

PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY BASED NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME AND EFFECTS ON WELFARE OF RURAL FAMILIES IN IKWERRE, RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA

ONOWU, E.O, ALBERT, C.O AND ISIFE, B. I.

**Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics/Extension
Rivers State University of Science and Technology, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.**

ABSTRACT

The study was on participation in Community Based Natural Resource Management Programme (CBNRMP) and its socio-economic effect on rural families in Ikwerre Area, Rivers State Nigeria. A structured questionnaire was administered to 60 beneficiaries of the programme. Data collected were subjected to descriptive and inferential statistics. Findings of their income before programme intervention indicated that they earned N15,100- N22,600 while a tremendous increase in income was observed after the programme's intervention where most (70%) of them earned ₦ 102,000.00 and above. The multiple regression coefficient (R^2) was 0.9215 which indicated that direct relationship exists between participation and socio-economic characteristics of the respondents. Participation in the Community Based Natural Resource Management Programme had empowered the beneficiaries in problem identification, ways of seeking for solution, project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of projects and making of decisions in issues that pertain to their welfare and development. CBNRMP programme had impacted greatly on the welfare of participants in areas such as household items, saving/ investments and increase in livestock herds. However, beneficiaries' were faced with some constraints which include: insufficient capacity building, insufficient storage facilities and inaccessibility to micro credit. The study therefore recommended that more emphasis should be on capacity building of beneficiaries of the programme, adequate provision of production inputs such as access to credit, farm inputs such as seeds and seedlings, fertilizers and reduction in cost of inputs should be taken into cognizance and proper mainstreaming of target beneficiaries of the programme intervention.

Keywords: Participation, effect, community resources, families

INTRODUCTION

The Community Based Natural Resource Management Programme (CBNRMP) is an integrated agriculture and rural development programme aimed at the improvement of the livelihood and living conditions of at least 400,000 rural poor households with emphasis on women and youths in the Niger Delta region (CBNRMP, 2015). According to International Fund for Agricultural Development, IFAD (2007) as quoted in Adegboye and Oyesola (2010), the community based projects help to build the capacity of rural dwellers and their service providers to intervene in their own developmental initiatives and establish an effectively disbursable community development fund to be managed by them. The Programme applies the Community Driven Development approach in its implementation strategy, which according to

Adegboye and Oyeshola (2010) is the best way to achieve sustainable agriculture and rural development. It is a Programme that is jointly funded by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN), Niger Delta Development Commission (NDDC), Nine (9) participating states of Abia, Akwa Ibom, Bayelsa, Cross River, Delta, Edo, Imo, Ondo and Rivers, fifty-one (51) Local government Areas and 153 rural communities.

The Community Based Natural Resource Management Programme (CBNRMP) came to birth as a result of the Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN) desire to improve the lot of its rural populace through rural development and poverty reduction (International Fund for Agricultural Development, 2002). Prior to the onset of this Programme, the rural areas were bedevilled with large group of rural poor, vulnerable women and youths that were exposed to social risks and marginalization as a result of breakdown in traditional coping strategies. IFAD (2010) affirmed that declining basic indicators of poverty and experience from field observations indicate that poverty in rural communities in Nigeria is becoming more widely entrenched.

The major occupation of the rural dwellers in Nigeria is agriculture which is at the heart of the livelihood of rural people (Udofia, & Essang, 2015). This is affirmed by the observation of Kozte (2003) as quoted in Tologbonse, Jibrin, Auta, and Damisa, (2013) that, about 75% of the poor, according to a recent World Bank estimate, lives in rural areas where they draw their livelihoods from agriculture and related activities. This means that to develop the rural areas, agriculture must be taken as a business and not as developmental programme (FMARD, 2013). The potential of the agricultural and fisheries sector is still not met due to environmental degradation, lack of new technologies with no comprehensive approach to community participation in development (IFAD, 2002). To bring poverty down to its barest minimum requires strengthening of the capacity of the rural poor and that of their institutions and improvement to their access to and / or effective management of land, water, and common property resources on a sustainable basis.

