

Infrastructural Development as a Tool for Enhancing Rural Development: Case Studies from Nigeria, Tanzania and China

POPOOLA AYOBAMI¹

HANGWELANI MAGIDIMISHA-CHIPUNGU²

ABSTRACT

Effective rural service delivery and improved infrastructure provision have been identified as a driver towards improving the livelihood conditions of rural people. Identifying this has resulted in the development of infrastructure-driven policies for the development of rural areas. This paper aims to explain the role played by infrastructure in enhancing rural livelihood(s) in Nigeria, Tanzania and China using a thematic review of literature. This study examined rural livelihoods, infrastructure investments and policy directions in Nigeria, Tanzania and China. The paper concludes by making arguments for the adoption of several rural development strategies that can trigger rural development. The suggested triggers include agricultural financing, the promotion of indigenous technologies, the encouragement of public-private partnerships, and the adoption of robust agricultural policies.

Key words: Rural Infrastructure, Rural Development, Nigeria, Tanzania, China.

¹Post-Doctoral Research Fellow, SARChI Chair for Inclusive Cities, School of Built Environment & Development Studies, College of Humanities, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Mazisi Kuene Road, Durban, 4041

²Post-Doctoral Research Fellow, SARChI Chair for Inclusive Cities, School of Built Environment & Development Studies, College of Humanities, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Mazisi Kuene Road, Durban, 4041

Introduction

One of the dilemmas of rural development in Nigeria is its neglect at the expense of urban areas (Adamu, 2016). Todaro and Stilkind (1981) report that the increasing rate of urbanisation in the developing countries of the world has resulted in the total neglect of their rural spaces. They aver that the rapid urbanisation of much of the developing world is the outcome of a philosophy and a failed strategy of development that has emphasised industrial and urban growth, at the expense of agricultural and rural development. Identifying the negative effects of the uncontrolled and unplanned urbanisation in these regions, Todaro and Stilkind (1981) suggest the need for the adoption of a policy for proper investments in rural areas, as rural population distribution is now on the increase. Buttressing assertions regarding limitations on the livability in rural areas, Alston et al. (2006) report on issues relating to the quality of and access to services in the rural areas in Australia, classifying them as low or poor when compared to those in urban areas, thus highlighting the high level of inequality between service provision in rural and urban areas.

Wu, Lyu and Li (2019) report that the unbalanced development of urban and rural areas in China influences the level and quality of education in China's rural areas. Grgić et al. (2010) and Khan (2019) found this influence on education to be an issue in their studies, stating that rural zones are subject to several socio-economic problems, lack sufficient tangible and non-tangible socio-physical infrastructure, and experience neglect despite large rural populations. Mazibuko (2012) argues that despite the abundance of resources in rural areas, their livability and sustainability is still threatened owing to little or no physical investments to sustain the rural populace's demands. In trying to correct the rural neglect, governments across the globe have introduced various policies to correct the rural disadvantage.

Examples of such policies include: trade liberalisation; selective rural engagement through the European Neighbourhood Programme for Agriculture and Rural Development (Kourtelis, 2018); modern traditionalism or the building of socialism; villagisation by order and collectivisation (Nyerere, 1977); the National Accelerated Food Production Programme; the Nigeria Agricultural and Cooperative Bank's 'Operation Feed the Nation'; and the Green Revolution Programme by the Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFPRI) (Uba, 2012; Sam, 2014; Paul, Agba and Chukwurah, 2014).

Irrespective of rapid urbanisation, rural areas remain a part of the human space. However, rural areas have been described as a place of abject poverty and infrastructural neglect. Studies (Ashley, 2000; Ako, 2018; Osuagwu and Osabohien, 2018; Chikozho and Managa, 2018; Arif, 2019) have established that resource endowments in rural spaces have not translated to attention and preference being given to rural areas in aspects of policy and plans formulation and implementation which ought to translate into development, and the need for enhanced rural sustainability. In Nigeria, rural dwellers can be said to be under-developed due to inequality in the provision of facilities such as unequal access to education, health care, technology, institutional support and markets (Oyekale, 2009; Okunola, 2016; Akinsola and Adewumi, 2018). It is generally inequitable and inefficient to deny basic services to rural people.

Although over the last decade, international aid has rightly stressed the importance of concentrating on the poor, it has neglected rural areas and thus the majority of disadvantaged people. This is an indication that the rural areas in Nigeria, which currently accommodate over 60 per cent of the Nigerian population, have long been neglected. Rural development which includes the provision of infrastructure (Asian Development Bank [ADB], 2007) is imperative for improving the rural economy

(Stewart, 2010). It thus becomes a duty for planners to investigate rural infrastructure investments and demands, and to assess how much rural livelihoods have been enhanced.

Methods And Materials

Like Nigeria - a super-power in Africa and often viewed as a more developed state within Africa, the People's Republic of China can be described as a developing or developed country, depending on what criteria are considered, and it is thus a great country or a superpower in waiting (Akinterinwa, 2017). Nigeria is aptly referred to as the 'Giant of Africa', based on varying criteria (Zulu, 2009), and continues to own her share of global interaction and trading relationships with countries such as the USA, UK, Japan, Ghana and China. China is an emerging Asian giant (Ianchovichina, Ivanic and Martin, 2009), with great global impact across African countries (Humphrey and Michaelowa, 2019). Nigeria is rapidly becoming China's second-largest trading partner, with trade between the two countries reaching over \$3 billion in 2006 (Taylor, 2007) and still on the increase (Okonkwo, 2018).

This study argues, without prejudice or neglecting the trade relationship between the two countries, that there is a need for the sharing of ideas (policies, monographs) that have shaped the country (China) towards development. It further argues that the rural policies that have been adopted in China and considered a success towards the development of her rural areas should be adopted by Nigeria and used as a yardstick for bilateral interaction. The reason for considering China as an efficient rural development example for Nigeria is borne from the views of Akinterinwa (2017), who avers that China has over the years improved its capacity through self-projected economic, political, military, technological and cultural means.

While Nigeria is considered close to self-sustainability in the

political, military and cultural sectors, it remains less economically sustainable (Adisa, 1994; Deekor and Maekae, 2015; Osakwe and Audu, 2017). The study further considers factors such as the population composition, the human development index (0.72 and 0.49 respectively) (Aneki, 2016), the heterogeneity of the people and the language, similar land masses, military defeats and invasions, the history of civil unrest and foreign occupations, improved living standards within all spaces, and improved participation in governance by rural people (Royal Oak, 2018) as arguments for considering rural China as a case study. Marafa (2015) argues that while China and Nigeria both have a vast population, China has been able to work towards meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which later transformed into the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG); an achievement yet to be achieved in urban Nigeria, let alone rural Nigeria. Summarising the relationship between the two countries is the currency swap recently introduced in Nigeria to ease the flow of trade and limit the need for dollars (Udo, 2018).

As with China, the relationship between Nigeria and Tanzania is unique, and these two countries share some similarities. Hoel (2008) investigated the military relationship that exists between Nigeria and the United Republic of Tanzania. Nigeria moved its capital city from Lagos to Abuja, and Tanzania has also experienced the movement of its capital city, which moved from Dar es Salaam to Dodoma. Tanzania was also colonised by the British government like Nigeria, and it gained its independence in 1961, while Nigeria gained its independence in 1960. Nigeria and Tanzania have a similar maximum rainfall level and the hottest season in both countries falls between November and February. Both countries formed a republic after their independence from Britain, thus both countries have historical similarities in their independence: Nigeria is characterised by the coming together of three ethnic groups - the Hausa, Igbo and the Yoruba, while Tanzania is characterised by two countries coming together.

