EFFECT OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC INFRASTRUCTURE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN KATSINA STATE, NIGERIA

BY

AHMED KABIRU SALISU

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION,
FACULTY OF ADMINISTRATION
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,
ZARIA

JULY, 2018

EFFECT OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC INFRASTRUCTURE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN KATSINA STATE, NIGERIA

BY

AHMED KABIRU SALISU
P15ADPA9010

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES, AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY (PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION)

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION,

FACULTY OF ADMINISTRATION,

AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,

ZARIA-NIGERIA

JULY, 2018

DECLARATION

I declare that the work in this Thesis entitled EFFECT OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC INFRASTRUCTURE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN KATSINA STATE, NIGERIA has been performed by me in the Department of Public Administration. The information derived from the literature has been duly acknowledged in the text and a list of references provided. No part of this thesis was previously presented for another degree or diploma at this or any other Institution.

Ahmed Kabiru SALISU	_____	_____
Name of Student	Signature	Date

CERTIFICATION

This Thesis entitled EFFECT OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC INFRASTRUCTURE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN KATSINA STATE, NIGERIA by Ahmed Kabiru SALISU meets the regulations governing the award of the degree of Masters of Philosophy (Public Administration) of the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

Prof. S. B. Abdulkarim _____ Date_____
Chairman, Supervisory Committee

Dr. B. Tanimu _____ Date_____
Member, Supervisory Committee

Dr. H. A. Yusuf _____ Date_____
Head, Department of Public Administration

Prof. S. Z. Abubakar _____ Date_____
Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I thank Allah (SWT) for the strength and endurance He gave me with all the abundant mercy and blessing He has bestowed on me. The whole credit for this work goes to my supervisors Prof. Sirajo Barau Abdulkarim and Dr. Bashir Tanimu who put me through in the course of my study and for proper guidance in the conduct of this study. I say *Jazakumullahu Khairan!*

A good academic work can never be a sole effort of an individual; many people are bound to offer help, advice, encouragement, or assistance in getting the work done. It is impossible in a brief acknowledgement like this to mention names of all my colleagues, friends and relations who have contributed immensely, towards completion of this work. Therefore, I wish to use this opportunity to express my profound gratitude to them, generally.

I also thank members of my PhD/MPhil class most especially our class captain Sa'idu Idris and my closest friend, Abbas Salihu as well as other members of the class such as Rechael Olech, Makeri Danladi, Adamu Babale, Oboromeni Amupitan, Lawal Bala Isa, Mohammed Omonisi, Solomon Danbaki, and Mustapha Haladu. Special thanks also go to my mentor, Dr. Hamza Abdullahi Yusuf for advising us how become good scholars. My thanks should also go to our Lecturers in the Faculty of Administration, especially Professor Adams A. Anyebe, Professor Adejoh Odoh, and Professor Sabo Bello.

My indelible gratitude goes to Dr Lawal Saleh who examined me during my internal and external defences and for his tremendous contributions in making constructive comments which helped in enriching this dissertation.

Lastly, my appreciation goes to my mum for supporting financially and mentally may Allah forgive her sins she died on 28th August, 2005 while I was in two hundred levels (200L) and also, to my Dad, who died on 2nd June, 2018, may their souls rest in perfect peace Amin. I also thank my family for the support they gave me throughout course of my academic endeavour.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to Allah for his special providence, divinely favour throughout my course of study. To my mum who dies on 28th August, 2005 while I was in two hundred levels (200L) may (Allah) bless her Amin. I also dedicated this work to my Dad who died on June 2 2018, and to all members of my family as well as my relative who encouraged me in one way the other in pursuing this programme of postgraduate studies.

ABSTRACT

Rural development which is a component within the broader national development has remained a problem for both developed and developing countries. In order to achieve the desired rural development in the developing countries, there are proliferations of rural development strategies over the years, Nigeria inclusive. The objective of the study was to examine the effect of socio-economic infrastructure on rural development in Katsina State, Nigeria. The study chose three local governments as the geographical scope, while schools, electricity, market road healthcare infrastructures were the subject scope. The research population was 510,683, out of which 550 were taken as the sample size of the study using Saunders (2007) sampling method. A total of 520 questionnaires were returned both from the rural populace and staff respondents, and data was collected mainly through primary sources, while qualitative and quantitative methods of data analysis were employed. Regression analysis and correlation were used in testing the hypotheses postulated to establish the relationships between socio-economic infrastructure and rural development. Findings of the study indicated that, there is positive and significant relationship between provision of socio-economic infrastructure and rural development as all the five null hypotheses were rejected. The study recommends that, government should provide more socio-economic infrastructure in order to develop the rural areas.

Table of Contents

TITLE PAGE iii
DECLARATION v
CERTIFICATION v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT vi
DEDICATION vii
ABSTRACT viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS ix
LIST OF TABLES xiii
LIST OF APPENDIX xiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATION xv
CHAPTER ONE 1
1.1 Background to the Study 1
1.2 Statement of the Problem 4
1.3 Research Questions 7
1.4 Objectives of the Study 7
1.5 Research Hypotheses 7
1.6 Significance of the Study 8
1.7 Scope of the Study 9
1.8 Limitation of the Study 10
1.9 Definition of Terms 10
1.9.1 Rural 10
1.9.2 Rural Development 11
1.9.3 Infrastructure 11
1.9.4 Socio-Economic Infrastructure 11
1.9.5 Outline of Chapters 12
CHAPTER TWO 13
LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK 13
2.1 Introduction 13
2.2 Literature Review 13
2.2.1 Concept of Development 13

2. 2.3 Concept of Rural 18
2. 2.4 Concept of Infrastructure 20
2.2.5 Concept of Rural Development 27
2.2.3 Empirical Studies 36
2.4 Theoretical Framework 43
2.4.1 Top-Down Approach 43
2.4.2 Bottom-Up Approach 44
2.4.3 Sectoral Approach 44
2.4.4 Multi-sectoral Approach 45
2.4.5 Territorial Approach 46
2.4.6 Local Approach 46
2.4.7 Integrated Rural Development (IDR) 47
2.4. 8 Underpinning Theory 48
CHAPTER THREE 51
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 51
3.1 Introduction 51
3.2 Research Design 51
3.3 Source of Data 51
3.3.1 Primary sources 51
i Questionnaire 52
ii. Interview 52
iii. Observation 52
3.3.2 Secondary sources 52
3.3.3 Administration of questionnaire 53
3.4 Population Size 53
3.5 Sample Size 53
3.6 Sampling Techniques 55
3.7 Method of Data Analysis 55
CHAPTER FOUR 57
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF KATSINA STATE 57
4.1 Introduction 57

4.1.1 Economy 58
4.1.2 Industries in the State 58
4.1.3 Education 59
4.2 Structure, Function and Objectives of Ministry of Rural and Social Development 60
4.2.1 Structure of the Ministry 60
4.1.2 Objectives of the Ministry 61
4.1.3 Function of the Ministry 61
CHAPTER FIVE 62
DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS 62
5.1 Introduction 62
5.2 Demographic Information of the Respondents 64
5.2.1 Gender of the respondents 64
5.2.2 Marital Status 64
5.2.3 Age of Respondents 65
5.2.5 Educational Level of the Respondents 66
5.2.6 Occupation of Respondents 67
5.2.7 Length of service of staff 68
5.3 Provision of Socio-Economic Infrastructure 68
5.3.1 School infrastructure 69
5.3.2: Electricity infrastructure 70
5.3.4 Road infrastructure 74
5.3.6: Health Infrastructure 75
5.6 Rural development dependent variable 78
5.7 Staff View on Socio-Economic Infrastructure 82
5.8 Hypotheses Testing 84
5.8.1 Normality test 84
5.8.2 Reliability Test 85
5.8.3 Test of Hypothesis I 85
5.8.4 Test of Hypothesis II 86
5.8.5 Test of Hypothesis III 86
5.8.6 Test of Hypothesis iv 87

5.8.7 Testing Hypothesis v 87
6.1 Discussion 88
5.2 Major Findings 90
CHAPTER SIX 92
6.1 Summary 92
6.2 Conclusion 93
6.3 Recommendation 93
REFERENCES 95
APPENDIX 112

