State Community and Social Development Agency. University of Applied Sciences, Van Hall Larenstein, Netherlands; 2012.
  21. OECD. Aid in support of women's economic empowerment, OECD, Paris. *Women Economic Empowerment.* 2011; 24.
  22. Agenor PR, Otaviano C, Luiz PS. On gender and growth: The role of intergenerational health externalities and women's occupational constraints. Policy Research Working Paper No. 5492. Washington DC: World Bank; 2010.
  23. Ochebo CO, Ejembi EP, Agada MO, Jiriko RK. Effects of community and social development projects on rural communities in the north central Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovation and Research in Educational Sciences.* 2018;5(6):650-655.
  24. International Food Policy Research Institute. Community-driven development programmes decision tools for rural development programmes. Rome. 2009; 10-13.
  25. Owolabi KE, Okunlola JO, Mafimisebi TE. Influence of participation in community and social development projects on beneficiaries' income in Ondo and Kwara States, Nigeria. *International Journal of Agricultural Extension.* 2018;6(3):203-214.

© 2020 Ajayi and Okunlola; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Peer-review history:*  
*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:*  
<http://www.sdiarticle4.com/review-history/63199>