History World (2018) states that in 1964, the two leaders of two different countries, Nyerere and Abeid Karume from Tanganyika and Zanzibar respectively, came together to arrive at the United Republic of Tanzania. Reports states that 69.1 per cent of Tanzania and about 70 percent of Nigeria's populace resides in rural areas (Bryceson et al., 2018; Bessong and Ojong, 2019).

The effect of independence and the origin of urbanisation in Tanzania is a reflection of migration from neighbouring villages to Dar es Salaam. Just as Nigeria is characterised by regional variations in development and immense pressure on urban land areas, so too is Tanzania. In Nigeria revenue and in-country finance is mainly dependent on oil (Odularu, 2008; Obi, 2010), while Tanzania's revenue and in-country finance is mainly derived from agriculture (Vuyisani, 2003), which indirectly means a heavy dependence on rural areas in Tanzania. Nigeria as a country needs to consider diversifying its revenue stream by including the agricultural sector, and the Nigerian government continues to work towards the diversification of the country's economy (Onoh and Ndu-Okereke, 2018). In Tanzania there has been heavy investment in infrastructure development, with a focus on rural areas, and this has received unfaltering political commitment over the years (Government of Tanganyika, 1964). The Tanzanian government is thus actively pursuing equality in the urban and rural spaces (Unterhalter and Heslop, 2012), something which Nigeria needs to embrace.

The increasing relationship between countries and the undoubted global integration among countries of the world have erased the idea of an isolated state. In the face of internationalisation of policies and cross country partnerships across the globe, nations of the globe, including Nigeria, are faced with adopting ideologies from their various neighboring countries and trading partners. Globalisation of economies provides both positive and negative effects. With increasing Chinese investment in Africa and most especially

improved investment and trade volume in infrastructure, commercial dealings and political alignment in Nigeria, China continues to consciously and unconsciously influence and shape Nigerian policy direction (Taylor, 2007). Likewise, Nigeria and Tanzania's relationship continues to soar high (Channels Television, 2018; Premium Times, 2018). This study attempts to look at the case studies of China (a developed country) and Tanzania (a developing country) to explain the rural development approaches used in these countries and consider what can be adopted in Nigeria towards the development of rural areas. This article examines rural development approaches in Nigeria, China and Tanzania and also proffers some ideals that may be incorporated from China and Tanzania into Nigeria. Secondary data from archives, journals, documents and press releases are used for the study. The sub-topics are thematically examined and explained.

Rural Livelihoods-development And Infrastructure

Although the term 'livelihood' has an early history, it began to enter the development lexicon significantly in the 1970s. The foremost definition of livelihood was given by Chambers and Conway (1992), as comprising the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (1998) defines livelihood as the means, activities and entitlements by which people make a living. This consists of a dynamic system that integrates both the opportunities and assets available to a group of people for achieving their goals and aspirations, as well as interactions with and exposure to a range of beneficial or harmful ecological, social, economic and political perturbations that may help or hinder groups' capacities to make a living (UNDP, 1998).

Livelihood then encompasses the multifarious activities and sources of support, especially for poor rural and agricultural households (Chambers, 2005). That is, a combination of the resources used and the activities undertaken by a household for the material

provisioning of its members' needs (Department of International Development, 2009). These resources consist of individual skills and abilities (human capital), land, savings and equipment (natural, financial and physical capital respectively) and formal support groups or informal networks that assist in the activities being undertaken (social capital) (Abiodun and Ayangbile, 2016). This may involve information, cultural knowledge, social networks and legal rights, as well as tools, land and other physical resources (Blaikie et al., 2004). Within the purview of this study, the physical resources may entail the physical infrastructure needs for improving household livelihoods or promoting rural development.

The World Health Organisation (2010) and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) (2010) report that the remoteness of rural areas owing to mobility challenges and limited access by rural people to infrastructure has resulted in increasing poverty, with over 1.4 billion poor in developing countries alone. Zegar and Floriańczy (2012) aver that the dichotomy of rural-urban infrastructure provision is mainly due to the high cost of service delivery associated with rural spaces. Infrastructure remains relevant and an essential ingredient for the success of a modern economy (Stewart, 2010), likewise it stands as one of the complementary factors for economic growth. Infrastructure is seen as a heterogeneous term which can be classified as physical structures, and social and economic infrastructure includes servicing facilities such as schools, hospitals, network utilities, energy, water, transport, and digital communications (Chan et al., 2009; Bottini, Coelho and Kao, 2013). Rural infrastructure is a broad term covering the basic facilities and services needed for rural communities and rural development (Food and Agricultural Organisation [FAO], 2006). Rural areas are grossly neglected as far as development projects and infrastructure are concerned (Adebayo, 2014). They remain marginalised in terms of the most basic elements of development (Chinsman, 1998) and are characterised by high infant and maternal mortality, low life expectancy due to a

lack of potable water, poor electricity supply, poor health care, inadequate educational and recreational facilities and insufficient motorable roads (Oyeranti and Olayiwola, 2005). It thus remains pertinent to enhance the development of rural areas in terms of the level of economic development, quality of life, access to opportunities, facilities and amenities, standard of living, and viability, since a large percentage of the population is found in the rural areas (Adebayo, 2014).

The quality of services for many rural people is considerably poor (Ogeidefa, 2010). Coupled with a social infrastructure dearth, rural areas are characterised by high levels of exhaustion, exploitation of the rural natural resources, and pollution of the rural environment (Jiang et al., 2017; Xiao et al., 2017; Yokohari et al., 2017). For over four decades in Nigeria, all attempts to put the rural areas on course for development have failed (Abiola, 2017; Agwu, 2017; Chimela et al., 2017). Studies by Oyeranti and Olayiwola (2005); the National Bureau of Statistics of China (2014); and Zhu, (2015) point out that rural areas are a major concern to governments, multilateral institutions and policy makers in different countries, as the conditions in the areas continue to worsen and poverty is a major issue in the rural areas despite their potential.

The relationship between rural development and access to quality and affordable education has been reiterated by Hinzen (2000). Mabogunje (1980); Wen (2012); and Zhu (2015) have identified the role that rural education plays in increasing household enterprises and businesses, bringing about improved and increased human resources and social change. The goals of rural development embrace, in addition, a systematic improvement of the other institutional, physical and social infrastructures in such rural communities (Titilola, 2008). The World Bank (2004) states that there exists an indirect relationship between rural infrastructure provision and household health conditions and communal levels of mortality. Studies by Hernandez and Taningco (2010); and Portugal-

Perez and Wilson (2012) point to the relevance of transport infrastructure in enhancing mobility, promoting trade, and generating more income for households. Ismail and Mahyideen (2015) assert that differences in the quantity and quality of infrastructure may account for differences in transport costs, and hence, variations in competitiveness. Summed up, the Department for International Development (DFID) (2001) and Abiodun and Ayangbile (2016) report that social and physical amenities remain a driver of improved livelihoods conditions.