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 Population and Sample Distribution----------55

Table 5.1 Questionnaire Rate of Return----------63

Table 5.2 Sex of Respondents----------64

Table 5.3 Marital Status----------65

Table 5.4 Ages of Respondents----------65

Table 5.5 Educational Qualification of Respondents----------66

Table 5.6 Occupation----------67

Table 5.7 Length of Service----------68

Table 5.8 School infrastructure----------69

Table 5.9 Electricity infrastructure----------70

Table 5.10 Market infrastructure----------72

Table 5.11 Road infrastructure----------74

Table 5.12 Healthcare----------75

Table 5.13 Rural development----------78

Table 5.14 Socio-economic infrastructure----------82

Table 5.15 Skewness and Kurtosis test ----------84

Table 5.16 Reliability test result----------85

Table 5.17 Result of hypothesis i testing----------85

Table 5.18 Result of hypothesis ii testing----------86

Table 5.19 Result of hypothesis iii testing----------86

Table 5.20 Result of hypothesis iv testing----------87

Table 5.21 Result of hypothesis v testing----------88

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix IA Questionnaire for the rural community----------113

Appendix 1B Questionnaire for staff ----------118

Appendix 2A Interview schedule for honorable commissioner----------120

Appendix 2B Group interview schedule for the rural people----------122

Appendix 3 School----------124

Appendix 4 Electricity----------125

Appendix 5 Market----------126

Appendix 6 Road----------127

Appendix 7 Healthcare----------128

Appendix 8A Hypothesis output----------129

Appendix 8B Hypothesis output----------129

Appendix 8C Hypothesis output----------130

Appendix 8D Hypothesis output----------130

Appendix 8E Hypothesis output----------131

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

UN----------United Nations

AEC----------African Economic Community

REC----------Regional Economic Community

AFDB—------African Development Bank

AUC----------African Union Commission

NPCA—------National Planning and Coordination Agency

UNECA-----United Nation Economic Commission for Africa

MDG--------Millennium Development Goals

PIDA--------Programme for Infrastructure Development in Africa

ADP---------Agricultural Development Programme

DFRRI------Directorate for Food, Road and Rural Infrastructure

RBDA—----River Basin Development Authority

FEC----------Federal Executive Council

NIMF--------National Integrated Infrastructure Master Plan

ICT----------Information and Communication Technology

US----------United State

ANC—---------Anti-Natal Vaccine

JSS----------Junior Secondary School

SSS------ Senior Secondary School

UNESCO— United Nation Education Scientific and Cultural Organization

AHDEL--- American Heritage Dictionary of English language

CRS----------Corporate Social Responsibility

GDP---------Gross Domestic Product

IRD----------Integrated Rural Development

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

The quest for rural development globally, calls for critical assessment of the relation between socio-economic infrastructure and rural development. Socio-economic infrastructures such as road, power, education, healthcare service, communication, water, and market are very essential for rural development and job creation which in turn, improve the standards of living of the rural people and reduces the incidence of rural poverty. According to Egunjobi (1987), the importance of infrastructure to rural socio-economic life can be seen from three perspectives. First, they stimulate economic activities. Second, they promote societal welfare and thirdly, they prevent rural depopulation.

The United Nations (2013) report indicates that, over much of the globe, rural poverty is on the increase. About 1.2 billion people of the world live on less than a dollar, and this is attributed to insufficient, or lack of socio-economic infrastructure that would stimulate and facilitate socio-economic activities which in turn, empowers the rural people and subsequently, improve their well-being.

The Regional Economic Communities (RECs) have been identified as the building blocks for improving the well-being of the rural people, and infrastructure is perceived as the key catalyst to transforming Africa. Numerous studies, analysis and forums, conducted by the African Development Bank (AfDB) and others, have brought out the fact that one of the biggest constraints to Africa's growth and competitiveness has been inadequate and underperforming infrastructural facilities such as schools, market, electricity, road, and healthcare.

The key to unlocking Africa's growth potential was investment in its infrastructure, particularly in education which is central to the development of individual, community as well as

the overall development of a nation. Despite these potentialities of education in rural as well as national development little priority is given to the education sector. For instance, previous federal budgets have depicted this negligence where from 2007 to 2014 the budget for education has been insignificant compared to other sectors as in 2007 what was allocated to education was 12%, in 2008, 10%, in 2009, 11%, in 2010, 9%, in 2011 9.5%, in 2012, 8.43%, in 2013, 10.7%, in 2014, 8.4% respectively (Federal Ministry of Education, 2014). This has indicated that education has not been accorded the desired priority in the national budgets as this is far below the United Nations' benchmark of 26% minimum for education.

The Millennium Development Goal (MDG), with input from African countries, recently completed formulating the Programme for Infrastructure Development in Africa (PIDA). This continental initiative, based on regional infrastructure projects and programmes, which will help to address the infrastructure deficits that severely hampers Africa's competitiveness within itself and in the world market. Continuing growth and prosperity would swell the demand for infrastructure, already one of the continent's greatest impediments to sustainable development. Successive Nigerian Governments at various periods had launched different programmes aimed at development the rural areas some of which include, Agricultural Development Project (ADP), River Basin Development Authority (RBDA), and Directorate for Food, Road and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI).

Ariyo (1991), concludes that, in most scholarly attempt to evaluate the performance of ADP, RBDA, and DFRRI, in terms of real extent, effectiveness and impact, the size and target population reached, level of production attained, and the quantity and quality of the infrastructure developed, these institution's achievement are un-impressive. According to him, rural development institutions such as those mentioned have produced limited result

consequently leading to the past deficiencies which include proliferation of institutions, lack of capacity building, institutional duplication, in-adequate funding, unjustified public intervention and wrong policy.

The federal Government has in 2013, initiated a new policy on infrastructural development in order to correct the past mistakes. The National Integrated Infrastructure Master Plan (NIMP)which is 30-year national integrated plan was developed by stakeholders to tackle the problem of inadequate infrastructure for the medium and long term period and has been has been dully approved by the Good luck Jonathan's administration. The NIMP required a total investment of $3 trillion over a period of 30 years from 2013 to 2043. The sectors for investment includes: energy, about $1 billion; transportation $775 billion, agriculture, water and mining $400 billion, housing and regional development $350 billion, ICT $325 million, social infrastructures $150 billion and vital registration and security $50 billion.

However, a similar plan was developed in Katsina State but on education, the Education Master Plan 2012-2020 for Katsina State has been developed to tackle the problem of the education sectors in terms of infrastructure. Lack of comprehensive infrastructural development plan or policy, no doubt, hinder rural development and it is against this background that, this study examines the effect of socio-economic infrastructure on rural development in Katsina State with a view to proffering solutions on how to improve on its provision focusing on three local governments' Batagarawa, Mani, and Dandume as the geographical scope and school, market, road, electricity, healthcare as the subject scope.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Switzerland was ranked first in terms of having quality infrastructure with 6.7 value which include transport, telephone and energy. In Africa, Namibia was ranked first with 5.3 value, followed by Tunisia with 5.0 value, South Africa had 4.8 value ranked 43 in the world and third in the Africa, Rwanda was fourth, with 4.6 value, Nigeria was ranked 120 and 56 in the world and Africa respectively (Pendse 1980, Abosedra, *et al* 2009).

The World Bank has shown that, poor infrastructure would make a country less attractive destination for investors. This explains the inability of the Nigerian governments to attract foreign investor in spite of endorsing several bilateral agreements and incessant government calls for foreign investors to come and invest in Nigeria. Nigeria is characterized with several cases of inadequate infrastructure. These include: irregular supply of electricity, shortage of pipe borne water, fuel scarcity, unreliable healthcare service, unstable education institutions, bad roads, mal-functioning ports and erratic telecommunication services.

A gloomy picture of Nigerian electricity situation was presented by Iwayemi (2008) where he lamented that for the past three decades, inadequate quantity and quality and access to electricity services has been regular feature in Nigeria. In the communication sector for instance, poor connectivity across telecommunication industries in Nigeria has led to public complain about network failure and other undesirable practices, there is a claim that each of the major telecommunication companies use over a million litters of fuel daily to power generator at their installation across the country thereby incurring additional cost which are usually shifted to the final consumers. Inadequate infrastructure has affected the cost of running business in Nigeria. The cost of a base station for telecommunication in South Africa is estimated to be 250,000 U S Dollars, while 375,000 U S Dollars is require for the same station in Nigeria (Obadare, 2006).

