

**AN EVALUATION OF THE STRATEGIES OF RURAL
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES IN PLATEAU
STATE 1999 – 2010**

**THOMAS TANKO SHUT
B.Sc. (ABU), M.Sc. (JOS)
PGSS/UJ/1428/06**

**A thesis in the Department of POLITICAL
SCIENCE, Faculty of Social Sciences,
Submitted to the School of Postgraduate Studies,
University of Jos, in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the award of the
degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY in
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION of the
UNIVERSITY OF JOS**

JULY 2014

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this work is the product of my own research efforts, undertaken under the supervision of Dr. Sylva Manti Ngu and has not been presented elsewhere for the award of a degree or certificate. All sources have been duly distinguished and appropriately acknowledged.

THOMAS TANKO SHUT
PGSS/UJ/1428/06

DATE:_____

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that the research work for this progress report and the subsequent preparation of the thesis by **THOMAS TANKO SHUT (PGSS/UJ/1428/06)** were carried out under our supervision.

Dr. Sylva Manti Ngu
Supervisor

Date

Dr. Bonaventure N. Haruna
Ag. Head of Department

Date

Professor Ezekiel G. Best
Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Almighty God, I say thank you for the strength and wisdom which enabled me to even venture into the programme. First, I wish to sincerely acknowledge the contributions of all the authors that I have cited their works in this work and the support of my field assistants in the course of administering the questionnaire for this work.

I also wish to thank my wife, Pheobe Shut and my children Kim, Dusu, Joseph and Weng for their support and daily prayer for me while I was undertaking this research. My gratitude goes to my supervisor Dr. S.M. Ngu, for his patience and kind words in support of this effort. The contribution of the internal Examiner Dr. C.O. Okoye, to enrich this work is also appreciated. Also my colleagues in the Department for their support in seeing that the work was well written and presented through their editorial works, corrections and pieces of advice especially Prof. H.S. Galadima, Prof. A.N Gambo, Prof. W.O. Alli, Prof. V.A. Adetula, Prof. Pam Sha, Dr. B.N Haruna, Mrs. A. Toye, Dr. C.O. Okoye and my good friend, Amayah F. Adakai. May the Good Lord reward all of you for your advice and inputs into this work.

I would like particularly to acknowledge the discussants and chair of my various presentations. First I would like to acknowledge Prof. H.S. Galadima who chaired the discussions at the departmental level from proposal presentation, to the final thesis, and Dr. C.O. Okoye who served as discussant. I also acknowledge Prof. Adetakun A.O. for serving as discussant at the faculty during my proposal presentation, Prof. Sati Fwanshak as discussant during my presentation for upgrading, and Prof. Grey Ejikeme who as Dean chaired all the presentations at the Faculty level. Lastly and not the least, Prof. Ezekiel G. Best the current Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences for his inputs before and after the defence of this thesis.

My thanks also go to my computer operator, Mr. Polycarp Y. Golbia of NANA Business Centre, who tirelessly typed and retyped this work.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my late father Da Shut Davou and my mother Ngo Garos Shut, who toiled to send me to school, and to all the oppressed masses in the rural areas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE
DECLARATION - - - - -	ii
CERTIFICATION - - - - -	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS - - - - -	iv
DEDICATION - - - - -	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS - - - - -	vii
LIST OF TABLES - - - - -	xi
EXPLANATIONS OF ACRONYMS - - - - -	xii
LIST OF APPENDICES - - - - -	xiv
ABSTRACT - - - - -	xvi

**CHAPTER ONE
INRODUCTION**

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY - - - - -	1
1.2 STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM - - - - -	4
1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS - - - - -	6
1.4 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES - - - - -	6
1.5 RESEARCH HYPOTHESES - - - - -	7
1.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY - - - - -	7
1.7 OPERATIONALIZATION OF CONCEPTS- - - - -	8
1.7.1 Development - - - - -	8
1.7.2 Rural Development - - - - -	8
1.7.3 Development Strategy - - - - -	9
1.7.4 Rural Development Policy - - - - -	9
1.7.5 Policy Evaluation - - - - -	9
1.7.6 Policy Impact Analysis- - - - -	9
1.8 SCOPE AND DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY- - - - -	10

**CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW**

2.1	AFRICA'S UNDERDEVELOPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	12
2.2	RURAL DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	15
2.3	REVIEW OF SCHOLARS' CONTRIBUTIONS TO RURAL DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	16
2.3.1	The Modernization Scholars	-	-	-	-	-	17
2.3.2	The Agrarian Transformation Scholars-	-	-	-	-	-	21
2.3.3	The Rural Integration Scholars	-	-	-	-	-	26
2.3.4	The Participatory Bottom up Scholars	-	-	-	-	-	27
2.3.5	Political Economy Scholars	-	-	-	-	-	35
2.4	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	-	-	-	-	-	40

**CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

3.1	RESEARCH DESIGN	-	-	-	-	-	47
3.2	THE AREA OF STUDY	-	-	-	-	-	47
3.3	POPULATION OF THE STUDY	-	-	-	-	-	47
3.4	SAMPLE SIZE AND SAMPLING TECHNIQUE	-	-	-	-	-	49
3.4.1	Sample Size	-	-	-	-	-	49
3.4.2	Sampling Technique	-	-	-	-	-	49
3.5	METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION	-	-	-	-	-	51
3.5.1	Primary Source of Data	-	-	-	-	-	51
3.5.2	Secondary Source of Data	-	-	-	-	-	51
3.5.3	Personal Observation	-	-	-	-	-	52
3.6	ADMINISTRATION OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENT	-	-	-	-	-	52
3.7	METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS	-	-	-	-	-	52

**CHAPTER FOUR
AN OVERVIEW OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
IN PLATEAU STATE**

4.1	AN OVERVIEW OF PLATEAU STATE	-	-	-	-	-	54
4.2	LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PLATEAU STATE	-	-	-	-	-	56

4.3	AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (ADP) AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PLATEAU STATE	-	-	-	-	58
4.4	RIVER BASIN AUTHORITIES (RBAS) AND RURAL DEVELOPEMNT IN PLATEAU STATE	-	-	-	-	63
4.5	COOPERATIVE SOCIETIES AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT	-				64
4.6	COOPERATIVE SOCIETIES AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PLATEAU STATE	-	-	-	-	65
4.7	POVERTY REDUCTION AGENCIES AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PLATEAU STATE	-	-	-	-	69
4.7.1	National Directorate of Employment (NDE)	-	-	-	-	69
4.7.2	National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP)	--	-	-	-	73
4.8	COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATIONS AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PLATEAU STATE	-	-	-	-	76
4.9.	FAITH BASED ORGANIZATIONS AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PLATEAU STATE	-	-	-	-	79
4.9.1	People Oriented Development of ECWA (POD) in Plateau State	-				80
4.9.2	Rural Christian Organization (RURCON) in Plateau State	-	-			86
4.9.3	Catholic Archdiocesan Rural and Urban Development in Plateau State	-	-	-	-	86
CHAPTER FIVE						
DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS						
5.1	DATA PRESENTATION-	-	-	-	-	88
5.1.1	Report of findings using the Table of Percentage	-	-	-	-	88
5.2	TEST OF RESEARCH HYPOTHESES-	-	-	-	-	100
5.3	ANALYSIS OF BUDGETS ALLOCATION IN PLATEAU STATE FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-	-	109
5.4	ANALYSIS OF SELECTED RURAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES IN PLATEAU STATE-	-	-	-	-	115
5.4.1	Plateau Agricultural Development Programme (PADP)	-	-			115
5.4.2	Plateau Direct Labour Agency (DLA)	-	-			121
5.4.3	Plateau Rural Water and Sanitation Agency (PRUWASSA)	-	-			123
5.5	DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	-	-	-	-	126

CHAPTER SIX
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	-	-	-	-	-	-	131
6.2	CONCLUSION	-	-	-	-	-	-	132
6.3	RECOMMENDATIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-	133
6.4	CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE-	-	-	-	-	-	-	134
6.5	LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	-	-	-	-	-	-	135
	REFERENCES	-	-	-	-	-	-	136
	APPENDICES	-	-	-	-	-	-	149

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Local Government Areas and their Population - - -	48
2	Sampled Local Government Areas, their Population and Sample Size - - - - -	50
3	Number of Cooperatives in Plateau State According to Types as at October 1996 - - - - -	67
4	Number of Trained Persons and Amount Disbursed in Plateau State by NDE in 2004 - - - - -	72
5a	Activities of Peoples Oriented Development of ECWA in Plateau State 1999 – 2005 - - - - -	83
5b	Assessment of the Activities of People Oriented Development of ECWA 2002- 2003 - - - - -	84
6	People Oriented Development of ECWA Field Activities 4 th Phase - - - - -	85
7	Areas of Benefit from Rural Development by the Three Selected Agencies to Plateau Communities - - -	89
8	Level of Involvement of the Beneficiaries of Rural Development Agencies in the Projects Located in their Communities - - - - -	91
9	Rating of Rural Development Programmes in Plateau State - - - - -	93
10	Assessment of the Involvement of Non Governmental Institutions in Rural Development in Plateau State - - -	95
11	Levels of Government that assist Communities in Self-help Rural Programmes in Plateau State- - - - -	97
12	Nature of Assistance Provided by the Three Levels of Government for Rural Development in Plateau State - - -	99
13	Stage of Involvement of Beneficiaries of Rural Development in Projects Conception and Implementation in Plateau State - - - - -	101

14	Chi-Square Calculation from Field Data to Test Hypothesis 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	104
15	Impact of Agencies on Rural Development in Plateau State -	-	-	-	-	-	-	106
16.	Chi-Square Calculation from Field Data to Test Hypothesis 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	108
17	Budget Allocations to Rural Development Agencies in Plateau State (1999 – 2010)	-	-	-	-	-	-	112
18	Analysis of Capital Budgetary Releases to the Three Rural Development Agencies in Plateau State (1999 – 2010) -	-	-	-	-	-	-	113
19	Percentage of Budget Released Compared to Total Yearly Budget in Plateau State (1999 – 2010)	-	-	-	-	-	-	114
20	Achievements of PADP between (1987 – 2004)	-	-	-	-	-	-	120

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ADP	Agricultural Development Programme
CBOS	Community Based Organizations
COWAN	Country Women Association of Nigeria
CRUDEP	Catholic Archdiocesan Rural Development
DIFRRI	Directorate of Foods, Roads and Rural Infrastructure
DLA	Direct Labour Agency
ECWA	Evangelical Church of West Africa
EU	European Union
IGRD	Integrated Rural Development
LGA	Local Government Area
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
NAPEP	National Poverty Eradication Programme
NDE	National Directorate of Employment
NEEDS	National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy
NGOS	Non Governmental Organizations
PADP	Plateau Agricultural Development Programme
PLASEEDS	Plateau State Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy
POD	Peoples Oriented Development
PRUWASSA	Plateau Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Agency
RBDA'S	River Basins Development Agencies
RURCON	Rural Development Counselors for Christian Churches in Nigeria

UNECEF	United Nations Educational Cultural and Economic Foundation
VIP	Ventilated Improved Latrines
WAS COM	Water and Sanitation Committee
WASU	Water and Sanitation Units

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX		PAGE
1A	Research Questionnaire for Rural Communities in Plateau State. - - - - -	149
1B	Interview Schedule with Chief Executives of Rural Development Agency in Plateau State. - - - -	156
2	Existing Equipments of Plateau Agricultural Development Programme (PADP). - - - - -	159
3	Summary of Projects Executed by Plateau State Direct Labour Agency between 2000- 2008 - - - -	160
4	Direct Labour Agency Road Projects Executed by May 2004, Northern Zone - - - - -	167
5	Summary of Projects Executed by PRUWASSA (Sanitation Department (2000-2007) - - - - -	177

ABSTRACT

This work evaluates the strategies of programmes implementation in Plateau State as they affect rural development between 1999 – 2010, using the three selected rural development agencies in Plateau State (the Plateau State Director Labour Agency, Plateau State Agricultural and Rural Development Programme, and Plateau State Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Agency) as case study. This was done through the following methodology. The purposive sampling technique was used to select the respondents who responded to the questionnaire administered. Interviews were used to collect information from the general managers of the selected rural development agencies. Information were also collected from the files, records and mission statements of the three selected rural development agencies in Plateau State, identified for the purpose of this research. The data collected were analyzed using simple percentage tables and the chi-square statistic was used in testing the research hypotheses. The work came out with the following findings: (i) that the state allocations to rural development in the yearly budget is not up to 1% of the total budget, (ii) that the beneficiaries of rural development are not involved in programmes initiation and implementation in Plateau State, (iii) that the three selected rural development agencies have not impacted positively on rural development in Plateau State. The research made the following recommendations based on the findings; that for effective performance of the study agencies, the beneficiaries should be involved at every stage of the programme(s). There should be the involvement of beneficiaries of rural development programmes in the process of programmes initiation/conception and implementation. There should be an agency on rural development, with a trust-fund contributed by the state, local governments and donor agencies in order to increase the rate of rural

development in the state. The agency on rural development should be located and coordinated from the Governor's office to ensure that all communities are reached. The research concluded that in view of the failure of the Top-down approach to rural development in the state, the Bottom-up approach be adopted. This is so because the Bottom-up approach is people centred, democratic, and representative of the interest of the beneficiaries of rural development in their own affairs.

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

More than 70% of Nigerians live in the rural areas, hence there is a need for the government to take the issue of rural development seriously, particularly issues related to the formulation and implementation of rural development policy (Nzimiro, 1985:1-3, 1990 population census). Besides, there is a global concern on issues of poverty and rural development by state governments and the United Nations. Any attempt to improve the rural condition is a welcome development. Nzimiro (1985:5-81) argues that:

part of the reasons for interest in rural development study is because of the increase in social differentiation between the rural and urban areas. The dwindling quality of rural life had encouraged many rural producers to escape from the suffering of rural poverty to urban misery.

The level of development in Nigeria is too low considering the amount of resources at Nigeria's disposal. In the immediate post independence years for instance, Nigerians had expected tremendous positive changes in their conditions of living. This however, was not the case. This condition of backwardness may be attributed to the level of development bequeathed to the nationalists at independence by the colonial masters who saw the rural areas as mainly sources of raw materials for export. (Rodney; 1972, Ake, 1981; Alkasum, 1986).

The modernization approach imported from the Western developed economies failed to transform the third world societies. Modernization was simply the adaptation of western institutions, structures, and values such as the Weberian type of bureaucracy, periodic elections, and excessive capital formation for investment and industrialization, etc.

Todaro and Smith (2006:435) have argued in support of this position that:

Based on the historical experience of western countries economic development was seen as requiring a rapid structural transformation of the economy from one predominantly focused on agricultural activities to a more complex modern industrial and service sector. As a result, agriculture's primary role was to provide sufficient low – priced food and manpower to the expanding industrial economy, which was thought to be the dynamic leading sector in any overall strategy of economic development.

Todaro and Smith argued further that, today, as we have seen, development economists are less sanguine about the desirability of placing such heavy emphasis on industrialization. They have come to realize that far from playing passive supporting role in the process of economic development, the agricultural sector and the rural economy in general must play an indispensable part in any overall strategy of economic progress.

Rural development has been approached from different perspectives, using different models or approaches. Modernization for example is supported by western capitalist countries, where it is seen as the process of transformation of society from its old ways to a new one. Ujo (1994:113) argues that, modernization is a process of total transformation of a traditional society to the type of technology and associated organization that is characteristic of the advanced economically prosperous and relatively politically stable nations of the western world.

It is argued by the proponents of modernization that, third world societies are backward because they lack technological skills necessary for development. They need to adopt new western technology and institutions that are more effective and efficient. The solution to the problem, Nkom argues (1995:23) “is assumed to be in

the adoption of modern technologies, institutions, managerial systems and ways of doing thing”. Some modernization scholars such as Williams, Mabogunje, Famiriyo see rural development as agrarian transformation, where modern methods of farming are adopted with new high yielding crops that is why the Agricultural Development Projects (ADP) were introduced in the early 1980s. To Mabogunje, it is integrated rural development where different facets or sectors are improved at the same time. Williams (1985), Mabogunje (1992) and Famiriyo (1985) have discussed extensively on this approach which involves agrarian transformation process of infrastructure provision such as construction of schools, clinics, and promotion of small scale enterprises, etc. All of these approaches are classified under the top-down strategy of rural development. There is also the redistributive Justice model whose emphasis is on equity and social justice. The model encourages land redistribution to the poor, access to basic social amenities, and participation by the people in the formulation of rural development policies. Community development is also one of the approaches which lay emphasis on mobilization of the people for self help. The two approaches are seen as the bottom up approach. Plateau State has adopted one or a combination of the approaches above particularly the adoption of western mechanized methods of farming under the current regime of Jonah Jang. Farm model centres managed by the Israelis, and the Plateau Agricultural Development Programme, a World Bank initiative, with a view to transforming agriculture, which invariably translates into rural development, using the top-down approach to rural development, but rural development goes beyond agricultural transformation. That is why the study of the three selected agencies are helpful if we are to understand the challenges of rural development in Plateau State.

The primary motivation to this study is the visible rural neglect, poverty and backwardness seen in the rural areas of Plateau State. Over the years, statements are made by government to transform the rural areas, yet you find the rural areas with bad roads, ill-equipped hospitals, no good drinking water, insufficient schools, etc. What has happened to the policy statements, programmes and budget allocations to the rural areas? The study has identified Plateau Agricultural Development Programme, Direct Labour Agency and Plateau Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Agency, because by their objectives, they have direct bearing on rural development in the state. It is for this reason that this research investigates the mission of the three selected agencies, their operation, and the extent of their impact on the rural conditions in Plateau State. The study also investigates the challenges faced by these agencies in the discharge of their functions.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Analysis of the Nigerian rural condition suggests that rural areas in Nigeria are in a state of neglect, with serious consequence for development in general and national development in particular (Olatonbosun, 1975). Colonial rule which gave credence to extraction of raw materials for export at the expense of food crops and other aspects of rural development laid the foundation for rural neglect. Even though the raw materials were extracted from the rural areas, the rural areas were neglected in terms of infrastructure development. There was also too much concern on the production of cash crops rather than developing indigenous food crops such as cassava, yams, cocoyam, etc which cater for the nutritional needs of the rural dwellers (Abba and Anazodo, 2006).

This trend seems to have impacted on our post-colonial elite who saw development as simply the adoption of modernization in agriculture. This may have

explained the reasons for the adoption of agrarian transformation through mechanization, importation of fertilizers, building of gigantic dams etc. as a solution to the agrarian crisis (Nzimiro, 1985, Nkom, 1985). The establishment of the Agricultural Development Projects (ADPS) in the early 1980s, the River Basins, construction of dams, etc were all aimed at propagating agrarian transformation which was seen as the major catalyst for rural development (Otaki, 2005).

The Federal and State governments began to place high premium on creating institutions, which were perceived to bring about rural development. For instance, the Operation Feed the Nation (OFN) was introduced by the Obasanjo regime in the early 70s, Shagari introduced Green Revolution in the 80s in which the Agricultural Development Projects (ADPS) became prominent. Babangida introduced Directorate for food roads and rural infrastructure (DFRRI), National directorate of employment (NDE), National Poverty eradication programme (NAPEP) and People's Bank in the 90s, while Obasanjo in the fourth Republic (1999), focused on National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP), and small-scale enterprises, etc. All of these institutions had their roles in rural development, but there was no concerted effort by the federal government as a matter of policy to evolve a comprehensive approach to rural development. In Plateau State, efforts towards rural development include the Agricultural project, Direct Labour Agency, Plateau Rural Water and Sanitation Agency, etc. All these have minimal impact on rural development.

Despite several attempts by the Federal and state governments through the introduction of rural development programmes such as Agricultural Development, Water Supply, rural infrastructure for rural development, the rural condition has not changed much. This forms the major statement of the research problem. The study investigates the strategy adopted for rural development in Plateau State to find out if it

has achieved the desired results or not, in the light of the aforementioned role of Agencies created in the State to accomplish the goal of rural development between 1999-2010.

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research is guided by the following research questions:

- (i) Are the programmes adopted for rural development in Plateau State appropriate?
- (ii) Are the strategies adopted for implementation relevant?
- (iii) Are the beneficiaries of the programme involved in the process of programme conception and implementation?.
- (iv) Are budgetary allocations to rural development in Plateau State adequate?
- (v) What are the challenges to rural development in Plateau State?

1.4 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The main objective of the study is to find out if the strategies to rural development adopted by the Plateau State Government promoted or retarded rural development. The specific objectives are as follows:

- i To assess the strategies of rural development in Plateau State between 1999 to 2010, using the three selected rural development agencies as case study.
- ii. To determine the level of involvement of the beneficiaries of rural development in the initiation and implementation of rural development programmes in the state, using the three selected rural development agencies as case study.
- iii. To evaluate the extent of programmes success with respect to rural development programmes in Plateau State using the three selected institutions

ie Plateau Agricultural Development Programme, Director Labour Agency, Plateau Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Agency.

- iv. To recommend ways of enhancing rural development in Plateau State if need be.

1.5 RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The study is guided by the following research hypotheses.

- H1: There is a significant relationship between the involvement of the beneficiaries and the successful implementation of rural development programme in Plateau State.
- H2: There is a significant relationship between the activities of the selected rural Development Agencies ie Plateau Agricultural Development Programme, Plateau Direct Labour Agency, and Plateau Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Agency and their level of impact on Rural Development in Plateau State.
- H3: There is a significant relationship between the strategy of rural development adopted in Plateau State and the level of rural development in the state.

1.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study is expected to contribute to the ongoing discussion on how to improve the rural areas as it is being addressed by African Heads of State through the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) policy/framework, and the Millennium Development Goals of the United Nations Organization. The study is also expected to contribute to the literature on rural development, and development administration in particular since a critical analysis of the institutions, programmes and policies under study in Plateau State's rural development efforts shall enable us proffer some solutions to the development problematic and thus a contribution to development administration, in general and public Administration in particular.

Also, the study is expected to benefit government/policy makers from its findings and recommendations which can help influence the strategies of rural development programmes in Plateau State and Nigeria in general. The study provides academics with empirical data on rural development programmes in Plateau State. Also, the general public can benefit when new strategies are adopted to change the conditions of the rural people in Plateau State.

1.7 OPERATIONALIZATION OF CONCEPTS

The following section focuses on the explanation of concepts that are used within the context of this research and their working definitions. These concepts are:-

1.7.1. Development

The concept of development has different meanings for different people. For the purpose of this research, we view development as a process of societal transformation from a state of underdevelopment, to a state of growth, progress and fulfillment where the basic needs of life such as food, shelter, clothing, health, education, transportation, water, etc are met with no constraints.

1.7.2 Rural Development

Rural development as the word implies is the development of a segment of the society i.e. the rural areas. Thus, rural development can be seen as a process in which a set of technological, socio-cultural and institutional measures are implemented with or for the inhabitants of the rural areas, with the aim of improving their socio-economic status or living condition in order to achieve a balance between the local and national sectors of the economy. For the purpose of this study, rural development means, a deliberate activity by the rural people themselves in conjunction with government or non-governmental agencies to change the well-being of the rural people for better, that is from an undesirable to a desirable state.

1.7.3 Development Strategy

A development strategy or policy is simply the method, approach or model of development adopted by a country for its rural development.

1.7.4 Rural Development Policy

Rural development policy may include a study of the rural setting, a study of property relations, individual rural property holding, social conditions of the peasantry, mode of production, etc. For the purpose of this research, rural development policy is a purposive course of action taken by a country, government, institution or community to address the problem of rural backwardness in order to bring about change or improvement in the rural condition. This is usually achieved through projects or a programme e.g. improving agriculture through the Agricultural Development Project (ADP).

1.7.5 Policy Evaluation

Policy evaluation is an assessment, appraisal or judgment of a policy, to find out if the policy has addressed the problems identified in its objectives or not. If so, to what extent? If not, why? In this study we are adopting the definition by SAPRU.

1.7.6 Policy Impact Analysis

Policy impact analysis is an evaluation of policy on the targeted population to find out if the goals of the policy are met or not. Policy evaluation serves the purpose of providing reliable information about policy performance and helps in clarifying policy goals (values) objective; it may also help in restructuring a policy or bring out new problems that require new policy objectives. Policy evaluation is based on the criteria of “effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, equity, and appropriateness” (SAPRU, 2006: 72 -77) Thus;

- a. Effectiveness refers to the degree to which a given course of action results in the attainment of an objective(s).
- b. Efficiency is used to denote the input/output ratio of an administrative unit. When viewed in naira terms, it refers to the cost of outputs. It is measured by calculating the cost per unit of production or service.
- c. Adequacy refers to whether a given policy has addressed the problem well or not. It is the amount of satisfaction derived from a policy. A policy may be effective and efficient but not adequate.
- d. Equity refers to fairness or justice in the system. A policy is equitable when it tries to reduce inequality in the system; e.g. poverty reduction programmes (NAPEP, NDE, Micro-credit) etc. It may be equitable but not efficient, or effective.
- e. Appropriateness here refers to the suitability of a policy or its fairness in addressing the problem. For the purpose of this research, we are adopting SAPRUS position on policy impact analysis, but limiting ourselves to the issues of effectiveness, adequacy and appropriateness due to the research methodology adopted in this work which is inadequate to measure efficiency, appropriateness and equity. Policy evaluation though desirable has its limitations because the evaluator may input his bias or the officials may give false information just to promote the regime's policy. A combination of the content analysis and the interviews help to reduce the problem/limitations of evaluation in this work, because the records speak for themselves, and the opinions of the respondents are reported as stated in the questionnaire.

1.8 SCOPE AND DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study covers the period 1999 to 2010, and also covers six local governments in Plateau State, two from each senatorial district, all of which are rural local governments in terms of infrastructure provision, and spatial distribution of

population. They are all agro-based rural areas in terms of economic activities. The study is limited by the fact that not all the 17 local governments in the state are covered. However, the six local governments are representatives of the 17 local governments in the state.

CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 AFRICA'S UNDERDEVELOPMENT

The concept of development is relevant to human society and rural development in general. Rodney (1972) views development as a human activity, where skills are acquired, capacity is built, creativity and self-discipline are acquired in order to face the challenges of life and overcome human needs and wants. He argues that development is a universal process. However, Africa's development was retarded because of the impact of slave trade and colonialism. The consequence of this was underdevelopment of Africa. Rodney, (1972:24) argues thus:

for the first three decades of colonialism, hardly any thing was done that could remotely be termed a service to the African people. It was infact only after the last war that social services were provided as a matter of policy. How little they amounted to does not really need illustrating. After all, the statistics which show that Africa today is underdeveloped are the ones representing the state of affairs at the end of colonialism.

Development by western scholars has been seen as synonymous with modernization or transformation from a pre-modern to modern stage (Rostow 1960, Gana, 1987; Hopkins; 1979). Hopkins (1978:27), contends that ...the dependency thesis argues that "it is the external links which have created economic backwardness by forging chains of dependence and inequality between the privileged core and the exploited periphery". It is in this line that Walter Rodney anchors his thesis "How Europe underdeveloped Africa"

Rodney's work is a detailed historical account of the integration of Africa in the world economy through slave trade, imperialism, colonialism, which contributed in the plunder of Africa's human and raw materials to Europe. This action led to the

stagnation of African's development and its dependency status on Europe; hence the thesis that "Africa is underdeveloped", because Europe plundered its resources. Rodney contends that, "in order to understand the present economic condition, Africa has realized so little of its natural potential and one also needs to know why so much of its present wealth goes outside of the continent (Rodney, 1972:24). Bourgeois economists have refused to give a historical account of the relationship of exploitation which allowed capitalist parties the core to grow fat and impoverished the dependent (Africa), and that "the interpretation of under-development as ordained by God is simply racist and prejudice to explain the underdeveloped state of Africa.

Rodney's methodology is a historical and detailed explanation of the factors that have led Africa not to be developed or became backward, some of which include slave-trade, imperialism, colonialism, unequal or unbalanced trade, exploitation, cultural and psychological dislocation of Africa in favour of western values. The objective of Rodney's work is to expose the damage that Europe has done to Africa using the historical analysis methodology, so that Africans should appreciate their good past and reconstruct their development from within, using their own resources instead of depending on the west or simply modernization or westernization.