In attempting to explain the infrastructure-livelihoods nexus, Abiodun and Ayangbile (2016) have identified that livelihood can be improvised by the physical, ecological, social, and economic environment in which people find themselves. For example, livelihood can be determined by education (defined by education infrastructure access, affordability and availability) and training/apprenticeship, migration and exposure (which is explained by the availability of training facilities and the training conditions). The potential of arriving at a sustainable livelihood condition is dependent on the livelihood assets available to a given individual, household or group that can be used in livelihood activities. These assets (tangible and intangible) such as food stores, cash savings, resources in the environment, claims and access to materials, information, education, health services and employment opportunities all provide households with options to earn a living. According to Eldis (2010), using physical capital (basic infrastructure) such as roads, buildings, energy, communications, water and sanitation, schools and ICT, and using producer goods including tools, livestock and equipment enables people to pursue their livelihoods. It includes facilities that people own and those that they have access to (roads, irrigation systems, telephone networks, etc.), whether provided by the government or by the private sector (and whether free or paid for).

The German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) (2017) in Nepal reports that food security has been achieved for 14,830 families through infrastructure provision and collaborative initiatives with the government and the people. A total of 33 kilometres of the planned 48 kilometres of road infrastructure have already been completed and an additional 17,000 pupils have been registered in the 58 schools offering basic education. The educational infrastructure's proximity has led to increased female children's registration and enrolment for the geographically and economically disadvantaged potential students. Brushett and John-Abraham (2006) identify that one way of improving rural people's income in Peru is with infrastructure bundling. In Tanzania, Ghana and Cameroun, Steel and van Lindert (2017) report that increased rural infrastructure investments in ICT, communication, and transport have led to increased household income, increased urban food security, increased trade connectivity between urban and rural spaces, less and effective use of remittance and finally local and regional development which promoted local development livelihood transformation for households and rural communities at large.

In Nigeria, Oyseola (2007) in his study in the Akinyele LGA of Oyo state reports that poor education infrastructure conditions have led to increased travel times and distances to school for children and this limits their households' human development index. He concludes that the level of infrastructural development is a significant determinant of the ability of rural dwellers to improve their productivity and standard of living. Likewise the Community and Social Development Project's Micro Projects in the rural areas of Edo state in Nigeria show an average drop in travel distance from home to school of 29.72 minutes and a 47 per cent reduction in the cost of buying water following infrastructural improvements. Improved access to quality water sources has reduced the average distance to such sources by 5.82 kilometres and the travel time to these water sources has been reduced by

10.56 minutes (Emokaro and Oyoboh, 2016).

RURAL DEVELOPMENT: NIGERIA, TANZANIA AND CHINA

Rural Policy Attempts in the Nigerian Experience

Currently only 20 per cent of Nigeria's rural population has access to electricity (Lawal, 2014). Ipingbemi (2008) observes in the Amuro district in Kogi State that passengers pay three times more per kilometre for transport on untarred rural roads, compared to the cost of travel on tarred roads, and the Central Bank of Nigeria's survey in (2002) confirms that most rural roads are in bad condition. A survey conducted by Hall (2006) reveals insufficient provision of pipe-borne or potable drinking water, as 50 per cent of the city dwellers and 90 per cent of the rural dwellers lack access to potable water. As a result, a large proportion of households have resorted to drawing water from unhygienic sources. This has led to the interrogation of the relevance of local government to the people. Within the local government, Oyesola (2007) identifies that programmes such as the Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Programme, the Second National Development Project and the Community-based Agricultural and Rural Development Programme have only limited success in many cases because of the lack of structural support, changing of the government and failure to recognise the diversity in the livelihood activities of rural dwellers across the ethnic and ecological zones of Nigeria.

Studies on rural development approaches in Nigeria have revealed mixed results, as the various policy attempts in rural Nigeria have been marred by both successes and failures. Abdullahi, Jahun and Sabo (2016); the Directorate for Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI) (1989); Okon (2016); Oladipo (2000); and Sam (2014) report that Nigeria has had many Development Plans over the years to try and improve the state of the country's

infrastructure. These include the 1st National Development Plan (1962-1968); the 2nd National Development Plan (1970-1974); the 3rd National Development Plan (1975-1980); the 4th National Development Plan (1981-1985); and three Rolling Plans from 1990-1992, 1993-1995 and 1996-1998 respectively. There was also Vision 2010, the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy and currently Nigeria 20:2020.

According to Sam (2014), there have been attempts by successive regimes in Nigeria at poverty reduction and rural development; and the approaches have usually been determined by the interpretation given to rural development by the different regimes or interventionists. Prominent among these programmes, as noted by Sam (2014), are: 1972 – the National Accelerated Food Production Programme and the one by the Nigeria Agricultural and Cooperative Bank; 1976 - Operation Feed the Nation to teach the rural farmers how to use modern farming tools; 1979 - the Green Revolution Programme to reduce food importation and increase local food production; 1986 –the DFFRI; 1987 – the National Directorate of Employment; 1993 – the Family Support Programme and the Family Economic Advancement Programme; 2001 – the National Poverty Eradication Programme that replaced the failed Poverty Alleviation Programme; and 2004 –the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy which was meant to achieve poverty reduction through wealth creation, employment generation and value re-orientation. While many of these programmes have failed, the DFFRI (1986) remains a policy that greatly influences the livelihoods and the physical infrastructural demands of the rural people, as the policy embarked on the construction of access roads from farming locations to markets and the provision of irrigation services where needed.

4.2 Rural Development in China

Since the Republic of China was founded in 1949, its regional policy has undergone several major adjustments in line with the

changes to its environmental and national development strategies (European Union, 2011). China's imbalance between its urban and rural spaces cannot be ignored (Kanbur and Zhang 2003; Khan and Riskin, 2004) as there exists disparity and income inequality between the rural and urban spaces and the rural areas are plagued by poor service delivery (Ghosh, 2011; Yusuf and Tony 2008), leaving rural residents vulnerable (UNDP, 2013) with uneven and diversified development conditions (Zhu, 2015).

China has actively embarked on reforms (land and financial), ranging from intensive use of land to increased financial access to policy-based support in the rural spaces (European Union, 2011). These reforms serve as a means to rural employment and the optimisation of resource allocation (Scientific Development Research Group, 2012; Shanghai Academy of Development and Reform [SADR], 2013; GOVCN, 2015; Wang, 2005) and have resulted from improved agricultural investments, a household responsibility system and liberalised agricultural product markets and prices. These have encouraged the development of operational systems and township enterprises (Cheng, 2006; National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2014), improved public services (Gu, 2006), increased rural education investment and increased social capital flow (SADR, 2013; Shi and Chen, 2008; Zhu, 2015). All of this has given birth to improvement in the general living standard in China (Zhu, 2015) and the improvement of the social safety net (Wen, 2012). Achieving the coordinated development of urban and rural areas has been the focus of the Chinese government since the new millennium (Hualou et al., 2011), with the introduction of a dualistic economic structure and a formulated rural development mechanism (Ghosh, 2011), improved infrastructure provision and agricultural modernisation (Wang et al., 2005; Wang, 2013).

In China, it has been observed that decades of reform have changed the economic landscape of the country (Sonntag et al., 2005).

These authors opine that this change has led to increased farm employment (40% of rural residents), improved agricultural income and rural industry, and the transformation of domestic and international markets, all of which have changed the face of rural China.

The Tanzanian Approaches to Rural Development

The merger of regions - Tanganyika and Zanzibar - to form the United Republic of Tanzania remains important to the regional development of the country. At independence in 1961, Tanzania as a nation, like Nigeria, was still considered poor in terms of the traditional criteria of per capita production for the market economy and consumption. An imbalance in development was also evident, as the physical and social infrastructure was concentrated in towns and export or cash crop-producing areas. The remainder of the agriculture and the rural population was largely left alone, and these rural people were sometimes called upon as a labour reservoir for labour-demanding estates. The government introduced the Self-Help/Village Settlement Scheme from 1961 to 1966. This self-help scheme was intended to make rural communities and households self-sustaining, and it was intended that the increasing rural populace would go through an incremental process to improve their living standards. The government introduced the scheme in phases and invested in basic initiatives to support the process.