The poor condition of health care system in Nigeria is one of the factors responsible for

low life expectancy which stands at 50 years, while other country like Malaysia has a life expectancy of 70 years. Similarly, immunization against measles of children from 1-2 years was 35% in Nigeria, while in South Africa it stands at 80%.In sanitation, While South Africa has 79%, Nigeria has less than 50 %. Nigeria has 53% of Mortality rate which implies that in every 1,000 infant 101.4 die, while in South Africa of 1,000 is 19.6 (World Bank,2012).

For electricity generation, United State of America with a population of about 316 million has 848,300 Megawatt capacity, South Africa with a population of 42.7 million has 44.650 Megawatt capacity, but Nigeria with a population of 140 million could only generate 4,000 Megawatt, This implies that about 85 million people lack access to electricity services less than 20% of rural areas have access to electricity, by 2010 only 40% of Nigeria will have access to electricity (Ibitoye, 2007; Nnaji, 2008).

The Nigerian roads exhibit numerous problems including faulty design, inadequate drainage, lack of maintenance, single lane and sharp bend, *etc*. The 2002 survey on the State of High-Way Roads in Nigeria indicated that, most of the Nigerian roads require complete rehabilitation due to major cracks, depression, broken down bridge and numerous potholes that makes road transport slow and unsafe .In the education sector the problem of in-adequate infrastructures manifest in obsolete laboratories, and overcrowded class rooms. Many of the laboratories and workshop were obsolete, they suffer from overcrowd, scarcity, broken furniture and in some instances kerosene stoves were being used as Bunsen burner especially in University of Jos and Uyo (Need Assessment, 2011).

Katsina State, which is in the North-west of Nigeria, is not spared from the lack of infrastructure. For instance, indicators of service access in the health sector in the State is low where in 2009, less than 40% of women reporting access to antenatal for their last delivery,

fewer than 3% of children receiving full immunization by the age of one, and fewer than 15% of women reporting delivery of their last child at a facility under the supervision of a skilled birth attendant (Doctor, *et al.* 2011). Similarly in the education sector the story of inadequate infrastructure is the same, for example the provision of classrooms in the primary, JSS and SSS stood at 45%, 72% and 85% of total requirement. Again, the supply of pupils' furniture in these classrooms as at 2009/2010 stood at 65% f or primary schools and 50% each for junior and senior secondary schools in the state which is below the UNESCO requirement which stipulated that a class should not be more 30 pupils (UNESCO, 2010).

Water provision is another area that has been grossly affected in the last five years only 1,000 communities are having access to potable water through the bore-hole construction in all the nooks and crannies of the state which is far too inadequate as a lot of communities are still left without safe drinking water (KMSRD, 2015). No economy and community will boast of any infrastructural growth without electricity, Katsina State was only able to connect 183 communities from 2000 to 2016 to the national grid across the State, but could only connects 11 communities per year. This is grossly inadequate going by the population of the State of over 5 million people of which about 80% resides in the rural areas (KSREA, 2015).

In essence, rural underdevelopment is the problem of this study in terms of inadequate provision of socio-economic infrastructure such as market, electricity, school, water, and communication and this is why rural areas in the state are lagging behind in terms development. The problem of rural underdevelopment could only be tackled through adequate provision of socio-economic infrastructure which constituted the problem of the study.

1.3 Research Questions

i. Is there significant relationship between school infrastructure and rural development?

ii. Is there significant relationship between electricity infrastructure and rural development?

iii Is there significant relationship between market infrastructure and rural development?

iv Is there significant relationship between road infrastructure and rural development?

v Is there significant relationship between healthcare infrastructure and rural development?

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The major objective of this study was to examine the effect of socio-economic infrastructure on rural development in selected local governments of Katsina State.

Specifically, the objectives of this study are to examine the followings:

i To analyze the effect of school infrastructure on rural development in Katsina State.

ii. To analyze the effect of electricity infrastructure on rural development in Katsina State.

iii. To analyze the effect of marker infrastructure on rural development in Katsina State.

iv To analyze the effect of road infrastructure on rural development in Katsina State.

v To analyze the effect of healthcare infrastructure on rural development in Katsina State.

1.5 Research Hypotheses

The hypotheses of this study which were in line with the objectives of the study include the following:

i. There is no significant relationship between school infrastructures on rural development in Katsina State.

ii. There is no significant relationship between electricity infrastructures on rural development in Katsina State.

iii. There is no significance relationship between market infrastructures on rural development

in Katsina State.

iv There is no significance relationship between road infrastructure on rural development in Katsina State.

v There is no significance relationship between healthcare infrastructure on rural development in Katsina State.

1.6 Significance of the Study

Theoretically, this study is going to make several contributions to rural development literature. Firstly, by integrating and identifying the core infrastructure for rural development such as schools, market, road, healthcare, electricity, and healthcare. Past studies conducted by Eneh (2011), Akpan (2012), Ibok (2013), Eneflok (2013), have not extensively addressed the relationship between socio-economic infrastructure and rural development empirically as most of these studies were conceptual in approach. Therefore, this study is of significance to filling this gap by conducting an empirical study on rural development.

Secondly, the present study will add to the existing literature by establishing the link between socio-economic infrastructures on rural development. Thirdly, previous rural development studies were largely conducted in the western contexts, while those that were conducted in Nigeria were mostly in the southern context, this study therefore filled the contextual gaps by conducting this study in the northern context. Thus, in addition to theory and literature development, this study is significant in practical sense as its importance to public sector organizations, international development organizations, and local donor organization by providing an insight into the mechanisms for rural development. Governments both at the federal, state and local government stand to benefit immensely, from this study in practical terms by making use of it in policy and programme initiation and implementation.

From the methodological perspective, as most studies on rural development were carried on qualitative approach such as Yahaya (2010), Ale (2011), Ogunowo (2012), Adesoji (2013), and Idara (2014), this study is important as it employed triangulation approach, where data was collected through three different methods (questionnaire, interview and observation), thus, this gab was filled by carrying out a mixed approach to rural development research which is more scientific.

1.7 Scope of the Study

This study is an examination of the effect of socio-economic infrastructure on rural development in Katsina state, focusing on three local Governments areas Batagarawa, Mani, and Dandume as the study area, spanning from 2007-2015. The selection of these Local Governments was informed first and foremost for a fair representative purpose, as the three local governments were selected each from the three Senatorial zones A, B and C. Secondly; they were chosen because they are all rural in settings (NBS, 2010). Thirdly, the selection of these governments to serve as geographical scope was based on the fact that they could best answer the research problem and objectives.

The period was chosen as it falls under democratic dispensation whereby the electorates expect acceleration of rural development effort as the elected officials were on the premise they serve the people in terms improving their living standard through initiation and execution of rural development projects and programmes. Again, school, electricity, market, road and healthcare were selected to serve as subject scope because these infrastructures formed the basic and critical element of rural development as a strategy (Ekpo, 1995; Leipziger, 2003; Olaseni, 2012; Unegbo, 2012).

1.8 Limitation of the Study

In undertaking this kind of study, various limitations were encountered which include: Firstly, some material that very relevant to this study could not be access from the officials of the relevant ministry as some information were classified confidential particularly those information pertaining to expenditure on rural development. Secondly, financial resources of the researcher were another constraint encountered by the researcher. Thirdly, time frame within which the programme stipulates that it be completed is another constraint to this study.

However, despite the constrains to the study, the first limitation was overcome through the use of primary data obtained through questionnaire, interview and observation, and the validity and reliability of the study has been established through the use of SPSS package which has a high degree of accuracy in data analysis.

1.9 Definition of Terms

Under definition of terms such terms as rural, rural development, infrastructure, socio-economic infrastructure were defined from various scholars and operational definition was given or adopted from other scholars.