Rodney (1972:30) argues thus "African economies are integrated into the very structure of the developed capitalist economy and they are integrated in a manner that is unfavourable to Africa... indeed structural dependence is one of the characteristics of underdevelopment". This economic subordination also led to political subordination through remote control of political leaders and institutions in their colonies, thereby producing puppet governments in Africa who shamelessly agree to compromise their peoples, interest, in favour of what their "masters tell them". The

summary of Rodney's findings can be presented in a statement credited to him when he (1972:33) says thus:

The question as to who and what is responsible for African underdevelopment can be considered at two levels. First, the answer is that the operation of the imperialist system bears major responsibility for African economic retardation by draining African wealth and by making it impossible to develop more rapidly the resources of the continent. Secondly, one has to deal with those who are either agents or unwitting accomplices of the system. The capitalists of western Europe were the ones who actively extended their exploitation from inside Europe to cover the whole of Africa.

This work is a path breaking one in trying to understand the state of development in Africa, and Nigeria inclusive. However, it has some gaps.

The study failed to explain the role of traditional African leaders in the whole process of trade and colonialism. They accepted some of the European terms voluntarily, and at the same time they also created local-core-periphery relationship in their attempt to satisfy the colonial masters. To that extent, the level of exploitation was uneven—that is some areas were advantaged while others were disadvantaged resulting into what some political commentators refer to as “internal colonialism”. Secondly, Rodney apart from stating the case of underdevelopment did not provide a workable solution to get out of the trap by Africa. The solution seems to be delinking of Africa from the West. However, can that work in an increasingly globalized world?

This work agrees with historical analysis of the causes of Africa's backwardness, by Rodney, but would fill in the gaps by examining the model of development that can best take Plateau State from its present state of backwardness

looking at the top-down approach which colonialism, modernization and westernization has foisted on Nigeria since independence to date.

2.2 **RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

Rural development must be targeted at the people as the beneficiaries of development. Chinsman (1988:3-4) asked the question, why put people first? In his view, “development is a process of economic and social advancement which enables people to realize their potential, build self-confidence, and live lives of dignity and fulfillment. It is a process which, if sincerely implemented, frees people from evils of want, ignorance, squalor and exploitation”. Meaningful developments in general and rural development in particular require the full utilization of the nation’s own resources, both human and material.

The work by Chinsman (1983) is based on his experience in Nigeria as the UNDP Representative, where he agrees that development is about people and not objects or things. The people must come first in the process of planning for their development. He identifies the benefits of development to include economic and social advancement, building peoples’ potentials, self confidence, dignity, freedom from evils of want and deprivation, ignorance, etc. In all of these, the people must be involved from the beginning to the end of the programme and policies of government. This researcher agrees with Chinsman and sees his work as being in agreement with the bottom-up approach to rural development, which is adopted as our theoretical framework for this research.

National development without transforming the countryside is cosmetic and simply rhetorical. The Federal government, for instance, in its Third National Development- Plan 1975 -80, articulated the position thus,

In addition to raising agricultural productivity, effort will be made to enhance the quality of life in rural areas through the provision of basic social amenities such as health centres, pipe borne water, feeder roads, and electricity, the combined effect of these measures should help narrow the disparity in living standard between the urban and rural population.

The crux of the matter in this research is to find out to what extent rural development has been achieved in Plateau State. What role governmental institutions play and to what extent are they successful or not? What are the gaps between the theory and the practical aspects of rural development programmes as expressed by the different agencies and models of rural development in Plateau State and their stated objective?

2.3. REVIEW OF SCHOLARS' CONTRIBUTIONS TO RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The study came across a lot of literature on rural development as discussed in the theoretical framework and the definition of terms. However, for the purpose of emphasis, few of them were discussed to find out our points of departure or convergence from existing works in the field. Some of the selected works discussed below, could be categorized into the two major approaches or divides i.e. those that adopt the top-bottom approach on the one hand, and the bottom-up approach on the other. Works by the following scholars are discussed to enable us know their contributions, to the subject of study, and the weaknesses or gaps in their works, and how this research is to fill the gap if any. The scholars are, Nkom(1995), Ujo(1994), Williams(1985), Mabogunje(1992), Toyo(2002), Aziz(1980), Otaki(2005), Kolawole(1993), Okoye(1987), Allain(1975), Idode(1989), Dare(2008), Alli(1989), and Nweze(1988).

The literature is discussed in a thematic form, where scholars that discussed rural development from similar perspectives are grouped under one heading but their views are discussed separately to enable us understand their contributions to the subject of this research such as, the modernization, agrarian transformation, integration, community mobilization perspective and the political economy perspectives on rural development.

Modernization as a model of development simply means the transformation of societal ways of doing things from the traditional mode to the modern e.g. transformation of technology from traditional to commercial and mechanized agriculture, industrialization of society, and rapid urbanization (Prawl, 1969.20). Ujo(1994) and Nkom(1995) in their various works have discussed modernization as follows:

2.3.1 The Modernization Scholars

Ujo in his work “Development Administration in Nigeria”, attempts to explain modernization by defining it as, “a strategy designed to improve the economic and social life of a specific group of people- the rural poor. It involves extending the benefits of development to the poorest, among those who seek a livelihood in the rural areas”. . . (Ujo, 1994:111).

Ujo tries to describe rural development strategy in Nigeria using the modernization approach, which relies on the creation of institutions by the state for rural development. He also discusses the challenges of rural development to include, socio-cultural beliefs, old traditions and ways of doing things, economic backwardness, religious beliefs and taboos, all of which impact negatively on the transformation of agriculture, industries, and the adoption of new technology in agriculture. To Ujo, rural development is contingent on the fundamental re-structuring

of the rural space, settlement, the creation of rural structures to facilitate financial resources for investment, mobilization of farmers, through effective organizational framework, provision of appropriate technology, food, housing, water supply, health services, creation of efficient transport network for rural and urban areas, agricultural transformation, to ensure food and raw materials production for industries, and the creation of progressive social system in rural areas (Ujo, 1994 112-113).

The description of modernization in the paragraph above is apt and correct. It is the typical westernization of society described as modernization. The model by Ujo however relies on the state to create all the structures and institutions, and also do the mobilization of “creative progressive social groups”. This is the top-down model of rural development which to the researcher, is inadequate because the people are seen as mere objects and not subjects of development. This model is seen as highly inadequate by the researcher and cannot serve our purpose of transforming rural societies on the Plateau. To the researcher, it is a model that can only work if the people are involved at the level of strategy, formulation and implementation of rural development programmes/policies. To that extent, the model cannot serve our purpose in this study.

Nkom (1995:19-31) on the other hand, discusses the background to the African agrarian crisis, where he argues that it was the optimism of the 1950s and 60s, that rapid agricultural transformation will occur once innovations in agrotechnologies and modern farming are introduced. However, this optimism faded away in the mid 1970s to the 1980s where food imports became the dominant feature of most African states trade with the west. To Nkom, the solution to this problem is to liberate the masses from rural poverty and exploitation which modernization has brought. He sees modernization or transformation of agriculture as, “mere panic

measures, which are adventurist policies that are elite biased and foisted on the rural masses in the name of rural development (Nkom, 1995).

The elite who are the architects of modernization are arrogant and feel they have all the knowledge to rural problems, and they jettison the knowledge of rural people acquired through centuries of experience as primitive and unscientific or traditional. Also, Nkom sees elite approach to rural development as a purely technicist issue with emphasis on programmes and projects without much involvement of the people at the point of conception and implementation. He argues that,

modernization theory takes off from the premise that rural development derives essentially from the primitive, unproductive and change-resistant values, institutions and technologies found in traditional societies which is characterized by inefficiency, low productivity and institutional inertia. The prevalence of tradition which represents primitivism and underdevelopment is quite central to modernization theory (Nkom, 1995).

The model has failed according to Nkom “because it is rooted in western prototypes of development where the people are seen as objects, not subjects of development”. This model is top-down bureaucratic and centralized approach to rural development Nkom (1988:29) further argues thus,

consequently the peasants have over the years been transformed into helpless victims of the adventurist policies of the arrogant technocrats (Bureaucrats), whose knowledge of the rural population is questionable which is derived from theories and paradigms that are of western origin.

To Nkom, the participatory strategy, where the rural people themselves are involved in the development process is the best option since according to him, no government can even have the knowledge and resources to single handedly

transform the rural areas. The strategy of rural development should emphasize the constructive tapping of the wisdom, resources, and energies of the local people in the task of development (Nkom 1988:29)

Rural development programmes are to be decentralized and handed to the local governments where grass-roots institutions are involved in the formulation and implementation of such programmes. Nkom (1995:30) supports the participatory approach to rural development as expressed below.

a participatory model of development involves the strengthening and use of existing peoples, organizations as instruments for initiating and supporting development.

The work strongly identifies with Nkom's views on participatory development, particularly the decentralization of development to the local governments where the people are involved in the planning, formulation, and execution of the programmes. However, the researcher differs from Nkom, where he believes that the state government should provide the policy framework with inputs from the local governments through their elected councilors on the nature and content of rural development policies/programmes in order to ensure that the local governments do not go to sleep as usual and leave the people to their fate. The states can assist the local governments with finance and technical know-how in conjunction with community associations that are the direct representatives of the people. However, Nkom's critique of the modernization model is comprehensive and very apt which does not require any debate.

Nkom's work is a critique of the modernization model adapted to agriculture particularly in the early 1970s where emphasis was on agrarian transformation via the World Bank Agricultural development sponsored projects. The objectives of this

work by Nkom' is to expose the limitation of the agrarian transformation model of rural development in Nigeria. He succeeded in explaining the failure of the model, where instead of food sufficiency, Africa's food import became the order of the day. The findings of this work is the perception gap between the elite who are champions of modernization in agriculture, and the local farmers who are perceived as ignorant and backwards, but at the end of the day, they provide the bulk of the food we eat. They have better knowledge of their farm environment, than the so called agricultural elite policy makers.

The work concludes that a participatory bottom-up approach is the solution to the food crisis, and rural under development in general. Nkom however leaves the job to state institutions, which to this researcher is going back to square one. The solution to this according to the researcher is in using local governments in collaboration with the peoples' organizations such as cooperative societies, community development associations that can plan, monitor and evaluate the implementation of the agricultural policies and programmes of the state, under the agricultural development programme.

2.3.2 The Agrarian Transformation Scholars

Williams (1985:3-121), examines the theory and strategy for rural development, with a focus on agricultural transformation via the application of science and technology and extension services, plus the training of personnel in order to improve our traditional method of farming. The magic of improved agriculture product will come if these improved methods and technology are properly communicated to the rural dwellers. William's focus is also on adopting the integrated approach to rural development. He contends that "integrated rural development then appears to be one of the basic ways of Nigeria harnessing her natural resources for the benefit of her people". Williams (1985:20) further states:

that a combination of factors, not only the right technology and education, but also access to physical inputs and attractive markets, integrated rural development means a multi-dimensional approach, thus rural extension programmes . . . education, health, rural electrification, cooperatives, each must be considered in connection with every other. He advocates for the creation of a central coordinator to head the council or unit that coordinates the different aspects of rural development.

The work subscribes to the views of Williams on his integrated approach which is multi-dimensional and participatory in the sense that the people are involved in the decision making process. However, Williams' work has its short comings.

- (1) It relies on external inducement for the people to adopt new methods and ideas of transforming agriculture, and later integrated rural development.
- (2) It lays emphasis on adaptation of foreign technology.
- (3) It also emphasises on the bureaucracy as the agent of change via the council to coordinate integrated rural development. All of these are okey if Williams sticks to modernization and transformation which is a top-down approach. The participation of rural people in his integration model will fail because the model itself does not rely on the people. The people are seen as objects of development and not subjects of development.

William's work focuses on two things, education of farmers through extension services and integrated approach to rural development in Nigeria. Williams discusses the strategy of extension services and his integrated approach. However, the work fails to link the people, the beneficiaries of the rural development to his integrated approach, where he relies on external inducement and adaptation of foreign technology, to be coordinated by the bureaucrats in the ministry of agriculture. The

adoption of modernization (top-down model of rural development) alongside integration of the people is a contradiction. The top-down model does not itself recognize the independent action of the people.

The gap in this literature is how can a model that is anti people adopt an integrated approach which is people oriented? This research adopts the integrated model by Williams, but rejects his top-down approach to rural development. The integrated model is better adopted in a bottom-up approach, which is the gap that this researcher intends to fill by the use of the integrated model, with a bottom-up, people oriented, and participatory approach to rural development. However, this work departs from that of Otaki through the study of the impact analysis of rural development agencies in Plateau State using the agricultural development project which Otaki discussed extensively. The agricultural development projects are top-down, agrarian transformation models of rural development. An impact analysis of this approach to rural development in Plateau State is what differentiates the approach by this researcher from that of Otaki, whose work is on Nigeria as a whole. This study focuses only on Plateau State. Otaki's focus is mainly on the transformation of agriculture via the Agricultural Development Projects; (ADPS) and the River Basin Development Authorities. He examines extensively the strategy and funding of the ADPS and River Basins, and their effects on transforming the rural areas. The work also examines the rural-urban divide in Nigeria, and concludes that our development policy is in favour of the urban areas to the neglect of the rural areas. It is also a top-down approach to rural development (Otaki, 2005:77-58). The work is detailed and incisive, it is one of the recent works on rural transformation. However, it still belongs to the traditional modernization school, which sees rural development within the lense of agrarian transformation (Otaki, 2005: 54, Todaro and Smith,

2003:452). The work throws light on the conditions of the rural societies in Nigeria, but fails to develop a model that can capture the problems, even though agrarian transformation has been the focus of this work. It is not a complete model to transform the rural areas. The work also fails to make an analysis of the impact of the agrarian transformation on the communities studied.

Kolawole's work is a case study of the two mentioned agencies (Kaduna State ADP and DFRRI) and the researcher adopted the evaluative approach through the use of questionnaire and interviews on selected local governments and communities in Kaduna State. The study examines different models of rural development particularly the integrative approach. (Kolawole, 1993:26). The study also examines the experiences of Tanzania, and Nigeria's rural development policies from 1900 particularly Nigeria's experiences from 1960 –70, 1970 – 80- to the 1990's and concludes that, there was no evidence that:

there was widespread consultation and involvement of the people in the conception, priorities, objectives, and aspirations which went into the formulation of the policies neither was there popular discussion and evaluation of the policies. (Kolawole, 1993:113).

The study concludes that the Kaduna state government did not succeed in its rural development effort through ADP and DFRRI, because the projects were not properly funded, though the level of mobilization and enlightenment of the people was high (Kolawole, 1993:213-220). The work is detailed enough on the methodology and theories of rural development particularly the integrated approach via DFRRI and the ADP in Kaduna State. The researcher benefited from his methodology but differs a little from his work, because Kolawole was interested in the funding of these projects and the views of traditional institutions and farmers.

He argues for the involvement of the traditional institution in the decision making process. This work however is interested in both funding and the impact of the policy on the rural people.

The study by Kolawole is an evaluation of the contribution of Agricultural development projects (ADPS) and Directorate of Food Road and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI) to rural development in Kaduna State. The variable employed towards this end was the improvement of agriculture and social welfare in the rural areas. The study also examined the commitment of the government and the involvement of traditional institutions in the attainment of the objectives of these rural development programmes.

The study's results showed that both the ADP and DFRRI have not satisfactorily improved agriculture and social welfare in Kaduna State. Neither crops output nor the levels of income of the people have improved. The study also found that, overall, the government has not been committed to rural development as seen from the cases of the ADP and DFRRI. Government was only committed to the area of educational institutions and health facilities in the rural areas. The findings also indicated that funding for the programmes are not adequate. The study also found out that traditional institutions that are crucial to the success of the programme were sidelined. "This is in spite of the fact that the village heads and the paramount chiefs demonstrated interest in participating in community development projects in their communities"(Kolawole, 1993:viii). The study recommends an alternative form of rural development, that is, the Integrated Grassroots Development Bureau (IGDB), with the traditional institutions as part and parcel of the model from the grassroots to the national level.

This researcher agrees with the proposal by Kolawole, and that his work has covered most of the gaps identified in previous literature reviewed. His integrated model of rural development agrees with the researcher's model (participatory and integrated approach to rural development). The involvement of traditional institutions is also a bottom-up approach which is recommended for this study as in our theoretical frame work.

The loopholes in Kolawole's work is the absence of a clear participatory model for the people who ought to benefit from these ADP and DFRRRI programmes in Kaduna State. Little wonder the programmes did not succeed.

2.3.3 The Rural Integration Scholars

Mabogunje (1992:68) in an article "Integrated Rural Development", discusses the integrated approach to rural development. He sees integration to include multi-dimensional approach to rural development. It includes:- land reform, infrastructure development, agrarian reform, institutional reform, rural modernization, mass mobilization for decision making, distributive justice between the urban and rural areas.

The focus of his paper was on the Directorate for Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure, which he cited as an example of the integrated rural development. To him, the success of integrated rural development is in the ability of the state to mobilize the people, their resources, create appropriate institutions and agencies, establish agro- allied industries, and plan for the entire country (Mabogunje, 1992:68-70).

This model is fantastic in theory but at the level of practice, particularly with regards to DFFRI, it was a failure. This is so because the people have always been taken for granted. Government pays lipservice to their involvement. The approach by

Mabogunje in this work did not point-out clearly how the people are to be mobilized? and by who? The Integrated participatory model recommended in this study is expected to take care of the shortcomings of Mabogunje's integrated rural development approach.

2.3.4 **The Participatory Bottom-up Scholars**

Dare (2008:4-5) in his work, discusses the creation of local governments in Nigeria, Nigeria's, socio-political context, cultural diversity and the import of these on local government administration in Nigeria. A brief historical background of local government is also discussed. The focus however is on the problem of local government administration as a challenge to rural development such as finance, inadequacy of skilled workers, problems of participation and involvement of the people in the decision making process, general indiscipline, undue interference by the Federal and State governments in local administration, misplaced priority, etc. Under the problem of participation which is the key to rural development, Dare states thus:

local government prepares estimates for its revenue and expenditure without proper recourse to, and consultation with the people for whom the exercise is being carried out to know their needs, and their potentials. A number of factors are responsible for non- involvement of the people in their own affairs. These include.

- (a) Loss of interest in the project that will not benefit the chairmen and their cohorts,
- (b) The age-long belief by the officials that people are ignorant, illiterate and unenlightened;
- (c) Lack of political will by the leadership to run an open administration.

(d) Poverty of socio-political philosophy (ideology) (Dare,2008:5).

The work brought out the challenges of rural development in Nigeria, except for the fact that it is more of theoretical than empirical study. This research work is involved in a more empirical study that can help policy makers and administrators in Plateau State. This work on Plateau State rural development agencies, allows room for more in-depth analysis than that of Dare which is too general and theoretical. Dare is more interested in consulting of the people by the political executives in the local governments. This research differs from Dare's because our interest is beyond mere consultation. The researcher is interested in participatory decision making, and involving the people, the bottom-up approach to rural development; and not for consultation, which is still part of the top-bottom approach. The people may be consulted after the decision has been made by the Political executive, but they are not involved in the initiation and implementation stage.

Alli (1989:31) argues that the import of the 1976 local government reforms was to enhance the role of local governments in rural development and allow for local participation in the decision-making process. The writer contends that:

even though these objectives were sanctioned in the 1979 Constitution, the prevailing local government structure did not provide the opportunity for the people at the rural areas to influence decisions affecting them beyond electoral participation. In some cases, non-democratic institutions are imposed on the people.

This has been so because the Federal government was more interested in devolution rather than decentralization of power which can enshrine the principle of participatory democracy and political responsibility to every citizen (Alli, 1989:32). Alli argues strongly for the participation of the people, where he states . . .

the socialist oriented countries eg Tanzania have been able to mobilize the population and ensure both participation at the urban and rural levels. However, the capitalist oriented African countries emphasize the management model which is more concerned with delegation of functions to the rural areas. This model gives great role to the bureaucracy and premium on control rather than participation (Alli, 1989:33).

Alli also supports mobilizing the people for development through a leadership that can critically analyse the needs of the society and plan to meet them. This kind of leadership can only emerge through the electoral process (Alli, 1989:38). He concludes as follows:

we feel strongly also that co-operative movement for collective production and sale of goods would go a long way in improving the participation level in local government areas, help increase production, and protect the rural populace from the encroachment of capitalist absentee farmers. This is of great necessity particularly in River Basin Areas where lands are being taken away from peasant farmers, prepared through irrigation and other means, only to be handed over to absentee farmers (Alli, 1989:38).

Alli further argues that the local governments be recognized as institutions for rural development instead of proliferating agencies by the federal and state to play such role. The local governments are the closest tier to the people as such are best placed to implement rural development projects (Alli, 1989:38). This work concurs with Alli's views, except for the fact that he did not develop the blueprint for mobilizing the rural people to enable them participate in rural development. Though he alluded to the use of cooperatives, but mobilization should go beyond just cooperatives. The community based associations, age grades, women, youth and

religious bodies can also play an effective role. The local governments are in a very good position to do the mobilization as suggested by Alli. However, the state through its central agency, located in the Governor's office is in a better position to coordinate this effort. This work agrees with Alli's suggestion for participation by the people, and the involvement of local governments in mobilization for participation in rural development, but disagrees with him on the fact that the local governments need a coordinating agency located in the Governor's office to evaluate the efforts of the local governments and to fund the process of rural development in Plateau State. In the same vein, "perspectives on community and rural development in Nigeria", edited by Nweze, discussed rural development. In the work, there are topics on theoretical orientation to community development, applied issues in community development, community development and health care, and a conclusion. The work is mainly theoretical, there is not much empirical studies. The views are purely those of the contributors. The author summarizes the views as observation of the seminar/workshop some of which include the following:-

- (i) Some development programmes at the local level are handed down from higher tiers of government without consultation with those whose lives are directly affected.
- (ii) Community development programmes in Nigeria suffer from poor conception, selection and planning, Insufficiency of resources, inadequate staffing and poor staff motivation, excessive partisan politics and leadership tussles, conflict between traditional and new emergent leadership at the local level, poverty of a development ideology, unintegrated nature of development efforts, lack of adequate education and mobilization of the

people by the government to participate and maintain development projects at the grass-roots (Nweze, 1988:200- 202).

The views expressed by Nweze as summary of recommendations and observations on the workshop papers which are published are apt, in the sense that community development and social development which are sometimes treated as synonymous, are crucial to rural development in Nigeria. This is summed up by the UNO, (1960) “that the principles of community development are (a) self help, (b) attention to peoples needs, and (c) attention to the development of the community as an integrated whole”. These are the elements in rural development strategy that this work believes are essential in the bottom-up mobilization or participatory model of rural development advocated in this work.

This study shares all of the views expressed by Nweze in his summary of observations presented above. The point of departure or the gap in Nweze’s work is the lack of a clear cut model or strategy of rural development proposed to mitigate what he observed as the shortcomings in his summary/observations. There is no clear methodology to address these short comings. The gaps to be filled by this work is the provision of a clear model of rural development that is, bottom-up approach and the participatory integrated model of rural development in Plateau State which Nweze’s work failed to address.

Okoye’s work is an article titled, “social clubs, resource management and rural development in Nigeria: lessons from Anambra State”.which tries to discuss the role of groups such as social clubs in rural development. The study is on the role of social clubs as a vehicle for rural development in Anambra State particularly in Ihiala Local Government Area. The study analyzed 25 projects embarked upon by 50% of the social clubs in the area in terms of resources appraisal, utilization, management and

environmental harmony (Okoye, 1987:222). The author argues that of all the resources for development, the human resource is the most vital, but little has been done on human resource appraisal and management, and their use in the development of the rural areas. He concludes, thus:

consequently, rural development programmes in Nigeria have usually been designed along the lines of the project approach, that is provision of social and industrial projects in the rural areas by urban-based experts policy makers and elite groups. Little or no attempt has been made at tapping the huge reservoirs of human resources locked up in the rural areas for the benefit of developing such areas (Okoye, 1987:222).

The data for the study were derived from interviews with principal officers of the social clubs and visits to the project sites. In all, 42 social clubs were studied. The interviews covered the objectives of the club, membership, methods of funding, projects embarked upon, stage of execution, and the organization's conception of rural development (Okoye,1987:223-224). The researcher found out that membership was mainly of rich traders from nearby urban centres, who because of their newly acquired status, spent most of their week ends at home in the village. Most of them have little formal education, but have managed to succeed in business. The analysis shows that most of the projects completed or ongoing, or plots of land were for recreational facilities to cater for the comfort of members during their home visits, but were not relevant to the over all- well being of the rural communities. Okoye (1987:225) argues that:

the complete absence of social services infrastructures such as roads, schools, health facilities, water project etc. . . which touch directly on the welfare of the rural dwellers can be explained by the following factors

- (i) The social club's conception of rural development as the provision of recreational services for the comfort of the urban weekenders.
- (ii) Lack of guidance by government on how to rationally use resources for the over-all well being of the rural people.
- (iii) Their limited education and conception of rural development determined the project they embarked upon.

The author opines that the wastage of financial resources and land that could have been put for better economic use eg agriculture by these social clubs could have been avoided, if the government were to "plan and control the activities of the organizations (clubs) to ensure rational resource use and environmental harmony (Okoye, 1987:226). The author concludes that:

if these resources had been invested in agro- based and cottage industries in the rural areas, they would have helped a great deal in bettering the lot of the rural population and transforming the rural landscape in a well planned fashion (Okoye 1987:226). The author is of the opinion that as a matter of policy, the government should evolve machinery for supervising the activities of these organizations. . . .in order to ensure they do not deviate from approved guidelines (Okoye, 1987:226). To Okoye, the problem with rural development is not lack of resources, but the proper appraisal and management of available resources, and the avoidance of misplaced priorities. This work agrees with Okoye on his analysis of the issues in the paper, but would disagree with his proposition that the government sets a guideline for their supervision. This is so because the government itself lacks coherent policy blue-print for rural development. So, how can it guide the social clubs? The second reason is that some of the elites in government were members of these social clubs and use them to promote their new social status. How can they fight what they are part of?

The researcher subscribes to a wholistic policy/strategy of rural development which spells out the role of the government, social clubs, community based organizations, religious institutions and other non-governmental organizations as the only solution to the planlessness called rural development in Nigeria today. This is the focus of this research in rural development in Plateau state using the three study agencies as case studies, to assess the way resources are managed and how the people are involved in the process of rural development. One of the reasons for the failure of social clubs effort in rural development examined by Okoye is the top-down approach to rural development. The bottom –up approach adopted in this study is expected to fill in the gap that Okoye’s study has observed as the lack of social infrastructure such as roads, schools, health facilities provided by the social clubs, and the non-involvement of the people in deciding what they need or want(Okoye, 1987:225). Another member of this school of thought Aziz whose work is on “Rural Development: Learning from China”. It is a text that tries to explain the role played by Chairman Mao after the Chinese Revolution of 1949, in his attempt to transform the rural areas of China. The work emphasizes the import of ideology as a vehicle of transformation. The work described Chinese society before the revolution, and the efforts made by the communist party under Mao to change the old order. The society before the revolution was a class society with big land lords dominating the rural setting. There were also poor peasants and landless peasants. The revolution tried to reduce the inequality via a process of land reforms, agrarian reform through agricultural collectivization (cooperatives), diversification of the rural areas, provision of social services, ensuring political control of brigades and commands under the communist party (Aziz, 1980:10)

These reforms, particularly in agriculture, were also to include production of tractors, fertilizer, other farm inputs, and water resources development via construction of dams and canals. The benefit of pooling resources together in the cooperatives was to ensure that the poor peasants benefited from the rich peasants, also through land reforms every body has a piece of land to tilt.

The experience of China was to serve as a model to other third world countries. Aziz admits that the social and environmental context of China and other developing countries are not the same but there are lessons to be learnt from China.

Aziz's work is rich, and gives us a lot of insight into how a backward society like China can be transformed. The lessons if applied to Nigeria are useful. However, the limitation of the work is that it cannot be used as a model for all societies because of their peculiarities. It is a model we can adopt for Nigeria except for the revolution in land distribution and cooperativization. The Nigerian people must be properly educated if they are to depart with the spirit of individualism which colonialism has foisted on them. The conditions for a revolution must also be ripe for it to occur. Nigeria does not have the experience of China at the time Aziz described.