Coulson (1982) informs that rural development in Tanzania was based on rural self-reliance with communal arrangements in ownership, work effort and the sharing of benefits; in other words, modern traditionalism or the building of socialism (Nyerere, 1977). The post-independence era was marked by continued global support, and the bulk of the support and cooperation came from European countries. Germany's Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development engaged in intensive and productive cooperation with the government of Tanzania to bring

about visible development in rural areas. The Tanga region was one of the focus areas of the bilateral co-operation between the two countries, with the formation and operation of the Tanga Integrated Rural Development Programme (TIRDP) between 1972 and 1991. The TIRDP, classified as a bilateral capital and resources intensive project, was required to improve the living standards of the rural population of the Tanga Region, and this was carried out in three support phases: the Infrastructural Support Phase (1975–1979); the Institutional Support Phase (1977–1983) and the Target Group Orientation Phase (1983 onwards).

Losch and Michaud (2016) provide a post-2000 analysis of rural development in Tanzania. They opine that the 2000s was a decade of strong investment in designing visions and development plans. Following the formulation of the Development Vision 2025 (2000), the National Rural Development Strategy was drafted in 2001, followed by the Agricultural Sector Development Strategy (ASDS) in 2003, and its operationalization through the Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP), adopted in 2006 (Losch and Michaud, 2016). As such, actions in the agricultural sector progressively became a major component of the new National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP I and II). The proliferation of strategies, plans and programmes on one side, and the reality of the government's organisation on the other side – with five ministries in charge of agriculture or dealing with agricultural issues - led the government to adopt crosscutting approaches to manage the growing coordination problems. In 2009, the Kilimo Kwanza Initiative (or Agriculture First) was launched by President Kikwete as a national resolution to accelerate agricultural transformation. Formulated under the patronage of the Tanzania National Business Council (TNBC), it proposes a holistic approach based on a public–private dialogue with discussion groups and the direct involvement of the private sector for the modernisation of the

agriculture sector (Losch and Michaud, 2016).

Hella et al. (2006) highlight that the government is mandated to support national and non-governmental establishments to research and extend programmes to improve their effectiveness, and to promote public-private partnerships in the process of product manufacturing, innovation and commercialisation. The researchers are required to present an overview of the strategies used by their research establishments to improve the productivity of resource-poor farmers by using cheap and locally available material in the Kyela and Matombo sites in Tanzania. This strategy has been instituted by the Tanzanian government to capture the existing situation in the research areas, to promote the prevailing macro-economic policies, and to stress the need for the sustainability of technology.

CONCLUSION AND LESSON FOR NIGERIA

Conclusion

Rural areas' experiences cannot be explained in isolation. They remain a part of the human space, thus rural development remains a necessity as rural sustenance remains critical for urban survival and sustainability. The aspect of rural development is significant to and rests squarely within the purview of the planning profession as the planners' focus is geared towards facility location, service delivery, liveability, equity and quality of life for all.

As stated by the Cork Declaration (1996), rural development consists of different activities, which help rural areas maintain their economic, ecological and social functions. Targeting rural migration into urban areas, combating household poverty, stimulating employment, providing equal opportunities and improving service delivery in rural areas are some of the suggested ways to uplift rural communities. Rural development and resettlement will play an increasingly important role in mobilising the continent's latent resource (mineral, human, cultural, social

and economic) base (Neumeier 2017; Rogge, 1977; Shariati and Dadfar, 2017).

Khan (2001) highlights that economic stability, competitive markets and public investment in physical and social infrastructure are widely recognised as important requirements for achieving sustained economic growth and a reduction in rural poverty. In addition, because the rural poor's links to the economy vary considerably, public policy should focus on issues such as their access to land, credit, education, health care and support services, and their entitlement to food. Most of these activities are within the planners' routine planning responsibilities, but before planners can proffer infrastructural solutions to rural areas and bring about sustainability within households, they need adequate and relevant data on the rural household characteristics and livelihoods. This will facilitate the required investigation into the outlook of the rural environment, the infrastructural demands and the livelihoods opportunities that can be adopted towards enhancing rural settlement sustainability.

The relevance of rural areas cannot be under-emphasised, as the livelihoods of the dwellers within these areas cannot be of less relevance to environmentalists. The promotion of equity and social inclusion to translate them into improved livelihoods, enhanced productivity and improved quality of life remains the focus of planners. The rural areas are important operational theatres for urban and regional (physical) planners to bring about sustainable development that translates into improved livelihoods and enhanced quality of life of rural households.

Lesson for Nigeria from the Chinese and Tanzanian Experiences

One major lesson to be learnt from regional and rural development efforts in China is that Nigeria's government should always imbue the culture of a bottom-up approach towards planning, which is also

known as 'planning with the people'. It has been discovered from the review of literature that China has begun the process of paying much more attention to its rural areas. Nigeria's government should focus more on developing its rural spaces that are far behind when compared to the country's urban areas in terms of development. This will always be a benefit for the country as it decongests its urban areas which have become centres for various social and economic vices.

It has been discovered that China is now making frantic efforts to further develop its agricultural and industrial sectors, aimed at addressing poverty across all its regions. This is laudable and Nigeria should take a cue from the People's Republic of China in this regard, as this will make development permeate through all of its regions or spaces. It has also been discovered in this study that there have been consistencies in policy making in China; reflected in their five-year development plan, where one development plan leads to another. There has also been focus and political will across regimes in all their regional development efforts, which has translated into the economic growth of the nation, most importantly for the rural Chinese. This should serve as a lesson to Nigeria that changes policies like clothes, as with each regime change there is a change in policies and this lack of consistency does not benefit the average man on the street.

China is today one of the leading producers of different industrial and agricultural products across the world. The country does not lag behind in the areas of science, technology and education, and Nigeria would do well to follow this practice. Studies by Ugwuanyi and Chukwuemeka (2013) and Madu, Yusof and Suyatno (2015) identify that the role of governance, policies and political will cannot be ignored in the rural development of Nigeria.

This study identified policy inconsistencies, poor policy implementation, a top-down approach, limited political will, local

government corruption, unpopular government leaders and the imposition of leaders, which are borne from the lack of local government autonomy, to be some of the limitations to the development of rural areas. This study argues that for the potential of rural areas to be maximised and for household capacity to be improved, as in China, a consistent rural government must be put in place, which is autonomous and has the political will and strength to propel the rural space's capacity and development through policies that enhance physical and social infrastructure provision.

Farm mechanization and a tax-free agricultural system could be adopted as the means of embracing rural household farming. It is also imperative that rural infrastructure provision and household financing remain viable routes to sustainable livelihoods, as proven in the case of China. Rural areas in Nigeria remain deficient in infrastructure and improved technology. The Nigerian government can learn from China, which encourages growth through local-craft industrialization; investment in agricultural infrastructure; improved accessibility across all regions and public service provision. It is hypothesized that this will translate into improved rural household capacity. The place of community participation cannot be over-emphasized in rural planning and development. Nigeria should as much as possible incorporate the local populace in development issues about their localities, as was adopted by the Tanzanian government in the Tanga Integrated Rural Development Programme. Tanzania's policies and development remain a source of great interest to both academics and policy makers. The lack of relationships between political intention, implementation and the results achieved remain a major setback towards rural development in Nigeria.