1.9.1 Rural

According to Atchoargrena (2003) the term rural, implies away from city, non-metropolitan areas where people live, typically, agricultural, woodland, mountainous and natural settings. It is also conceived as an area where there is absent of social amenities as compare with urban area. Operationally, rural area as used in this study refer to a settlement where most people are poor and lack means of livelihood, it is a place where most people works on farm and there was lack of infrastructural facilities.

1.9.2 Rural Development

Adewumi (1987) conceived rural development as comprehensive mode of social transformation, a socio-economic progress seeking to bring about a more equitable distribution of resources within the society and a veritable acceptance of the principle of growth from below. Rural development generally refers to the process of improving the quality of life and economic well-being of people living in relatively isolated and sparsely populated areas. Operationally, rural development as used by this study refer to effort aimed at improving the living standard of rural dwellers through the provision of socio-economic infrastructure such as road, electricity, healthcare services, school, and market.

1.9.3 Infrastructure

Frischmann (2007) defines infrastructure as asset that accommodate social services. The term typically refers to the technical structures that support a society in both social and economic activities. Infrastructures as used in this study refer to amenities such as roads, electrical grids, school, healthcare, road, and market.

1.9.4 Socio-Economic Infrastructure

Socio-economic infrastructure is defined by Frank (2003) as structure and asset that support a society economically and socially in development effort which include:

1. Power, electricity,
2. Transport infrastructure: surface road, rail system,
3. Water infrastructure: Piped water and bore hole
4. Communication infrastructure: Mass Media, internet, phones, postal services
5. Health infrastructure: primary, secondary, and tertiary health care services
6. Education infrastructure: all categories of schools nursery, primary secondary and tertiary

institutions

7. Financial Infrastructure: Banks, market, wire houses, stores.

Other infrastructures include: parks, dams, recreational facilities.

Socio-economic infrastructure as used by this study refers to school, electricity, market, roads, and healthcare.

1.9.5 Outline of Chapters

This research work is structured into Six Chapters. Chapter one, houses the introduction, statement of the research problem, research questions, objectives, significance, scope and limitation of the study as well as the definition of terms and plan of the study.

Chapter Two focuses on the review of the relevant literature to the study, concept of rural development and rural areas are discussed, and the theoretical framework of the study was discussed, the component of the theory as well as the critique and the relevancy of the theory to the study. Chapter Three contained the methodology of the study, it houses sources of data collection both primary and secondary sources, population and sample size of the study was discussed as well as method of data analysis. Chapter Four contained the back ground of Katsina State, the structural formation of the state and the background of ministry of social and rural development, the function of the ministry and its objectives. Chapter Five covers data presentation and analysis generated from the primary data, it also contains interpretation of data analysed, the chapter also houses discussion, and result of findings from the analysis while Chapter Six contains summary, conclusion and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

The previous Chapter presented the background to the study, statement of the problem, the objectives and the significance of the study, this Chapter reviews the related literature from different scholars in order to have a wider perspective of the subject matter.

2.2 Literature Review

Under the literature review, a comprehensive review of related concept was given such as rural, rural development, and infrastructure, *etc*.

2.2.1 Concept of Development

The term development is a multi-dimensional concept, and thus, appears elusive as its precise meaning is debatable. However, we would attempt to define development from different perspectives by exploring various scholars view on the concept. The term development means different things to different people. Some people take it to mean change, others take it as advancement, improvement, and progress, and some scholars regard it as modernization or westernization.

Some scholars have argued that for the concept to be properly understood it must be pinned down to a specific sphere of life. In this respect, terms such as political and administrative development are taken as contributory factors to the change in the quality and span of life of people, such contributory factors are inter-related and interdependent, which cannot be separated but rather would be viewed simultaneously as development indicators and whichever variants of development we look at as indicators of positive change in the quality and span of

life of the people it must include:

i. Ability to feed, clothe and shelter oneself resulting from more income earned from one's occupation and from the provision of infrastructural facilities like roads water, electricity, telecommunications and other factors of production.
ii. Ability to live a longer life as a result of provision of better health and medical facilities, prevention of disease through better sanitation and other preventive measures.
iii. Ability to read, write and to understand forces surrounding people through the provision of formal and informal education.
iv. Ability to participate meaningfully in political activities and in policy making both at societal and governmental level.

These are in no way exhaustive of things that constitute development, when these and a host of other things take place in society or community we say there is development. Man is the centre of development, the ultimate goal is his well-being his happiness and his comfort.

Generally, development is a concept, which explains the general upliftment in the material, social and psychological conditions of a given human society. There are various scholars' views about development, however only few will be discussed in this study. Development implies a change that is desirable. Society is dynamic, and so, what is desirable at a particular time, place and in a particular culture may not always be desirable a to the replaces or at other times and in the same cultural milieu. Therefore, it is impossible to think of a universally acceptable definition of development. But developments in general include spectrum such as:

(i) Increase in real income per capita(economic growth);

(ii) Improvement in distribution of income(equity);

(iii) Political and economic freedom; and access

(iv) Equitable to resources, education, healthcare, employment opportunities, and justice (Palanithurai, 2010).

Thus, Anyebe (2014) defines development to mean total transformation of a system, but when used to describe a nation, describe the transformation of the various aspect of the life of the people of the nation. He went on to assert that development implies a progression from a lower and often undesirable state to a high and preferred one. It is a continuous process of positive change in the quality and span of life of a person or group of persons of a nation, it is ascension from a lower to a higher stage.

Development is generally associated with positive socio-economic change. It means moving forward to something that is better than the present (Asema, 2011). Development is empowerment; it is about encouraging the local people to take control of their own lives, expressing their own demands and finding their own solutions to their problems (Brookfield, 2012). Development implies qualitative change in the way the society carries out its activities such as through more progressive attitude by the population, the adoption of more effective social organisation and more advanced technology which may have been developed elsewhere, it is a continuing process that begins from conception to death, it is the growth of human throughout the life span (Leigh, 2013).

From a policy perspective, economic development can be defined as efforts that seek to improve the economic well-being and quality of life for a community by creating and/or retaining jobs and supporting or growing in comes and tax base. Development is fundamental about enhancing the factors of productive capacity land, labour, capital and technology of a

national, state or local economy (Asema, 2010). Development is the development of economic wealth of countries or region for the well-being of their inhabitants. It is the process by which a nation improves the economic, political and social wellbeing of its people (Monisola, 2012).

Development as a concept is broad and therefore, does not subject itself to a single definition. It indeed covers a wide range of human endeavours. Asemah (2011) sees development as a gradual process of bringing about positive attitudinal change in the people. It is a continuous process of improving their living conditions, through positive change. The essence of development according to him is the development of people with change in their attitude, leading to change of habit. This means that just changing things without concurrent change of habit or attitude is not a healthy development, development is a process of change in attitude, social structure and general acceleration of economic growth, through reduction of poverty and inequality. Rodney, notes that, development in human society is a many-sided process. At the level of the individual, it implies increased skills and capacity, greater freedom, creativity, self-discipline, responsibility and material well-being. The achievement of any of these aspects is very much tied in with the state of the society as a whole. Development involves the creation of opportunities for the realisation of human potentials. Human beings have certain basic requirements, which must be satisfied so that they can properly function in the society. Among these are enough food, employment and the elimination of all kinds of inequality, which lead to poverty and social problems (Odigbo, 2013). In this light Akpa (2008), sees development as a broader concept that recognizes psychological and material factors that measure human well-being. Development therefore is a multifaceted phenomenon and man cantered. It is the process of empowering people to maximize their potentials, and develop the knowledge and capacity to exploit nature to meet daily human needs.

Similarly, a number of scholars such as He (2012), Pearce (2013), and Bolis (2014) argue that development must take into account the qualitative improvement in employment, social justice and equality. Implicitly, in every use of the term, however, is the notion that some countries and regions of the world are extremely poor whereas others are very prosperous. The discussion of development is often tied with basic such as questions like, why are poor countries poor and rich countries rich, why do poor countries lay behind rich countries in the development of their standards of living. How can poor countries become more prosperous? How can poor countries catch up with the rich countries? In this sense an important dimension of the concept of development refers to economic growth or more precisely growth of national income per capita.