The rural and core poor populace in Nigeria lack the necessary wherewithal to address their poor situation. According to Albert and Deekor (2013), poverty situation at individual level in the rural area include inability to feed oneself sufficiently, physical insecurity, inadequate assets, ignorance, incapability to afford basic amenities to meet social and economic needs and the powerlessness to improve one's situations. To ascertain how the CBNRMP intervention programme has succeeded in tackling these observed problems through the community members' participation in the development intervention of the Federal Government in Ikwerre Local Government Area of Rivers State is the focus of this study. To assess the rate of community members' participation in CBNRMP programme, and its socio-economic effect on rural families in Ikwerre LGA, the following questions need to be answered. What are the socio-economic characteristics of beneficiaries? What are the levels of participation of beneficiaries in CBNRMP? What types of productive resources are available to the beneficiaries? What are the effects of the programme on socio-economic lives of the beneficiaries? And what are the constraints of participants in the programme?

Citizen's participation means active involvement of all citizens (men, women, youths and children) in the community, irrespective of age, nature of citizenship, socio-economic status, political affiliation, religion, level of education and others in planning and implementing programmes and projects that are of benefit to the people (Onyenemezu, 2014). Anyanwu (1992) as cited in (Abiona & Bello, 2013) refers to citizen's participation as an active process whereby beneficiaries influence the direction and execution of development projects rather than merely receiving a share of the project benefits. Thus, it can be said that citizen participation in organizational development programmes entails the involvement of the people or their representatives in the formulation and development of proposals, planning of programmes and its implementation. Imhabekhai (2009) perceives citizen's participation in community development as a process by which the people themselves or with the stimulation of an agency, initiate and execute projects / programmes by themselves or in collaboration with government and non- governmental agencies. Participation is based on voluntary relationships between various actors, which may include government institutions, individual housing and urban services users, community-based organizations, user groups, private enterprises, and non-governmental organizations (Nour, 2011). The term 'popular participation' entails maximization of people's involvement in the spheres or stages of development (Mukandala, 2005). Mukundane (2011) posits that involvement has to go beyond implementation or donation of 'free' labour and cash contributions and extend to policy decisions. This entails the involvement of the people in the whole process of planning to implementation and taking quality decisions affecting their lives. The notion of people's participation in their development has been gaining momentum in the process of human empowerment and development (Samah and Aref, 2009; Dale, 2004 and Slocum, Wichhart, Rocheleau, and Thomas-Slayter (1995). Consequently, despite the angle from which one looks at citizen participation, it all boils down to community involvement in the decision-making processes (Mapuva and Mapuva, 2015).

Arnstein (1969) in Mapuva and Mapuva (2015) observed that participation exists in three tiers. At the bottom of the ladder is non-participation which includes; manipulation and therapy where decisions are made from the top and handed down to citizens. On the second tier, the quality of participation is through informing, placation and consulting citizens without giving assurances that their contributions will be considered for decision-making purposes. The third tier consists of a wholesome involvement of citizens in the public decision-making process where citizens become partners, possess powers and control in decision making and influence policy formulation and implementation.

Norad (2013), presents Pretty's seven stages of participation to include; Manipulative Participation - pretence, with nominated representatives having no legitimacy or power; Passive Participation- unilateral announcements without listening to people's responses; Participation by Consultation- external agents define problems and information- gathering processes and so control analysis; Participation for Material Incentives- people participate by contributing resources (labour) in return for material incentives; Functional Participation- external agencies encourage participation to meet

predetermined objectives; Interactive Participation-people participate (as a right) in joint analysis, development of action plans and formation or strengthening of local institutions and Self-mobilization- people take initiatives independently of external institutions to change systems.