Halfway through the first five-year planning period in Tanzania it became clear that the strategy chosen was unsuccessful. The main objectives listed above were not achieved. It was a centre-down strategy with capital, technology and expertise expected to come

largely from abroad. The central government failed to supply enough input, and some inputs which arrived were used inefficiently, resulting in limited spreading of the effects. This was the case with the settlement schemes. Growth was patchy and slow; but more importantly, development in the country was influenced more by external factors than by the Tanzanian authorities. This is also an issue peculiar to Nigeria's rural developmental strategies and Nigeria, like Tanzania, is also being influenced by external factors which dictate the state of development in the country.

Nigeria and Tanzania both remain blind to the ideology that all that is needed to trigger development in the rural areas is investing in agriculture and creating policies relating to agriculture. This issue remains an ideal that needs to be revisited by both countries. The place of indigenous technology financing and promotion remains relevant to rural development in Nigeria and it needs to be integrated into the rural development strategies in the country. As such, encouraging private investments through improved public-private partnerships for rural development cannot be ignored by the government of Nigeria, as it will help to bring about the rural modernization embraced by the Tanzanian government.

References

- Abdullahi, A., Jahun, B. and Sabo, M. 2016. Impact of Irrigation Project on Fadama Community of Bauchi State Nigeria. *International Journal of Advanced Engineering and Science*, 5(1): 20-30.
- Abiodun, O. and Ayangbile, O. 2016. Livelihood. In L. Egunjobi (Ed.). *Contemporary Concepts in Physical Planning, Volume II*. Ibadan, Nigeria: Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Ibadan: 593-610.
- Abiola, I. 2017. The Integration of Mosques and Churches to Urban Planning of Ibadan Nigeria: A Historical Overview. *Planning Malaysia Journal*, 15(1).
- Abonyi, N and Nnamani O. 2011. Development and Food Crisis in Emerging Economy: A Critical Appraisal of Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Administrative Science*, 9(1-2): 265–278.
- Adamu, A. 2016. Urbanization, Physical Planning and Economic Growth: Leveraging the Value Chain as a Strategy for National Development. Lecture delivered at the 5th Waheed Kadiri Annual Lecture on Thursday 18th February, 2016 at Moshood Abiola Polytechnic, Abeokuta, Ogun state, Nigeria.
- Adebayo, A. 2014. Local Government and the Challenges of Rural Development in Nigeria (1999 to Date). *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 19(4): 98-107.
- Adedibu, A. and Okebukola, A. 1989. Issues in the Environmental Sanitation of Lagos Mainland, Nigeria. *Environmentalist*, 9: 91-100.
- Adisa, J. 1994. Nigeria in ECOMOG: Political Undercurrent and the Burden of Community Spirit. *Small Wars & Insurgencies*, 5(1), 83-110
- Agbakoba, O. and Ogbonna, H. 2004. *Local Government Administration and Development in Nigeria*. Lagos: Hurilaws.

- Agwu, A. 2017. Farmer Literacy Education Strategies for Achieving Poverty and Hunger Reduction among Rural Farmers in Abia State, Nigeria (Doctoral dissertation), University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Nigeria.
- Akinsola, G. and Adewumi, M. 2018. *Analysis of Infrastructural Profile and its Impact on Poverty of Rural Communities in Kwara State, Nigeria* (No. 2058-2018-5272). International
- Akinterinwa, B. 2017. Why China is able to Develop and Nigeria Cannot: Some Lessons from China's Soft Power Approach. Available at:
<https://www.thisdaylive.com/index.php/2017/04/02/why-china-is-able-to-develop-and-nigeria-cannot/> [Accessed 7 May 2019].
- Ako, R. 2018. Economic Recovery and Growth Plan and Agricultural Development in Nigeria. *Operational Research in Management, Social Sciences & Education*, 4(1): 96-107.
- Alston, M., Allan, J., Dietsch, E., Wilkinson, J., Shankar, J., Osburn, L., Bell, K., Muenstermann, I., Giorgas, D., Moore, E., Jennett, C., Ritter, L., Gibson, R., Wallace, J., Harris, J. and Grantley, J. 2006. Brutal neglect: Australian rural women's access to health services. *Rural and Remote Health*, 6(1), 475-494.
- Aneki, 2016. *China vs. Nigeria*. Available at: http://www.aneke.com/comparison.php?country_1=China&country_2=Nigeria [Accessed 17 April 2019].
- Appadorai, A. 1975. *The Substance of Politics*. New Dehil, Oxford University Press.
- Arif, S. 2019. Cursed by Oil? Rural Threats, Agricultural Policy Changes and the Impact of Oil on Indonesia's and Nigeria's Rural Development. *Journal of International Development*, 31(2): 165-181. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.3399> [Accessed 17 April 2019].
- Ashley, C. 2000. Applying Livelihood Approaches to Natural Resource Management Initiatives: Experiences in Namibia and Kenya. *ODI Working Paper*, 134, London.

- Asian Development Bank (ADB). 1995. *Governance: Sound Development Management*. Manila: ADB. Available at: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_nlinks&ref=000097&pid=S1414-753X200700020000700006&lng=en [Accessed 19 May, 2017].
- Asian Development Bank (ADB). 2007. *Rural Development: Household Perceptions on Rural Development*. Available at: <http://www.adbi.org/discussion.paper>, [Accessed 14 March 2017].
- Association of Agricultural Economists (IAAE), 2018 Conference, July 28-August 2, 2018, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Awa, E.O. 1981. The Theory of Local Government, *Quarterly Journal of Administration*, 25(1&2): 23-40.
- Bessong, F. and Ojong, F. 2019. Rural Development in Nigeria: The Gateway to improving standard of living. Outlook on Human Capacity Building and Development: A Handbook of Research in Honour of Professor Ibrahim Njodi edited by Jacinta A. Opara University of Maiduguri Press: Maiduguri, Nigeria. ISBN:978-978-2323-35-4
- Blaikie, P., Cannon, T., Davis, I. and Wisner, B. 2004. *At Risk: Natural Hazards, People's Vulnerability and Disasters*. New York: Routledge.
- Bottini, N., Coelho, M. and Kao, J. 2013. *Infrastructure and Growth "Launch Version I"*.
- Submission to the LSE Growth Commission. Available at <http://www2.lse.ac.uk/researchAndExpertise/units/growthCommission/documents/pdf/SecretariatPapers/BInfrastructure.pdf> [Accessed on 11 May 2017].
- Brushett, S. and John-Abraham, I. 2006. Infrastructure for Improved Rural Livelihoods. *Enbreve*, 93: 1-4. World Bank: Latin America and Caribbean Region. Available at: http://web.worldbank.org/archive/website01271/WEB/IMAGE/S/SEP06_93.PDF [Accessed 9 May 2019].