This work agrees with Aziz on the role of cooperatives and mobilization of cooperatives for rural development. The model and strategy Aziz adopted is good for society in revolutions, but Nigeria does not seem to have that revolutionary vanguard yet, hence the model has little utility to this study.

2.3.5 Political Economy Scholars

The work by Janvry is a publication in the American Journal of Agricultural Economics Vol. 57, No 3. August (1975), titled, "The Political Economy of Rural Development in Latin America" whose tool of analysis is the theory of unequal exchange between the periphery and the centre, and the interpretation of rural

development in Latin America. The work serves to explain the causality of agricultural stagnation under the dominance of the latifundio, and the economic functionality of the subsistence sector where rural poverty is concentrated (Janvry, 1975:490). The author argues that agricultural poverty has generally been analyzed in the context of traditional agriculture. In order to solve the problem, governments in this region, recommended the new technology in particular the Green –Revolution technology. The author argues further that:

the alternative interpretation that is defended in this paper is that underdevelopment cannot be treated apart from development, if backward areas or countries are related by the market to the advanced areas or countries (Janvry, 1975:490).

His analysis of agricultural performance in Latin America and most of the colonized less developed countries should be seen within the context of the economic destruction of traditional societies through market forces after the industrial revolution in England, the conditions of unequal exchange, between the developed and dependent nations,. . . all of which had led to structural dualism and marginalization of large sections of society. Rural Poverty should be analyzed in the framework of marginality rather than traditional culture (Janvry, 1975:491).

Rural development within the context of peripheral economies that operate within a largely marginalized social formation, can be explained in what the author call;

Socio-political structure of the country, class alliances between the traditional landed elite, national industrial capital, and foreign capital, while the socio-political nature of rural development programs is characterized as

integrative (instrument of social control) or incorporative (Instrument of social liberation).

The marginalized in agriculture are the farmers who lose control of the means of production because they cannot withstand the competitive pressure of the modern sector. They join the ranks of marginal as minifundistas and subsistence farmers in a modern economy. In peripheral economies, they constitute large masses that have been objectively created by the dynamics of accumulation.

The introduction of modern farming technologies and later import substitution industrialization did not solve the problems of the periphery because of the unequal exchange, marginalization of the rural poor as a result of an unbalanced terms of trade, resulting into declining prices of raw materials in the international market which further impoverishes the marginalized in agriculture:

Janvry (1975:494) states thus, “Even where outward growth can confer substantial dynamics to modern industrial enclave, reinforced structural dualism and marginality are the dominant traits of peripheral societies . . . these contradictions lead to agricultural stagnation and rural poverty”.

He states further that in most of Latin America, the opportunities for profitable industrial investment, created in the early 1900s, by import substitution policies, induced the traditional landed elites to extend their sectoral control toward industry and finance while retaining their control of land in the Latifandio, but because of the inherent contradictions of the capitalist economy, terms of trade were unfavourable to agriculture.

Development of a functional dualism between subsistence agriculture and the commercial sector is fully consistent with the needs of growth in the periphery under condition of unequal exchange. In this structure, the subsistence sector

produces cheap labor for the commercial sector which, in turn can produce cheap food for the market (both domestic and foreign). Janvry (1987:495) argues further that:

generally, rural poverty in Latin America is hence a logical outcome of three-level chain of exploitative relations, first the international level between dominant centres and dependent peripheries. Secondly, the sectoral level between modern industry which produces mass consumption items using cheap domestic labour and the consequent deterioration of the internal terms of trade. Thirdly, the social level between land lords and agricultural labour and marginal populations in the context of transmission of labour cost . . . and sectoral unequal exchange.

To understand rural poverty in most of Latin America, the concept of traditional agriculture needs to be replaced by that of functional marginality. Governments are interested in alleviating rural poverty only as a way of containing mass popular pressure brought about by increasing marginality and/or the economic goal of cheap labor from the minifundio, (Janvry 1975:496). Janvry (1975:297) states further that, “under these conditions, rural development projects, will tend to be aimed at prolonging the social status quo of contrived dualism. Therefore, at least initially, such projects will be integrative instruments of social control over the rural marginal”

To conclude this article, Janvry (1975:498) states:

the design of successful rural development projects requires a clear understanding of the process by which rural poverty is created and perpetuated through surplus accumulation by national and the metropolitan bourgeoisie .

The article uses hard political economy language to explain the state of rural development in Latin America particularly the concept of dependency, centre vs

periphery, unequal exchange, unfavourable terms of trade. The creation of marginality in the agricultural sector, and the pursuit of rural development projects, just as a means of containing mass revolt from the marginalized peasantry.

In Nigeria, the situation is the same with Latin America in terms of the ideology of the ruling elite. The only distinction is that the marginalized to this work, are more in the modern sector than in agriculture, because it is agriculture that has been the stabilizing factor in the economy; subsistence farming has sustained this country much more than any form of modern agriculture. This researcher subscribes to Janvry's views on a theory of marginality and its relation to the kind of projects pursued by the Nigerian political leaders in general and Plateau State in particular, to address rural development/poverty. This may explain why the ruling elites see rural development as a favour to the people and not a right.

The model by Janvry may not fit properly into Plateau State because the kind of marginality created by the latitudinal in Latin America is not there, but there is a peasantry that is poor, not because it lacks land for agriculture, but the inputs are too costly for them, as such they have resorted to farming for their subsistence, and not for export. This work differs from Janvry's because the conditions described by him are not the same on the Plateau and besides, his approach is more ideological than examining a model or strategy of development in rural areas, which is the focus on this research. Janvry's analysis has no relevance to this study, except to give us a picture of the marginalization of the poor in decision making which is a characteristic of all capitalist systems, Nigeria inclusive.

Eskor Toyo (2002), another scholar, in his work "Rural Development Communication", emphasizes on the role of communication in development. The style and technique of communication that will mobilize the people, and increase their

capacity for development were examined by the work. Toyo focuses on the process and end result of development where the people are given a role. He contends that:

by authentic development we mean a multi-faceted process of continuously increasing the peoples capacity to collectively develop and use their human creative energies in all their manifestations in transforming their physical material and human resources for producing goods and services.....that satisfy their social needs (Toyo, 2002:4).

Toyo's approach is radical and revolutionary. It is okay because he gives the people their primary place in the process of development. His focus is not only on institutions, but those who manage those institutions for rural development, and the benefit of their actions or inactions on the people, the target beneficiary of development. We subscribe to his definition of rural development but how do we use his radical approach to rural development with out- steering a revolution in Nigeria? How does it not end as rhetorics?

2.4 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Rural development can be understood within specific theoretical models of analysis. The study of rural development, like development itself, has been perceived from different viewpoints such as the modernization or transformation approach, redistributive justice approach/mobilization approach, and the integrated approach, (Ujo,1994:51-56, Williams 1985, Todaro 2003, Kolawole, 1993). We shall examine some of these theoretical models to enable us pick one as a framework of analysis.

There are basically two approaches to rural development. The top- down and the bottom-up approaches. The top-down is that which the policy makers/bureaucrats/governmental agencies decide what is best for the rural people, and go ahead without their involvement in the processes of planning, decision making

and even implementation, while the bottom-up approach allows for the mass mobilization and participation of the beneficiaries of the programmes and projects of rural development. This model is sometimes referred to as the redistributive justice model or participatory model. Modernization theory takes off from the premise that rural underdevelopment derives essentially from the primitive, unproductive and change – resistant values, institutions and technologies found in “traditional” societies, which is characterized by inefficiency, low productivity, waste, and inertia which tend to act as obstacles to development (Rostow, 1961). The agricultural stagnation and increasing poverty in Africa are thus seen as natural outcomes of the continued reliance on these traditional, inefficient and crude methods and techniques of production. The solution to the problem is assumed to lie in the adoption of modern technologies, institutions, managerial systems and ways of doing things, hence modernization (Rostow 1961, Otaki 2005, Mabogunje 1992, Kolawole 1993, Todaro and Smith 2003).

Modernization is simply a western prototype of development which third world or less developed economies are encouraged to adopt, or imposed on them. Modernization is a total transformation of a traditional society into the type of technology and associated social organizations that characterizes the advanced economically prosperous and relatively politically stable nations of the western world (Todaro and Smith, 2003:50). Under the assumptions of modernization, for third world or developing countries to develop, they have to move from a state of traditionality to that of modernity, that the traditional society is characterized by values of particularism, ascription, and functional diffuseness, while the modern society on the other hand is characterized by universalism, achievement orientation and functional specificity (Parson, 1951, Riggs, 1967).

To overcome their burden of underdevelopment, traditional values, techniques and methods have to be changed via transformation or diffusion, which is simply the imposition of western type of development through agrarian transformation and the adoption of western belief and values. The modernization approach is simply aimed at transforming rural areas through the introduction of programmes on agriculture such as the Gezira schemes in the Sudan, World Bank assisted projects such as the Funtua, Lafia, Gombe and Anyigba projects, Bakolori Dam project in Sokoto, etc. (Beckman, 1985), Under this model, emphasis is on increase in quantity of food production for exports and Gross National Product (GNP). Growth becomes the major reason for and indicator of national development. This has led to the endorsement of the progressive farmer strategy as a way of breaking through the strong wall of resistance by traditional farmers through the use of innovations, technology and farm inputs of the west. The adoption of extension services, demonstration farm centres, green revolution etc, is part of the modernization approach to rural development. Nkom (1995:50) has to argue that,

The diffusion model, especially at its onset had considerable appeal in many less developed nations. It imports an extension bias to agricultural development... In their search for the most effective method of diffusing innovations, many policy makers, and extension administrators resort to a number of devices such as experimental stations, and demonstration farms, which are supposed to help in the spread of new techniques through demonstration effects.

The model has been criticised by Nkom (1995) as the failure of policy makers to successfully spread the so called new technology, use of progressive farmers yields, disappointing results in terms of the number of farmers converted to the use of

modern techniques and the new technology. Despite its inadequacy, this model has remained the most widely practiced in Africa and in Nigeria in particular. On the other hand, the Bottom-up approach to rural development is seen as an attempt to allocate resources equitably, between the different sub-sectors, classes, and geo-political areas. This model is also seen as the distributive justice or mobilization model. To this model, it is unjust to concentrate development in the urban centres to the neglect of the rural majority peasants and farmers. This model lays emphasis on human beings as the centre of development and not just as object of development. It prefers a development process that the people are involved in taking critical decisions affecting their well-being, especially in the formulation of policies and programmes that affect them e.g. rural development in Tanzania under Nyerere, China under Chairman Mao, and the Israel Kibbutz (Aziz, 1978; Nyerere, 1967). This model, also referred to as the mobilization approach, encourages the “pooling together, harnessing, activating, actualizing and utilizing potential human and material resources for the purpose of development”, (Ujo, 1994:119). Under this model or approach, community development, cooperativization, comprehensive planning and implementation as in the Comalli project in Bangladesh, prevail.

Another good example of the model is the Chinese model introduced by Chairman Mao, after the revolution of 1949, when the old dynasty was overthrown by a revolution organized by Mao Tsetung. He was guided by the communist ideology of equity, social justice, and the elimination of classes and domination and exploitation of man by man. The model was built on the following key elements (Aziz, 1980: 1-179).

- 1.) The motivation of the people through a non-material factor rooted in its traditions of discipline, and hard work,

- 2.) Rapid growth in agricultural production through an equitable distribution of land (land reforms) in the rural areas.
- 3.) The organization of the rural population on cooperatives for land improvement, irrigation and water control projects/dam construction. This encouraged;
 - i. The mobilization of surplus labour for land and water development
 - ii. Pooling of savings for investment
 - iii. Uniform sharing of knowledge and technology
 - iv. Greater specialization and better management
- 4.) Diversification of activities to ensure increasing social productivity in the rural areas to reduce unemployment, and raise income levels. Diversification means moving away from agricultural improvement into fisheries, forestry and animal husbandry, rural agro industries, transportation, etc.
- 5.) The promotion of a policy of social development which may include the expansion of education and health facilities, housing, etc, in order to improve employment and income distribution.
- 6.) Finally, political and administrative capacity (institution building) to link the rural community with the rest of the economy and to resolve the conflicts which will inevitably arise between different interest groups within the community or outside of it. The most fundamental issue in this approach is the development ideology adopted by the political leadership of a country and the political will to carry on major reforms that will enhance productivity, well-being and the dignity of the rural people.

China was able to do this with some relative success because as Aziz (1978:110) argues,

In practice, all economic systems are based on certain institutions, practices, and ideals which, taken together, constitute, its ideological and ethical foundations and its philosophy. In some societies, the political philosophy is explicit and therefore illustrated by theories, strategies and programmes. In others, the political philosophy is implicit and often difficult to define, with many views which clash with each other, and often change over time...

The top-down model and the bottom – up models may have different variants, or strategies, but at the end of the day, a country's political philosophy determines which of these models is adopted, or a combination of both may be adopted, but a higher proportion of one over the other.

Since no government can even have all the knowledge and resources to single handedly transform its rural areas, the strategy or model of development should emphasize the constructive tapping of the wisdom, resources and energies of the local people in the task of development. The mobilization model, to our mind, is the most appropriate of the two because it involves decentralization of governmental machinery so as to bring the decision making process within the reach of the local people through devolution of powers over planning and decision making to the local levels. In the context of Nigeria, it means devolution of more powers and allocation of more resources and responsibilities to the local governments, as well as the creation or consolidation of district and village development committees or representative councils.

Nkom supports the bottom-up approach because popular grass-roots institutions such as cooperatives, community development associations youth clubs, age grade associations, occupation groups, women associations etc, provide the platform for concretizing people's involvement in development, and the harnessing of

local resources, talents, and creativity for development. There are other packages under the participatory model, (Bottom-up), which include the small – farmer cooperatives, small packages for target groups, area development projects, private ownership with state management, for example, the Moshav in Israel, rural workers programme and the landless e.g. land redistribution and micro credit schemes (Nkom, 1995:29-30).

The bottom-up approach is adopted to evaluate the programmes of rural development in Plateau State as this will enable the examination of the programmes to find out who are the beneficiaries, whose class interest the project serves, and its consequences for rural development of the state.

CHAPTER THREE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

The research adopted the survey design. The survey research enables a researcher to study a group of people or items or a population, by collecting and analyzing data from only a few people or items considered to be representative of the entire group (population). Thus, rather than obtain data from the whole population being studied only a sample is selected from the whole through a sampling process.

3.2 THE AREA OF STUDY

The area of study is Plateau State, which has a population of about 3.2 million people (1990 population projection in 2010). The state comprises of 17 local government areas, namely Bassa, Barkin Ladi, Bokkos, Mikang, Jos North, Jos South, Jos East, Pankshin, Kanke, Kanam, Riyom, Langtang North, Langtang South, Mangu, Qua'an-Pan, Shendam and Wase. Out of which only six local government areas, namely, Bassa, Barkin Ladi, Bokkos, Kanke, Mikang and Qua'an-Pan are selected.

3.3 POPULATION OF THE STUDY

The population of the study area is presented on table 1 below as listed per local government.

TABLE 1: LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREAS AND THEIR POPULATIONS

S/No	Local Government	Population
1	Barkin Ladi	179,805
2	Bassa	189,834
3	Bokkos	179,550
4	Jos East	88,301
5	Jos North	437,217
6	Jos South	311,392
7	Kanam	167,619
8	Kanke	124,268
9	Langtang North	142,316
10	Langtang South	105,173
11	Mangu	300,520
12	Mikang	96,388
13	Pankshin	190,114
14	Qua'an-Pan	197,276
15	Riyom	131,778
16	Shendam	205,119
17	Wase	159,861
	Total	3,206,531

Source: Federal Republic of Nigeria Official Gazette No.2 Feb, 2009 Vol. 96

3.4 **SAMPLE SIZE AND SAMPLING TECHNIQUE**

The research adopted purposive sampling method, and a sample size of 300 respondents was used in this research. This was so because the researcher did not have the time and resources to study all the over 3.2 million inhabitants of Plateau State. The purposive sampling enables the researcher to pick on target groups such as farmers, farmers cooperative societies and the community development association leaders who are resident in the local governments selected.

3.4.1 **Sample Size**

The sample picked for this research was 300 respondents out of a total population of 3.2 million (1990 population census as projected in 2010). The 300 respondents are picked from the six identified local governments where the research was conducted.

3.4.2 **Sampling Technique**

The random sampling method was adopted for this research. By random sampling we mean the selection of respondents by chance. A total of 300 respondents were selected from the six local governments under investigation namely Barkin Ladi, Bassa, Bokkos, Kanke, Mikang, and Qua'an-Pan. Two each, from the three Senatorial Districts in the State.

The sampled population in each of the selected local government areas shared similar characteristics, such as being farmers, live in deprived conditions such as bad access roads, poor water sources, poor sanitation, lack of equipped clinics and good schools, markets, and inadequate basic necessities of life. This is presented in the table below.

TABLE 2: SAMPLED LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREAS, POPULATION AND SAMPLE SIZE

S/No	Local Government	Population	Sample Size
1	Barkin Ladi	179,805	50
2	Bassa	189,834	50
3	Bokkos	179,550	50
4	Kanke	124,268	50
5	Mikang	96,388	50
6	Qua'an-Pan	197,276	50
	Total	967,121	300

Source: Federal Republic of Nigeria official Gazette No. 2 Feb, 2009 Vol. 96.

3.5 METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

The researcher adopted the primary and secondary sources of data collection.

3.5.1. Primary Sources of Data

Under the primary source of data were the questionnaire and the interview. A questionnaire was developed to obtain information from the rural dwellers who are the beneficiaries of rural development programmes in Plateau State. The questionnaires were structured in line with the research objectives and research hypotheses. Each section of the questionnaire was designed to collect information from the respondents in relation to a particular hypothesis.

The respondents through the questionnaire were expected to verify the claims of government with respect to the provisions of services such as fertilizer and other farm inputs, water supply and construction of roads in their localities. The respondents were given the chance to assess the performance of the local government within the selected local governments to find out if the strategy of rural development adopted in Plateau State is successful or not.

The second source of primary data, the interview was conducted with the Managers of the selected rural development agencies in order to get their views on how their programmes are managed, sources of funding, extent of the involvement of the beneficiaries in programmes conception, implementation, and evaluation.

3.5.2 Secondary Sources of Data

The secondary data were collected from the official documents of the selected study agencies such as the mandate establishing the agencies, records of projects executed, ongoing or abandoned projects, research reports, or briefs etc. Other sources of secondary data were the budget speeches of Plateau State government between 1999 – 2010, obtained from the ministry of Finance and Economic Planning.

3.5.3 Personal Observation

The researcher also adopted personal observation when the study local governments were visited to retrieve administered questionnaire. The researcher adopted the systemic observation when he visited the study areas to assess the conditions of the rural areas and some of the projects executed or abandoned by the selected study agencies in the selected local government areas.

3.6 ADMINISTRATION OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

Copies of the questionnaire were administered by research assistants picked from the selected local government areas. The assistants were briefed on the research instrument (the questionnaire), and how to administer it. The fifty (50) copies questionnaire for each local government were administered on the selected respondents. See table 2. The respondents that were considered as the target group were the farmers, artisans, civil servants and cooperative societies (focused group). Out of these category, 25 questionnaire were administered on the farmers, 15 on the cooperative society members, 5 on the artisans and 5 on the civil servants. This was to give a fair representation to the groups resident in the local government areas.

3.7 METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS

The methods of data analysis employed in this research are qualitative and quantitative. The data were basically from two sources (primary and secondary sources). The primary sources were from the questionnaire administered and the interview scheduled with managers of the three selected study agencies. The quantitative data were generated from the codified responses of respondents to the administered questionnaire, budget speeches, and documents obtained from the records of the study agencies. The qualitative data were obtained from files, records,

and documents of the selected study agencies and interviews with managers of the selected agencies which were analysed by the researcher. The data obtained from the questionnaire were analysed using simple percentage statistic to enable the researcher ascertain weights of opinion to particular questionnaire. The generated data were used to assess the weight of respondents views to a questionnaire.

The simple percentage table relied on the formula $\frac{NR}{TNR} \times 100$. Where NR, equals number of responses to each questionnaire, and TNR equals the total number of responses. This tool of analysis enables the researcher assess weights of opinion to a questionnaire and the percentage allocated to that weight of opinion.

The chi-square statistic was also used to establish association between variables in the research hypotheses.

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(fo-fe)^2}{fe}$$

where X² = chi-square

∑ = summation

fo = observed frequency

fe = expected frequency

The decision rule in the X² is that if the chi-square (X²) value is greater than or equal to the critical value, the research hypothesis is rejected and vis-visa. The hypotheses were tested by simply assessing the weight of opinion from the table of percentages and the level of association between the variables in the hypotheses as established via the chi-square. These methods were justified because they are used as tools of analysis in the Social Sciences.

CHAPTER FOUR

PERSPECTIVES ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PLATEAU STATE

4.1 AN OVERVIEW OF PLATEAU STATE

For the purpose of this study, Plateau State is our area of focus, particularly the institutions that are central to bringing about rural development. Such institutions are the Plateau Agriculture and Development Agency (PADP), Direct Labour Agency (DLA), and Plateau State Agency for Water Supply and Sanitation (PRUWASA). These institutions are more rural targeted. That is why they are chosen as our primary units of focus.

Plateau derives its name from the Jos Plateau. The state is a multi-cultural, linguistic and religious state. It was carved out of Bauchi province in 1926, after the great re-organization which affected the whole of Northern Nigeria (Nengel, 2001:2). The people of Plateau State have lived in their present abode many centuries before the advent of colonialism. Mwangvwat (1984) has argued that history of the Plateau can be traced to several phases; first phase C 200 BC to C 1000 AD, as the prehistoric phase; the second phase CI100 to C 1700AD; and the third phase, C 1600 to 1800AD. All these phases were products of developments in other polities like the Kanem Borno empire, Jukun Kwararafa kingdom and the Sokoto Caliphate during Jihad which were responsible for migration of people running away from areas of political and religious upheavals (Mwangvwat, 1984:4). Plateau State is a land of diversified geographical features. In the North, it is very rocky, and hilly, with a height ranging from 500 metres to 1,500 metres above sea level and it is endowed with a cool semi temperate weather. In the central area, it is made up of highlands, hills and flat land especially the Dengi/Kanam area, and in the south it is mainly flat fadama land. The state, because of its geographical features and good weather, has earned the name a “Home of Peace and Tourism” (Ngobak, 2005:46-47).

The state has a population of 3,178,712 million as per 2006 census estimate, and grows at about 2.8% (National population commission, 2006). Between 1976 – 1996, the state had been split twice. First, as Plateau State carved from Benue- Plateau and second as Plateau State when Nassarawa State was created on 1st October 1996.

The Plateau people are mainly agrarian and supplement farming with hunting, and breeding of livestock such as cows, goats, sheep, chicken, dogs and donkey. Land is an asset to the people because of their agrarian nature, and it is held in trust for the whole family by the elders of the family or clan.

Communal labour is the most important source of labour on the farm. Until very recently, commerce was relatively alien to the people. Commerce is seen as a second occupation to farming. Most of the Plateau communities live in districts and villages with their chiefs as their political leaders. The elders play advisory role to the chiefs. The polities are mostly semi- autonomous republics (Nengel, 2001)

The physical environment which is rocky, hilly, and made up of deep gullies and rivers especially in the Northern and Central parts of the state, poses a big challenge to development because it is difficult to farm and its rocky terrain makes roads construction very difficult and costly. The area had also suffered from mining activities which had deprived the land of its fertile top soil good for agriculture, and deep mining ponds are widely scattered thereby constituting a threat to human beings and animals in the Northern and Central zones of the state.

In the southern zone, the land is mainly flat with dotted rivers and fadama land which is good for rice, cassava and yam cultivation. Fishing activities are also carried out here especially around Qua'an-Pan- Shendam axis. The state is inhabited by different ethnic groups, but the dominant ones are the Berom in the northern zone, Mwaghavul and Ngas in the Central Zone, and the Taroh and Goemai in the southern

zone. There are settlers such as the Hausa, Fulani, Igbo and Yoruba, etc. The state has great potentials for tourism and agriculture especially of temperate crops such as tomatoes, potatoes, and vegetables, coffee, tea, apples, etc. The state however has a great challenge of infrastructure and social amenities provision. That is why it has attracted our attention to examine the quality of rural development as provided by the government.

4.2 LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PLATEAU STATE

Local Governments are units of government created by law to provide for the wellbeing and welfare of the rural populace. Nigeria has 774 local governments recognized by the 1999 constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria out of which Plateau State has 17 (1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria). The 1999 Constitution also recognizes the local governments as third tier of government, with residual powers created for amongst other reasons to;

Promote economic development from below. This includes infrastructure provision, promote political integration and nation building, promote local freedom of action/autonomy; and enhance grassroots democracy (Iman, 1996:4).

Also, contributing on the subject matter, Ngu (1994:37) opines that:

the importance of local government in the process of socio-economic transformation of societies cannot be contested or disputed by any political scientist or any political system world wide. This is so because there is hardly any modern political system that dispenses with local government as a second or third tier of government, as the case may be. Infact, a big chunk of the social services and infrastructures are provided by local governments in the various countries including Nigeria.

Ngu further argues that the desired processes of the provision of the social services may be hampered if democratic principles and practices are not given due consideration and recognition in the implementation of projects and he submits that:

the recognition and operation of democratic principles do not stop at mere election of chairman and council members. They go beyond this to embrace popular participation in the process of provision of social amenities by the various communities affected (Ngu, 1994:37).

Local government as an institution for rural development in Plateau State does so by carrying out its functions, some of which include the provision of primary education, primary health care, construction of roads, culverts and bridges, and management of market stores, parks and gardens, recreational facilities, libraries, maintenance of cemeteries, collection of rates/taxes, control of liquor production/consumption through relevant edicts, etc. It is believed that through participatory democracy, the grass-roots can be effectively reached.

Participation which is one of the approaches of rural development from the bottom-up approach must be encouraged if any meaningful development is to take place. However, participation is not that easy. **Cohen and Uphoff (1977)** argue that in considering participation, the following questions should be asked: Participation by who? (the local people, the leaders, government personnel and foreign personnel? The second is how to participate. There are seven possible factors of analysis

- (a) Source of initiative: from above or from below
- (b) Nature of inducement for participation: voluntary or coerced?
- (c) Structure of participation: individual or group?
- (d) Channels of Participation: formal or informal?
- (e) Duration of participation: once and for all or combination of both?

- (f) Scope of participation: intermittent or continuous?
- (g) Empowerment of participation: how involved are the people? If these questions are properly addressed, the issue of grassroots development may be a thing of the past (*Cohen & Uphoff, 1977:D*).

The concept of participation and grassroots development according to Egonwan and Ibodje (1998:79-81) involve three elements.

- (i) Consultation with the people who are the supposed beneficiaries
- (ii) Access to and participation in decision making process in all those programmes which affect their lives.
- (iii) Are the people involved in the implementation, costs, and benefits of development. This is in line with our philosophy or model of development, which advocates involvement of the people at the level of implementation and evaluation of policies and programmes.

Plateau State is the focal point of rural development particularly under the Jang administration whose ten point agenda include Tourism and Rural development, which are basically grassroots activities. We shall discuss this in greater detail in our analysis of rural development agencies in Plateau State in our next chapter

4.3 AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS (ADP) AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PLATEAU STATE.

Rural development policy in Nigeria has been subsumed under agricultural transformation. It is assumed that once agriculture is transformed, with the right inputs, technology and price policy, there will be rural transformation and thus rural development. It is in the light of this that agricultural development projects were adopted as part of the World Bank strategy for rural development in Africa. The ADP strategy is one of the project approaches to rural development in Nigeria. It is a World

Bank initiative which began in the 1970s. The Nigerian government adopted the ADP strategy on the advice of the World Bank in 1970. The pilot projects were started in Funtua, then in Kaduna State, Gombe then in Bauchi State, and Gusau then in Sokoto State. According to Otaki (2005:54-55); the government also expanded the programme to cover Plateau State (Lafia Agricultural Development project) (ADP now in Nasarawa State), and Anyigba in Kogi state then in Benue State. Other ADP projects were established in Ilorin, Kwara State, and Oyo state. The Federal Government planned to make the programme nationwide. Thus by January 1982, the World Bank, one of the financiers of the ADP programme had spent-well over ₦277 million on 11 ADP projects in Nigeria.