It is further argues that, economic growth could take place without any economic development. An example is provided by those oil exporting countries, which experienced sharp increases in national income but saw hardly any changes in their economic structure (Achimigu, 2012). For the purpose of this study, we modified the definition of development by Seer (1969) where he defined it by posing these questions "The question to ask about a country's development according to him is therefore, what has been happening to inequality, unemployment and poverty? In addition, what has been happening to in-security, what has been happening to incessant labour union strikes, and what has been happening to lack of socio-economic infrastructure, what has been happing to incessant power outage, insecurity, high rate of road accidents, high rate of mortality, high rate of illiteracy as well as abject poverty? What has been happening to youth unemployment? What has been happening to prevalence of diseases, what has been happening to in-equality and social justice? If all these have been reduced from high level, to a lower level then beyond doubt, this has been a period

of development for the country concerned. If one or two of these central problems have been growing up especially all the mention problems, then it would be strange to call the resultant development, even if the per-capita income multiplies several times.

This lead us to the argument that, what Nigeria is experiencing is not development, rather, it is a quantitative increase i.e. growth. Because the substantial rise in the revenue profile of the country does not diffuse to the majority of the masses, instead it is infused in the hands of the few elites. Development is therefore viewed principally from the perspectives of how well the collective resources of a nation are translated into better life for all its citizenry.

2. 2.3 Concept of Rural

The definition of rural is not universal as such its viewed from different perspectives; hence, the study will view rural from a broader perspective in order to capture the real nature of rural areas. Rural areas are large and isolated areas of an open country with low population density (Atchoargrena, 2011). In the same vein, rural area is defined as comprising open country and settlements with fewer than 2,500 residents (United States Census, 2000). National Bureau for Statistics, Nigeria (2010) defines rural area as any settlement with less than 10,000 inhabitants as a rural area. This is a population perspective where number of people is used as indicator of being rural or urban.

Looking at rural area by the population is somehow complex as some areas may be densely populated and yet it is rural because it lacks the necessary infrastructure to be qualified as urban. Rural areas generally refer to areas in a country that are not fully developed, they are areas in a nation where you still have high traditional lifestyles that cannot be found in the urban areas or centres, for example, people in the rural areas normally go to the towns and cities whenever they need healthcare services.

Characteristically, rural area is characterised by of lack the necessary infrastructure to make a meaningful living. They lack infrastructure like good roads, electricity, portable water, good market, banking institutions, good schools, health centres, etc. Those in the rural areas need to go to urban areas whenever they need such infrastructures. From the foregoing therefore, the rural areas are the villages and the communities that are outside the cities, towns and state capitals in a country. Contrary to what is obtainable in the urban areas, closeness of the people to the natural environment, greater social homogeneity, smallness of the communal aggregates, predominance of agricultural occupations and relative sparse population are what are discernible in the rural areas.

Rural dwellers as disadvantaged people, whose houses seldom have running water and electricity, which live in extreme survival crises during rains, sun, wind, storms, harmattan, blizzards and drought, who possess no good roads, no portable water, area cutely isolated. In the same vein Asemah (2011), sees the rural part of Nigeria as representing the preserve of much of what is traditionally underdeveloped in the socio-economic life of the country. By implication, a rural community in Nigeria could therefore be seen as that fraction of the population that live in the rural areas of the country either in clustered, dispersed settlement or may be nomadic, but sharing values in common and are directly or in directly dependent on primary production of agricultural products and also engaged in dyeing, fishing, black smiting, trading or small scale mining.

Although the characteristics of the rural population in Nigeria vary according to different geographical locations, the most common among them is the high degree of illiteracy, poverty, absence of almost all amenities of life. Available data has shown that the overall illiteracy level in Nigeriaisabout35-40percentand much lower among women and in rural communities

(Harande, 2009). Hence, rural populaces are predominantly farmers, engaged in primary production of agricultural products and other raw materials for industries.

Comparatively, rural communities in the northern part of Nigeria are more dispersed in nature and are nomadic, while southern communities are clustered in nature. In addition to farming, the rural populace also engages in fishing, black smiting, lumbering, small scale, mining and trading. Not only is their reading habit poor, they lack access to information which is a vital necessity for their developmental process. Another common characteristic is the poor road network system, because these communities are inaccessible and the obvious consequences of this, is isolation from the rest of the country, Also, the absence of amenities in these areas does not encourage or attract suitable personnel to the areas and in all, there is a low rate of unemployment as virtually everyone is self-employed in agriculture, fishing, trading, black smiting, mining or small scale industries.

2. 2.4 Concept of Infrastructure

The Term Infrastructure is wide in scope as it covers almost everything that is use to produce another thing. The study attempts to capture meaning and nature of infrastructure from different view point.

According to the Online Etymology Dictionary, the word infrastructure has been used in English since at least 1927, originally meaning the installations that form the basis for any operation or system, other sources, such as the Oxford English Dictionary, trace the word's origins to earlier usage, originally applied in a military sense. The word was imported from French, where it means sub grade, a constructed pavement or railway.

The word is a combination of the Latin prefix "infra", meaning "below", and "structure" Accordingly, Olaseni and Alade (2012) see infrastructure as an umbrella term that for many

activities usually referred to as social overhead capital by development economists. Infrastructure is the basic physical and organizational structure needed for the operation of a society or enterprise, or the services and facilities necessary for an economy to function. It can be generally defined as the set of interconnected structural elements that provide a framework supporting an entire structure of development. It is an important term for judging a country or region's development.

The term infrastructure typically refers to structures that support a society, such as roads, bridges, tunnels, water supply, sewers, electrical grids, telecommunications, and so forth, and can be defined as the physical components of interrelated systems providing commodities and services essential to enable, sustain, or enhance societal living conditions. Viewed functionally, infrastructure facilitates the production of goods and services, and also the distribution of finished products to markets, as well as basic social services such as schools and hospitals; for example, roads enable the transport of raw materials to a factory. Infrastructure means the basic facilities which are necessary for the development of a nation. Economic infrastructure is the combination of basic facilities which is helpful in economic development of an economy and businesses. It includes facilities of telecommunication, electricity, transportation, energy while Social infrastructure is the combination of basic facilities which are necessary for human development. It includes health (hospitals), education (school, colleges and housing.

Both of these infrastructures are complementary to each other and are necessary for the overall development of an economy. (Francis 2012). Infrastructure lack a precise definition, but US National Research Council panel sought to clarify the situation by adopting the term "public works infrastructure referring to both specific functional modes such as highways, streets, roads,

and bridges; mass transit; airports and airways; water supply and water resources; wastewater management; solid-waste treatment and disposal; electric power generation and transmission; telecommunications; and hazardous waste management.

A comprehension of infrastructure spans not only these public works facilities, but also the operating procedures, management practices, and development policies that interact together with societal demand and the physical world to facilitate the transport of people and goods, provision of water for drinking and a variety of other uses, safe disposal of society's waste products, provision of energy where it is needed, and transmission of information within and between communities.

Infrastructure is classified into various categorization such as Hard" infrastructure which refers to the large physical networks necessary for the functioning of a modern industrial nation, it is the capital assets that serve the function of conveyance or channelling of people, vehicles, fluids, energy, or information, and which take the form either of a network or of a critical node used by vehicles, or used for the transmission of electro-magnetic waves. whereas "soft" infrastructure refers to all the institutions which are required to maintain the economic, health, and cultural and social standards of a country, such as the financial system, the education system, the health care system, the system of government, and law enforcement, as well as emergency services.

Infrastructure systems include both the fixed assets, and the control systems, software required to operate, manage and monitor the systems, as well as any accessory buildings, plants, or vehicles that are an essential part of the system. Also included are fleets of vehicles operating according to schedules such as public transit buses and garbage collection, as well as basic energy or communications facilities that are not usually part of a physical network, such as oil

refineries, radio, and television broadcasting.

Transportation infrastructure this include, road and highway networks, including structures (bridges, tunnels, culverts, retaining walls), signage and markings, electrical systems (street lighting and traffic lights), edge treatments (curbs, sidewalks, landscaping), and specialized facilities such as road maintenance depots and rest areas, mass transit systems ,commuter rail systems, subways, tramways, trolleys, City Bicycle Sharing system, City Car Sharing system and bus transportation).Railways, including structures, terminal facilities (rail yards, railway stations), level crossings, signalling and communications systems, canals and navigable waterways requiring continuous maintenance ,dredging, Seaports and light houses. Airports, including air navigational systems. Bicycle paths and pedestrian walkways, including pedestrian bridges, pedestrian underpasses and other specialized structures for cyclists and pedestrians Ferries (Adepoju, 2013).