METHODOLOGY

The study was carried out in Ikwerre Local Government Area (KELGA) of Rivers State. The Local Government Area has boundaries with Imo State in the North, Emohua Local Government Area in the West, Etche Local Area in the East and Obio/Akpor Local Government Area in the South. River State is located in latitude 4° 45' 0" North and longitude 6° 49' 60" East and situated at 598 kilometers (193") South of the approximate centre of Nigeria and 488 kilometers (189") South of Abuja, the capital city (Rivers State, 2012). The people of KELGA major occupation is agriculture. Due to her high agricultural productivity, it was referred to as the indispensable food basket of Imo and Rivers States (Wahua, 1993) as cited in Nlerum (2012). The thirteen major communities of KELGA are Aluu, Apani, Elele, Igwuruta, Ipo, Isiokpo, Omademe, Omagwa, Omanwa, Omuagwor, Omerelu, Ozuaha and Ubima. Community Based Natural Resource Management Programme is currently taking place in three communities of Apani, Ozuaha and Ubima in KELGA. The study made use of purposive sampling technique to select the communities due to their participation in the programme under study. The random sampling technique was employed to choose respondents out of the 100 active members. A total number of 60 respondents were used for the study. The data collected were analysed using descriptive and analytical statistical technique which include percentage and mean score. The hypothesis was tested using multiple regression and paired t-test, where different welfare indicators such as income, educational level, TV, radio, building among others owned by respondents before participation and after participation.

Multiple Regression Model

$$Y = a_0 + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + \dots + b_8X_8 + e_i \dots \dots \dots 1$$

Where

- X₁=Sex
- X₂=Marital Status
- X₃=Age
- X₄=Level of Education
- X₅=Occupation
- X₆=Income before
- X₇=Income after
- X₈=Household
- e_i = Stochastic error term

The participation index (Y) for the respondents was obtained by first dividing the number of CBNRMP activities undertaken by the total number of activities the respondents were expected to completely undertake and multiplied by 100 %. Mathematically, this is represented as:

$$Y = \frac{fx}{z} \dots\dots\dots 2$$

Where

Y= Participative index

x = number of CBNRMP activities undertaken and

z = total number of CBNRMP activities the respondents were expected to completely undertake.

Dependent variable = Participation in CBNRMP

Independent variable = sex, marital status, age, level of education, occupation, household size, income before participation and income after participation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-economic characteristics of respondents

Table 1 reveals that there were more married (60%) than the unmarried (40%) respondents in the study. This connotes that married people are receiving more empowerment from the project than the unmarried. High numbers (50%) of the respondents were between the ages of 25-40 years. This means that majority of the respondents were youths as confirmed by Nlerum and Wuche (2013) where they noted that reasonable proportion (61.1%) of the respondents in their study on Community-based Natural Resource Management Programme were youths. Educationally, most (80%) of the respondents were educated. This means that 20% did not have formal education. This is supported by the study of Bifarin and Moyinjesu (2008) where 71% of the respondents had acquired one form of formal education status or another. This implies that participation in CBNRMP had greatly influenced their educational status

Most (90%) of the respondents were employed in agriculture and related enterprises, which signifies that the programme has met one of its objectives of creating jobs for the core poor. The other 10% were civil servants who were part-time farmers benefiting from the CBNRMP programme. A high (50%) percentage of the respondents were made up of household size of between 1-4, while the household size of between 5-8 was 30%. This means that the smaller households had more influence from CBNRMP than the large families. Findings in their income before programme intervention indicated that 50% of the respondents earned ₦15,100.00 - ₦22,600.00

per annum while 50% of them earned more than ₦22,600.00 per annum. This connotes high level of poverty among the respondents as stated in CBNRMP appraisal report (IFAD, 2002). The respondents' income level increased tremendously after programme intervention. Most (70%) of the respondents earned ₦102, 000.00 and above per annum, while 10% earned ₦96, 000.00 – ₦101,000.00. Similarly, 20% of the respondents earned ₦90, 000.00 – ₦95, 000.00 per annum. This connotes that the CBNRMP had impacted on the respondents' source of livelihood which had greatly empowered the beneficiaries financially as was observed. This was confirmed by Nlerum and Wuche (2013) when they stated that CBNRMP beneficiaries earned a mean income of ₦ 90, 649.40 per year which shows that the programme is helping people out of poverty.