- Bryceson, D., Ingham, K., Mascarenhas, A.C. and Chiteji, F. 2018. *Tanzania*. Available at: <https://www.britannica.com/place/Tanzania> [Accessed 6 May 2019].
- Central Bank of Nigeria. 2002. *Highway Maintenance in Nigeria: Lessons from other Countries*. Abuja: CBN.
- Chambers, R., 2005. Sustainable Livelihoods - Developments, Reflections and the Future. *Chambers and Ideas for Development*. 259. [Online]. Available at: https://www.google.co.za/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwjeaTqkobXAhWoK8AKHTUaB6MQFggmMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.miis.edu%2Fsystem%2Ffiles%2Fmedia%2Fsustainable_livelihoods_-_ideas_for_development_-_robert_chambers.doc&usg=AOvVaw3bNwABaMEYQAkmuqDN0R4 [Accessed 23 October 2017].
- Chambers, R. and Conway, G. 1992. Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century. IDS Discussion Paper No. 296. Brighton, UK, Institute of Development Studies.
- Chan, C., Forwood, D., Roper, H. and Sayers, C. 2009. *Public Infrastructure Financing: An International Perspective*. Productivity Commission Staff Working Paper.
- Channels Television (June 7, 2018). *Nigeria to Strengthen Economic Ties with Tanzania*. Available at: <https://www.channelstv.com/2018/06/07/nigeria-to-strengthen-economic-ties-with-tanzania/> [Accessed 21 August, 2018].
- Cheng, G. 2006. China's Agricultural Policies and Rural Development. *Development Research Center*. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/tag/agricultural-policies/37726009pdf>. [Accessed 13 March 2017].
- Chikozho, C. and Managa, R. 2018. Can We Unlock Rural Socio-economic Transformation through Land Reform? Revisiting the Land Redistribution Public Policy

- Imperatives in South Africa. *HSRC Policy Briefs*. Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.11910/11800> [Accessed 6 May 2019].
- Chimela, N., Nkem, O., Nnaemeka, O. and Abiodun, O. 2017. Socio-economic Factors Affecting the Utilization of Primary Health Care Services among Cassava Farmers in Abia State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Agricultural Extension*, 4(3): 173-180.
- Chinsman, B. 1998. *A Matter of People*. Lagos: UNDP.
- Coulson, A. 1982. *Tanzania, a Political Economy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dalal-Clayton, D., Dent, D. and Dubois, O. 1999: *Rural Planning in the Developing World with a Special Focus on Natural Resources: Lessons Learned and Potential Contributions to Sustainable Livelihoods: An Overview*. Report to UK Department for International Development. Environmental Planning Issues No.20, IIED, London.
- Deekor, L. and Maekae, J. 2015. Culture and Cultural Diversity in Sustainable Development: The Nigerian Experience. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 6(13): 249-254.
- Department of International Development. 2009. *Livelihood: Concepts. The Ohio State University Sustainable Livelihoods Guidance Sheets*. Available at: <http://www.livelihoods.org>. [Accessed 6 May 2019].
- Directorate for Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFFRI). 1989. *DFFRI in Akwa-Ibom State: Projects/Achievements*. Uyo: Government Printer.
- DFID. 2001. *Making Government Work for Poor People: Building State Capacity*. London: DFID.
- ELDIS, 2010. *Livelihoods Connect*. Available at: [Accessed 6 May 2019].
- Emokaro, C. and Oyoboh, D. 2016. Impact of Rural Infrastructure on the Livelihood of Smallholders in Agrarian Communities in Edo State, Nigeria. In *Transforming Smallholder Agriculture in Africa: The Role of Policy and*

- Governance*. Paper presented at the 5th International Conference of the African Association of Agricultural Economists, September 23-26, 2016, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- European Union. 2011. *Regional Policy in China and the EU: A comparative perspective*. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/cooperate/international/pdf/brochure_eu_china_v17_en.pdf. [Accessed on 13 May 2017].
- Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO). 2006. *Technical Consultation on Rural Infrastructure Issues on Rural Infrastructure and Challenges*. Available at: www.fao.org/ag/magazine/ags-infra.pdf. [Accessed on 23 May, 2017].
- German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). 2017. *Improving Livelihoods in Rural Communities*. Available at: <https://www.giz.de/en/worldwide/17835.html> [Accessed 9 May 2019].
- Ghosh, J. 2011. Poverty Reduction in China and India: Policy Implications of Recent Trends. In Chowdhury, A. A., & Sundaram, J. K. (Eds.), *Poor Poverty: The Impoverishment of Analysis, Measurement and Policies*. London, United Kingdom: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Government of Tanganyika. 1964. *Tanganyika Five-Year Plan for Economic and Social Development 1st July, 1964/65-30th June, 1969*. Dar-es-Salaam: Government Printer.
- Grgić, I., Žimbek, T., Tratnik, M., Markovina, J. and Juračak, J. 2010. Quality of Life in Rural Areas of Croatia: To Stay or to Leave?. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, 5(8): 653-650.
- Gu, W. 2006. Speeding up Shanghai's New Suburban and Countryside Construction to Further Coordinate Urban and Rural Development. *Shanghai Rural Economy*, 11(1): 1.

- Hall .D. 2006. *Water and Electricity in Nigeria*. A Report Commissioned by Public Service Interaction Unit (PISRU), Business School of University of Greenwich, London. Available at: www.world-post.org. [Accessed on 23 May, 2017].
- Hernandez, J. and Tangingco, A. 2010. *Behind-the-Border Determinants of Bilateral Trade Flows in East Asia*. *Asia-Pacific Research and Training Network on Trade (ARTNeT) Working Paper Series. No. 80*. Bangkok: United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.
- Hella, J., Mbwaga, A., Ley, G. and Riches, C. 2006. *Rural Development Strategies through Farmer Groups and Farmer Oriented Research: A Case Study*. SUA-FOA. Available at : http://www.fao.org/docs/eims/upload/agrotech/1997/r8194_ftr_anx2.pdf [Accessed 19 August 2018].
- Hinderick, J. and Sterkenburg, J. 1978. Spatial Inequality in Underdeveloped Countries and the Role of Government Policy, *Tijdschrift Voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 69: 5-16.
- Hinzen, H. 2000. Education for All: The Dakar Framework for Action - Meeting our Collective Commitments. *Adult Education and Development*, 55.
- History World. 2018. *History of Tanzania*: Available at: <http://www.historyworld.net/wrldhis/PlainTextHistories.asp?historyid=ad23> [Accessed 6 May 2019].
- Hoel, R. 2008. Civil-military Relations in Nigeria and Tanzania: A Comparative, Historical Analysis, Master's Thesis, Department of International Studies, Stellenbosch University, South Africa. Available at: <http://scholar.sun.ac.za/handle/10019.1/1735> [Accessed 6 May 2019].
- Hualou, L., Jian, Z., Jessica, P. and Yurui, L. 2011. Analysis of Rural Transformation Development in China Since the

- Turn of the New Millennium. *Applied Geography*, 31(3): 1094-1105.
- Humphrey, C. and Michaelowa, K. 2019. China in Africa: Competition for traditional development finance institutions?. *World Development*, 120, 15-28.
- Ianchovichina, E., Ivanic, M. and Martin, W. 2009. *Implications of the Growth of China and India for the Other Asian Giant*. Moscow, Russia: The World Bank.
- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). 2010. *Rural Poverty Report 2011 – New Realities, New Challenges: New Opportunities for Tomorrow's Generation*. Rome, International Fund for Agricultural Development. Available at: <http://www.ifad.org/rpr2011/index.htm> [Accessed 15 March 2017].
- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). 2014. The Sustainable Livelihoods Approach. Available at http://www.ifad.org/sla/index_f.htm [Accessed 10 April 2014].
- Ismail, N. W. and Mahyideen, J. M. 2015. *The Impact of Infrastructure on Trade and Economic Growth in Selected Economies in Asia*. ADBI Working Paper 553. Tokyo: Asian Development Bank Institute. Available at: <http://www.adb.org/publications/impact-infrastructure-trade-and-economic-growth-selected-economies-asia/> [Accessed 15 March 2017].
- Ipingbemi, O. 2008. Exploring Labour-based Approach for Rural Road Maintenance in Nigeria. *Journal of Social Science*, 17(2): 103-111.
- Jiang, G., Ma, W., Dingyang, Z., Qinglei, Z. and Ruijuan, Z. 2017. Agglomeration or Dispersion? Industrial Land-use Pattern and its Impacts in Rural Areas from China's Township and Village Enterprises' Perspective. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 159: 207-219.
- Kanbur, R. and Zhang, X. 2003. *Fifty Years of Regional Inequality in China: A Journey Through Central Planning, Reform*