Under the Third National Development Plan (1975-1979), the Nigerian government committed N260 million on the three pilot projects in Funtua, Gusau, and Gombe. Out of this amount, the World Bank gave the Federal government N43 million as loan for the project. In the fourth National Development Plan (1979-83), the government of Nigeria had committed nearly ₦2.3 billion to the ADP strategy. By 1980, the ADP strategy was extended to other parts of Nigeria, and by 1981, nearly every parts of Nigeria was covered by the ADP strategy (Tukura,1985:20).

The ADPS were primarily concerned with transforming agricultural productivity through improved seedlings, provision of fertilizer, pesticide, high yielding varieties (HYV) seeds, citrus and tubers, vegetables, tomatoes, onions, etc, and a credit facility in cash and kind, including land clearing services, tractor hiring, development of feeder roads and extension services (Otaki, 2005:77).

The benefiting communities were to be grouped into two.

- (a) The large scale farmers or the progressive farmers
- (b) The traditional farmers.

The large-scale farmers are those who accepted the ADP strategy and own large-scale agricultural enterprise. They also use modern agricultural equipment because they can afford them. The large-scale farmers are those who are not necessarily owners of large scale agricultural enterprise, but have embraced the ADP strategy and are willing to accept the services of extension workers trained by the World Bank.

The traditional farmers on the other hand, are small scale farmers who do not totally patronize the ADP strategy, or even seek for advice. They rely on their traditional values and mode of production. They are in the long run an experimental group to copy from the “successes” of the large-scale and progressive farmers. The projects have not succeeded in providing for the needs of the rural people because as Adelakun, cited in Nwanunobi, et al (1995:175),

from empirical studies of the various projects (Sano 1983, Wallace, Beckman 1981, William 1981, Van Apeldorn 1981, Adelakun 1984), there is no evidence that the project had benefited their ostensible “targeted population,” the poor peasants. On the other hand, benefits had mainly accrued to urban based armchair capitalist farmers...

In Plateau State, the agricultural development project is tagged PADP, which started in Lafia in November 1977 as an integrated Rural Development Project as part of the World Bank/Federal government initiative to reform agriculture and increase food production. The Federal government was to contribute 25%, Plateau State government 43% and the World Bank 32% (Dalis, 2004:47). The programme laid emphasis on the establishment of Farm centres, Demonstration Farm units, construction of feeder roads, and provision of fertilizer for farmers use, herbicides, pesticides and technical support to farmers. Although the focus is on

agriculture, other related activities such as feeder roads, water dams are provided. All these contributed to rural development. At inception, the cost of the project stood at N52.4 million, and the total World Bank funding was N27million (Brief on Plateau Agricultural Development Programme, 1999 to 2004).

The Plateau Agricultural Development Project started in June 1985 with 20% funding by the Federal government, 4% Plateau State and 66% by World Bank. The programme covers an area of 54,000km² with a size of 365,584 farm families; with the headquarters in Dogon Dutse, Jos (Dalis, 2005: 48). The programme is operated on the following zones, northern, central and southern zones. The programme has the following objectives:

- (i) To increase food crop production and income of small scale farmers
- (ii) To improve rural living standards through investment in Agriculture.
- (iii) Timely and adequate provision of farm inputs.
- (iv) Provision of feeder roads and portable water.
- (v) To assist the state through a more effective extension services (PADP House Journal, 2000).

The programme has a technical services department with a view to promoting the use of new farm technology and seed multiplication, an extension services department to provide technology dissemination and diffusion to farmers, Animal Traction, Fadama Development, Gender Issues/HIV AIDS campaign, fisheries, and livestock production, while the commercial services Department sales agro-chemical, sprayers, herbicides, and seeds at subsidized rate. Engineering services Department handles Rural Water Supply and Feeder Roads. The personnel department treats personnel matters and also coordinates the Project Management Unit (PMU).

The finance/accounts Department handles financial records of the programme, while the planning, monitoring and evaluation unit prepares routine and adhoc reports in respect of project implementation that affects the programme.

The programme has made the following physical achievements from 1987 – 2004.

(1)	Rural Roads/Dams	
	Road reinstatement	978.7km
	Road maintenance	1,020km
	Bridge construction	16
	Culverts	443
	Dam construction	3
(2)	Rural Water	
	Well construction	601
	Hand pump Installation	241
	Borehole construction	248
	Wash bore Drilled	342
(3)	Animal Traction	
	Purchased and train bulls	4000
	Distribution of Ox Driven Ridges	4,607
(4)	Input Distribution	
	Fertilizer	- 492,976.01MT
	Vegetable seeds (assorted)	- 6,253.104
	Improved seeds	- 14,090.438 MT
	Seedlings (Apple, coffee)	- 6,731.1 stands
	Agro Chemical	- 273,272.75 litres/ 22,061.77kg

(Source: PADP Annual Report, 2005)

4.4 RIVER BASIN AUTHORITIES AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PLATEAU STATE

The River Basin and Rural Development programme, otherwise known as River Basin Development Authority, is one of the project approaches to rural development of the Nigerian state. The aim of the programme is to develop the River Basins and their adjacent rural areas through the provision of irrigation facility, land clearing and tractor hiring services. It is also aimed at providing fertilizer, pesticide and all other agricultural inputs to the farmers in the river basin and those in the adjacent sides of the river basin. There were over 11 River Basins in Nigeria in 1986.

The River Basins include, the Chad Basin, Hadeja Jama'are River Basin, Owena, upper Niger, Lower Niger, Upper Benue, lower Benue, and Sokoto Rima Basin Development Authorities (Otaki, 2005:57 -58). The services of the River Basins were to arrest the impact of drought and desertification in the north, and lay a foundation for wheat, sugar, and rice production to reduce the high cost of food imports. Thus in the Third National Development Plan (1975-1980), the sum of N535 million was allocated to the River Basin and Rural Development authorities nationwide. According to Otaki (2005:58), in the Fourth National Development Plan (1979-83), N2.1 billion was committed to the River Basin Development programmes nation wide. He had concluded that despite the huge sums committed to the River Basin authorities, they are yet to make any significant impact on the lives of the people. That in spite of their existence, Nigeria still, imports 1.3 metric tones of wheat and rice annually. For example, Nigeria spent \$800 million in 2003, on the importation of rice alone.

The project has resulted in some places, in the displacement of large farming communities e.g in Bakolori, where in 1975, the Federal government contracted the

dam for the sum of ₦110 million to an Italian construction Firm Impresit and a subsidiary contract to another Italian Firm for the sum of ₦44 million. The project was to be completed in March 1980, at the cost of ₦154 million. By January 1980, the cost had risen to ₦350 million. The government also had to pay the Italian Consortium, the sum of ₦1 million monthly as disturbance allowance caused by the rioting peasants, whose land was confiscated by the government without compensation (Beckman,1985:74-108).

In a study on the Kano Hadeija River and the Dam project, Wallace (1981:281) showed that 25% of all the households and 34% of their dependents became wage labourers in Hadeija and the Kano River projects. Thus, rather than serving as instruments for peasant welfare, the project has become an instrument for polarizing peasantry into the classes of rich farmers on the one hand and poor, dispossessed peasants on the other. In Plateau State, the lower Benue River Basin covers the southern parts of the state – Shendam, Qua’an Pan, Mikang, Langtang North and South, and Wase. These are the areas that the lower Benue can cover effectively through irrigation. Apart from the Longkat Project in Qua’an Pan, there is nothing to suggest the presence of lower Benue in Plateau state. The River Basin has not impacted much on the Plateau especially the central and northern senatorial districts.

4.5 COOPERATIVE SOCIETIES AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The cooperative society is one important unit that can help change the rural condition. This is so because the African society was and is still largely a communal society. It is a society in which “the production unit was built around the extended family. Men, women and children all had their roles to play in the production process, although a greater part of the responsibility revolved around able-bodied young men”

(Idode,1989:123). The society was also concerned with sharing such that excessive accumulation of wealth was avoided; no individual was allowed to suffer undue deprivation or want. It is in this light that the cooperative became vital to rural development. A cooperative is simply a uniting of people, their ideas, resources, and energies to perform task that will enhance their well being. (Idode, 1989:123). There are producer and consumer cooperatives. The producer cooperatives may include rice mill cooperatives, produce marketing cooperatives, small scale industry producer cooperatives, while the consumer cooperatives may include supply/consumer cooperatives, and there is also the thrift society or the *esusu* or *Adashe* group. The *esusu* is widely practiced in West Africa (Idode,1989). The *esusu* is a kind of contribution in group by rotation. It could also mean a place where you hide your money in a small clay pot until you have placed enough, then you break it and use the money. Plateau State has a Ministry for Commerce and Industry which oversees the activities of cooperatives, (Haruna, 2003:188).

4.6 COOPERATIVE SOCIETIES AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PLATEAU STATE

The cooperative movement can be classified as the indigenous, pre-colonial and the Western-European post colonial type. The indigenous cooperatives were either credit or producer cooperatives e.g. the *esusu*, which is a rotating credit association, and the cash crop producer cooperatives for cocoa, rice, groundnut, etc. In the then Western Region, cooperatives such as Agege Planters Union (1907), Egba Farmers Association (1910, and Ibadan Agricultural Society (1904) existed. Cooperative societies have played a vital role in the economic and social affairs of the people in Africa, and to that extent, are veritable tools for rural development if properly organized and utilized. The successes of rural development in China as discussed in our previous chapters are as a result of cooperativization along the

production brigades and the communes. The organization of cooperatives on the Plateau is modeled after the 1956 defunct Northern Nigeria region enactment on cooperative societies. In 1976, Plateau State adopted cooperative societies Law of Northern Nigeria. The cooperative movement was expected to be an independent, self – sustaining organization guided by the cooperative principles, laws and regulations (PLSG, Dept of Cooperatives, 1997:10). The cooperatives are under the supervision of the Registrar on Cooperatives in conjunction with the team of supporting staff in the 17 local governments (Bonaventure, 2003:188). The Cooperative Department has the following sections.

- (i) The Apex Organizations
- (ii) The Agriculture and Marketing
- (iii) The Accounts, Audit and Statistics
- (iv) The Consumer, Cooperative Thrift and Loans,
- (v) The Personnel Matters
- (vi) The Cooperative Education (Bonaventure, 2003:188)

By October 1996, Plateau State had the following cooperatives;

TABLE 3: NO OF COOPERATIVES SOCIETIES IN PLATEAU STATE ACCORDING TO TYPES AS AT OCTOBER 1996

S/No	Types of Coop. Society 4	Total No Registered	Total No unregistered	Total membership registered and unregistered
1	Thrift and credit	59	29	3,336
2	Group farming	5	11	8,861
3	Consumer	68	88	3,834
4	Farmers	330	375	4,015
5	Farmers Multi-Purpose	567	77	3,86
6	Fishery	28	27	1,590
7	Women coops.	54	325	1,724
8	Multi- Purpose cooperatives	35	49	3,109
9	Cooperative in informal sector	234	136	5,300
10	Live stock coops	28	46	1870
	Grand Total	1,131	1,163	37,625

Source: Haruna, 2003:194

The most active of these cooperative societies in the state are the farmers multi-purpose cooperative societies, which do not engage in crop farming, but help the farmers to procure subsidized loans and farm inputs for their members (Bonaventure, 2003:194). There are two apex cooperative organizations in the state, ie the cooperative federation and the cooperative financing agency. The financing agency sales shares to its members to raise capital, and also from its monthly savings, and an annual subscription of N1000.00 by all its members. The agency at its inception (1995) distributed the sum of N312,000.00 to the various cooperative societies and N166,000 to individual members registered with the organization giving a total of N478,000.00 (Cooperative Financing Agency Report, 2001:2).The cooperative Federation on the other hand registered in 1978 has 187 primary cooperative societies, out of the 4,328 registered cooperatives as its affiliates with a share capital of N300,000 by the year 2000 (Bonaventure, 2003:199).

From the assessment of cooperative organizations in the state, they have not impacted much on rural development, but they are potential bodies to mobilize the rural farmers towards more effective rural development (Bonaventure, 2003:283)

The cooperatives have their limitations as observed by Idode (1989:30). Thus: it is clear from the above discussion that contrary to the general principles of a co-operative movement which emphasizes the democracy, autonomy, initiative and self-reliance of the members, the cooperative law provided the basis for the serious compromise of these principles under the present system of running the co-operatives, initiation is stolen from the people and placed in the bureaucracy. The people become takers and not makers of decisions affecting their movement, they develop a dependence syndrome, and the cooperative movement becomes merely an extension of the public

bureaucracy. The people ought not to be mere passive participants or observers, they ought to be active participants in the making of decisions and executing such decisions for the management of their movement. Meaningful participation by the masses in the cooperatives will infuse elements of egalitarianism in the production and distribution of wealth.

4.7 POVERTY REDUCTION AGENCIES AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PLATEAU STATE

It was the Babangida regime and the Obasanjo civilian regime that introduced two major poverty reduction agencies, the National Directorate of Employment (NDE), and the National Poverty Reduction Agency (NAPEP) respectively. It is these two agencies that we intend to examine in this section.

4.7.1 National Directorate of Employment (NDE)

The National Directorate of Employment came into being with the inauguration of the board on November 19th, 1986, with a Decree or Law No. 24 of 19th October 1989 under the Babangida Regime. It had the mandate to:-

- (i) Design and implement programmes to combat mass unemployment
- (ii) To articulate policies aimed at developing work programmes with labour intensive potential
- (iii) To obtain and maintain a data bank on employment and vacancies in the country with a view to acting as a clearing house to link Job seekers with vacancies in collaboration with other government agencies, and
- (iv) To implement any other policies as may be laid down from time to time by the board established under section 3 of its enabling act (NDE Brochure, :2006).

The beneficiaries are:

Those with little or no school at all, school dropouts, school leavers, artisans, graduates of tertiary institutions, retired persons (public and private sectors), disabled persons, women groups (NDE Brochure May, 2006).

The NDEs contributions to rural development is in the following areas; entrepreneurship development programme, school leavers farmers scheme, crop farming scheme, crop processing scheme, artisan fishing scheme, livestock production scheme, dry season irrigation farming scheme, block making scheme, integrated farming training scheme, agro services, rural development training scheme, rural handicrafts scheme. All these are considered as Rural Empowerment Promotion (REP). There is also the Special Public Works (SPW) with the major areas as Community Development Scheme, Rural Handicrafts Scheme, National Sanitation Employment Scheme, Water Trucking and Portrage Scheme and Wheel Barrow Scheme. It is hoped that all of these programmes will help combat rural poverty and thus create an environment for rural development. The big question is how far has the scheme succeeded? How much is government committed to the scheme in terms of resources? It is one scheme that would have transformed Nigeria, if the policy objectives are fully realized. However, this was not the case.

The NDE programme has recorded the following achievements in Plateau State

(1) **Special Public Works (SPW)**

(a)	Graduate Attachment Programme (GAP) –	365
(b)	Environmental Beautification Scheme (EBS)	720
(c)	Water Trucking Scheme (WTS)	102
(d)	Transitory Job	<u>3,925</u>
	Total	<u>5,112</u>

(2) **Vocational Skills Development (VSD)**

Number of apprentices in various vocational trades 21,221

Loan given to undergraduates (316) N5,525,678

(3) **Rural Employment (REP)**

No of people trained	19,211
----------------------	--------

No of people resettled	971
------------------------	-----

Total amount of loan	N 6,196,895.35
----------------------	---------------------------

(4) **Small Scale Entrepreneurship (SSE)** (NDE Brochure 2006).

The state has trained and granted loans to the following beneficiaries under the following sub-programmes.

**TABLE 4: NUMBER OF TRAINED PERSONS AND AMOUNT DISBURSED
IN PLATEAU STATE**

S/No	Details	No Trained	No. Benefited Loan	Amount Disbursed In Naira
1	EDP Training for corpors	15,921	-	-
2	EDP Training for matured people	200	10	₦ 400,000
3	EDP/SYOB for Artisans	2,500	22	₦ 596,451.20
4	BBT training for Artisans	1,500	20	₦ 946,000
5	Motor Cycle loan	60	23	₦ 2,125,365
6	Special Loan	10	1	₦ 300,000
7	NDE/NACRDB	346	50	₦ 5,173,150
8	WEB Beneficiaries	475	60	
9	Jembi Phones	55	50	₦ 1,350,000
	Total Disbursement			₦ 11,980,966.70

Source: NDE Annual Report, 2004

From the statistics presented above, one could see that a number of people have benefited from NDE programmes in the state, some of which have rural linkages and help address rural – urban drift, which in the long run would help boost rural development in Plateau State.

Within the period under discussion, over N23 million had been expended on various NDE programmes in Plateau State (NDE Annual Report, 2004).

4.7.2 National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP)

NAPEP is one of Nigeria's policy measures to reduce poverty. Poverty is one of the most serious problems confronting Nigerians today. It is generally associated with conditions under which people live. It is usually defined in either absolute or relative terms. Absolute poverty denotes a condition in which a person or group of persons are unable to satisfy their most basic and elementary requirements of human survival in terms of good nutrition, clothing, shelter, foot wear, energy, transport, health, education and recreation (Napep Blue Print 2001).

The aforementioned conditions are relatively lacking in the rural areas, thus the level of rural underdevelopment. Any attempt by way of policy to reduce the poverty level, contributes to rural development. NAPEP was established to perform these functions as stated below:

- (i) Formulate policies and strategies to alleviate poverty
- (ii) Set targets for institutions and agencies of government mandated to reduce poverty
- (iii) Mobilize and allocate resources for approved programmes.
- (iv) Establish the legislative and constitutional framework for the successful implementation of these programmes.

- (v) Establish proper administrative instruments necessary for the implementation of poverty alleviation programmes
- (vi) Monitor the functions of the coordination committees at the state and local government levels (NAPEP Blueprint 2001:49).

NAPEP has gone further under the present administration to introduce what it called Village Economic Development Solutions as a way of promoting the seven-point Agenda of the Umaru Musa Yar'adua's administration. The village solutions are a local community-driven development programme designed by the Economic Growth and Development Centre and adopted by NAPEP:

in the village solutions local villages/ communities are guided in their community economic development efforts that involve modernizing their villages and promoting income generating activities. (Village Solutions, 2008:2).

This can be done through the following stakeholders, Federal government, state government, local government, village sector/business, Community Development Associations (CDAs), cooperative societies etc.

The villages are sensitized, and assisted through micro-finance for projects execution that is identified by the village community/Cooperative society. The state and local governments are to play a pivotal role in such sensitization. The communities are to open a village solutions Trust- fund Account from which community development projects will be funded. A deposit of N50,000 for a project of N10 million and above, N200,000 for projects between N10- N50 million. N10,000 for projects less than N10 million. To achieve the objectives, the government is to organize private sector/NGO to promote investment through cofunding of projects, one percent (1%) of loan to be donated to the Trust Fund account by government,

Village management committees appoint a manager/NGO who convenes regular meetings to discuss management of village solutions, trust fund, and over all economic development, all stakeholders i.e. NAPEP, States, Banks, NGOs and Communities sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Where the cost of the project is less than N500,000.00, the 1% trust fund may be used to undertake direct community development projects (Village Solutions 2007:15).

Village solutions as a strategy for eliminating poverty and promoting rural development is concerned with modernization of the village, community development, reversal of rural urban migration, reduction in inter generational transfer of poverty, effective mass participation in economic development process, job creation and income generation, better appreciation of government's role in the village modernization and community development, (Village Solutions, 2008:16).

The village solutions proposal is good and well intentioned on paper, but the problem is the political will by government to commit resources to the scheme and the likely politicization of the programme by politicians, and hijacking it for their selfish ambitions. If properly implemented, it can reduce poverty, and enhance rural development in Nigeria.

NAPEP on the Plateau has contributed immensely in the following areas. The programme covers areas such as capacity acquisition, keke NAPEP, village cooperatives. The following programmes below have been implemented with a number of their beneficiaries in Plateau State.

1999

- (1) Mandatory Attachment Programme (MAP) - 1092
- (2) Capacity Acquisition Programme (CAP) -2142
- (3) KEKE NAPEP Phase 1 - 29
- (4) KEKE NAPEP Phase II - 105

2004

- (1) Farmers Empowerment Programme (FEP) Phase I 113
- (2) Farmers Empowerment Programme phase II -150
- (3) VVf centre ECWA Jos – Nil
4. Skill Development Centres (Jos South and North) 599
- (5) Promise Keeper Programme -10 Faith Based Organization (FBO)

2008/2009

- (1) Widows Empowerment Programme -589
- (2) Village Economic Solutions -150 cooperatives societies
- (3) COPE in- care of people, in progress
- (4) Micro Credit Scheme 940

Source: NAPEP Plateau State, May 2009

Note: All these programmes were carried out with a view to reducing rural poverty and bring about rural development in Plateau State.

A combination of NDE Projects NAPEP/village solutions will make Nigeria a wonderland, if the policies and projects are implemented to the latter. The aforementioned discussion has been embarked upon to give the reader a picture of what past and present Nigerian administrations have done, with a view to reducing poverty, and to bring about an improved rural condition. The following sections cover areas that non-governmental agencies have played a role in rural development in Nigeria, and Plateau State in particular.

4.8 COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATIONS AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PLATEAU STATE

The CBOs are made up of a plethora of communities in Plateau State with their cultural names as tags for identifying and as vehicles for political mobilization

and community/rural development. The most commonly identified probably because of their numerical strength are the Berom, Ngas, Mwangavul, Taroh, Gomei, Ron, Afizere, Anaguta, Buji, Rukuba, Irigwe, Mushere/Kulere, Bogghom, etc. They all have their organizational leadership objectives, and methods of social mobilization. The most common feature of their identity is cultural festivals, such as the Nzem Berom, Puskat, Pusedung, Olum O' Taroh, etc. Our concern here is not with the culture perse but the role of these community associations in rural development. A number of them have built schools, clinics, constructed bridges, culverts, roads, dug wells, constructed dams, etc for their communities. For instance, the BECO Comprehensive School at Kwi for the Berom nation, Mangu Community Secondary School for the Mwangavul nation, etc.

The concept of community development like many Social Science concepts is difficult to operationalize. Ladan Banki, the then Commissioner for Education and Community Development in North Central (now Kaduna State), has this to say as cited in Ngu, (1994:46-47);

Community development in this country is geared towards helping people in helping themselves so that they may be able to take effective and intelligent part in their social, cultural, and economic development. This is in line with the United Nations definition of community development which we have based our policy.

This definition implies that the people and government have to partner in order to bring about their development. Shut (2002:109) in his analysis of "Community Development work in Nigeria, operational problems and strategies for improvement", sees community development effort to include: reduction of poverty, articulate the needs of the community, conscientizing the community through education, planning

community programmes, participating in decisions affecting the community, stimulating self-help projects and community spirit in the people, attracting governments' attention to the community problems/needs/aspirations, mobilizing community resources for self help and development. He went further to state that community development is:

the deliberate effort by a community, through its leadership to plan, promote, and pursue projects and programmes, that will bring about an improvement in their living conditions, either by mobilizing themselves and their resources through levies, freewill donation, launching etc, or by calling on government to support them having first, identified their problem(s) and mobilized resources to address them (Shut:2002:109).

Ugal (cited in Elomola and Nwosu (eds)1992:220) in his analysis of the "Role of Non-Governmental Development Association: The Experience of Cross River State", argues strongly about their utility and role in rural transformation in Nigeria. He contends that:

One of the enduring and flourishing heritages of traditional societies in Africa and Nigeria in particular is their involvement in community development. It has been the indigenous mechanism and techniques developed and employed by the people to identify their felt needs choose what they want and take cooperative action to satisfy their needs. He argues strongly too that before the introduction of development planning in Nigeria, rural communities had learnt to pool their resources to provide physical facilities for themselves such as construction and fortification of ancient walls, boats, trenches, shrines, churches, mosques and of recent, educational institutions.

It is a widely accepted view that for any attempt to understand the development process at the grass-roots level, one must necessarily come to terms with those community based organizations around which the people have always organized themselves for the collective, improvement of their living conditions, (Ohachenu, 1986 and Kabiru, 1985).

Ohachenu, (1986), was able to demonstrate that grass roots non-governmental associations possess the essential ingredients that make for self-sustaining development in the rural communities. They are the basic agencies of grass roots development in the rural communities. Uphoft et al (1979), have suggested that, we learn from these grass-root associations so that government can partner with them in the provision of rural development services/projects. Through the effort of communities, they have been able to build schools, clinics, roads, bridges, culverts, dams, parks, gardens, halls involving millions of naira, (Shut, 2002:110).

We have been able to establish the need for community effort in rural development, and the linkage between governments and the community in the process of transforming the rural areas. However, more often, government takes the community for granted and brings projects without their participation to enable government know their priorities, and primary needs. It is our intention to bring out these gaps in the study to three selected agencies and make concrete recommendations for purposes of policy and action by government.

4.9 FAITH BASED AGENCIES AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PLATEAU STATE.

Faith based agencies are those non governmental agencies involved in rural development partly because they want to use it for evangelization, or partly to promote the well being of their members through what they call 'Holistic Development.'

The Faith Based Agencies are created, financed and run by their various missions. The ones that are in place and are visible in Plateau are the Christian Faith Based Agencies such as ECWA People Oriented Development (POD), Catholic Jos Archdiocese (CARUDEP), and Rural Development Counselors for Christian churches in Africa (RURCON). We shall discuss the approaches and roles of these three agencies in Plateau State, to enable us appreciate their contributions to rural development.

4.9.1 People Oriented Development of ECWA (POD)

ECWA POD was started in 1988, through the integration of the Extension section of ECWA Rural Development Ltd and the preventive health section of ECWA Community Health programme. The two departments had the same target groups who are the rural poor. POD in its original conception had the support of a German Faith body tagged (EZE). The first phase covered the period from 1989-1992, second phase, 1995-1998, third phase, 1998-2000, Fourth phase 2001-2003, while the 5th phase 2004-2006, (ECWA REPORT MANGU/JOS Districts 1999-2005). The Headquarters is at Evangel Hospital, Jos Plateau State. The researcher was unable to get any information on POD ECWA beyond 2006.

Mandate: POD is involved in wholistic community- based development as an act of demonstrating God's love to mankind.

Goal: The goal of POD is to reach out to Nigerian Communities, and attaining sustainable and wholistic development.

Mission: PODs mission is to promote sustainable wholistic development a ctivities through effective animation and capacity building.

Target Group: PODs target is to help the poor and under priviledged communities in Nigeria.

POD Values:

- (1) POD values people, their potentials, full participation in their development through the utilization of available resources through communal efforts as well as their realization of God's love
- (2) Integrity, POD believes in total honesty, transparency and accountability at all levels and respect to its leaders.
- (3) Indigenous knowledge: POD believes in peoples' indigenous knowledge about their environment, and the utilization of such knowledge.
- (4) God's love. The love of God to all mankind which must be demonstrated by action through us

Mission Statement: The mission statement of people's oriented development is to promote sustainable living conditions through effective community mobilization and capacity building of the underprivileged communities in Nigeria. The strategy for achieving the mission statement is capacity building through their field staff, especially the community development officers, coach target communities, teach them techniques for development, encourage participatory technology development, formation of community development committees by the people to carryout their development activities (POD Document, 1999-2005).

Within Jos/Mangu District alone, about 300 community development members have been trained from 105 communities in the last 3 years. The programmes embarked upon includes:

- (1) Community mobilization (awareness rising) through participatory learning action approach.

- (2) Community Based Health care for health Education, voluntary health works, Traditional Birth attendants, HIV/AIDS prevention awareness campaigns, VIP toilets construction.
- (3) Food security/sustainable agriculture. Teach people on agro-forestry, dangers of deforestation, construction of rural roads, wells, filters, literacy classes made from local materials etc.
- (4) Sustainable water supply: Assist communities to dig concrete wells, for portable drinking water, so far 600 wells have been completed and are in use.

Other areas are economic empowerment through awareness amongst youths, and women, peace building to promote harmonious relationship in target communities, awareness on human rights, democracy, good governance and conflict resolution, etc. (POD Document, 1999-2005).