Table 1: Socio-economic characteristics of the beneficiaries

Characteristics	Frequency (n=60)	Percentage
Sex		
Male	30	50.0
Female	30	50.0
Total	60	100.0
Marital Status		
Married	36	60.0
Single	24	40.0
Separated	0	0.0
Widow	0	0.0
Divorced	0	0.0
Total	60	100.0
Age (Years)		
25-40	30	50.0
41-56	24	40.0
57-72	6	10.0
Total	100.0	100.0
Educational Level		
None	12	20.0
Primary	12	20.0
Secondary	24	40.0
Tertiary	12	20.0
Total	60	100.0
Major occupation		
Farming	24	40.0
Civil servant	6	10.0
Self-employed	30	50.0
Total	60	100.0

Household size

1-4	30	50.0
5-8	18	30.0
9-12	13	20.0
12 and above	0	0.0
Total	60	100.0

Income per year before joining the programme

Less than N 7,500.00	0	0.0
N 7, 500.00- N 15,000.00	0	0.0
N 15,100.00- N 22,600.00	30	50.0
More than N 22,600.00	30	50.0
Total	60	100.0

Income per year after joining the programme

Less than N 90,000.00	0	0.0
N 90,000.00- N 95,000.00	12	20.0
N 95,000.00- N 101,000.00	6	10.0
N 120,000.00 and above	42	70.0
Total	60	100.0

Source: Field survey, 2015

Testing of Hypothesis. H_{01} : There is no significant relationship between beneficiaries' socio-economic characteristics and their participation in CBNRMP. Table 2 reveals that the multiple regression coefficient R^2 is 0.6025 which indicates that direct relationship exists between socio-economic characteristics of the respondents and participation at P-value is 0.05, where types of farming (1.3), occupation (-2.1) and income (-1.11) were significance. It connotes that there is significant relationship between socio-economic characteristics and beneficiaries' participation. Given this significant result, the null hypothesis was rejected. Conclusion therefore was that beneficiaries' socio-economic characteristics do significantly influence their participation. This implies that socio-economic characteristics of beneficiaries of the CBNRMP programme had remarkable influence in the participation of the respondents in CBNRMP. From the result obtained from field survey, $X= 8$; $Z=15$; Then $Y= 8/15 \times 100 = 50\%$

Participation index for respondents = 50%

Table 2: Relation Between Beneficiaries' Socio-economic Characteristics and their Participation in CBNRMP

	Parameters	Linear
	Multiple R (R^2)	0.6025*
	f-ratio	-0.565*
	P-value of the f. ratio	0.00003.8
	Variables	0.00019
b0	Intercept	69.5(2.11)
b1	Sex	-19.5 (-2.03)ns
b2	Marital status	3.50(5.16)
b3	Age	6.5(1.65)ns
b4	Level of Education	12.50(2.42)
b5	Occupation	-28.5(-1.11)*
b6	Income	-0.0034(-2.1)*
b7	Size of household	-27.5(-3.64)
b8	Type of Farming	30.50(1.3)*
b9	Farming Experience	35.5(6.02)
b10	Farm size	22.5(5.67)
b11	Contact with extension	46.5(6.88)

Source: Field survey, 2015 Significant @ $P<0.05$

Mean distribution of beneficiaries stages of Participation in CBNRMP

The stages of participation of beneficiaries in CBNRMP Programme are shown in Table.3. From the results presented in Table 3, using a mean score of >1.50 as the decision rule, the following activities were accepted to have positive effect on the beneficiaries' stages of

participation. They were: I was used to identify my problem (M=3.0), I participated but did not know anything about the project. I was given the impression that participation is good for me (M =2.8), I participated because of the incentives (money, inputs) given to me (M =3.0), I participated by actively interacting with the project providers to identify the problems in my community and the action plans (M=3.0), I participated at the implementation stage (M=3.0), I participated at the monitoring stage (M=3.0) and I participated at the planning stage (M=3.0). The implication of this result is that, the CBNRMP applied the community driven development approach in carrying out activities in the various communities of operation as stated in CBNRMP appraisal report IFAD (2002.).