Energy Infrastructure include generation plants, electrical grid, substations, and local distribution, Natural gas pipelines, storage and distribution terminals, as well as the local distribution network, fleets of ships and trucks transporting liquefied gas, associated storage and distribution terminals, refineries, Specialized coal handling facilities for washing, storing, and transporting coal ,Steam or hot water production and distribution networks for district heating systems. Electric vehicle networks for charging electric vehicles (Kessides, 1993).

Water infrastructure, include drinking water supply, the system of pipes, storage reservoirs, pumps, valves, filtration and treatment equipment and meters, including buildings and structures to house the equipment, used for the collection, treatment and distribution of drinking water Sewage collection, and disposal of waste water, Drainage systems ,storm sewers, and ditches, Irrigation systems ,reservoirs, and irrigation canals, flood control systems, dikes, levees,

major pumping stations and floodgates, Large-scale snow removal, including fleets of salt spreaders, snow plops, snow blowers, dedicated dump trucks, sidewalk plows, the dispatching and routing systems for these fleets, as well as fixed assets such as snow dumps, snow chutes, snow welters coastal management, such as seawalls, breakwaters, groynes, floodgates, beach nourishment, sand dune stabilization and the protection of mangrove forests and coastal wetlands (Kessides, 1993).

Communications infrastructure, include, postal service, sorting facilities , telephone networks, land lines, telephone exchange systems, Mobile phone networks, Television and radio transmission stations, the regulations and standards governing broadcasting, Cable television, physical networks, receiving stations and cable distribution networks, Internet, core routers, and server , local internet service providers as well as the protocols and other basic software required for the system to function ,and Communications satellites (Aigbokha,1999).

Governance infrastructure this include, the system of government and law enforcement, the political, legislative, law enforcement, justice and penal systems, as well as specialized facilities ,government offices, courthouses, prisons, and specialized systems for collecting, storing and disseminating data, laws and regulation, such as civil registration, business and company registries, land registration, and maintenance of other databases (Ncube 2011).

Emergency, such as police, fire protection, and ambulances, including specialized vehicles, buildings, communications and dispatching systems. In military parlance, the term refers to the buildings and permanent installations necessary for the support, and operation of military forces military bases, arms depots, training facilities command canters, communication facilities, major weapons systems, fortifications, specialized arms manufacturing, strategic reserves, redeployment barracks, headquarters, airfields, , stores of military equipment, port

installations, and maintenance stations (Smith, 2012).

Economic infrastructure this include, The financial system, the system, the payment system, exchanges, the money supply, financial regulations, as well as accounting standards and regulations, Major business logistic facilities and systems, warehouses, and shipping management systems. Manufacturing infrastructures, including industrial parks and special economic zones, mines and processing plants for basic materials used as inputs in industry, specialized energy, transportation and water infrastructure used by industry, plus the public safety, zoning and environmental laws and regulations that govern and limit industrial activity, and standards organizations (Ncube, 2011).

Agricultural, forestry and fisheries infrastructure, including, specialized food and livestock transportation, and storage facilities, major feedlots, agricultural price support systems ,agricultural insurance, agricultural health standards, food inspection, experimental farms and agricultural research canters, and schools, the system of licensing and quota management, enforcement systems against poaching, forest wardens, and fire fighting (Oyedepo, 2011).

Social infrastructure, include, the health care system, hospitals, the financing of health care, health insurance, the systems for regulation and testing of medications and medical procedures, the system for training, inspection and professional discipline of doctors and other medical professionals, public health monitoring and regulations, as well as coordination of measures taken during public health emergencies such as epidemics, educational and research system, elementary and secondary schools, universities, specialised colleges, research institutions, the systems for financing and accrediting educational institutions, Social welfare systems, including both government support and private charity for the poor, for people in distress or victims of abuse (Adeyemo,1989).

Cultural, sports and recreational infrastructure, this include Sports and recreational places, such as parks, sports facilities, the system of sports leagues and associations. Cultural infrastructure, such as concert halls, museums, libraries theatres, studios (film studios and recording studios), and specialized training facilities. Tourism infrastructure, including both man-made and natural attractions, convention canters, hotels, restaurants, amusement parks, and other services that cater mainly to tourists and business travellers, as well as the systems for informing and attracting tourists, and travel insurance (Salisu, *et al* 2016). Critical infrastructure is use to describe those facilities that are essential to the running of a system or society which include transportation routes in a city, bridges, highways, electricity generation, banking system, telecommunication, hospital, and railways system (AHDEL, 2010).

Green infrastructure, include clean water and healthy soils, as well as the more anthropocentric functions such as recreation and providing shade and shelter in and around towns and cities. The management of storm, water runoff at the local level through the use of natural systems to treat polluted water has been a key aspect of development. From the foregoing conceptualization of infrastructure, we can deduct that infrastructure is simply the facilities and services necessary for a system to function. The World Bank consider infrastructure to include, energy, communication, mining, transportation, urban development, water supply and sanitation (Ogbuozobe,1997; Salisu et al, 2016).

Similarly, American Heritage of English Dictionary operationalize the definition of infrastructure as an underlying base or foundation especially for organization or system, it is the basic facility, services, and installation needed for the functioning of a community or society such as transportation, communication, power, public institution such as schools' prisons, and post office (AHDEL, 2010).

Bill-Clinton (1996) gives a more comprehensive definition of infrastructure from a national security point of view, where he sees infrastructure as the framework of interrelated and interdependent networks and systems comprising identifiable industries, institutions including people and procedures, cap distribution abilities that provide reliable flow of product and services essential to the economy, and the defence of United State. From the above concept of infrastructure people are view as infrastructure because they facilitate production of goods and services and this is a modern definition of the term infrastructure which this study adopted.

2.2.5 Concept of Rural Development

The concept of rural development has evolved over the past decade from mere agricultural development to a broader meaning which goes beyond agricultural development. In the 1970s the concept was conceived by the World Bank (2010) as a strategy designed to improve the economic and social life of specific group the rural poor". It involves extending the benefits of development to the poorest, among those who seek a lively hood in the rural areas. The concept was synonymous with agricultural improvement with more emphasis on increase agricultural productivity which stem from industrialized nations quest for raw materials for their industries. Recent developments have changed the views on rural development from narrow view to a broader view especially from 1980 to 1990 (World Bank, 2010).

Four factors were responsible for the changed, firstly, the changing meaning of development itself, from a mere quantitative increase to qualitative improvement, secondly the realization of the importance of infrastructure in rural development especially the role it played in china in developing the rural areas, thirdly, establishment of millennium development goals. The concept of rural development has begun to be use in a broader sense, particularly on poverty and inequality. In more recent years, increased concerns on the environment al aspects

of economic growth have also influenced the changes (Idira, 2014).

Today's concept of rural development is fundamentally different from that used about 3 or 4 decades ago. The concept now encompasses concerns that go well beyond improvements in growth, income, and output. The concerns include an assessment of changes in the quality of life, broadly defined to include improvement in health and nutrition, education, environmentally safe living conditions, and reduction in gender and inequality (Francis, 2012).

Rural development in general is used to denote the actions and initiatives taken to improve the standard of living in non-urban neighbourhoods, countryside, and remote villages. These communities can be exemplified with a low ratio of inhabitant stooping space. Agricultural activities may be prominent in this case whereas economic activities would relate to the primary sector, production of food stuffs and raw materials. Rural development can be conceived as comprehensive mode of social transformation, a socio-economic progress seeking to bring about a more equitable distribution of resources within the society and a veritable acceptance of the principle of growth from below. A rising from this view point of rural development, the objective of rural development therefore, extent beyond any sector (Tersoo, 2014).

They encompass improved productivity, increase employment, reduction of poverty and general improvement on the standard of living of the poor. The meaning of rural development has been the subject of much debate and little agreement. The definition or rural development may be cantered on income criterion in which the concept is made to address the problem of rural poverty. Or it may be defined in sociological concept in which the rural poor represents a reservoir of untapped talent a target group that should be given the opportunity to enjoy the benefits of development through improved education, health and nutrition (Olawepo, 2012).