The project/programmes embarked upon by POD in Jos/Mangu districts of Plateau State are listed below:

TABLE 5A: ACTIVITIES OF POD OF ECWA IN PLATEAU STATE

S/N	NAME OF COMMUNITY	WATER/HEALTH PROJECT	OTHER ACTIVITIES
1	Patiko Matare	2 wells 5 VIPs 1 Clinic	-
2.	Sali	3 VIPs 2 Wells	-
3.	Kwahaslalek	2 VIPs	Sustainable agric practices
4.	Rabwak	6 VIPs 1 Well	-
5.	Gindiri (JUTH) Gindiri (TOWN (for one house hold)	4 well 1 well and 1 VIP	-
6.	Sabon Layi (COCIN Leprosy and Rehabilitation Centre)	3 VIPs	Firewood saving stove
7.	Kwi	1 well	-
8.	Luwe	1 VIP	-
9.	Gyangyang	5 Wells	-
10.	Gunji	2 wells	-
11.	Tabulung	1 well	-
12.	Tingkum	1 Well	-
13.	Lukgere	1 Well	-
14.	Mariri	1 Well 1 VIP	-

Source: Project update from the inception of POD ECWA 1999-2005

TABLE 5B: ASSESSMENT OF THE ACTIVITIES OF POD ECWA BETWEEN 2002 - 2003

NAME OF COMMUNITY	POPULATION		NO OF MEETINGS	TYPE OF ACTIVITY PROJECT/TRAINING	DATE STATING	STAGE	DATE OF COMPLETION	TRAINING PARTICIPANTS	REMARKS
	MALE	FEMALE							
Pandadi	200	300	5	Well 1	15/3/02	Completed	5/4/02		Good work
				Training Well digger	15/3/02			4	Adhoc
Rabwak	130	220	4	VIP	2/02	Completed			Successful
				Clinic	4/02	Collapse			Being rebuild
Jwak millet	200	300	5	Well 1	6/4/02	Completed	5/02		Good work
				Training well digger	6/4/02			4	Adhoc
				Tree Nursery	5/02				Successful
Tingkum	200	350	9	Well 1					Successful
				Local toilet 1					Successful
				CDC Trained				5	Functioned
				VHW Training				2	Functioned
Tabulum	120	200	3	Dish rack 1	2002				
				Local toilet 1	2002				
				VHW F/up training	7/11/02		8/11/2002		
Ampang West	500	800		VHW F/up training	7/11/02			8	Functioned
Fwam	30	50	6	Animation PLA					
Dangu	150	300	6	Animation PLA					
Bwagaform	70	100	6	Project Meeting					
Sali	130	200	3	Project Meeting					
Garah	125	300	2	Project Meeting					
Gyangyan	300	4	2	Project meeting					
Patiko			3	Project Meeting					
Kufai	215	425	2	Reflection					
	2370	5745	56						
Zakukpang	70	150	3	Well 1	24/3/03	Lining Completed			No. over/Apron
				Local well digger	4/3/03			4	Adhoc
Pandadi				Well 1	3/4/03			4	Impressive
Ampang West	500	800		CDC Trained	11/3/03		12/3/03	24	Impressive
Kufai	215	425		Need assessment					Successful
Rabwak	120	200	VIP 1	24/4/03					

Source: POD ECWA Report 2005

TABLE 6: PEOPLE ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT OF ECWA FIELD ACTIVITIES UPDATE 4TH PHASE

NAME OF COMMUNITY	POPULATION		NO OF MEETINGS	TYPE OF ACTIVITY PROJECT/TRAINING	DATE STATING	STAGE	DATE OF COMPLETION	TRAINING PARTICIPANTS	REMARKS
	MALE	FEMALE							
Bwagafom	70	100	3	Clinic 1	3/01	Complete	4/02		Good work
				Animation (PLA)	Jan. /01		4/02		
				CDC Formation	Ja. /01				Not train
Tabulung	120	200	3	Well 1	5/01				No cover/apron
				VHW	20/10/01		24/11/01	9	Successful
				CDC Formation					Not Train
Ampang West			4	VHW Training	16/10/01		20/10/01	10	Successful
Gunji	30	40	3	Well 2	5/01				No Cover/apron
Patiko	100	150	2	Clinic	4/01	Collapse			Gathering
				VIP 2	2001	Complete			Material
Sali	130	200	3	15 dish racks	2001	Complete			
Garah	87	150	4	Animation PLA	20/1/01				
				CDC Formation	2001				Not train
				VHW	2001				Not train
Rabwak	120	200	2	Project meeting	2/2001				Successful
Dangu	150	300	4	Animation PLA	3/9/01				Successful
Fwan	30	80	5	Animation PLA	15/8/01				Successful
Jwak Millet	150	350	2	Project meeting	5/9/01				Successful
Kwahaslek	100	180	2	Animation Reflection	29/10/01				Successful
Gyan-Gyan	300	400	2	Animation (Health)	9/9/01				Successful
	1487	2350	41						

Source: POD ECWA; 2001-2003

4.9.2 Rural Christian Organization In Plateau State

Rural Development counselors for Christian churches in Africa (RURCON) is a pan African Network of a team of African Christian facilitators sharing their faith and development skills through Sub-Saharan Africa. RURCON came into being in 1971, with a view to building capacities for church leaders, members and followers to adopt the concept of wholistic evangelization. The church should not only touch the soul but the body through economic empowerment. RURCON believes in self-reliance and sustainable life style based on Christian stewardship. Its philosophy is “Caring management” with a focus on the poor. The headquarters is in Jos, Plateau, Bible Translation Trust. RURCON’s mission statement is to “provide for a wholistic development of the people through Christian churches/organizations in Africa in order to transform them as God intends”. (Rurcon Publication, 2000).

RURCON’s Core Values:

RURCON is guided by its core values which include: Christian wholistic development, people’s participation, leadership, Christian morality/ethics as the bedrock for development, and the pursuit of justice, peace, and integrity.

RURCON unlike ECWA POD does not run projects, but rather they advise on Christian stewardship and development. RURCON is more interested in training, education, capacity building than getting directly involved in physical projects. (RURCON pamphlets).

4.9.3 Catholic Archdiocesan Rural and Urban Development (Carudep)

CARUDEP located in Kuru Plateau State, is a faith based organization, whose mandate is to facilitate wholistic human development to all irrespective of tribe, creed or gender (CARUDEP pamphlet). The organization is presently coordinated by the Justice Development and Peace Mission (J.D.P.M). The activities of CARUDEP are a

combination of direct project implementation, workshop, and training, capacity building for the marginalized in the rural and urban communities in Jos Archdiocese and beyond.

CARUDEP is guided by a vision statement of self-sustained, well structured and wholistic development of the people. This is carried out by networking with others towards building an empowered community. Its mission statement is to serve God, and empower the poor through raising their awareness and capacity building for wholistic transformation in order to bring about justice and peace in our communities.

Objectives of CARUDEP

The objectives of CARUDEP among others include, to animate and build local capacities in various fields for sustainable development among individuals and communities, to raise awareness and train local farmers in sustainable agriculture, to improve health standards especially of disadvantaged communities in rural areas through provision of portable sources of water, to facilitate environmental protection through control of erosion and afforestation and to collaborate with individuals and other organizations who share the same goals/objectives.

CARUDEP's activity areas includes; well construction, rain water harvesting, VIP latrines construction, sand filtration, bio-gas production, small culverts construction, sustainable agricultural activities, food processing, sustainable livestock production, etc (CARUDEP CALENDAR NOT DATED)

CHAPTER FIVE DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

5.1. DATA PRESENTATION

This section deals with the presentation of data (collated information from our primary sources) and their analyses. The questionnaire was divided into five sections. Section one bio data; section two dwells on PADP; section three on direct labour agency; section four on Plateau State Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Agency while section five is on general information. The field questionnaire collates responses from communities through individuals resident in those communities about their awareness, roles and contributions of these selected rural development agencies in Plateau State. The field report and analysis are presented below in tables. Simple percentages, and chi-square statistics were employed for data analysis.

5.1.1 Report of findings using the Table of Percentages.

The following section discusses the aggregate responses and the percentage to each questionnaire for the six selected local government areas. Not all the questionnaire asked were analysed, only those that helped us address the research questions and the hypotheses in this research were analysed using the table of percentages and the chi-square.

TABLE 7: AREAS OF BENEFIT FROM RURAL DEVELOPMENT BY THE THREE SELECTED AGENCIES TO PLATEAU STATE COMMUNITIES

	PADP	Responses	%	DLA	Stage of	Responses	%	PRUWASSA	Responses	%
	Areas of			Projects	completion			Projects		
	services			Embark	of projects			Executed		
	provided			ed upon						
Areas of benefits, items 4, 5,	Fertilizer	101	38	Roads	Completed	62	24	Boreholes	121	41
& 3 of the research	Chemicals	55	22	Schools	Ongoing	28	10	Well	121	41
questionnaire are used to	Farm Seedling	19	08	Bridges						
generate data				Culverts	Abandoned	168	66	Sanitary		11
								Services	30	
	Feeder Roads	37	14					Dams	17	07
	Enlightenment	47	18							
TOTAL		259	100			258	100		259	100

Source: Field Survey, 2010

Table 7 above presents a picture of the range of activities of the three selected rural development agencies in Plateau State and their benefits to rural communities. For Plateau Agricultural Development Programme (PADP), the major areas of benefit is fertilizer indicated by 38% respondents, chemicals 22% respondents, farm inputs 8% respondents, feeder roads 14% respondents, and public enlightenment 18% respondents. From the table above, the bulk of the benefits of PADP is in fertilizer and chemicals. It is however worthy of note that under the present Jang administration, this responsibility has been shifted to agric research and mechanization agency located at Kassa, under an Isreali firm. This leaves PADP with merely feeder roads, fadama farming and public enlightenment of communities.

For direct labour agency, the area of focus is in roads, schools, bridges, culverts, at various levels of completions. Data show that 24% of respondents indicated the projects are completed, 10% ongoing, while 66% indicated they are abandoned. This shows that most of the projects are not completed as at the time of collating the information for this research.

The Plateau rural water supply and sanitation agency PRUWASSA is involved in the areas of boreholes provision, wells, dams, and sanitary services in the rural areas. Data on the above table show that 41% respondents see the activities of the agency as mainly the provision of boreholes, 41% wells, 11% sanitary service, while 07% dams. It is clear from the data analysis that water is the major preoccupation of the agency, and sanitary services a marginal activity of the agency. The table above has clearly indicated the areas of services of the selected agencies but as to whether their impacts are felt or not, or the beneficiaries are carried along at the stages of the projects is addressed in the table 8 below.

TABLE 8: LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT OF THE BENEFICIARIES OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PLATEAU STATE

Stage of Involvement of beneficiaries		PADP Responses	%	DLA Responses	%	PRUWASSA Responses	%
Items 5,7 & 6 of the questionnaire are used to generate data	Conception	77	28	55	25	67	32
	Implementation	70	25	36	16	55	26
	Not involved	123	47	129	59	86	42
TOTAL		270	100	220	100	208	100

Source: Field Survey, 2010

From the table above, the picture of involvement of benefiting communities in the projects of the selected rural development agencies is clear. At the level of conception of PADP projects, only 28% of respondents say they are involved, while for direct labour agency only 25% respondents are involved, but for Plateau rural water supply and sanitation agency only 32% respondents are involved. For projects implementation, PADP indicates that 25% respondents are involved. Direct labour agency 16% respondents are involved while PRUWASSA 26% respondents are involved. For those respondents who indicated they were not involved at all, PADP recorded 47%, DLA 59% and PRUWASSA 42%. It is very clear and instructive that, majority of the respondents were not involved at any stage of the projects circle.

TABLE 9: RATING OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES IN PLATEAU STATE.

Assessment of Programme	PADP Responses	%	DLA Responses	%	PRUWASSA Responses	%
Very high	22	07	19	07	20	07
High	73	25	46	19	77	27
Very low	95	36	71	29	88	31
Low	92	32	108	45	95	35
TOTAL	282	100	244	100	280	100

Source: Field Survey, 2010

Data on the above table show that for PADP, 7% respondent put the rating very high; 25% as high, 36% very low, and 32% low. On a general note, PADP's performance in the state is very low with 36% as against 7% very high. The direct labour agency has a rating of 7% very high, 19% high, 29% very low and 45% low. The finding shows that the response for low performance (45%) is higher than that of high performance (19%). It is therefore evidently clear that the performance of direct labour agency is rated low in the state. For PRUWASSA, the rating is 7% very high, 27% high, 31% very low and 35% low. The analysis shows that the performance of PRUWASSA is low (35%) compared with its high rating of 27%. We therefore conclude that the programme performed low in the state.

TABLE 10: ASSESSMENT OF THE INVOLVEMENT OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL INSTITUTIONS IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PLATEAU STATE

Institutions	Number of respondents	%
Cooperative societies	18	6
Community based Associations	245	89
Faith based organization	16	05
TOTAL	279	100

Source: Field Survey 2010

The above result indicates that of the non-governmental institutions involved in rural development in Plateau State, community based organizations are the most dominant. This is evident in the responses where 89% indicates that community based associations play a greater role in rural development in Plateau State than cooperative societies with 6%, and Faith based organizations 5% respectively.

TABLE 11: LEVEL OF GOVERNMENTS THAT ASSIST COMMUNITIES IN SELF-HELP RURAL PROGRAMMES IN PLATEAU STATE.

Level of government	Number of Respondents	%
Federal	5	2
State	46	26
Local government	97	62
Both institutions	18	10
TOTAL	176	100

Source: Field Survey 2010

From the table above, all the levels of governments assist in one way or the other in rural development in the state, but a higher percentage is from the state and local governments. From the table above, 5% respondents are of the view that support for projects comes from the Federal Government, 26% respondents indicated that support comes from the state government, 62% from the local government, while 10% respondents are not sure of which institution supports them so they indicated Federal, State and Local government. It is normal for the state and local government to play a significant role because they are closest to the people.

TABLE 12: NATURE OF ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY THE THREE LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS IN PLATEAU STATE.

Nature of Assistance	Number of respondents	%
Finance	55	31
Manpower	39	22
Materials	41	24
Mobilization	40	23
TOTAL	175	100

Source: Field Survey, 2010

The table above explains the nature of assistance by the three levels of governments in Nigeria towards rural development related projects. The bulk of the assistance is in finance and manpower, which recorded 31% and 22%, respectively while materials take 24% and mobilization of the rural beneficiaries by government 23%. It is also instructive that only 23% of the assistance is in the form of mobilization, while 67% is in cash, manpower and materials.

5.2 TEST OF RESEARCH HYPOTHESES.

To test hypotheses one and two of the research, the chi-square statistic was used. The chi-square (χ^2) formula is;

$$\chi^2 = \frac{\sum (f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$$

To obtain the expected frequency f_e , the formula is, $f_e = \frac{R \cdot C}{N}$, where

f_o = observed frequency

f_e = expected frequency

R = Row total

C = Column total

N = Grant total

The following section presents the details of the procedures that arrive at the testing of the research hypotheses in this work.

Hypothesis One

This hypothesis was set to find out the level and stage of involvement of beneficiaries of rural development programmes in Plateau State.

H1: “There is a significant relationship between the involvement of beneficiaries and the successful implementation of rural development programmes in Plateau State”.

CONTINGENCY TABLE 13: STAGE OF INVOLVEMENT OF BENEFICIARIES OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PROJECTS CONCEPTION AND IMPLEMENTATION IN PLATEAU STATE.

Stage of Involvement of Beneficiaries in Rural Development Programmes in Plateau State	Number of Respondents in each Rural Development/Agency			
	PADP	DLE	PRUWASSA	TOTAL
At Conception	86	65	67	219
At Implementation	60	46	55	161
Not involved at all	103	109	106	318
Total	250	220	228	698

Source: Field Survey, 2010.

To obtain f_e for the hypothesis, we used the formula

$$f_e = \frac{R \times C}{N} \quad \text{where}$$

f_e = Expected frequency

R = Row Total

C = Column total

N = Grand Total

Therefore, the f_e for the first hypothesis was calculated as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{1}^{\text{st}} \text{ Row:} \quad \frac{219 \times 250}{698} = 78.4 \\
 \frac{219 \times 220}{698} = 69.0 \\
 \frac{219 \times 228}{698} = 71.5 \\
 \text{2}^{\text{nd}} \text{ Row:} \quad \frac{161 \times 250}{698} = 57.7 \\
 \frac{161 \times 220}{698} = 50.7 \\
 \frac{161 \times 228}{698} = 52.6 \\
 \text{3}^{\text{rd}} \text{ Row:} \quad \frac{318 \times 250}{698} = 113.9 \\
 \frac{318 \times 220}{698} = 100.2 \\
 \frac{318 \times 228}{698} = 103.9
 \end{array}$$

The chi-square formula is given below:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 X^2 = \sum (f_o - f_e)^2, \text{ where} \\
 X^2 = \text{Chi- square} \\
 f_o = \text{observe frequency} \\
 f_e = \text{Expected frequency} \\
 \sum = \text{summation}
 \end{array}$$

Therefore, the individual frequencies are calculated as follows:

$$\frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$$

Thus: $\frac{(86 - 78.4)^2}{78.4} = 0.94$

$\frac{(65 - 69)^2}{69} = 0.23$

$\frac{(67 - 71.5)^2}{71.5} = 0.28$

$\frac{(60 - 50.7)^2}{57.7} = 0.09$

$\frac{(46 - 50.7)^2}{50.7} = 0.44$

$\frac{(55 - 52.6)^2}{52.6} = 0.11$

$\frac{(103 - 113.9)^2}{113.9} = 1.04$

$\frac{(109 - 100.2)^2}{100.2} = 0.77$

$\frac{(106 - 103.8)^2}{103.8} = 0.05$

$\chi^2 = 3.95$

TABLE 14: CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION FROM FIELD DATA

Fo	Fe	fo-fe	(fo-fe)²	(fo-fe)²/fe
87	78.4	8.6	78.96	0.94
65	69.0	-4.0	16.0	0.23
67	71.5	-4.5	20.25	0.28
60	57.7	2.3	5.29	0.09
46	50.7	-4.7	22.09	0.44
55	52.6	2.4	5.76	0.11
103	113.9	-10.9	118.81	1.04
109	100.2	8.8	77.44	0.77
106	103.8	2.2	4.84	0.05

$$\underline{\underline{\mathbf{X}^2 = 3.95}}$$

Source: Field Survey: 2010

Degree of freedom (df) is calculated as

Df = (C-1) (R-1), where

df = Degree of freedom

C = Number of columns

R = Number of row

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Df} &= (3 - 1) (3 - 1) \\ &= 2 \times 2 \\ &= 4 \end{aligned}$$

Using 95% level of significance (0.05) under 4 degrees of freedom, the tabulated X^2 value is 9.49.

The rule state that if the calculated value of X^2 is less than the tabulated value, the research hypothesis which states that “There is a significant relationship between the involvement of beneficiaries and the successful implementation of rural development programmes in Plateau State”, is rejected, and the alternate hypothesis which states that. “There is no significant relationship between the involvement of beneficiaries and the successful implementation of rural development programmes in Plateau State,” is upheld.

Hypothesis Two

The hypothesis H2 is restated as follow:

H2: There is a significant relationship between the activities of the selected rural development agencies (PADP, DLA and PRUWASSA) and the level of impact on rural development in Plateau State.

The following items in the questionnaire were used to generate data for this hypothesis namely 6,8,7 of the questionnaire.

CONTINGENCY TABLE 15: IMPACT OF AGENCIES ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN PLATEAU STATE.

SELECTED RURAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES	LEVEL OF IMPACT ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT				
	Very High	High	Low	Very Low	Total
PADP	22	73	95	92	282
DLA	19	46	71	108	244
PRUWASSA	20	77	88	95	280
TOTAL	61	196	254	295	806

Source: Field Survey, 2010

To obtain fe for the hypothesis, we used the formula $\frac{R \times C}{N}$

Therefore, the fe for the second hypothesis was calculated as follows:

1st Row:

$$\frac{282 \times 61}{806} = 21.3$$

$$\frac{282 \times 196}{806} = 68.6$$

$$\frac{282 \times 254}{806} = 88.9$$

$$\frac{282 \times 295}{806} = 103.2$$

2nd Row:

$$\frac{244 \times 61}{806} = 18.5$$

$$\frac{244 \times 196}{806} = 59.9$$

$$\frac{244 \times 254}{806} = 76.9$$

$$\frac{244 \times 295}{806} = 89.3$$

3rd Row:

$$\frac{280 \times 61}{806} = 21.2$$

$$\frac{280 \times 196}{806} = 68.1$$

$$\frac{280 \times 254}{806} = 88.2$$

$$\frac{280 \times 295}{806} = 102.48$$

$$X^2 = \frac{\sum (fo-fe)^2}{fe}$$

Therefore, for individual frequencies, the following formula was applied.

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(fo-fe)^2}{Fe} \\ \text{Thus: } & + \frac{(22 - 21.3)^2}{21.3} = 0.02 \\ & + \frac{(73 - 68.6)^2}{68.6} = 0.28 \\ & + \frac{(95 - 88.9)^2}{88.9} = 0.42 \\ & + \frac{(92 - 103.2)^2}{103.2} = 1.22 \\ & + \frac{(19 - 18.5)^2}{11.5} = 0.01 \\ & + \frac{(46 - 59.3)^2}{59.3} = 2.98 \\ & + \frac{(71 - 76.9)^2}{76.9} = 0.45 \\ & + \frac{(108 - 89.3)^2}{89.3} = 3.92 \\ & + \frac{(20 - 21.2)^2}{21.2} = 0.07 \\ & + \frac{(77 - 68.1)^2}{68.1} = 1.16 \\ & + \frac{(88 - 88.2)^2}{88.2^2} = 0 \\ & + \frac{(95 - 102.5)^2}{102.5} = 0.5 \\ X^2 & = 11.08 \end{aligned}$$

TABLE 16: CHI-SQUARE CALCULATION FROM FIELD DATA

Fo	Fe	fo-fe	(fo-fe)²	(fo-fe)²/fe
22	21.3	0.7	0.49	0.02
73	68.6	4.4	19.36	0.28
95	88.9	6.1	37.21	0.42
92	103.2	11.2	125.44	1.22
19	18.5	0.5	0.25	0.01
46	59.3	-13.3	176.89	2.98
71	76.9	-5.9	34.81	0.45
108	89.3	18.7	349.69	3.92
20	21.2	-1.2	1.44	0.07
77	68.1	8.9	79.21	1.16
88	88.2	-0.2	0.04	0.00
95	102.5	-7.5	56.25	0.55
				<u>X² = 11.08</u>

Source: Field Survey 2010

Degree of freedom

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Df} &= (C-1) (R-1) \\
 &= (4-1) (3-1) \\
 &= 3 \times 2 \\
 &= 6
 \end{aligned}$$

Using 95% confidence level, X² critical (tabulated) is 12.59. The calculated value, X² which is 11.08 is less than the table value which is 12.59.

Decision:

This rule states that if the calculated value of X^2 is less than the tabulated value the research hypothesis is rejected and the alternate accepted. In this case the calculated value 11.08 is less than the tabulated value 12.59, the research hypothesis which states that. “There is a significant relationship between the activities of the selected rural development agencies (PADP, DLA, and PRUWASSA) and the level of impact on rural development in Plateau State is rejected, and the alternate which states. “There is no significant relationship between the activities of the selected rural development agencies (PADP, DLA, and PRUWASSA) and the level of impact on rural development in Plateau State,” is upheld.

Hypothesis Three

To test hypothesis three which states that;

“There is a significance relationship between the strategy of rural development adopted in Plateau State and the level of rural development in the State”, the researcher relied on the interview scheduled with Project Managers of the three selected rural development agencies who are only three in number. They agreed that, “the strategy of rural development adopted in the state is defective and does not address the problems of rural development in the State”. (Interview with Managers of rural development agencies, 2010). The managers of the selected rural development agencies supported the adoption of an alternative strategy to rural development in the state.

5.3 **AN ANALYSIS OF BUDGET ALLOCATIONS IN PLATEAU STATE FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT.**

Budgets are annual estimates of the state on sectoral allocation. It expresses the intention of the state to allocate funds to different sectors of economy. In Plateau State

between 1999 and 2010, two Governors Dariye and Jang held the mantle of leadership, each with broad policy statements and programmes of rural development for the state. Table 5.1.a below provides the figures on budget allocations and the percentage allocation to rural development agencies. In 1999 for example, the total budget was N3,257,802,819.22 and only N102,630,490, representing 3.15% was for rural development related agencies. Plateau Agricultural Development Programme was allocated N47,630,490, Plateau State Directorate of Integrated Rural Development N45 million, and N10 million for rural electricity, N10 million for boreholes and feeder roads. The total for rural development does not reflect the budget's focus tagged "Budget of poverty alleviation and provision of social services". In the same vein, the year 2000 budget allocated N90 million for direct labour agency, N80,704,708 for Plateau Agricultural Development Programme. In 2001, the budget tagged "budget of Sustainable Rural Transformation and Tourism Development", N419,600,000.00 was allocated for fertilizer blending at Bokkos. N320,000,000.00 for direct labour agency and N1,043,496.00 for rural roads, which represented 4.7% of the total budget. For the year 2002, N1,205,000,000.00 was allocated for integrated road networks, most of which were in the rural areas. N56,622,000.00 for Plateau Agricultural Development Programme, N140,000.00 for rural electrification, N46,000,000.00 for hand dug wells, 17 boreholes and 85 tube wells in the 17 local government areas. In 2003, the budget allocated N162,884,280.00 for rural water supply and Sanitation, N104,250,000.00 for rural feeder roads, N103,969,218.00 for direct labour rural roads N260,190,000.00 for rural electrification, N50,000,000.00 for Plateau Agricultural Development Programme. The 2004 budget tagged "Budget of Hope and Participatory Development", N70,000,000.00 was allocated to rural water and sanitation, N280,000,000.00 for wards development "initiative programmes". In 2005, N239,400,000.00 was allocated for rural water and sanitation, N388,500,000.00 for direct labour agency, and N306,400,000.00 for rural electrification. In 2006, tagged "Budget of Consolidation and Rural Transformation",

N2,615,142,637.00 was allocated to agriculture and rural development with a focus on accelerated rural development (rural roads, water supply electrification and sanitation) In 2006, PADP had an allocation of N600,396,500.00, direct labour agency N500,000,000.00, Plateau Rural Water Supply and Sanitation N311,880,000.00. In 2007, the information was not available to the researcher. In 2008, under the regime of Jonah Jang, N11.676 Billion was allocated for water resources and rural development. In 2009, N4.5 billion was allocated to agriculture, water resources and rural development, N530,000,000.00 to MDG office, N202,065,000.0 for rural water supply and sanitation. In 2010, the budget estimates of Plateau agricultural development programme was Nil, direct labour agency N100,000,000.00, and PRUWASSA N150,000,000.00. A detailed picture of the total budgetary allocation, capital budget releases and the percentage of the budget allocation compared to the total budget for each of the three selected agencies is seen in tables 17, 18 & 19 below.

**TABLE 17: BUDGET ALLOCATIONS TO RURAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES
IN PLATEAU STATE, 1999 - 2010**

Year	Total Budget	Budget for Rural Development Agencies	% of Allocation
1999	3,257,802,819.22	102,630,490.00	3.15%
2000	7,847,766,900.00	170,704,708.00	2.18%
2001	17,349,962,787.00	825,500,000.00	4.78%
2002	15,997,407,043.00	1,278,622,000.00	7.99%
2003	16,261,207,261.00	1,557,094,498.00	9.58%
2004	20,490,956,373.00	588,300,000.00	2.58%
2005	9,404,438,855.00	934,300,000.00	9.93%
2006	19,078,614,727.00	1,412,276,500.00	7.40%
2007	N.A	N.A	N.A
2008	63,006,723,833.00	11,676,00,000.07	18.53%
2009	83,023,908,165.00	5,032,065,000.00	6.06%
2010	N.A	N.A	N.A

Source: Computed by Researcher from Budget Speeches from 1999 – 2010.