Table 3: Mean distribution of beneficiaries on Stages of Participation in CBNRMP

Variables- Stage of participation	High	Medium	Low	Mean	Remarks
I was used to identify my problem	60	0	0	3.00	Accept
I participated but did not know anything about the project I was given the impression that participation is good from me	48	12	0	2.80	Accept
I was invited to participate when the project has already been planned by the executors	0	0	0	0	Reject
I was consulted to know my opinion about a problem that is being planned for through social and diagnosis surveys	0	0	0	0	Reject
I participated because of the incentives (money inputs) given to me	60	0	0	3.00	Accept
I participated by actively interacting with the project providers to identify the problems in my community and the action plans	60	0	0	3.00	Accept
I took the initiative to identify a project and embark on its actualization independent of external bodies	0	0	0	0	Reject
I participated on paper/document than actual facts	12	19	29	1.71	Reject
I was consulted and informed, but the project was then designed by external agencies	0	0	0	0	Reject
I participated at the implementation stage	60	0	0	3.00	Accept
I participated at the monitoring level	60	0	0	3.00	Accept
I participated at the planning stage	60	0	0	3.00	Accept

Reject: Mean score<1.50; Accept: Mean score≥1.50

Source: Field survey, 2015 **Impact of CBNRMP Programme on the welfare of beneficiaries.**

Table 4 reveals that beneficiaries had impact on their welfare in the following areas.

Household items with mean before intervention as 14.23 while that after intervention is 48.23. The computed t value is 8.4029 while critical value for t is 1.7822. Since $t_{cal}=8.4029 > t_{crit}=1.7822$ we reject the null hypothesis. More so probability value (P-value) = 0.000113 < 0.05 level of significance. Therefore we conclude that CBNRMP had impact in the welfare of beneficiaries in the area of household items. In the area of savings / investment mean before programme intervention is 2.5 while that after intervention is 45. The computed t value is 2.9593 while critical value for t is 2.3533. Since $t_{cal}=2.9593 > t_{crit}=2.3533$ we reject the null hypothesis. More so probability value (P-value) 0.029 < 0.05 level of significance. It therefore means that in saving / investment, the beneficiaries experienced considerable level of impact in their welfare. Another area beneficiary's experienced impact in their welfare is livestock production. The mean for sheep/goats before intervention is 2 while after intervention is 15.66. The computed t is 6.2524 while critical value for t is 2.9199. Since $t_{cal}=6.2524 > t_{crit}=2.9199$ we reject the null hypothesis. More so probability value (P-value) = 0.01 < 0.05 level of significance, therefore it is concluded that beneficiaries had access to livestock input resources. From the above narrative, it is therefore concluded that participants in CBNRMP experienced reasonable impact in household items, savings / investment and livestock production which connotes that CBNRMP had improved the living conditions of its beneficiaries in those areas as were identified.

Table 4: Paired T-test data of impact of CBNRMP Programme on the welfare of beneficiaries before and after participation

CBNRMP After	t Stat	t Crit	P-value	df	Pearson Corre.	Mean Before	
Mobility	-1.4411	1.9431	0.09	6	0.894 4	8.57 15	
Shelter Acquired	-0.5853	2.1318	0.29	4	-0.1344	17.8 26	
Household item	8.4029	1.7822	0.000113	12	0.6197	14.23	48.23
Saving/invest	2.9593	2.3533	0.029	3	0.33	2.5	45
Land size (plots)	0	2.015	0.5	5	0.6846	10	10
Sheep/goat (herd size)	6.2524	2.9199	0.01	2	0.3711	2	15.66
Income –Biz	0	2.1318	0.5	4	-0.6262	12	12
Enterprise-Biz	0	2.3533	0.5	3	0.7229	15	15
Total Expenditure	0	2.3533	0.5	3	-1	15	15
Food Expenditure / Month	-1	2.9199	0.2113	2	0	20	20
Number of wards in school	0	2.3533	0.5	3	0.626	15	15