This is one of the most important definitions of rural development as the provision of social infrastructures could provide the catalyst that would transform the rural areas (World Bank, 2014).

In essence Rural Development may imply a broad based re-organization and mobilization of rural masses in order to enhance their capacity to cope effectively with the daily task of their lives and with changes consequent upon this. According to the World Bank (2010) Rural Development must be clearly designed to increase production. It recognizes that improved food supplies and nutrition, together with basic services, such as health and education, not only directly improve the physical well-being and quality of life of the rural poor, but can also indirectly enhance their productivity and their ability to contribute to the national economy.

Rural Development ensures the modernization of the rural society and the transition from its traditional isolation to integration with the national economy. It is concerned with increased agricultural production for urban and international markets. This is essential so as to generate foreign exchange, and to attract revenue to finance public and private consumption and investment. In order to encourage increased production rural development may offer a package of inputs and welfare services for the rural masses.

Such inputs and welfare services include physical inputs (such as the provision of feeder roads, water and electrification), social inputs (namely health and educational facilities) and institutional inputs such as credit facilities, agricultural research facilities, rural expansion services among others. Rural communities are characterized by general underdevelopment and low agricultural output.

The state of rural development growth in Nigeria has overtime impacted profoundly on all sectors of the national economy. Development initiatives in the sector began rather too late in the

history of development in the country. The Second National Development Plan period, 1970-74 marked the beginning of national and academic agitation for rural infrastructural development for accelerated national economic development growth (Anyebe, 2012; Adenipekun, 2013).

The objective of rural development is to increase productivity and income of rural families as well as providing minimum acceptable level of feed, shelter, education and health. Apart from increase in agricultural output and economic growth, rural development involves changes in social and economic structure, relationship and attitudes .it is aimed at providing skills and capital to improve the material and social condition of the rural families in order to stimulate and expand employment in the rural areas (World Bank, 2014).

Rural development is a problem solving strategy with improve technology as one aspect of it, development policy must be people oriented and directed toward solving the problem of poverty, and must be motivated, initiated and control from the bottom. In the past, progress in agricultural sector alone, and particularly an increase in the productivity of rural farmers is considered to be satisfactory but recently there is move to undertake development effort from a holistic approach.

Idoma, (2013) asserts that, self-reliance is the key the sustainable rural development, he opined that self-reliance is independent; it is the ability to think and act without the help or influence of others, the ability to decide what you should be. Economic self-reliance development is a kind of development that relies on the internal human and capital resources as oppose to external resources.

Economic development any country to greater extent depends on rural development which assist the economy to grow and sustain Indira (2014). According to Francis (2012) the definition of rural development varies from one point of view to the other. The definition of

rural development has evolved through time as a result of changes in the perceived mechanisms and/or goals of development. A reasonable definition of rural development would be: development that benefits rural populations; where development is understood as the sustained improvement of the population's standards of living or welfare. Rural development can be seen as not an outside intervention, but the aspiration of local people living in rural areas for taking the challenge themselves and improving their life circumstances and their immediate environment (Ogidefa, 2010).

Rural development should be seen as a process whereby concerted efforts are made in order to facilitate significant increase in rural resources productivity with the central objective of enhancing rural income and creating employment opportunity in rural communities for rural dwellers to remain in the area. It is also an integrated approach to food production, provision of physical, social and institutional infrastructures with an ultimate goal of bringing about good healthcare delivery system, affordable and quality education, improved and sustainable agriculture etc. Rural development can be distinguished from Agricultural Development which it entails and transcends (Shiru, 2008).

There is this erroneous misconception by successive governments that rural development is synonymous with agricultural development only. Efforts by such governments to pump money into agricultural development did not yield the meaningful change desired hence efforts should be made to include provision of modern infrastructure, primary health care, food and shelter, employment opportunities, recreational facilities, affordable and compulsory primary and secondary education, loans and other incentives, to be part of rural development for the benefits of rural dwellers (Ogidefa, 2010). In essence, rural development may imply a broad based re-organization and mobilization of the rural masses in order to enhance their capacity to

cope effectively with the daily task of their lives and with changes consequent upon this (Awojobi,2014).

From the foregoing, it is obvious that rural development is not a one-off thing or an immediate and snap phenomenon. Rather, it is a gradual and progressive towards perfection having a set standard in mind. The most realistic approach to effective rural development in Nigeria is the integrated development strategy. This according to Shiru (2008) seeks to develop all sectors of the rural economy and link them up effectively with their urban components.

Integration in rural development can be discussed in various ways. It's most common understanding concerns the integration of various economic sectors - agriculture, industry, services. In order words, this approach seeks to promote spatial, social economic and even psychological linkage not only among the various sector of the economy but also among different region of the national economy. Therefore, programmes of agriculture, education, health and nutrition, rural electrification, cooperatives and the likes must not be conceived in isolation. Each programme must be considered in connection with other. This approach is integral in the sense that all of its components are important and related in the part that they play both individually and collectively

Some authors such as (Lele (1975), and Francis (2012) have looked at rural development from increase in per capital income of the rural dwellers. Others looked at it from the qualitative improvement in the standard of living of the people availability of job opportunities, reduction of poverty to an acceptable minimum, and the provision of policy that will emphasize on constant equality of all. In addition to the above, others have advocated for basic needs approachintheprovisionofbasicinfrastructureaswereavailableinurbanagglomerationstoreducethei mbalance between the urban and rural areas (Chinweke, 2015). There is no consensus on the

definition of rural development as a (strategy or outcome) a means or an end. According to Conference on Regional Planning and Economic Development in Africa means, "the outcome of series of quantitative changes occurring among a given rural population and whose conveying effects indicate, in time, a rise in the standard of living and favourable changes in the way of life of the people concerned." Lele (1975) viewed rural development as the improvement in the living standards of the rural dwellers by engaging them in productive activities such as establishment of rural industries that will increase their income.

A meaningful rural development must be on *self*-sustaining basis, through transforming the socio-spatial structures of the productive activities. Rural development is a strategy designed to transform rural life by extending to the masses of the rural population the benefits of economic and social progress, it stresses fundamental principle process through equitable access to resources, imputes and services and participation in the design and implementation programmes."In this view, it is argues that, rural development is a process of not only increasingthelevelofpercapitaincomeintheruralareasbutalsothestandardoflivingofthe rural people, depending on such factors as food (nutrition) level, health, education, housing, recreation and security (Chinweke, 2015).

Similarly, this socio-economic development approach is simplified by where it is explained that rural development to means the improvement of living conditions in rural areas through increased productivity of agriculture and related enterprises which constitute the main economic activities of the population, it is a concept that is used to describe a strategy that is designed to improve the economic and social life of the people in the rural areas (Tersoo, 2014).

Development is a strategy that is designed to improve the economic and social conditions of a specific group of people, that is, the rural people. It involves extending the

benefits of development to the poorest, among those who seek a livelihood in the rural areas. Rural development in general, is used to denote the actions and initiatives taken to improve the standard of living in non-urban neighbourhoods, countryside and remote villages. These communities can be exemplified with a low ratio of inhabitants to open space. (Momodu, 2012)

As earlier noted, rural areas are such areas in a country that lack necessary social amenities and infrastructures which are necessary for good living. Thus, there is the need for advancement and growth in these rural areas. The process of bringing about this advancement and growth in the rural areas is what is referred to as rural development. Anaeto (2010) observe thus:

> *Rural development is a sub-set and important part of national development. The idea and concern for rural development stems from the fact that majority of the people in the developing countries reside in rural areas. And the fact that development of the nation cannot be achieved without the development of the rural areas, even the developing countries have recently come to realise that unless the rural areas are well-developed, hardly would any meaningful development to occur in these countries.*

The above assertion implies that rural development is part of national development, because when rural communities are not fully developed, the objectives of national development cannot be achieved. No country can boast of development when its rural communities have not been positively affected. This perhaps explains why some scholars explains that rural community education entails all activities like social, economic, educational, political and cultural, which touch on the lives of rural communities, knowledge of which is essential to purposeful living and progress.