TABLE 18: ANALYSIS OF CAPITAL BUDGETARY RELEASES TO THE THREE RURAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES IN PLATEAU STATE 1999 – 2010

Year	Budgetary provision			Budgetary releases		
	PADP	DLA	PRUWASSA	PADP	DLA	PRUWASSA
1999	58,056,000.00	Nil	Not provided	Nil	Nil	Nil
2000	112,704,000.00	Nil	“	Nil	Nil	Nil
2001	164,040,000.00	Nil	“	9,000,000.00	31,467,084.00	Nil
2002	80,316,000.00	421,600,000.00	“	Nil	34,675,501.00	Nil
2003	80,316,000.00	531,100,000.00	“	Nil	2,598,738.00	3,000,000.00
2004	85,306,000.00	315,000,000.00	“	755,000.00	21,825,336.00	9,006,440.00
2005	85,524,000.00	402,000,000.00	“	15,000,000.00	26,671,585.00	Nil
2006	83,277,000.00	361,375,000.00	“	31,728,427.00	20,052,929.00	Nil
2007	83,227,000.00	361,375,000.00	“	11,910,000.00	15,788,042.00	15,000,000.00
2008	521,358,420.00	219,808,050.00	“	8,650,000.00	50,000.00	37,175,000.00
2009	Zero Budget	109,341,000.00	“	Nil	Nil	10,376,679.00
2010	Zero Budget	130,000,000.00	“	Nil	Nil	7,432,000.00

Source: Field Survey, 2010

From the table above, it is clear that budgetary releases do not match budgetary provisions by the Agencies. In some cases, there are zero budgetary releases to the Agency.

Table 19: PERCENTAGE OF BUDGET RELEASE COMPARED TO TOTAL YEARLY BUDGET FROM 1999 – 2010.

Yearly	Budget	% of Budget release for capital projects for the year					
		PADP	%	DLA	0%	PRUWASSA	0%
1999	3,257,802,819.00	Nil	0%	Nil	0%	Nil	0%
2000	7,847,760,900.00	Nil	0%	Nil	0%	Nil	0%
2001	17,349,962,787.00	9,000,000.00	0.05%	31,467,089.00	0.18%	Nil	0%
2002	15,997,407,043.00	Nil	0%	34,675,501.00	0.21%	Nil	0%
2003	16,261,207,261.00	Nil	0%	2,587,738.00	0.02%	3,000,000.00	0.01%
2004	20,490,956,273.00	7,505,000.00	0.03%	21,825,336.00	0.10%	9,006,440.00	0.04%
2005	9,404,438,855.00	15,000,000.00	0.02%	26,671,585.00	0.03%	Nil	0%
Z2006	19,078,614,727.00	31,728,427.00	0.16%	20,052,929.00	0.11%	Nil	0%
2007	N.A	11,910,600.00	Not computed	15,758,042.00	Not computed	15,000,000.00	Not computed
2008	63,006,723,833.00	8,650,000.00	0.01%	50,000.00	0.00%	37,175,000.00	0.06%
2009	83,023,908,165.00	Nil	0%	Nil	0%	10,376,679.00	0.01%
2010	N.A	Nil	0%	Nil	0%	7,432,000.00	Not computed

Source: Field Survey, 2010

Note: Those not computed because the budgetary figures for the year were not available at the point of analysis of the research data.

From the data presented, none of the rural development agencies got up to 1% of total budget of the year. The essence of the above evaluation is to see the budgetary proposals alongside actual releases. The budgetary releases are too small compared to budget proposals (see table 17 above, also the % of budget allocation to rural development agencies is too small (see tables 18 and 19 above). This analysis has serious implication to the actual performance of the three selected rural development agencies in Plateau State.

5.4 ANALYSIS OF SELECTED RURAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES IN PLATEAU STATE

The agencies evaluated are Plateau Agricultural Development Programme (PADP), Director Labour Agency, Plateau Rural Water and Sanitation Agencies. These agencies are the focal points of our study area, with emphasis on their activities in the six selected local governments, two from each senatorial zone, earlier discussed in the methodology section.

5.4.1 Plateau Agricultural Development Programme (PADP)

Agricultural development programmes are initiatives of the World Bank's interventions in agriculture. The agricultural development programmes became popular in the early 1970s specifically in 1976, when the Federal department of rural development was established as a unit of the Federal ministry of agriculture, intended principally to provide an agency for effective promotion and coordination of the World Bank integrated agricultural development Projects (ADPS). It was in this light that PADP, started as an enclave project at Lafia (LADP in November 1977 as a pilot project. The success of the LADP, led to the establishment of the State wide project now known as Plateau agricultural development programme (PADP) in 1986. Like other ADPs nation-wide, the Plateau, ADP was funded through a tripartite funding

arrangement between the Federal Government, State Government and the World Bank (PADP Briefs, 2009:3).

While the World Bank was responsible for 66% funding, Federal and State Governments contributed 20% and 14% respectively. These figures continued to change overtime as the programme became more adapted in the states. Currently, the World Bank has withdrawn itself from funding. Sources of funding such as the state government, international fund for agricultural development (IFAD), National Programme for food security and National Fadama Project are the available sources (PADP Briefs, :7,9,13)

The main objective of the programme in Plateau State is to increase food production and incomes of the small-scale farmers, while the specific objectives among others include:-

- (i) To implement a cost effective unified Agricultural Extension workers and their regular visits to farmers.
- (ii) To develop flexible phased approach to agricultural development.
- (iii) Procurement and distribution of agricultural inputs through a network of farm service centres, e.g. the Kassa Farm Centre Headquarters of ASTC.
- (iv) Provision of rural infrastructure (rural feeder roads and portable water supply (PADP Briefs, 2009:3-4).

The programme was operated on a zonal basis, based on differences in agro-ecological settings, namely,

- (i) **Northern Zone**, comprising Barkin Ladi, Riyom, Jos South, Jos North and Bassa LGAs with headquarters in Bukuru.

- (ii) **Central Zone**, comprising Kanam, Kanke, Pankshin, Mangu and Bokkos LGA's with headquarter at Mangu and,
- (iii) **Southern Zone**, comprising Wase, L/North, L/South, Mikang, Shendam and Quan Pan LGAs with headquarters at Shendam.

These zones are also in line with the state geo-political zones of Senatorial Districts. The zones are manned by zonal officers, who are specialist in agricultural services. These officers provide technical support and supervision to the frontline, extension agents who work directly with the farmers.

The programme was implemented on a pilot scheme basis in the state. For instance, the National Fadama Project started at Federe, Jos East, with 10 kilometer Fadama Access road, 1,100 units of irrigation pumps, and a total of 1,135 Fadama Users Association formed. The root and tuber expansion programme, had five participating Local Government Areas - Bokkos, Langtang North, Shendam, Riyom, and Mangu LGAs. In each of the participating local government areas, five communities were selected as sites, giving a total of 25 communities as beneficiaries in the state. The National Programme for Food Security (NPFS) had three pilot areas in 2004, namely Hwak-Kuru (Jos South LGA), Mile 8 Fier (Pankshin LGA), and Gidan Adamu (Shendam LGA). By 2007, the following communities were selected for the programme.

Jos South	-	Hwak Kuru
Pankshin	-	Mile 8 Fier
Shendam	-	Gidan Adamu
Jos East	-	Laminga
Barkin Ladi	-	Gwakim (Dorowa Tsoho)
Mikang	-	Garkawa
Langtang South	-	Mabudi
Kanam	-	Bankilong
Bokkos	-	Fakkos

The total cost of the programme was estimated at \$205.1 million or N35 Billion Naira, for the 36 states and the FCT. Accordingly, Plateau State Government was to contribute the sum of N42.4 million, while the 9 participating LGAs are to contribute N3.6 million each for the year 2007 (PADP Briefs, 2009:7-10).

According to our interview with the General Manager, the PADP has contributed positively in the state through agricultural research, agricultural extension services, construction of feeder roads, water supply, dams, boreholes etc and communities participate through demand-driven approach, capacity building lectures at their zonal levels, (Field Interview, July 2009). The field interview with the Ag. general manager of PADP suggests that the major problem of the agency has been timely release of funds and obsolete equipment which were procured during the enclave project at Lafia in 1976 (See Appendix 3 attached). In spite of all these challenges, the PADP has made the following achievements.

- (i) Rated the best performing ADP in Nigeria in terms of project implementation and effective loan utilization in 1992, by a committee comprising World Bank, federal agricultural coordinating unit, and Federal department of agriculture.
- (ii) In 1992, PADP, won the first position in Nigeria, and was awarded the Nigeria national farming system research network performance certificate (PADP Briefs, 2009:11-12).
- (iii) In 1994, the farm management association of Nigeria (FAMMAN) awarded a certificate of merit to PADP for its distinguished services to small-scale farmers in the state.

- (iv) Again, in 1994, PADP was adjudged the best exhibitor amongst ADPS during a National Agricultural show to commemorate the 16th World food day in Abuja.

These achievements were possible because the programme was funded in the 1990s. The field offices were also active in their job. By the year 2000 to date, the performance of the PADP had begun to dwindle due to under funding (PADP Briefs 2009:12). Of recent, the following are some of the infrastructures provided by the PADP. Jos-Mazah Road in Jos north, Gora bridge in Jos east, rehabilitation of Mabudi and mile 4 earth dams in Langtang South, rehabilitation of Laminga- Dilimi village road in Jos South LGA, construction of numerous boreholes all over the state including Uni-Jos, Plateau State University Bokokos, and J.D Gomwalk State Secretariat Jos (PADP Briefs, 2009:13-14).

The present administration which has agriculture as part of its 10 points agenda has promised to revive PADP in its 2009 broadcast. Our discussion/analysis of PADP has shown the potentials of PADP as a vehicle for rural development given the right financial and technical support. However, beginning from the early years of 2000, this was not the case; hence the low performance of the agency as adjudged by the acting Project manager in our field interview report. For the details of PADP achievements, see table (20) below:

TABLE 20: ACHIEVEMENTS OF PADP BETWEEN 1987-2004

	AREA	UNIT/NO
(1)	<u>Rural Roads/Dams</u>	
	Road reinstatement	978.7km
	Road maintenance	1,020km
	Bridges constructed	16
	Culverts	443
	Dams Constructed	3
(2)	<u>Rural Water</u>	
	Wells	601
	Hand Pumps	241
	Boreholes	248
	Wash bore drilled	242
(3)	<u>Animal Traction</u>	
	Bulls purchased and trained	4,000
	Oxford driven ridges distributed	4,607
(4)	<u>Farm Inputs</u>	
	Fertilizer	492,976.01MT
	Vegetable seed (assorted)	6,253,104
	Improve seeds	14,090,438 MT
	Seedlings (Apple, coffe)	6,731.1 Stands
	Agro-Chemicals	273,272.75 litres/ 22,061.77kg

Source: PADP Annual Report, 2005.

In an interview with the General Manager of PADP, on the benefits of PADP to rural communities in Plateau State, he indicated that the programme at inception in 1976, up to the end of the military era in 1998, had contributed in the area of fertilizer procurement and distribution, farm inputs, farm machinery such as the water pump, roads construction etc as indicated in table 20 above. However, with the advent of civilian regime in 1999, the programme began to have challenges. First, the World Bank withdrew its support, secondly the politicians did not give the programme the free-hand to operate. Fertilizer became an item of political patronage. Only party supporters are granted the contract to supply fertilizer which the PADP never received. The supply of farm inputs and machinery declined due to poor funding. In table 18 earlier presented, you could see that allocation to PADP was zero in 1999, 2000, 2002, 2003, 2009 and 2010. The farmers were left to the mercy of middle men. Under the current regime of Jonah Jang, PADP no longer handles fertilizer, farm seedlings, and tractors etc. It is handled by the farm service centre at Kassa and Vom, managed by an Israeli farm company. The PADP currently exists to take care of fadama farmers, who enjoy some kind of loans. The farmers are encouraged to form cooperatives and apply for loans, which the PADP provides with funds from the National Fadama Programme. The obtaining of such loans is also a subject of political connection with the ruling party. PADP, as currently constituted, is not impacting much on rural development based on the findings from the interviews with the project manager of PADP. (Interview with PADP Manager July, 2009).

5.4.2 Plateau Direct Labour Agency

The Direct Labour Agency is a creation of the Plateau State government to enhance its rural transformation efforts. The agency has the main objective of designing, constructing and maintaining rural roads. The agency embarks on water

supply, culverts, bridges, government building, mechanical equipments, selected installation of plants, and household equipments to generate funds. However, for now, the agency has concentrated on the construction and maintenance of rural feeder roads, culverts, and bridges; provision of earth dams and boreholes for water (Field interview Report July, 2009).

According to the General Manager, the process of identifying critical needs, projects conception, formulation and implementation are carried out in partnership with benefiting communities such as maisons, carpenters, artisans are involved in the implementation of the projects in their localities. The local communities who are beneficiaries are encouraged to see the project as their own, and are involved in the maintenance of such projects after completion. The list of such projects embarked upon in the state between 2000- 2008 are provided in Appendix 3. The list of ongoing and completed roads by the Agency according to Senatorial zones is also attached as appendix 4.

The Agency, from the spread of its roads, water, and dams projects has a great potential to impact on rural infrastructure and thus rural development in the state, while its challenges are the non release of funds for their statutory responsibilities as earlier discussed.

The Agency has provided roads to 17 communities in the state. One from each local government, totaling 267.3 km. It has provided 5 earth Dams in Langtang South, North and Shendam all in the southern Senatorial District. It has constructed 5 bridges, 112 surface hand pump wells in the 17 local governments of the state. The details of these projects are contained in appendix 3 and 4 attached. A personal visit by the researcher to some of these local governments did not support this claim because most of the roads and wells were either not completed or they are not

functional especially the surface hand pump wells. The villagers in the communities visited testified to the non-existence of such projects, besides the projects were poorly done such that after one years, no one could recognize that the project existed. For instance, some of the culverts were too weak and have been washed away by the rain, or too small and are covered with debris. The performance of direct labour has not been felt much in the state.

After the end of the Dariye tenure, the current regime of Jonah Jang does not release funds to the agency for its operation. The agency has a lot of machines that are laying waste in its premises. An interview with the General Manager indicated that they only received N100,000 in 2010 as impress, but every year the agency presents a budget that no release of funds is made to them as indicated. Most of the time, the agency gets 0% release, and not up to 5% of their proposed budget is released in the year. This, according to the General Manager, has affected their operation. The staff of the agency only go to report and collects salary at the end of the month, with no project executed. This is because government prefers to use contractors rather than the agency. Sometimes the contractors hire the machines of the agency to do their work.

5.4.3 Plateau Rural Water and Sanitation Agency (PRUWASSA)

This Agency is also a creation of the state government established in 2001 with the objective of building capacities of the agency, Local government councils, and the benefiting communities in the area of water Supply and Sanitation (WSS), and the provision of projects for effective service delivery. The agency also maintains these facilities in conjunction with benefiting communities. The agency's major objectives as outlined by its general manager during the field interview includes:-

- (i) To improve water supply coverage in the rural communities in Plateau State.

- (ii) To improve sanitation coverage in the rural areas.
- (iii) To increase hygiene awareness through education/advocacy.
- (iv) To support the establishment of water and sanitation units (WASU) in the LGAs and water and sanitation committees (WASCOM) in communities.
- (v) Build capacities of the LGAs on water supply, sanitation and hygiene implementation
- (vi) Build low cost household/schools/clinics and latrines.
- (vii) To promote inter-sectoral linkages between agencies involved in water and sanitation
- (viii) Training for LGAS, NGOs on water and sanitation (Interview with General Manager during Field Work July, 2009).

The agency's mission is to increase access to safe drinking water, improved sanitation and hygiene promotion through advocacy, partnership, capacity building and networking. This is done in partnership with external support agencies and NGOs, namely water-aid Nigeria, United Nations children education fund UNICEF). The 17 local governments, country women association (COWAN), and community development associations who are expected to contribute 5% of the total project sum in materials, or labour; or even security to the projects or materials and equipments (Field interview with General Manager PRUWASSA July 2009).

The agency adopts a community driven approach in selecting and implementing its projects rather than the top down or supply approach. The agency has made its contributions to rural water supply and sanitation as listed in the projects provided to communities as indicated in Appendix 6 which includes some of the following:

- (i) The agency has a drilling rig.
- (ii) UNICEF has supported the construction of 37 boreholes, 2 hand dug wells, 3 rain harvesters, 18 blocks of VIP latrines in primary schools, 480 house hold latrines in some selected LGAs
- (iii) EU/UNICEF has supported the construction of 5 boreholes
- (iv) Water Aid has constructed 18 boreholes, 5 hand dug wells, 1 VIP laterine, 758 household latrines in 6 focus LGAs.
- (v) Philanthropic persons have supported the construction of 27 boreholes across the state.
- (vi) Communities have constructed 6 boreholes in the state.
- (vii) LGAs have constructed 40 boreholes in the state
- (viii) The State Government has constructed 46 boreholes and 5 hands dug wells.
- (ix) NGOs have constructed 6 boreholes through donor support
- (x) Schools, churches and others have constructed 7 boreholes (PRUWASSA Document on the net 2008).

The agency, despite its achievements, has the following challenges. These include political interference with its activities, conflicts and civil unrest, bureaucratic bottle necks of the civil service, poor geology/access roads in the state, poor power supply, cultural and religious beliefs, lack of mobility (Field vehicles), lack of geographical survey equipments and personnel such as surveyors and geologists, poor funding of the agency (PRUWASSA document on the internet, 2008). In spite of its challenges, the agency embarked on some projects (see appendix 5).

PRUWASSA seems to have done much better than the other two agencies because it receives support from many sources such as EU, UNICEF, Water aid,

LGA'S Communities, State government and NGOs. Its impact is felt in the area of boreholes and hand pump wells, but the area of sanitation is still not felt at the rural areas (See appendix 5)

6.0 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This section discusses the findings of this research in the light of the analysed data. There were two sets of data presentation and analysis. First the table of percentages derived from our field data and second, the test of hypothesis using chi-square statistics. In discussing the findings, related literature and theoretical framework were used.

The findings reveal that the level of involvement of the people who are the beneficiaries of rural development in the conception and implementation of rural development programmes in Plateau State is very low. This is supported by the alternate hypothesis one (1) in our findings which states that there is no significant involvement of the beneficiaries of the rural development programmes in Plateau State in projects conception and implementation. This corroborates the works of Stephen Nkom, (1995). While writing on the agricultural development programmes in Nigeria (ADP's), he argued that the programmes are elite driven, top-down and the people are not considered important in the process because the programmes are, "rooted in western proto type of development where the people are seen as objects, not subjects of development" (Nkom, 1988:29). Our analysis using the table of percentage in table 8 in the report of findings also supports this position, where from the conception to the implementation of the programmes on rural development in Plateau State, only a few people at the top are involved. The beneficiaries are not carried along, or are left behind. This may explain their poor rating of the programme in Plateau State. It is very clear that the majority of people in the rural areas were not

involved in the processes of rural development projects that affect their lives. They were kept aside and decisions made from the top by the federal, state or local government for them. This further confirms the non involvement of beneficiaries in rural development in Plateau State in discussions of projects conception and implementation and supports the directive or top-down model of rural development, with emphasis on modernization, and agrarian transformation. This has been clearly demonstrated in the literature by (Nkom 1995, Kalowole 1993 and Otaki 2005), where emphasis on rural development is on modernization of agriculture through agric development programmes, river basin authorities, and farm demonstration centres.

This finding supports the alternate hypothesis one which states that “There is no significant relationship between the involvement of beneficiaries and the successful of implementation of rural development programmes in Plateau State”. It is true because the findings indicate the non-involvement of the majority of the beneficiaries (tables 8 above) and the high percentage of abandoned projects (tables 7 above).

The findings also reveal that the three selected rural development agencies used for this study ie PADP, DLA, and PRUWASSA, are not impacting positively on rural development in Plateau State. This is supported by our findings in hypothesis two, where the result shows no significant relationship between the activities of rural development agencies in Plateau State and their level of impact on rural development. The analysis from the table of percentages also rated their performance very low for PADP, their performance is 32%, director labour agencies 29%, while Plateau Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Agencies 35%. (See table 9 in our findings). From the above analysis, it is clear that all the three selected rural development agencies

performed below expectation. All of them performed low as indicated in the results above. This position supports the alternate hypothesis two which states “There is no significant relationship between the activities of the selected rural development Agencies, and their level of impact on rural development in Plateau State” (See tables 8 in our findings. This is also supported by the alternate hypothesis three which states that, “there is no significant relationship between the strategy of rural development adopted in Plateau state and the level of rural development in the state”. This is supported in the literature by the works of (Nkom 1995, Ujo 1994, Kalawole 1993, and Ojaki 2005) who discouraged the top down approach to rural development because it does not involve the people. Nkom particularly argues for the participatory bottom-up approach to rural development.

We also examine the activities of non governmental institutions that play a role in rural development in the state. This is not directly related to our research objectives or hypothesis, but it helps paint a proper picture of the stakeholders in rural development in Plateau State. From our analysis of table 10, community based associations contribute a lot to rural development in Plateau State. It will be helpful if the state and local governments can identify the community based associations in the state and cooperative societies, with a view to supporting them. This is in line with the literature reviewed in Nweze’s work (1988) on community mobilization to rural development and Okoye’s work (1987) on “social clubs, resource management and rural development in Nigeria, lessons from Anambra State”. Both authors argue in support of mobilizing the rural people for self-help projects, and supporting them with resources, supervising them to ensure that they operate in line with the approved guidelines on community development. This approach provides participatory decision making to programmes implementation in rural development, which is opposed to the

directive approach used by Plateau State government. This view is in agreement with some of the literature reviewed (Alli 1989, Nweze 1988, UNO 1960, Okoye 1987, Aziz 1980, Toyo 2002, Abba and Awazodo 2006).

The work also established the fact that the local government which is closest to the people assists in the area of rural development more than other levels of government ie federal and state. It is obvious that constitutionally, the state and local government that are closet to the people, play a greater role in rural development in Plateau State. This raises a question as to the role of the federal government in rural development. It is not very clear what role the federal government plays in rural development in the state, except for jointly funded projects under the MDGS, which is outside the scope of this work.

The research findings also revealed that the three tiers of government support to rural development does not involve mobilizing the people in order to participate actively in the process of their development. The people are considered ignorant and lacking initiative, as such they are given hand-out from the state. This is supported in the literature by (Nkom 1995, and Anazado 2006) which is a critique of the capitalist modernization approach to rural development, with emphasis on provision of hand outs by the State in the form of grants, materials, inputs, without necessarily consulting the people in order to mobilize them for the projects ahead. The people are considered as ignorant, lacking initiative and unwilling to change, as such, the bureaucrats in the state ministries and government agencies decide for them, thus adopting the top-down approach to rural development. From our findings, we also established from the managers of the selected rural development agencies that most of the projects were high-jacked by politician especially the supply of fertilizer to PADP, and its distribution. Also contracts for the construction of boreholes and culverts most

of which were abandoned mid-way were given to politicians. Some of the information given by our respondents were that politicians collected mobilization fee for contracts and abandoned the jobs. (Interviewed report with general managers of PADP, DLA, and PRUWASSA July, 2009).

The findings also revealed that the projects are usually sited based on the political exigencies of the government in power, and not the agencies so designated to handle such projects. “Because in a political dispensation, the political pressure from above superceeds the agencies autonomy of action in decision making”. (Interviewed with Managers of PADP, DLA, and PRUWASSA July, 2009). Most of the projects are poorly executed or abandoned (See table 7 in findings). This picture is typical of the top-down model of rural development or the modernization model which is being adopted in Plateau State, rather than the mobilization model which is supported in the literature by the works of (Alli 1989, Nweze 1988, Okoye 1987, and Aziz 1980), earlier discussed in the literature reviewed.

The findings also reveal that over the years, budgetary allocations and releases to rural development agencies has been very low. Between 1999-2010, the highest allocation was in 2008 (18.53%), while for budget releases, between 1999 – 2010, it is not up to 1% for any of the agencies involved in this study. (See tables 17,18 and 19 in our findings).

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

6.1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The following research findings are derived from the analysis of data and test of hypotheses.

That the yearly budgetary allocations in the states, with high presumption of rural development such as “Budget of rural transformation” “rural engineering”, etc do not translate into any significant impact on rural development in Plateau State. Besides, budgetary allocation to rural development has never exceeded 19% of the budget, despite the huge population that reside in the rural areas, budget allocation to rural development Agencies in Plateau State from 1999 – 2010 (tables 17), is small, worst of all budgetary releases have never exceeded 1%. It is clear from the findings that government is interested in mere symbolic than substantive approach to rural development in the state.

That despite the claim by the civilian administrations in the state to serve the grass-roots as contained in their budget speeches, the beneficiaries of rural development (the people) are not involved or do not participate in the process of decision making at the level of conception or implementation of the projects that affects their well being.

That the three selected rural development agencies have not impacted positively on rural development in the state. Table 8 and 15 of this research are evident. In table 9 we established that the respondents rated the performance of the three selected rural development agencies low.

That the top-down (modernization or transformation) model of rural development adopted in the state has failed to adequately address the problems of the rural areas. This is established by the views of the managers of the three selected rural

development agencies, and the poor rating of the agencies by the respondents, with a high percentage of abandoned projects by the Direct Labour Agency.

That apart from the state and local governments that played some role in rural development, the Community Based Associations, Cooperative Societies, and Faith Based Organization like ECWA are playing some role in rural development in the state, especially in the areas of health care, agriculture and sanitation where VIP toilets are provided.

6.2. CONCLUSION

The study was carried out to find out the impact of selected rural development agencies in Plateau State on rural development. The specific areas investigated are the budgetary allocations to the three selected agencies in the state, the role of the beneficiaries in the process of decision making and implementation of the programmes of the selected agencies and the impact of the selected agencies on rural conditions or rural development in the state.

In order to solve the identified problem of study, data were collected through questionnaire, oral interview and documented information. These data were analysed and the conclusion reached, that budgetary allocations to rural development agencies in the state is very low or meger; that the beneficiaries of the rural development are not involved in decisions and implementation of programmes that are to affect their well-being; that the three selected agencies have failed to impact positively on the living conditions of the rural people in Plateau State; that the traditional top-down model which was inherited from the colonial masters has failed to impact on rural development in the state, therefore an alternative model is required (paradigm shift).

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this research, the following recommendations are made:

- i) There is the need for a paradigm shift from the traditional (modernization) or top-down model of rural development to the bottom up, participatory approach to rural development in Plateau State.
- ii) The agencies engaged in rural development be properly funded and given free hand to operate in order to avoid the state of abandoned projects as presented in appendix 4, 5 and 6. These agencies should be under first line charge directly from the Governor's office, considering the importance of rural development to the overall national development. This fits into the transformational agenda of the state government and the Federal Government. A tripartite arrangement be made such that rural development programmes become the responsibility of the Federal, state and local government, with support from benefiting communities such that the funding be made on the following ratios; Federal 10%, State 50%, local government 10% and the communities 10%. The community contribution can be in the form of labour and not necessarily cash. By so doing, the people are participating and become owners of these projects.
- iii) There should be a comprehensive policy or road-map to rural development in the state with adequate budgetary allocations, rather than relying on paltry allocations to rural development related agencies during budgets. There should be an agency named Plateau Rural Development Agency (PLARDA) to coordinate the activities of all rural development agencies using the road-map to rural transformation fashioned in the state. Also, zonal offices should monitor rural development programmes/projects and liaise with local

governments and community based organizations in the areas of rural development in order to have a common direction in the pursuit of rural development.

- iv) Policy makers should involve the beneficiaries of rural development right from the point of conception to implementation of projects. This will help reduce the vandalization of rural development projects such as the solar powered boreholes, and the misconception by rural dwellers that rural development projects are government projects rather than their projects.
- v) There should be an integrated approach to rural development where all sectors such as education, health care; housing, communication, security, agriculture and basic infrastructure services are provided to rural communities in the state. This integrated model with a bottom-up approach or demand driven model, where the people are the drivers of the programmes and not the government be adopted. This will make for a new paradigm shift in the approach to rural development in Plateau. A paradigm shift is necessary in view of the failure of the present model of rural development discussed in our findings to this work.

6.4 **CONTRIBUTIONS TO KNOWLEDGE**

The findings of this study provides a basis for the provision of alternative strategies for implementation of subsequent rural development programmes in Plateau State ie the bottom-up or participatory model which has been jettisoned by policy makers and policy implementors in Plateau State. An alternative paradigm is required if there shall be any meaningful “engineering or transformation”, in Plateau State.