Reject H_0 : $t_{stat} > t_{crit}$ ($P < 0.05$); Accept H_0 : $t_{stat} < t_{crit}$ ($P > 0.05$)

Source: Field survey, 2015

Constraints of beneficiaries in the Programme

Table 5 reveals that certain factors were constraints to beneficiaries in the programme. From the results presented in Table 5 using a mean score of 2.50 as decision rule, the following factors were identified as constraints to beneficiaries in their participation in the programme. They were: insufficient capacity building (M =4.0), insufficient storage facilities (M =4.0), inaccessibility to micro credit (M =4.0), inadequate farm input (M = 2.66), high cost of input (M =2.66), and none participation of people the programme is

meant for (M=4.0). The implication of this is that the CBNRMP programme had impact on the lives of the beneficiaries who participated in the programme but more needed to be done in the areas of capacity building, provision of storage facilities, linkage to source of credit, adequate provision of farm input, reduction in cost of input and mainstreaming of the target audience in intervention programme

Table 5: Mean distribution of Constraints of beneficiaries in the programme

Constraints	Very great extent	Great extent	Little extent	Very little extent	Mean	Remarks
Poor education level	12	12	24	12	2.20	Reject
Inadequate project staff	0	0	60	0	2.00	Reject
Insufficient capacity building	60	0	0	0	4.00	Accept
Inadequate market outlet for farm products	0	0	0	60	1.00	Reject
Insufficient storage facilities	60	0	0	0	4.00	Accept
Inaccessibility to micro credit	60	0	0	0	4.00	Accept
Inadequate farm input	20	40	0	0	2.66	Accept
High cost of input	20	40	0	0	2.66	Accept
High cost of transportation	0	0	0	60	1.00	Reject
Long distance to training centres	0	0	0	60	1.00	Reject
Corruption	0	0	60	0	2.00	Reject
Youth restiveness	0	0	0	0	0	Reject
Pollution resulting from oil pollution	0	0	0	60	1.00	Reject
None participation of people the project is meant for	60	0	0	0	4.00	Accept

Reject: Mean score < 2.50; Accept: Mean score ≥ 2.50

Source: Field Survey, 2015

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Relationship exists between participation and socio-economic characteristics. Participating in the CBNRMP programme is influenced by types of farming, occupation and income of the respondents. Participation in the Community Based Natural Resource Management Programme had empowered the beneficiaries in problem identification, ways of seeking for solution, project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of projects and making of decisions in issues that pertain to their welfare and development. CBNRMP programme had impacted greatly on the well-being of participants in areas such as household items, saving/ investments and increase in livestock herds. Although beneficiaries' participation was faced with some constraints such as: insufficient capacity building, insufficient storage facilities, inaccessibility to micro credit, inadequate farm input ,

high cost of input, and none participation of people the programme is meant for. The implication of this is that the CBNRMP programme had impact on the lives of the beneficiaries who participated in the programme but more needed to be done in the areas of capacity building, provision of storage facilities, linkage to source of credit, adequate provision of farm input, reduction in cost of input and mainstreaming of the target audience in intervention programme. The study therefore recommended that more emphasis should be on capacity building of beneficiaries of the programme to enhance their development. Adequate provision of production inputs such as access to credit, farm input such as seeds and seedlings, fertilizers and reduction in cost of input should be taken into cognizance to enhance production. And lastly, proper mainstreaming should be carried out to make sure that target beneficiaries of programme intervention participate in the programme.