- and Openness*, Paper prepared for the UNU/WIDER Project Conference on Spatial Inequality in Asia, Tokyo. United Nations University, World Institute for Development Economics Research: Helsinki, Finland
- Khan, M.H. 2001. *Rural Poverty in Developing Countries. Implications for Public Policy Economic Issues* No.26. Washington, D.C: International Monetary Fund.
- Khan, A. and Riskin, C. 2005. China's Household Income and its Distribution, 1995 and 2002. *China Quarterly*, 182(2): 356-384.
- Khan, S.Y. 2019. Sustainable Rural Development. In Q.R Yasser (Ed.). *Handbook of Research on Rural Sociology and Community Mobilization for Sustainable Growth*: 296-311. DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-7158-2
- Kourtelis, C. 2018. From Neglect to Selective Engagement: The EU Approach to Rural Development in Arab Mediterranean after the Arab Uprising. *Mediterranean Politics*, 23(1): 23-42.
- Lawal, T. 2014. Local Government and Rural Infrastructural Delivery in Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4(4): 139-147.
- Losch, B. and Michaud, A. 2016. Evolution of Rural Development Strategies and Policies Lessons from Tanzania. Document de travail ART-Dev 2016-3 October 2016 Version 1. Available at: https://art-dev.cnrs.fr/images/WorkingPapers/wpARTDev_2016_03-Evolution-rural-tanzania.pdf [Accessed 17 April 2019].
- Mabogunje, A. 1980. *The Development Process: A Spatial Perspectives*. London, U.K.: Hutchinson Press.
- Madu, A., Yusof, R. and Suyatno. 2015. Democracy and Rural Development in Nigeria's Fourth Republic: Challenges and Prospects. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(6 S4): 445-451. Doi:10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n6s4p445
- Marafa, L. 2015. *China and Nigeria: Seeking Partnership and a Symbiotic Relationship*. Available at: <http://www.gamji.com/article4000/NEWS4520.htm> [Accessed

7 May 2019].

- Mazibuko, S. 2012. *Ensuring Sustainable Use of Natural Resources for Rural Economic Development*. Paper presented at the Conference on Promoting Effective Rural Economic Development in South Africa on 22-24, July 2008. Available at: file:///C:/Users/217078706/Downloads/5408_Mazibuko_EnsuringSustainableUse.pdf. [Accessed 15 March 2017].
- Moore, W., Pearson, F., Rife, J., Poole, J., Moore, L. and Reaves, A. 2016. Reinventing Social Work Education and Service Delivery in Rural Areas: An Interdisciplinary Model for Serving Vulnerable Populations. *Contemporary Rural Social Work*, 8(2): 63-76.
- National Bureau of Statistics of China (NBS). 2014. *China Statistical Yearbook 2014*. Available at: <http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjsj/ndsj/2014/indexeh.htm> [Accessed on 13 May 2017].
- Neumeier, S. 2017. Social Innovation in Rural Development: Identifying the Key Factors of Success. *The Geographical Journal*, 183(1): 34-46.
- Nyerere, J. 1977. *The Arusha Declaration Ten Years After*. Dar es Salaam: Government Printer.
- Obi, C. 2010. Oil extraction, dispossession, resistance, and conflict in Nigeria's oil-rich Niger Delta. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 30(1-2): 219-236.
- Odularu, G. 2008. Crude Oil and the Nigerian Economic Performance. *Oil and Gas Business*, 1-29.
- Okon, D. 2016. Sustainable Management of Community Development Projects: A Study of Selected Macro and Mini-Water Projects in Akwa-Ibom North-East Senatorial District, South-South, Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(3): 185-199.
- Okonkwo, K. 2018. *Nigeria China Trade Relations and National Development in Nigeria 2011-2015*. Enugu, Nigeria: Godfrey Okoye University. Available

- at:<http://eprints.gouni.edu.ng/id/eprint/661> [Accessed 12 April 2019].
- Okunola, A. 2016. Nigeria: Positioning Rural Economy for Implementation of Sustainable Development Goals. *Turkish Journal of Agriculture-Food Science and Technology*, 4(9): 752-757.
- Oladipo, E. 2000. *Ensuring Increased Private Sector Participation in Project Monitoring and Evaluation*. Paper presented at the National Seminar on Participatory Monitoring and Plan Implementation, Sheraton Hotels and Towers, Abuja, 20-21, March, 2000.
- Ogeidefa, I. 2010. *Rural Development in Nigeria: Concept, Approaches, Challenges and Prospect*. Nigeria: SOCYBERTY.
- Onoh, J. and Ndu-Okereke, O. 2018. Dependence on Oil Income Earnings and Diversification of the Economy–The Nigerian Response. *Journal of Developing Country Studies*, 8(2): 95-106.
- Osakwe, C. and Audu, B. 2017. The Nigeria Led ECOMOG Military Intervention and Interest in the Sierra Leone Crisis: An Overview. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(4): 107-115.
- Osuagwu, E and Osabohien, R. 2018. *Social Protection Policies and Agricultural Output in Nigeria: Empirical Investigation Using Household Survey Data*. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3186392> [Accessed 7 May 2019]
- Oyekale, A. 2009. Climatic Variability and its Impact on Agricultural Income and Households' Welfare in Southern and Northern Nigeria. *Electronic Journal of Environmental, Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 8(1): 13-34.
- Oyeranti, O. and Olayiwola, K. 2005. *Policies and Programmes for Poverty Reduction in Rural Nigeria*. An Interim Research Report Submitted to the African Economic Research Consortium (AERC), Nairobi for the Second

- Phase Collaborative Poverty Research Project. Available at:<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.459.4408&rep=rep1&type=pdf> . [Accessed 7 May 2019]
- Oyesola, O. 2007. Rural Dwellers' Perception on Effect of Infrastructural Facilities on Livelihood Activities in Akinyele Local Government Area of Oyo state, Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Rural Development*, 16(1): 83-92.
- Paul, S., Agba, M. and Chukwurah, D. 2014. Rural Development Programmes and Rural Under-development in Nigeria: A Rethink. *International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research*, 2(4): 1-14.
- Portugal-Perez, A. and Wilson, J.S. 2012. Export Performance and Trade Facilitation Reform: Hard and Soft Infrastructure. *World Development*, 40(7): 1295–1307.
- Premium Times (June 7, 2018). *Nigeria to boost economic relations with Tanzania –Buhari*. Available at: <https://www.premiumtimesng.com/foreign/africa/271508-271508.html> [Accessed 21 August, 2018].
- Reegan. 2008. *Local Government Administration and Development in Nigeria*. Available at: <http://grassrootleadership.blogspot.co.za/2008/12/normal-0-false-false-false.html> [Accessed on 12 May 2017].
- Rogge, J. 1977. Rural Development Problems in Africa: Some Lessons from Western Nigeria. *The Canadian Geographer*, 21(3): 250–267.
- Royal Oak. 2018. *Compare Nigeria to China*. Available at: <https://countryeconomy.com/countries/compare/nigeria/china> [Accessed 6 May 2019].
- Sam, I. 2014. Achieving Sustainable Poverty Reduction and Rural Development in Nigeriathrough Local Economic Development Strategies. *American Journal of Rural Development*, 2(1): 13-19.
- Scientific Development Research Group (SDRG). 2012. Further Improve the Service and Management for Migrant Workers