The findings and suggestions made in this research are modest contributions to knowledge. The study has established the need for an integrated – bottom-up approach to rural development in Plateau State which is the paradigm shift advocated

in this work. The difference between this proposition and others is that no work has under taken a detailed study of rural development programmes in the state. In some cases, where similar works have been done, emphasis is on one programme such as Agricultural development programmes or cooperatives (Otaki 2005, Dalis 2004, and Bonaventure 2003). This work studied three agencies that have direct impact on the rural people. This is much more encompassing than just one programme. This is the novelty in this work that has contributed to knowledge, because rural development is much more than agricultural development or cooperative societies as indicated in works studied before this one. The combination of more than one programme gives this work a broader perspective of rural development than just one programme, hence its contribution to knowledge on rural development in Nigeria.

6.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

In this section, attention is drawn to some of the shortcomings in the present study which will guide any future investigation of a similar problem or research study.

The major limitation of this study lies in the sample size of 300 respondents and the sample of six local governments. The sample of 300 respondents may not be adequate for representativeness, and the coverage of the local governments may not be adequate considering the fact that we have 17 local governments in the state. However because of limitation of resources, the researcher used this sample size for the purpose of this study. A study with sufficient funds can go beyond the current sample size and cover a wider population of the state. This limitation does not in any way invalidate the findings and recommendations in this work.

REFERENCES

BOOKS

- Abba, E.U & Anazodo, R. (2006). *Development administration in Africa* Onitsha: Abbot Books.
- Abasiokong, E.M. (1982). *Integrated rural development in the third World, its Concepts, Problems, and Prospects*; New York: Exponation press.
- Agbodike, C.C (1991). "Mass-Mobilization and rural development in Nigeria: an appraisal". In: Olisa Obiukwu (eds) *Rural development in Nigeria: a Conceptual and analytical Perspective*, Nsukka: Spectrum Ltd.
- Ade, S.O. & Nwosu A.C (eds), (1992). *Rural development Strategies in Nigeria*; Ibadan: Adetunje Press.
- Ake, C. (1979). *Social Science as Imperialism*; Ibadan: University Press.
- Ake, C. (1981). *The political economy of Africa*; Ibadan: Longman.
- Alkasum, A. (1985). *The Nigerian economic crisis; causes and solutions*; ZARIA: ASUU Publication
- Akinbode, I. (1986). *The role of Local Governments in agricultural training and extension Services in Nigeria*; Ibadan: University Press.
- Akor, M.E. (2005). *Ideological strands in Africa*, Jos Mono Press.
- Anikpo, M. (1995). "Policy Options for innovative rural development in Nigeria", in Nwanunobi (eds), *Innovative approaches to rural development in Nigeria*; Department of Sociology and Anthropology; University of Nigeria Nsukka.
- Anon, R. (1975). *Rural development*; World Bank. Arthur, F.R (1970), *rural development in action*; London: Cornell University Press.
- Awa, C.E. (1987). *Transformation of rural societies; A Study of rural development in the eastern States of Nigeria 1976-79*, Kuru: NIPSS.

- Aziz, S. (1978). *Rural development learning from China*; London: Macmillan Press.
- Batten, T.R. (1975). *The non directive approach in group and community work*; London: Oxford Press.
- Chinsman, B. (1981). *A matter of the People*; Lagos: Pulse Marketing Communications.
- Chambers, R. (1983). *Rural development, putting last first*; London: Meuthen.
- Collins, P. (1980). *Administration for development in Nigeria*; Ibadan: African Educational Press.
- Craig, J (2001). *Local Democracy, democratic decentralization, and rural development, challenges and Options for Policy*; forth coming: rural policy and environmental group oversees development institute from the Internet.
- David, K. L. (1973). *Rural administration in Kenya*: east African literature Bureau.
- David, E. (1992). "Decentralization strategy to rural development in Nigeria", in Olomola & Nwosu eds, *rural development strategy*; Nigerian rural sociology association. Ibadan: Adetunji Press.
- Dijeomah, V.P. (1973). "Rural development in Nigeria: The role of fiscal Policy" In *rural development in Nigeria*; P. 97 Proceedings of the 1972 Annual Conferences of Nigeria Economic Society, Ibadan.
- Duddley, S. (1972). "The meaning of development" in Norman T.Uphoff and Warren E. lichman (eds), *The political economy of development*; Berkeley; University of Carolina press: p 122-129.
- Ebo, E.C (1995). "Sustainable development: The theory and implication for rural Nigeria": In: Eboh, et, al, *Rural development in Nigeria, concepts, Processes and Prospects*; Enugu: Autocentury Publishing company.

- Egonmwan, J.A. (1980). *Public policy analysis, concepts and applications*; Benin City: S.M.O Aka Press.
- Egonmwan, J.A, & Ibodje, E.W. (2001). *Reinventing local government in Nigeria*; Benin: Festa Press.
- Ejionye, U.A, (1995). "Inter and intra- community relations in rural development", in Nwanunobi (eds), *Innovative approaches to rural development in Nigeria*; Department of Sociology & Anthropology University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Essang, S. M. (1981). "Growth models and rural development", in: Olayide, et al: *elements of rural economics*, Ibadan: University Press Publishing House.
- Fanon, F. (1967). *The wretched of the earth*; Harnondsworth: Penguin Publishers.
- Friedlan, W.H, & Rosberg C. G. (eds) (1964). *African socialism*; California: Stanford University Press.
- Freud, B. (1981). *Capital and labour in the Nigerian Tin mines*; England: Longman.
- Gana, A.T. (1987). "Theories of development and under development", in Stephen Olubemi *Alternative Political futures for Nigeria*; a publication of the Nigerian Political Science Association.
- Goron, H. (1982). *Beyond Ujamaa in Tanzania*; London: Heinemann.
- Gideon, M.M. & Rolio, S.W (eds) (1975). *Readings in African political thought*; Nairobi: Heineman.
- Hopkins, A.G. (1973). *An Economic History of West Africa*; London: McMillan Press.
- Hopkins, A.G. (1979). *Two essays on underdevelopment*; Geneva: University of Portcourt Press.

- Huntington, S.P. (1968). *Political order in changing societies*; New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hyier, J. P & Cavin W. (1981). "Rural development". In: Hyier, et al, *rural development in Tropical Africa*, London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Igbozurike, M. (1989). *Strategies for rural development in Nigeria; Zaria*: A.B.U Press Ltd.
- Idode, J.B. (1989). *Rural development and bureaucracy in Nigeria*; London Longman.
- Idachaba, F.S. (1992). "Transforming Nigeria's agricultural production systems" in *Social transformation for Self reliance; Proceedings of a National Conference published by the directorate for Social mobilization Ibadan; (MAMSER). Publication.*
- Idachaba, F.S (1980). *Concepts and strategies on integrated rural development. lesson from Nigeria, food technical research paper* Ibadan: University Book company.
- Ijere, M.O. (1981). *Leading Issues in Nigerian rural development*; Department of agricultural economics; University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Imam-Bello, I.B. (1996). *Local government in Nigeria, evolving a third tier government Ibadan*: Heinemann Educational Books plc.
- Isichei, E. (ed) (1991). *Jos oral historical and literature texts*, Vol. Two, Uni-Jos; Department of History Publication.
- Lele, U. (1975). *Defining rural development*; London: Kegan Paul.
- Lenin, V.I. (1975). The state; Peking: Foreign Languages Press.
- Laidler, H. (1958). *History of socialist thought*; London: Penguin.

- Long, N. (1977). *An Introduction to the sociology of rural development*; London: Taristalk Publication.
- Luxerburg, R. (1979). *Theories of underdevelopment*; London: Macmillan.
- Mabogunje, A.L. (1992). "Integrated rural development" *In social transformation for Self reliance*; Foundation Press Ibadan: MAMSER Publication.
- MabogunJe, A.L. (1995). "Integrated rural development" in *social transformation for self Reliance*; Proceedings of Foundation Press Ibadan: MAMSER Proceedings.
- Marx, K. & Engles, F. (1975). *Manifesto of the communist Party*; Peking: Foreign Languages Press.
- Moore, W.E (a) (1963). *Social hange*; New Jersey: Englewood Cliff.
- Moore, E.W. (b) (1963). *Leading issues in economic development*; New Jersey: Oxford University Press.
- Mugbualu, L.N. (1991). "The taskforce approach to rural development in Nigeria, an evaluation of the directorate for food, roads, and rural infrastructure", In: *Olisa, M.O and Obiukwu J.I. (eds) Rural Development in Nigeria*. Nsukka; Spectrum Books Ltd.
- Nabudere, R.K(1999).*The Political economy of imperialism*; London: Zed. Press.
- Nengel, G. (2001). (eds) Plateau State: *The heritage and hope*; Plateau State Government.
- Ngu, S.M. (1994). *Minority politics and rural development in Nigeria: Zaria: MANTI NGU*.
- Ngu S.M. (2005). *Research methodology made simple for social and behavioral Sciences, Zaria: Manti Ngu*.

- Ndubude, R. K. H. (1995). "Community mobilization as an instrument for rural development in Anambra State" in *Innovative approaches to rural development in Nigeria*; Nwanunobi (ed), Department of sociology and Anthropology; University of Nigeria Nsukka.
- Nzimiro, I. (1985). *The Green revolution in Nigeria or modernization of hunger*; OGUTA: Zim-Pan African Publisher.
- Nyerere, J.K. (1967). *Freedom and unity*; Dares Salaam; London: Oxford University Press.
- Nyerere, J.K.(a) (1968). *Freedom and socialism*; Dare Salaam, London: Oxford University Press.
- Nyerere, J.K. (b) (1968). *Ujamaa essays on socialism*; London: Oxford University Press.
- Nyerere, J.K. (1967). *Socialism and rural development*; Dares-Salaam: Government Printer.
- Ntukidem, A.E. (19787). *Humanistic approach to rural development in Nigeria*; University of Nsukka Press.
- Nkom, S. (1985). "The modernization approach to rural development a theoretical synthesis and critique". in Nwanunobi (eds), *Innovative approaches to rural development in Nigeria*; Department of sociology and Anthropology; University of Nigeria Nsukka.
- Nweze, A. (1988). *Perspectives on community and rural development in Nigeria*; A Publication of the centre for development Studies University of Jos.
- Olaniyi, J.O. (2001). *Fundamentals of public policy analysis*; Ibadan: SUNAD Publishers Ltd.
- Otaki, A. (2005). *Rural sociology an introduction*; Kaduna: Joyce Publishers.

- Olatunbosun, D. (1975). *Nigeria's neglected rural majority*; Ibadan: Oxford University Press.
- Okorie, A. O. (1986). "The sociology of rural development, An overview of theory and practice", in *rural information officers corps*; (RIOC); (Enugu Ministry of Information).
- Olisa, S. O & Obiukwu J.I (1995). "Capitalist growth models of rural development in Nigeria", In: *rural development: a conceptual and analytical Perspective*_Nsukka: Spectrum Books Ltd.
- Paul, M. H. (ed), (1980). *Poverty progress and development*; London: Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Parson, T. (1951). *The social system*; Glencoe III Free Press.
- Ray, L., (1975). *Action research on community development*; London& Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe under developed Africa*; Nigeria: Panaf Publishing Abuja.
- Rostow, W.W. (1960). *The stages of economic growth: A non communist manifesto*; England: Cambridge University Press.
- Riggs, F.W. (1964). *Administration in developing countries*; Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sapru, A. K. (2006). *Public policy formulation, implementation, and evaluation*; NewDelhi: Sterling Publishers Ltd.
- Shut, T. (2005). *An introduction to public policy making and analysis*, Jos: Mono Press.

- Sorkaa, A. P. (1987). "The theory and practice of rural development in China, Lessons for Nigeria", in Stephen O. Olugbemi (eds), *Alternative Political futures for Nigeria; A Publication of the Nigerian Political Science Association*.
- Todaro, M.P. (1977). *Economic development in the third world*; New York: Longman.
- Todaro, M.P. & Smith C.S. (2006). *Economic development*; India: Dorling Kindersley.
- Toyo, E. (2002). *Rural development communication*; Eskor Toyo Centre Oron.
- Ujo, A.A. (2002). *Social research a non qualitative approach*; Kaduna: Salmora Press Ltd.
- Ujo, A.A. (1994). *Development administration*; Kaduna: Salmora Press Ltd.
- Ugal, G.A. (1992). "Role of non governmental grass-roots agencies in rural Development, the experience of cross river states", in *Rural development Strategy*; Olomola & Nwosu (eds); A Nigerian rural sociology Association Publication.
- Uyanga, J.T. (1980). *A Geography of rural development in Nigeria*; Washington D.C: University of America Inc.
- Williams, S.K T. (1995). *Rural development in Nigeria*; Ile- Ife: University of Ife Press.
- Yeawood, P. (1981). *Jos oral history and literature texts*, Vol, One Jos.

JOURNALS

- Alli, W. O (1989). "Rural community in the political and development process- The case of Nigeria" *Development Studies Review*, 3 (1 &2), 31-39.

- Anzaku D. & Dashe D.(2003). community mobilization in human resources development in the third world implications for normads in Nigeria” *Current Issues in Development* No.5, (1 & 2),75- 78.
- Abasiekong, E.M. (1980). “Integrated approach to community development as a strategy for rural development” *Journal of Community Development: (3)*, 1-2.
- Anthony, Q.B.O (1967). “The stagnant sector in the Nigerian economy” *Bulleting of Rural Economics and Sociology*, 2 (3), 221-228.
- Arema, J.A. (1983). “*Popular participation in rural development*” ERES, 16 (3), 15-18
- Akinbode, I. (1976). “A perspective on rural development in Nigeria”, *Journal of Administration* University of Ife, II,127 – 135.
- Beckman, B. (1985). “Bakolori Peasants, VS the State and Capital”, in *the Journal of Political Science*, 4, (1 & 11) 78 – 104.
- Benedic, N. (1984). “Theories of development how relevant to Africa”, in *towards Self- Reliant Development. PAN African Journal* 1,5-25.
- Conyers, D. (1977). “Administration in China” *Journal of Administration Overseas* XXI, (2), 3-4.
- Dare, A (2008). “*Local administration and the challenges of rural development in Nigeria*” Posted on the Internet.
- Famiriyo, S. (1985). “*Rural development revisited*” *Journal of Rural Development in Nigeria* 2, 51-57.
- Janvry, A.(1975). “ The political economy of rural development in Latin America. An interpretation, *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 57, (3) 490 – 499.

- Mabogunje, A.L. (1981). "The dilemma of rural, development in Africa", in *Regional development dialogue*, 2, Autum.
- Marguba, L.B. (1984). "Rural development in developing countries", *International Journal of Development Studies* 37(1), 10-12.
- Okoye, J.C (1987). "Social clubs resource management and rural development in Nigeria: Lessons from Anambra State", *Translation of the British Institute of geography* 13. (2), 222-227.
- Olowu, D. (1986). "Institutional approach to rural infrastructural development in Nigeria", *Journal of Administration University of Ife* (3 & 4), 153 –179.
- Oluwayomi, D.A. (1986). "Overcoming rural Underdevelopment in Nigeria, Past Approaches and An Alternative View", *Journal of Administration XX*, (3 & 4), 137 – 152.
- Shut, T. (1991). "Local Governments and rural development in Nigeria", *Journal of Social Science, College of education Akwanga* 1, (1), 8-13.
- Shut, T. (2003). "Challenges for the Local governments in Nigeria", *International Journal of Continuing Education University of Jos* 3. (2), 112 -126.
- Shut, T. (2002). "Community development work in Nigeria, Operational Problems", *Journal of Humanity University of Jos*. 5(1 &2), 70-74.
- Shut, T. (1995). "Theories of rural development", *University of Jos, Journal of Political Science, Mono Press*, 1(1),127 – 132.

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS/SEMINAR PAPERS/WORKSHOP PAPERS

Akorodula Ake E.O. "Nigeria's fundamental national objectives and the question of appropriate National development strategy" paper presented at DFRRRI National workshop on integrated *rural development for Local government Chairmen and secretaries*) Durba Hotel Badagry Express Way, Lagos, 30th-Jan.- 2nd February 1989.

Alubo, S.O. , "Rural development in contemporary Nigeria, A dialectical critique" *paper presented at the 4th National conference of the Nigerian rural Sociological Association, ABU, Zaria, May 17-20th. 1987.*

Anikpo, M., "Rural development in the third republic: Precondition for National integration in Nigeria", *Paper Presented at the 1989 NASA Conference Ogun State University Age-Iwoye, November 26th -30th, 1989.*

Ake, C. , "Sustaining development on the indigenous", *paper prepared for the world Bank special economic office, African Region December. 1987.*

Amadi, B.C., "Integrated rural development" *Proceedings of the National Conference on integrated rural Development and Women in development, University of Benin., 1980.*

Beckman, B., "The Nigerian State whose State", *Department of Political Science Seminar Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, 1982.*

Idachaba, F.S., "Rural development in Nigeria: Foundation of sustainable economic recovery" *Faculty lecture of the Faculty, of agriculture, University of Ife. 1986.*

Kabiru, K. ; "Non governmental organizations (NGOs): Contributions to development"; *occasional Paper No. 50. Institute for development Studies, University of Nairobi Kenya. 1985.*

Obanure, T.O. , “Mobilization of Nigerian’s towards National development; Problems and prospects” *paper presented at the Social Science Council of Nigeria.* 1988.

Okorji, E.C., “Women and rural development, strategies for sustaining Women’s Contribution in rural households of Anambra State, Nigeria”. *Working paper No. 166, Women in informational development Enugu State University,* 1988.

UNPUBLISHED WORKS

Adelakun, A.O. (1984). “Social structure and rural development in Nigeria”, unpublished Ph’D Thesis University of Wales. *Cited in Innovative approaches to rural development in Nigeria,* Onyeka Nwanunobi (et al), (1995).

Bonaventure, N. H (2003). “*The State agricultural multipurpose cooperative Societies and rural development in Nigeria. A case study of Plateau State*” Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation, University of Jos.

Dalis, B.S (2004). “*An Impact assessment of Plateau agricultural development Programme (PADP), on rural development in Plateau State,*” Unpublished MPA Thesis, University of Jos.

Gobak, J. G. (2005). “*Rural development and SEEDS in Plateau*” *State Research project for Senior Executive Course 27* National Institute for Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS), Kuru.

Mangwat, M. (1984). “*A history of class formation in the Plateau Province, 1902 – 1960; the genesis of a ruling Class*”, Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, ABU, Zaria.

Obaitan, K (1993). “*The contributions of ADP and DFRRRI to rural development in*

Nigeria, A Case Study of Kaduna State ADP and DFRR". A Ph.D Thesis
Submitted to the Post Graduate School, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Tukura, D. (1985). "*The Political economy of food dependence*"; Unpublished M.Sc
Thesis, Department of Sociology, ABU Zaria.

MONOGRAPHS

(CARUDEP Calendar Jos 2007).

Cohen J. & Uphoff N. "Rural development Participation", In rural development
monograph, No.2 published by *the rural development committee Centre for
International Studies*, Cornell University, Jan. 1997:D.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

United Nations, New York (2001), Sustainable Development, African Perspectives.

Nigeria, Indigenization Decree 1977 and 1978.

Nigeria, NEEDS Document, 2006.

Nigeria, Third Development Plan, 1975-1980.

Nigeria National Directorate of Employment (NDE) Annual Report 2004.

Nigeria, National Directorate of Employment (NDE) Brochure May 2006.

Nigeria, National Poverty Eradication programme (NAPEP) Blue Print, 2001.

Nigeria, Village Solutions (2008) A Napep Publication.

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999.

RURCON Pamphlet (A Christian based organization in Jos). 2000.

People Oriented Development, (POD) pamphlet of ECWA (A Christian based
organization in Jos). 2002

Plateau Agricultural Development Programme House Journal 2000.

Plateau Agricultural Development Programme Activities (1999 – 2003).

APPENDIX 1(A)

Department of Political
Science,
University of Jos,
P.M. 2084, Jos.
20th July, 2009.

Dear Respondent,

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE TO RURAL COMMUNITIES IN PLATEAU STATE.

This is a research questionnaire drawn mainly to collect data or information on certain areas of rural development in Plateau State. The research is meant to collect data for an MPHIL.Ph.D work on rural development policies in Plateau State. Our focus is mainly on three key institutions that have a target at the rural areas. These institutions are the Plateau Agricultural development programme (PADP), the Plateau Direct Labour Agency (DLA), and Plateau State Rural Water and Sanitation Agency.

You are assured that every information given by you objectively, will be treated in strict confidence.

Thank you for your kind acceptance to respond to the questionnaire honestly and objectively to the best of your knowledge.

SECTION ONE: Please tick (✓) as appropriate

BIODATA

1 sex

Male []

Female []

2. Marital stated

Married []

Single []

Divorced []

Widow(er) []

3. Age

18-25 years	[]
26-35 years	[]
36-45 years	[]
46-60 years	[]
61 and above	[]

4. Highest academic qualification

Doctorate Degree	[]
First Degree/HND	[]
WASC/SSCE/NECO/Grade II	[]
None of the above	[]

5. Religion

Christianity	[]
Islam	[]
Others	[]

6. How long have you lived/stayed in your local government area of domicile?

Below 5 years	[]
5-10 years	[]
11-15 years	[]
16-20 years	[]
21-25 years	[]
26-30 years	[]
31-35 years	[]
36 years and above	[]

7. Occupation

Farmer	[]
Civil servant	[]
Businessman/woman	[]
Clergy/Religious leader	[]
Retired/ pensioner	[]
Applicant	[]
Student	[]

SECTION TWO: Questions on Plateau Agricultural Development Project (PADP).

Please tick [√] as appropriate.

1. Have you ever heard of the above named agency?

Yes []

No []

2. If yes as in question 1 above, do you know what it does?

Yes []

No []

3. Have your community benefited from their services?

Yes []

No []

4. If yes list the way(s) your community has benefited from the PADP?

Fertilizer provision []

Farm inputs/ seedlings []

Chemicals/pesticides []

Feeder roads construction []

Fadama farm loans []

Enlightenment campaign/lectures []

5. At what level was your community involved in taking decisions with respect to PADPs services/programmes?

Initiation stage []

Implementation stage []

Not involved []

6. How would you rate the impact of PADP in the area of rural development in your area?

Very hig []

High []

Very low []

Low []

7. Please advice on how to improve performances of the PADP.

.....
.....
.....
.....

SECTION THREE: Questions on Plateau Direct Labour Agency.

Please tick as appropriate.

1. Have you heard of the agency above?

Yes []

No []

2. If yes as in question 1 above, do you know what it does?

Yes []

No []

3. Has the Direct Labour Agency provided any service(s) to your community?

Yes []

No []

4. If yes as in question 3 above, list the project(s)/service below:

.....

.....

.....

.....

5. What was (is) the stage of the project(s)?

Complete []

Ongoing []

Abandoned []

6. Was your community involved in deciding the projects?

Yes []

No []

7. At what level was your community involved?

Initiation stage []

Implementation stage []

Not involved []

8. How do you rate the agency in terms of performance?

Very high []

High []

Very low []

Low []

9. Please advice on how to improve on the performance of the Direct Labour Agency in Plateau State.

.....

SECTION FOUR: Questions on the Plateau State Rural Water and Sanitation Agency (PRUWASSA).

Please tick [] as appropriate.

1. Are you aware of the existence of this Agency?

Yes []

No []

2. If yes in question 1 above, do you have an idea what it does?

Yes []

No []

3. Which of these projects have the Agency provided to your community?

Motorized boreholes []

Earth Dam(s) []

Sanitary services []

Others (list) []

4. Was your community involved in the decision to site any project(s) by the Agency in your locality?

Yes []

No []

5. If the Agency has done nothing to your community, how does your community take care of its water needs?

Stream water []

Self made wells []

Others []

6. If yes as in question 4 above how is your community involved?

At inception of project(s) []

At the level of implementation []

Not involved []

7. How would you rate the performance of the Agency on rural development in Plateau State?

- Very high []
- High []
- Very low []
- Low []

SECTION FIVE: General

Please tick as appropriate.

1. Apart from government what other agencies assisted in the development of your area/community?

- Community Based Organizations (CBOs) []
- Cooperatives []
- Faith Based organizations []
- Non-government Organizations (NGO's) []

2. Please kindly list the project(s) undertaken by your community in the past.

.....

.....

.....

.....

3. Was there any government assistance?

- Yes []
- No []

4. What was the nature of assistance?

- Financial []
- Manpower []
- Material []
- All of the above []

5. Which level of government assisted?

- Local government []
- State government []
- Federal government []
- Both levels []

6. How would you advice the government of Plateau State with respect to the role played by its agencies in rural development?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

APPENDIX 1 (B)

Department of Political
Science,
University of Jos,
P.M.B.2084, Jos.
20th, July, 2008.

Dear General Manager

**INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR CHIEF EXECUTIVES OF RURAL
DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES IN PLATEAU STATE.**

Sir, I am a post-graduate student of the University of Jos undertaking a research on “**Rural Development Policies in Plateau State an Evaluation of Plateau Agric. Department Project (PADP), Direct Labour Agency, and Plateau Rural Water and Sanitation Agency.** The research is purely an academic exercise, and information collected shall be used in strict confidence. Please, you may kindly help us by responding to the questionnaire by ticking or filling the appropriate columns.

1. What is the name of your organization?

.....
.....
.....

2. What are the main objectives of your organization?

.....
.....
.....
.....

3. What are you major areas of contribution to rural development?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

4. How are the beneficiaries of your rural project(s) involved? At the level of initiation of projects

.....
.....
.....
.....

At the level of implementation of projects

.....
.....
.....

5. How would you encourage communities to participate in the planning, initiation, formulation of government projects that affect the rural area?

.....
.....
.....

6. Can you kindly help us with a list of projects executed by your organization in the past five years in the rural area? Please attach list.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

7. Were the projects implemented to their fullest?

Yes []

No []

8. If no, what were the obstacles?

.....
.....
.....
.....

9. What are your plans for the future development of the rural areas in Plateau State?

.....
.....
.....
.....

10. Comment freely on the mode/strategy of rural development pursued by your organization.

.....
.....
.....
.....

11. Do you think it is the most appropriate strategy?

.....
.....
.....
.....

12. If not, what mode/strategy are you suggesting?

.....
.....
.....
.....

APPENDIX (2)
EXISTING EQUIPMENTS OF PADP

A. ROADS

NAME OF MACHINE

1. D8k Cat Bull Dozer
2. D7G Cat Bull Dozer
3. D7G Cat Bull Dozer
4. 14G Motor Grader
5. 12 Motor Grader
6. 12 G Motor Grader
7. 120G Motor Grader
8. CAT 930 W/Loader
9. HAMM Roller
10. HAMM Roller
11. FR 10B. W/Loader
12. Back- Hoe Loader

B. WATER DEVELOPMENT EQUIPMENT

1. Aqua rig
2. Ureka Rig
3. ABEM SASB Terramater
4. Land Survey
5. XAH 280 Air Compressor

Most of these equipments were procured during the enclave project 1976 as such there is need for rehabilitation.