REFERENCES

- Abioma, A. & Bello, W. N (2013). Grassroots participation in decision-making process and development programmes as correlates of sustainability of community in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, Canadian Center of Science and Education, 6(3), 47-54
- Adegboye, M.A & Oyesola, O.B (2010). Influence of socio-economic status on participation in community-based development project: A case study of Jos South Local Government Area, Plateau State, Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Rural Sociology*. 11(2), 1-2.
- Albert, C. O. & Deekor, B. (2013). Impact of International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) on rural and agricultural development in Southern Nigeria. *Agriculture Practice and Science Journal*. 87 (3-4), 83- 89
- Anyanwu, C.N. (1992). *Community Development: The Nigerian Perspective*. Ibadan: Gabesther Educational Publishers.15, 66
- Arnstein, S.R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 32
- Bifarin, J.O & Moyinjesu, E.I (2008). Assessment of Fadama farmers' access to credit in Ondo State. *Continental Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 2,1-5
- Community Based Natural Resource Management Programme-Niger Delta, (CBNRMP-ND) (2015): 17th IFAD Supervision Mission Report
- Dale, R. (2004). *Development Planning: Concepts and Tools for Planners, Managers and Facilitators*. London: Zed Books.
- Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, FMARD (2013). Agricultural Transformation Agenda Mid-Term Report Score Card.

- Imhabekhai, C.I. (2009). *Management of Community Development Programmes and Projects*. Benin: Uniben Press
- International Fund for Agricultural Development, IFAD (2002). Appraisal Report, African Division 1 Programme Management Department
- International Fund for Agricultural Development, IFAD (2007): IFAD's strategy in Nigeria. <http://operations.ifad.org/web/ifad/operations/country/home/tags/Nigeria> Retrieved Dec.4, 2009
- International Fund for Agricultural Development, IFAD (2010). The economy of Nigeria: Nigeria Community Based Natural Resource Management Programme, Niger Delta Appraisal Report.
- Kozte, D.A. (2003). Role of women in the household economy, food production and food security: Policy guidelines. *Outlook on Agriculture*. 32(2), 111-121
- Mapuva, J and Muyengwa-Mapuva (2015). Arnstein's ladder of participation and citizen participation in Zimbabwe. *International Journal of African and Asian Studies*, Vol. 11
- Mukundane, M. (2011): Popular participation in rural development programmes in Uganda: a case study of the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) programme in Mbarara district. An unpublished MSc. Thesis in Public Administration and Management Makerere University, Uganda.
- Nlerum, F.E and Wuche, P. (2013). Community Based Natural Resources Management Programme: A strategy for poverty alleviation in rural, Nigeria. *International Journal of Research, Innovations and Sustainable Development*, Centre for Advanced Training and Research, Cameroon, 3(2), 121.
- Norad (2013). A Framework for Analyzing Participation in Development. Norway, Oxford policy management.
- Nour, A.M. (2011). Challenges and advantages of community participation as an approach for sustainable urban development in Egypt. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 4(1), 79-88
- Onyenemezu, C.E (2014). The Imperative of citizen's participation in community development. *Academic Research International*, 5(1), 2223-9944
- Tologbonse, E.B., Jibrin, M.M., Auta, S.J, and Damisa, M.A. (2013). Factors influencing women participation in Women In Agriculture (WIA) programme of Kaduna State Agricultural Development Project, Nigeria. *International Journal of Agricultural Economics and Extension*. 1 (7), 47-54.
- Udofia, L. and Essang, N. (2015). Agricultural expenditure and poverty alleviation in Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(21), -1905

Samah, A.A & Fariborz, A. M (2009). People's participation in community development: A case study in a planned village settlement in Malaysia. *World Rural Observations*. Marsland Press, 1(2), 45-54

Slocum, R., Wichhart, L., Rocheleau, D. and Thomas-Slayter, B. (eds) (1995). *Power, Process and Participation*. London: ITDG Publishing.