- in Shanghai, Promote the Common Development of Urban and Rural Areas - the Way, Prospects and Initiatives to Solve New Dual Structure. *Scientific Development Journal*, 2(1).
- Shanghai Academy of Development and Reform (SADR). 2013. *The Path and Breakthrough: The Co-ordinated Development of Shanghai Urban and Rural*. Shanghai, China: Shanghai Academy of Development and Reform.
- Shariati, S. and Dadfar, A. 2017. A Survey of the Role and Place of the Non-governmental Organizations in Rural Development. *International Journal of Multifaceted and Multilingual Studies*, 3(10).
- Shi, Y. and Chen, Y. 2008. Experiences and Enlightenments in Eliminating the Urban-rural Dual Structure. *Nantong University Journal*, 6: 22-27.
- Sonntag, B., Jikun Huang, Rozelle, S. and Skerritt, J. 2005. *China's Agricultural and Rural Development in the Early 21st Century*. ACIAR Monograph No. 116, xxxviii + 510p.
- Steel, G. and van Lindert, P. 2017. Rural Livelihood Transformations and Local Development in Cameroon, Ghana and Tanzania. London: IIED. Available at: <http://pubs.iied.org/10811IIED>. [Accessed 6 May 2019].
- Stewart, J. 2010. The UK National Infrastructure Plan. In: Strauss, H. (ed). *European Investment Bank Papers: Public and Private Financing of Infrastructure*, 15(2): 28-33.
- Taylor, I. 2007. China's Relations with Nigeria. *The Round Table: The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs*, 96(392): 631-645.
- Taylor, N. 1998. *Urban Planning Theory since 1945*. London: Sage Publications: 67-68.
- Titilola, S. 2008. Environment and Sustainable Agricultural Development in Nigeria. In Adedotun O. Phillips, E. and Ndekwe, C (Eds.). *Structural Adjustment Program in a Developing Economy: The Case of Nigeria*, Ibadan: NISER.
- The Cork Declaration. A Living Countryside. 1996. The

- European Conference on Rural Development, Cork Ireland, November, 1996. Available at:http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/rur/cork_en.htm [Accessed on 9 January 2017].
- The Global Environment Outlook 4. 2005. *Environment for Development (GEO-4)*. Available at: <http://web.unep.org/geo/assessments/global-assessments/global-environment-outlook-4#sthash.UanUv1Yy.dpuf> [Accessed 18 March 2017].
- Todaro, M. and Stilkind, J. 1981. *City Bias and Rural Neglect: The Dilemma of Urban Development*. New York: New York Population Council (Public Issues Paper PI-04).
- Uba, A. 2012. *The Cry of the Rural Poor in Nigeria*. Kano, Nigeria: JENES Press Ltd.
- Udo, B. 2018. CBN Issues Guidelines for China-Nigeria Currency Swap Deal. Available at: <https://www.premiumtimesng.com/business/271756-cbn-issues-guidelines-for-china-nigeria-currency-swap-deal.html> [Accessed 17 September 2018].
- Ugwuanyi, B. and Chukwuemeka, E. 2013. Enhancing Rural Development in Nigeria: Periscoping the Impediments and Exploring Imperative Measures. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 2(7): 91-101.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). 1998. *Sustainable Livelihoods: Concepts, Principles and Approaches to Indicator Development*. Available at:http://www.undp.org/sl/Documents/Indicators_and_eval/SL%20oncepts/sl_concets_priniples_nd_approaches_to_indicator_development.htm [Accessed 7 May, 2019].
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). 2013. *China National Human Development Report 2013: Sustainable and Livable Cities: Toward Ecological Civilization*. Beijing:UNDP.
- Unterhalter, E. and Heslop, J. 2012. *Transforming Education for Girls in Tanzania and Nigeria: Cross Country Analysis of Endline Research Studies*. Available

- at:http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/10018923/1/TEGINT_cross_country_summary_report_December_2012.pdf [Accessed 6 May 2019].
- Vuyisani, M. 2003. *Preview of Housing Finance Systems in Four Different African Countries: South Africa, Nigeria, Ghana and Tanzania*. Available at: http://www.housingfinance.org/uploads/Publicationsmanager/Africa_PreviewofHousingFinanceSystemsinFourDifferentAfricanCountries.pdf [Accessed 6 May 2019].
- Wang, M. 2005. *Promotion of Agricultural Mechanization in Peoples' Republic of China*. Country Report Presented to the First Session of the TC of APCEAM 21-22 November 2005, New Delhi, India.
- Wang, W., Wu, F. ., Fang, Z. 2005. *Rethinking on Shanghai Firstly to Achieve Agricultural Modernization. Agricultural Economic Issues*, 5.
- Wang, S. 2013. Stage Characteristics and Development Strategy of the Urban and Rural Co-Developing - Focusing on Shanghai. *Jiangnan Academic*, 32(2): 5-13.
- Wen, J. 2012. China's Agricultural and Rural Development. *English Edition of Qiushi Journal* 4(2): 1.
- Wilson, J., Mann, C. and Otsuki, T. 2005. Assessing the Benefits of Trade Facilitation: A Global Perspective. *The World Economy*, 28(6): 841–871.
- World Bank. 2004. *Composite Indicators of Development*. Available at: http://www.worldbank.org/depweb/english/beyond/beyondco/beg_15.pdf. [Accessed 11 May 2017].
- World Health Organisation (WHO). 2010. *Rural Poverty and Health Systems in the WHO European Region*. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe.
- Wu, C., Lyu, C. and Li, J. 2019. Experiences and Challenges of the Chinese Rural Education Development in the Context of the Rapid Urbanization. In Q.R Yasser (Ed.). *Handbook of Research on Rural Sociology and Community Mobilization for Sustainable Growth*: 271-295. Available

at: DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-7158-2

- Xiao, L., He, Z., Wang, Y. and Guo, Q. 2017. Understanding Urban–rural Linkages from an Ecological Perspective. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology*, 24(1): 37-43.
- Yokohari, M., Murakami, A., Hara, Y., and Tsuchiya, K. 2017. Sustainable Landscape Planning in Selected Urban Regions. Basel, Switzerland: Springer
- Yusuf, S. and Tony, S. 2008. *China Urbanizes: Consequences, Strategies, and Policies*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Zegar, J.S. and Floriańczyk, Z. 2012. *Main problems of agriculture and rural areas in Poland in the period of transformation and integration with European Union*. Manesova, Poland: Institute of Agriculture and Food Economics.
- Zhu, T. 2015. *Coordinated Urban and Rural Development in China: A Comparative Study of Shanghai and Chengdu*. Lund, Sweden: Faculty of Social Sciences, Lund University.
- Zulu, I. 2009. Nigeria: The Giant of Africa, *The Journal of Pan African Studies*, 3(3): 1-2.