APPENDIX 3

SUMMARY OF PROJECTS EXECUTED IN THE YEAR 2000 – 2008 BY
DIRECT LABOUR AGENCY IN PLATEAU STATE

A. ROADS AND RELATED PROJECTS

S/N	LOCATION	DIST.(KM)	YEAR	LGA
1	Hoss- Rim BAchit	22.7	2000	Riyom
2	Zambko- Talbut-Mabudi	33	2000	L/ South
3	Jengre-Katako-Amo Bisa	14	2001	Bassa
4.	Rinjigai- Angware	14	2001	Jos East
5.	Dogon Dutse- Maza	5	2003	Jos North
6.	Gora Bridge Rehabilitation	43	2003	Jos East
7.	NDLEA- Dilimi village	5	2004	Jos South
8.	Township Roads-Fudawa Rikkos, Rantya and ECWA Staff School Roads	9.1	2004	Jos North
9	Pankshin Township Roads	9.1	2004	Pankshin
10	Namu- Shindai –Doema	18	2005	Q-Pan
11	Mbar – Mangar – Mangif	25	2005	Bokkos
12	Maraban Kantoma- Bawan Dodo	18	2005	B/Ladi
13	Doemak –Bwal with 2 Bridges	9.7	2005	Q-Pan
14	FCE Pankshin with 2 Bridges	1.2	2005	Pankshin
15	Ungwar Doki-Rayfield	6	2006	Jos South
16	Bokkos- Dafo- Sha	30.5	2006	Bokkos
17	Sabon Layi-Gazum Waroh	6/14	2004	L/North
	UNDP			
1	Zabollo- Zallaki	12	2003	Bassa
2	Horop – mun	10	2003	Bokkos

3	Dawaki – Songsong	5	2003	Kanke
4	Ungwar Dadi-Shargan	4	2003	Shendam
5	Karfa- Gwande	5	2003	Bokkos
6	Kurgwi- Mpap	5	2003	Q-Pan
7	Kor-Gung	4	2003	Pankshin

EARTH DAMS AND OTHERS

1. Mabudi Dam Rehabilitation Langtang South 2001
2. Sabon Gida Dam Rehabilitation Langtang South 2001
3. Mile 4 Dam Rehabilitation Langtang South 2005
4. Lantang Airstrip Clearing Langtang North 2004
5. Centenary Arena-Shendam 2007

SUMMARY

Roads	-	267.3Km
Dams	-	3 Nos.
Clearing	-	2 site
Bridges	-	5 Nos.
2008	-	Simple machine services rendered to organization like MOW and ECWA

B. WATER AND RELATED PROJECTS

S/N	LOCATION	DIST.(KM)	YEAR	LGA
1	Plateau State Polytechnic	1	2000	B/Ladi
2	FGC Jos	1	2000	Jos North
3	Pankshin New Layout	1	2000	Pankshin
4	Cottage Hospital Tunkus	1	2000	Mikang
5	Jing	2	2000	Pankshin
6	Nassarawa	1	2000	Wase
7	Gwarlak Kanam	1	2000	Kanam
8	Dukum Kanam	1	2000	Kanam
9	Kwatas	1	2000	Bokkos
10	Gung	1	2000	Pankshin
11	Kor	1	2000	Pankshin
12	Horop	3	2000	Bokkos
13	Gindiri	1	2001	Mangu
14	FCE	3	2001	Pankshin
15	Anguldi	1	2002	Jos South
16	Kwata	1	2001	Jos South
17	Abattoir	1	2001	Jos South
18	Pilgani	1	2001	L/North
19	SPS Kurgwi	3	2001	Q-Pan
20	GTC Bukuru	1	2001	Jos South
21	D.G. Lodge. St. Pirans	1	2001	Jos North
22	COWAN Kazuk II & II	2	2002	Kanke
23	Government College Jos	1	2002	Jos North

24	Riyom Police Station	1	2002	Riyom
25	Horop	3	2002	Riyom
26	Fan Gasso	1	2002	Bokkos
27	Dorowa Babuje	1	2002	B/Ladi
28	Kerang I, II,III	3	2003	Mangu
29	Dikibin	1	2003	Mangu
30	Rantya	1	2003	Jos South
31	Piapung	1	2003	Mikang
32	Angware	1	2003	Jos East
33	St. Johns College Jos	1	2003	Jos North
34	University of Jos	3	2003	Jos North
35	Naraguta Avenue	1	2003	Jos North
36	Rayfield	1	2003	Jos South
37	Shendam	1	2003	Shendam
38	Kwande I & II	2	2003	Q-Pan
39	Tina Junction	1	2003	Jos North
40	Jiyep Hwolshe	1	2003	Jos South
41	State Secretariat	2	2003	Jos South
42	Abuja Hostel Uni Jos	1	2003	Jos North
43	Bauchi Road Motor Park	1	2003	Jos North
44	Kugiya	1	2003	Jos South
45	GSS Riyom	1	2003	Riyom
46	Fobur Market	1	2003	Jos East
47	Govt. Lodge Rayfield	1	2003	Jos South
48	St. Louis College Jos	2	2004	Jos North
49	Rantya	1	2004	Jos South

50	Rayfield	1	2004	Jos South
51	Rayfield Resort	1	2004	Jos South
52	Rukuba Barrack	1	2004	Bassa
53	Theological College Gindiri	1	2004	Mangu
54	Jing	1	2004	Pankshin
55	Rayfield	1	2004	Jos South
56	GGSS Shendam	1	2004	Shendam
57	College of Education Gindiri	1	2004	Mangu
58	Rayfield	2	2004	Jos South
59	Horop	1	2004	Bokkos
60	Langtang Airstrip	2	2004	L/North
61	Kwang Rayfield	1	2005	Jos South
62	Ali Kazaure	1	2005	Jos North
63	Mere	1	2005	Riyom
64	Kwogo	1	2005	Mangu
65	Tal	1	2005	Riyom
66	Manhot Chip	1	2005	Pankshin
67	Kabwir I, II, & III	3	2005	Pankshin
68	Abattoir	1	2005	Kanke
69	Kwa	1	2005	Jos South
70	Abuja Hostel Uni Jos	1	2005	Jos North
71	Naraguta Hospital Uni Jos	1	2005	Jos North
72	Richard Roads Hostel Uni Jos	1	2005	Jos North
73	Abattoir	1	2005	Jos North
74	Nkru Miango	1	2005	Bassa
75	Rantya Awatai	1	2005	Jos South

76	Shishiri	1	2005	Langtang North
77	New Crescent	1	2005	Jos North
78	Trinity College	1	2006	Pankshin
79	Roi Ganawuri	1	2006	Riyom
80	Evangel Hospital Jos	1	2006	Jos North
81	Bethany Academy	1	2006	B/Ladi
82	Gwol Model	1	2006	B/Ladi
83	Fujing	1	2006	Q-Pan
84	Ba'al	1	2006	Q-Pan
85	Funglect	1	2006	Q-Pan
86	Kapil	1	2006	Pankshin
87	Heipang	1	2006	B/Ladi
88	PSU	7	2006	Bokkos
89	Chigwong	1	2006	Pankshin
90	Gazum	1	2006	L/North
91	Pangwan Dyis	1	2006	Pankshin
92	Rankum Riyom	1	2007	Riyom
93	Tanishal Ganawuri	1	2007	Riyom
94	Kwakwi	1	2007	Riyom
95	Lwa Riyom	1	2007	Riyom
96	Sacred Heart Shendam	1	2007	Shendam
97	CTI Shendam	1	2007	Shendam
98	State House of Assembly	1	2007	Jos North
99	SJV Seminary	1	2007	B/Ladi
100	Ahmed Isa D/Kowa	1	2007	Jos South
101	Shen Road Bukuru	1	2007	Jos South

102	Maraban Jama'a	1	2007	Jos South
103	Dakin Kowa	1	2007	Jos South
104	Government College Bokkos	2	2007	Bokkos
105	Gwash	1	2007	Jos North
106	Governors Office Jos	1	2007	Jos South
107	Leadership training centre	1	2007	Jos South
108	Bwonpe	1	2007	Mangu
109	St. Louis College Jos	1	2007	Jos North
110	Jankassa Jos East	1	2008	Jos East
111	Nafan Dredge	1	2008	B/Ladi
112	Ramzee D/Dutse	1	2008	Jos North

SUMMARY

1. Borehole
2. Motorized Pumps BH – 3 Nos at PSU
3. Hand Pump BH- 4Nos. AT PSU
4. 100,000L surface Reservoir (Steel-1No.at PSU)
5. 75,000L overhead tank (Steel) at PSU
6. Lift Pump Reticulation awaiting electrification/Balance Payment at PSU
7. Construction of 120,000L Steel Ground Tank with submersible and Lift pumps as well as reticulation at Governors office Jos.

(Source: Direct Labour Agency 2009, collected by Researcher during field work)

**APPENDIX 4
DIRECT LABOUR AGENCY
ROAD PROJECTS EXECUTED, MAY 2000-TILL DATE
NORTHERN ZONE.**

S/NO	PROJECT	L.G.A	DATE OF COMMENCEMENT	DATE OF COMPLETION	SPONSORED APROVED BY	PROJECT COST	TOTAL RELEASES MADE	OUT STANDING BALANCE	REMAKS
1	AMO-JINGER-KATAKO	BASSA	2000	2001	PLSG	741,400	714,400	-	COPLETED
2	YELWA ZANGAM-NEPA	JOS NORTH	2000	2000	PLSG	4,484,760	3,017,228	1,467,532	-
3	INLAND CONTAINER PORT ACCESS ROAD	B/LADI	2001	ON-GOING	PLSG	1,074,745	1,074,745	-	Not completed
4	ZALLAKI-ZARIA ROAD	BASSA	2000	ON-GOING	PLSG	10,178,398	1,000,000	9,178,398	APPROVED GIVEN, FUNDS YET TO BE RELEASETED
5	MI'ANGO-TAEGBE JROAD	BASSA	2000	2000	PLSG	4,000,103	-	4,000,103	COMPLETED
6	DONG-LAYOUT	JOS SOUTH	2001	2001	MLS AND TP	600,000	600,000	-	COMPLETED
7	ANGWARE MULTI-CU-ELL CULVERT	JOS EAST	2000	2000	PLSG	954,300	924,300	30,000	COMPLETED
8	DOGON DUTSE-MAZA	JOS NORTH	2004	ON-GOING	PLSG		500,000	-	PDLA CONTRIBUTION GOING
9	MAIJUJU-ZANDI ROAD	JOS EAST	2006	2006	MEMBER REP.J/EAST, HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY	2,542,000	2,542,000	-	COMPLETED
10	MARIT-MAZAT-GAFFAT ROAD	B/LADI	2006	ON-GOING	B/LADI	2489,812	829,903	1,659909	ON-GOING
11	EMBANKMENT OF	JOS SOUTH	2005	2005	GBONG GWOM	285,150	200,000	85,150	ON-GOING

	WATER RESERVOUR AT LITTLE				JOS				
12	EXECUTION OF RURAL ROADS IN RIYOM LGC.	RIYOM	2006	ON-GOING	RIYOM	9,066,354	5,023,000	4,043,354	ON-GOING

CENTRAL ZONE

S/NO	PROJECT	L.G.A	DATE OF COMMENCEMENT	DATE OF COMPLETION	SPONSORED APROVED BY	PROJECT COST	TOTAL RELEASE S MADE	OUT STANDING BALANCE	REMAKS
1	PANKSHIN –KOR LANKAN	PANKSHIN	2000	2003	PLSG	2,792,840	1,792,840	1,000,000,	COMPLETED
2	FCE LANKAN (STABILIZATION OF SLOPES AND REHABILITATION)	PANKSHIN	2004	2004	PLSG	1,994,175	1,000,000	994,175	UNCOMPLETED EXECTING FUTHER RELEASE OF FUNDS
3	DAFFO-TOFFO-SIKEN	BOKKOS	2001	ON-GOING	PLSG	18,000,000	18,000,000	-	COMPLETED
4	JARMAI-TUNGA-GARGA	KANAM	2001	ON-GOING	PLSG	43,725,000	500,000	43,225,000	-
5	LANGTANG ROAD NGOLONG NGAS PALACE	PANSHIN	2001	2001	PLSG	-	-	-	ASSISTED HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS
6	ABWORDYIS –KAGU SHIN(GRADING ONLY)	PANKSHIN	2002	2004	PLSG	422,000	422,000	-	COMPLETED
7	TAL-BABAN-LAMBA (GRADING)	PANKSHIN	2003	2003	PLSG	11,08,906	572,800	-	GRADIND DONE
8	DENGI- GAGDI-WAWUS (REVIEWED 2006)	KANAM	2002	ON-GOING	PLSG	83,558,421	16793,539	66,764,882	WORK STOPED DUE TO LACK OF FUNDING

9	DENGI-JARMAI	KANAM	2004	2004	PLSG	1,205,900	1,200,000	-	SPOT DEVELOPMENT
10	PUSHIT-TAKKAS-KADUNG	PANKSIN	2004	ON-GOING	PLSG	30,146,095	5,000,000	25,146,096	WORK STOPED DUE TO LACK OF FUNDS
11	MANGUN CHANFEM	MANGU	2004	ON-GOING	PLSG	18,520,283,	5,000,000	13,520,383	-
12	MANGAR- MARGIF-HORROP	BOKKOS	2004	ON-GOING	PLSG	28,814,165	3000,000	25,481,165	WORK STOPED DUE TO LACK OF FUNDS
13	PUSHIT-JANARET	PANKSHIN	2005	ON-GOING	PLSG	26,364,318	2,500,000	23,864,318	WORK STOPED DUE TO LACK OF FUNDS
14	DENGI-ZANGON-KARMO	KANAM	2005	ON-GOING	KANAM-LGA	5,163,811	1,500,000	3,663,811	ON-GOING
15	ABWOR DYIS-LANKANG	PANKSHIN	2005	ON-GOING	PLSG	13,118,900	-	13,118,900	FUNDS YET TO BE RELEASED
16	KANKE H.Q ROAD(PHASE 1 AND 11	KANKE	2005	ON-GOING	KANKE	7,984,210	2,500,000	5,484,210	LGC YET TO BE RELEASE FUNDS
17	PRTVC-DANKANG SUBSTATION ACCESS ROAD	KANKE	2005	2005	PRTVC	259,200	259,200	-	COMPLETED
18	SUWA-KANGER ROAD	BOKKOS	2006	ON-GOING	PLSG	24870570	2,000,000	22,870,570	FUNDING STOPED
19	PASSAKAI-BRIDGES	BOKKOS	2006	2006 COMPLETED	PLSG	2,000,000	2,000,000	-	COMPLETED
20	KUNBUN-BOKKOS	MANGU	2006	ON-GOING	COMMUNTY	3,000,000,	1,200,000	1,800,000	BALANCE OF FUNDS YET TO BE MADE

21	MBAR-MANGAR-RICHA	BOKKOS	2006	ON-GOING	PLSG	10,000,000	10,000,000	-	ON-GOING
22	GINSHERE-GWAMLAR-GIDGID ZAKAM	KANAM	2006	ON-GOING	KANAM LGC	13,885,098	7,000,000	6,885,098	WORK ON GOING

SOUTHERN ZONE

S/NO	PROJECT	L.G.A	DATE OF COMMENCEMENT	DATE OF COMPLETION	SPONSORED APPROVED BY	PROJECT COST	TOTAL RELEASES MADE	OUT STANDING BALANCE	REMAKS
1	SABONGIDA-TURAKA-KARKASHI	LANGTANG SOUTH	2000	ON-GOING	PLSG	21,200,000	1,700,000	19,500,000	WORK STOPED DUE TO LACK OF FUNDS
2	GIDAN ADAMU-PLAPUNG	MIKANG	200	ON-GOING	PLSG	15,349,322	1,800,000	13,549,322	WORK STOPED ON FUNDING
3	AOEMAK- SHEDAM BRIDGES	QUA'ANPAN	2002	ON-GOING	PLSG	12,450,000	1,468,000	19,982,000	LACK OF FUNDING
4	GARKAWA-TUNKUS BRIDGES	MIKANG	2002	2002	PLSG	500,000	500,000	-	COMPLETED
5	WASE-KADARKO	WASE	2004	2004	PLSG	6,000,000	6,000,000	-	COMPLETED
6	WASE-LAMBA	WASE	2005	2005	WASE LGA	7,793,600	7,793,6000	-	COMPLETED
7	EATH DAM CONSTRUCTION(KARKASHI AND DEMSHIN)	LANGTANG SOUTH	2005	ON-GOING	L-SOUTH LGA	800,000	300,000	500,000	WORK STOP DUE TO LACK OF FUNDS
8	MARARABAN DEMSHIN- DEMSHIN SHIMANKAR	SHENDAM	2005	ON-GOING	SHENDAM LGA	43,865,938	3,000,000	40,865,938	LGC YET TO RELEASE FUNDS
9	WASE-MAVO	WASE	2005	ON-GOING	WASE LGA	11,310,475	5,510,000	5,809,475	LGC YET TO RELEASE FUNDS

(Source: Direct Labour Agency Office 2009)
(Collection from field Interview by Researcher.)

APPENDIX 5

NO OF BOREHOLES CONSTRUCTED BY PRUWASSA FROM 2003-2007			
S/NO	LGA	COMMUNITY	SPONSOR
1	Barkin Ladi	Newo 1	Water Aid
2	Barkin Ladi	Newo 11	Water Aid
3	Barkin Ladi	Newo111	L.G.A
4	Barkin Ladi	Mara	Water Aid
5	Barkin Ladi	Kushe 1	L.G.A
6	Barkin Ladi	Kushe 11	Water Aid
7	Barkin Ladi	Ndind 11	Philanthropy
8	Barkin Ladi	Nding 1	UNICEF
9	Barkin Ladi	Nding 111	UNICEF
10	Barkin Ladi	Rahai 1	UNICEF
11	Barkin Ladi	Nyarwei	UNICEF
12	Bassa	Saya 1	Water Aid
13	Bassa	Saya 11	Water Aid
14	Bassa	Saya 111	Govt.
15	Bassa	Ancha	Water Aid
16	Bassa	Gboro	Govt.
17	Bassa	Bimbop	Govt.
18	Bassa	Kishika	Govt.
19	Bassa	Rumfan Gwamna	Govt.
20	Bassa	Majaj 1	Water Aid
21	Bassa	Majaja 11	Water Aid
22	Bassa	Binkan 1	Water Aid
23	Bassa	Binkan 11	Water Aid
24	Bokkos	Kawel	Govt.
25	Bokkos	Ikngwkap 1	Govt.
26	Bokkos	Minjin Horop	Govt.
27	Bokkos	Mbor	Govt.
28	Bokkos	Daffo town	Govt.
29	Bokkos	Daffo Rcc	Govt.
30	Bokkos	Daffo fangha	Govt.

31	Bokkos	Makada	EU/UNICEF.
32	Bokkos	Butura Gida	Govt.
33	Bokkos	Tafftudu	Govt.
34	Bokkos	Taff Tabiu	Govt.
35	Bokkos	Taff 3	Govt.
36	Bokkos	Ikngwkap2	Govt.
37	Bokkos	Kuba	EU/UNICEF
38	Bokkos	Kunet	Govt.
39	Bokkos	Sangwak	Govt.
40	Bokkos	Turkey	EU/UNICEF
41	Bokkos	Kangil	EU/UNICEF
42	Bokkos	Jemut	Govt.
43	Bokkos	Kadim Bisa	EU/UNICEF
44	Bokkos	Margif	Govt.
45	Bokkos	Karfa	EU/UNICEF
46	Bokkos	Gwande 1	L.G.A
47	Bokkos	Gwande 2	Philanthropy
48	Bokkos	Mai hakurin gold	Govt.
49	Bokkos	Dashorong	Govt.
50	Bokkos	Government college Bokkos	PTA/PRUWSSA
51	Bokkos	Angwan Hausawa	Philanthropy
52	Jos East	Fadan Fobur primary sch.	UNICEF
53	Jos East	Fandan fobur community	UNICEF
54	Jos East	Bayan Dutse	Water Aid
55	Jos East	Maigemu	Philanthropy
56	Jos East	Gwash	Philanthropy
57	Jos East	Gwaji	Philanthropy
58	Jos East	Tere	Philanthropy
59	Jos East	Dadin kowa	UNICEF
60	Jos East	Agric. Farm S.Fobur	Philanthropy
61	Jos East	Naton	UNICEF
62	Jos East	Fadan federe	Philanthropy
63	Jos East	Fobur Ekan	Philanthropy

64	Jos East	Kerker	Philantrophy
65	Jos East	Sabon kaura	UNICEF
66	Jos East	Rizek	UNICEF
67	Jos East	Kutek Aku	UNICEF
68	Jos East	Danche	UNICEF
69	Jos East	Dorong	UNICEF
70	Jos East	Nakwang	Philantrophy
71	Jos East	Zandi	Philantrophy
72	Jos East	Gwadong	Philantrophy
73	Jos North	Naraguta Hostel	UNIJos
74	Jos North	ST. Village Hostel	UNI Jos
75	Kanam	Kass	L.G.A
76	Kanam	Gyabgub	L.G.A
77	Kanam	Gyambar	L.G.A
78	Kanam	Gbogoom Palace	L.G.A
79	Kanam	Emir palace Dengi	L.G.A
80	Kanam	Gidgid pada	L.G.A
81	Kanam	Gagdi Dapshi	L.G.A
82	Kanam	Yugur sullem	Govt.
83	Kanam	Pesheyi	Govt.
84	Kanam	Jarmai	Govt.
85	Kanam	Gangar kasuwa	Govt.
86	Kanam	Bayan Katanga Dengi	Govt.
87	Kanam	Gwamlar Tudun	Govt.
88	Kanam	Gwamlar kasuwa	Govt.
89	Kanam	Tal-Bushi	L.G.A
90	Kanam	Dapshi	L.G.A
91	Kanke	Lur 2	Philantrophy
92	Kanke	Mimyak	L.G.A
93	Kanke	Kwak college	Philantrophy
94	Kanke	Garyang 1	UNICEF
95	Kanke	Gargang 11	UNICEF

96	Kanke	Gugur pada	L.G.A
97	Kanke	Laplek	L.G.A
98	Kanke	Seri	L.G.A
99	Kanke	Dungung	L.G.A
100	Kanke	Mwel	L.G.A
101	Kanke	Bolkon	L.G.A
102	Kanke	Lur 1	L.G.A
103	Kanke	Gyangyang	L.G.A
104	Kanke	Langshi	L.G.A
105	Kanke	Tigya 1	UNICEF
106	Kanke	Tigya 2	L.G.A
107	Kanke	Golten	L.G.A
108	Kanke	Kali 1	L.G.A
109	Kanke	Tom-tom	L.G.A
110	Kanke	Tabulung	L.G.A
111	Kanke	Kwall Guest House	L.G.A
112	Langtang North	Yakot	BOLDA
113	Langtang South	Gamakai	UNICE
114	Langtang South	Karkashi	UNICE
115	Langtang South	Timbol 1	UNICE
116	Langtang South	Timbol 11	L.G.A
117	Langtang South	Tongchin	L.G.A
118	Langtang South	Jigawa	L.G.A
119	Mangu	GSS Panyam	Govt.
120	Mangu	Jakwom 1	Govt.
121	Mangu	Jakwom 2	Govt.
122	Mangu	Apan West 1	Philantrophy
123	Mangu	Apan west 11	Philantrophy
124	Mangu	Panyam district	Philantrophy
125	Mangu	Panyam RCC	Church/PRUWASSA
126	Pankshin	Dilla	L.G.A
127	Pankshin	Wokkos	L.G.A

128	Pankshin	Vel	Govt.
129	Pankshin	Takkas	Govt.
130	Pankshin	Nungwus	Govt.
131	Pankshin	Lunchag	Govt.
132	Pankshin	Longdereng	Govt
133	Pankshin	Jibam	Govt.
134	Pankshin	Wapbelp	Govt.
135	Pankshin	Jeneret	Govt.
136	Pankshin	Lapbwai-wokkos	COWAN
137	Pankshin	Gung	COWAN
138	Qua'an pan	Kwoor	Govt.
139	Qua'an pan	Npap	Govt.
140	Qua'an pan	Carse	Govt.
141	Qua'an pan	Labi	Govt.
142	Qua'an pan	Kwa	Govt.
143	Qua'an pan	Shindai	Govt.
144	Qua'an pan	Hanchi kare	UNICEF
145	Qua'an pan	Anigo	UNICEF
146	Qua'an pan	Turayaing	UNICEF
147	Qan'an pan	Gidan Bube	UNICEF
148	Qua'an pan	Kwande (Angwan Dap	UNICEF
149	Qua'an pan	Tudun sakwa	UNICEF
150	Riyom	Ta-Hoss	L.G.A
151	Riyom	Ra-Hoss	L.G.A
152	Riyom	Shu'u	L.G.A
153	Riyom	Rim	L.G.A
154	Riyom	Gwon (Lwa)	L.G.A
155	Riyom	Gwonkyang	L.G.A
156	Shendam	Poeship 1	Water Aid
157	Shendam	Poeship 11	Water Aid
158	Shendam	Kawo	Water Aid
159	Shendam	Yelwa LAD	UNICEF

160	Shendam	Yelwa RCM	UNICEF
161	Shendam	Yelwa LED 11	UNICEF
162	Shendam	Yamini	NGO
163	Shendam	Areil 1	Water Aid
164	Shendam	Shepwan-Abortive	Water Aid
165	Shendam	Tumbi	Water Aid
166	Shendam	Dokan Tafa	Philanthropy
167	Shendam	Kasuwan Doya	Philanthropy
168	Shandam	Gidan Adamu	UNICEF
169	Shandam	Dokan Tofa	UNICEF
170	Shandam	Soklout	UNICEF
171	Shendam	Kalong	UNICEF
172	Shendam	Damshi	UNICEF
173	Shendam	Angwan zam	UNICEF

APPENDIX 5 CONTINUES
ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT FROM INCEPTION TO DATE
1.0 SANITATION DEPARTMENT

ACTIVITY	SUPPORTED BY	L.G.A	COMMUNITY	NUMBER	YEAR
Construction of sanplat household latrines and a V.I.P latrine in prim sch.	Water Aid	Bassa	Saya	160 H/H sanplat and a Block of V.I.P latrine	2004
Latrine (sanplat)	Water Aid	Bassa	Ancha	80 H/H	2004
Supported 3 communities with sanplat latrine	Unicef	Quan'pan	Npap, Miket and Goepun	40H/H 20H/H 20H/H	2004
Suported construction of sanplat in 9 communities	Unicef	Jos East B/Ladi Bassa Bokkos	Fobur Ban Rimi Kwok Mazat kawel Newo Naton Kunet	5-10 H/H 5-10 H/H 5-10 H/H 10-20H/H 10-20 H/H 10-20H/H 10-20 H/H 20-40H/H	2004
Construction of sanplat slabs	Water Aid	Pankshin	Mwasam Giban	5-10 H/H 5-10 H/H	2004
Construction of V.I.P Latrine	Unicef	Kenke	Tipik/Tigya	2 Block	2005
Construction of sanplat in Bassa	Water Aid	Bassa	Majaja Binkan	43 bags- 86 H/H 56 bags -112H/H	2005
Training of Artisans	Water Aid	Jos East Bassa	Bayan Dutse, Dinya, majaja Binkan	30	2005
Training of WASU	Water Aid	Bassa		20	2005
Training of WASU and WASCOM	Water Aid	Shendam	Kawo poeship	20	2005
V.I.P[latrine construction	Unicef	Kanke	LGEA primary Garyang	2 Blocks	2006
Construction of V.I.P latrines	Unicef	J/East,	LGEA fandan fobur,	2 Blocks of 3	2006

		L/South Kanke	Gamakai, Karkashi and Tigya	comparment 4 Blocks of 3 compartment 1 Blocks of 3 compartment	
Construction of V.I.P latrines	Unicef and E.U	Bokkos	Kuba, kadin sama, makada Turkey	V.I.P in 4 primary school	2006
Need Assessment for Establishment of sanitation center	Water Aid	Pankshin B/Ladi Jos East L/North RIyom		30	2006
Construction of V.I.P Latrine	Unicef	J/East	LGEA Dadin kowa	2 Block of 3 compartments	2006
Construction of H/H Latrine	Water Aid	B/Ladi	Newo Kushe	100bags 200 H/H 50bags 100 H/H	2006
Training on CLTS	Water Aid	Bokkos B/Ladi Bassa Shendam Kanke J/East Pankshin L/south L/North Q/Pan Riyom COWAN Loving care		45 people	2007

Construction of V.I.P Latrine	Unicef	J/East	LGEA Ekan	2 Block of 3 Compartments	2007
Construction of V.I.P Latrine	Unicef	Kanke	Tigya	2 Block of 3 compartments	2007
Construction of V.I.P Latrine	Unicef	Riyom	Tahoss	2 Blacks of 3 compartment	2007
Training of WASU, WASCOM and Artisans in Bassa	Water Aid	Bassa	L.G.A	20	2005
Supervision of Activities	Water Aid	Bassa	Majaja and Binkan		2005
Digging of sand plat pits and sand plats mould	Nil				2004
Support construction of sand plat slabs		J/East Bokkos	Naton and kawel	Sand plats slabs	2004

Source: PRUWASSA Records collated by Researcher during field work