Anaeto (2010) says that rural development entails interventions aimed at improved productivity, improved employment/ incomes for the target groups, as well as minimum acceptable levels of food, shelter, education, health and housing. The idea and concern for rural

development stems from the fact that majority of the people in the countries reside in the rural areas which calls for their development by introducing to them new practices, ideas, innovations and methods, and when the rural dwellers accept these practices, it leads to economic gains (Asemah, 2013).

According to Olawepo (2012), rural development is a positive term denoting a state of short or long time transformation and improvement in the standard of living of people living in the rural areas of a nation. Nigerian rural development involves many Government agencies; these agencies make policy, manage rural development programmes, maintain infrastructures, channels fund to non-farm activities, sell input and carry out other activities in the rural sector. This study argues that the performance of rural development institutions such as ADP, RBDA, and DFRRI in terms of policy realization, and impact, the size and target population reached, level of production attained, and the quantity and quality of the infrastructure developed by these institutions were un-impressive. Accordingly, rural development institutions such as those mentioned have produced limited result consequently leading to the past deficiencies which include proliferation of institutions, lack of capacity building, authoritarism, institutional duplication, In-adequate funding, unjustified public intervention and wrong policy (Emma, 2013).

From these perspectives of rural development, we deduct that rural development entails the total transformation of the rural component of the nation mode of production, technology, and organization, but also social relationship and social basis for coordinating the rural population. Rural development is concern with raising the quality of life of the low income population living in the rural areas on a self-sustaining basis through a fundamental transformation of rural mode of production. Ruralites don't only require change in life situation,

but also respond favourably to locally meaningful and rational change be it initiated by external or internal source (Kamar, 2014).

Akpan (2012) posit that rural development programme of the Nigeria governments did not come as a conscious policy practice. The contents of the various policies at colonial and post-independence periods showed that rural agrarian-led rural development policies were, however, distorted beginning from the early 1970s to 1980s which lead to the failure of rural development strategy. It is time the nation starts to focus on a realistic approach to rural development which should centres on empowering the rural people through the provision of basic infrastructures such as schools, road, and electricity and healthcare facilities. Past studies mainly centres on specific infrastructure such as the work of Ikpi, (1989), Spencer, (2002), Poulton*etal*, (2005), Lipton (2005), Omoke (2007),Sanusi, (2010), Tunde, and Adeniyi, (2012). Hence, this study integrated these infrastructures in a single study hence filling in the gap.

2.2.3 Empirical Studies

The effect of corruption on rural development is devastating as substantial amount of money meant for rural development are diverted for selfish individual use which is detriment to rural development. Until and unless corruption is wipe-out in all in all aspect of government business, the quest for rural development will remain an illusion. To buttress this point, Akpa (2008) observed that fight against corruption is the key to meaningful rural development in Nigeria. He asserts that, the truth of the matter today is that Nigeria is a classical study in lawlessness, recklessness in all forms, high infrastructure decay, moral bankruptcy,

Extreme poverty, hopelessness, and so on and on, hardly would any rational person witness this level of societal decay and not call for a total war against official corruption, a call for a revolution or change necessary to replace evil with good, a shift in paradigm from a politics

of self-service to one of public service in its real sense and indeed from poverty of character to a regime of discipline, integrity and justice. The study revealed that corruption has grave and devastating impact on the lot of the Nigerians dwelling in the rural area. it also indicated, official corruption in Nigeria is known to have dealt lethal blows on the following aspects of community life.

Wealth and employment creation is the corner stone for rural development, a study by Agagba, (2008) titled fast tracking rural infrastructure development imperative for wealth and employment creation supported this assertion. According to the findings, the development of rural infrastructure is important in order to enhance the living standards of the rural dwellers. In other words, the development of indigenous technology for agricultural practice, rural water supply, and provision of rural electrification, roads and other facilities will greatly enhance the creation of employment opportunities and eventually wealth. For instance, technological development in the rural areas may include the acquisition of knowledge in science, education, skills and know how, institutional organization of the methods of production, coordination and relationship to the environment, the evolution of technique or method of production or

The issue of rural development is sometime looked at form poverty alleviation perspective. In this regard Shaheed (2010), undertook a study titled Poverty Situation in Nigeria an Over view of Rural Development. The study perceived rural development from the poverty alleviation perspective where he asserts that "Nigerian rural development involves many Government agencies, and these agencies make policy, manage rural development, maintain infrastructures, channels fund to nonfarm activities, sell input and carry out other activities in the rural sector and yet the issue of rural poverty is remain a problem in Nigeria as 70% of the population are poor and mostly ruralites.

Information and Communication technology is an important tool for dissemination of information which enhances day to day business and social interaction via electronic and non-electronic devise, this infrastructure if sufficiently provided in the rural areas will definitely induce rural development. Yahaya, (2010) in a study titled rural development via Information Service, provide evidence that, the success of rural development depends on effective use of information in daily activities.

Information services are multi-dimensional and serve socially as binded thread among different group of rural dwellers. He further observed that Nigeria has policies and plans which include rural information service, but the condition of rural communities is degenerating instead of advancing, what could be the reason for this unwanted, unhealthy, uncomfortable, undesirable and unbearable situation? The answer is not hard to determine, a high rate of illiteracy in the rural community is a major factor. People in rural area are lag behind in accessing information to attain their goals. In terms of rural electrification infrastructure, its imperativeness cannot be overemphasized. This is because its main aim is to provide the basic infrastructure for socio-economic development and industrialization of the rural areas which will in the end enhance employment and generation of wealth for the rural communities. For instance, if there is electricity in the rural areas, small and medium scale industries will spring up which would in turn, provide employment opportunities to the rural dwellers and thus, transform their socio-economic life. Electricity utilization in the rural areas will manifest itself in the areas of irrigation, oil processing, and grain processing, garri processing, food and fruit preservation, poultry and livestock production.

Road infrastructure serve as the main link between rural community and the mainstream urban areas for transportation of goods and conveying passengers, the importance of road cannot

be overemphasize in terms of its importance to rural development, because without road conveying goods to the market be not be possible as such road serve as a catalyst for rural development. Research on the impact of road on rural development supported this assertion, for example, a study by Olagunju (2014) on the Effect of rural road and markets infrastructure on income of farming house hold in Osun States implication for sustainable development, revealed that most essential infrastructures such as road, market, pipe borne water electricity bank are lacking.

Similarly, Kefle (2012) undertook a study titled, Rural Roads and Development Evidence from Ethiopia. It The study reveals that roads induce rural income growth substantially higher than what was reported by previous studies, road induced factor of production returns to land, and labour are also found to be the main channels by which better road access enhances rural income. Also, Adenuga, (2012) findings, shows that the state of the road infrastructure in the study area Oyo is poor, as only 12% of the roads are tarred. Cost of input fertilizer, farm size access to fertilizer, labour and access to good roads were identified as the factors influencing farmers output in the area.

In the same vein, Adedeji, (2013) in a study he conducted in Obokun Local Government Area revealed that an inequality in the provision of road infrastructure and rehabilitation of road in the area resulted in disparity in the level of development. Similarly, Econg (2013) in a research the impact of rural road and bridges on the socio-economic development of Akwa-Ibon revealed that rural roads and bridges form the basis for transformation and communication. They constitute the most critical infrastructure in the rural areas thereby facilitating delivery of farm inputs to the farms and evacuation of product from the farm to the market and reduction in the cost of transportation.

In the same vein, in a study on the Effect of rural road and markets infrastructure on income of farming house hold in Osun States implication for sustainable development by Olagunju, (2014) revealed that most essential infrastructures such as road, market, pipe borne water electricity bank are lacking. The study also revealed that, non-availability of these infrastructures affect annual income positively and negatively.

Even though, much studies were conducted in rural development in relation to road and market panacea to rural backwardness, Adegboyega (2011) in contrast, studied the contribution of corporate responsibility to agriculture and rural development, and, the study found that, the contributions of corporate social responsibility to development in the country cuts across agriculture, capacity building, economic empowerment and provision of rural infrastructure in health, education and potable water; which make agriculture and rural development sector a major recipient of CSR interventions.

Traditionally, rural development strategy was conceived to be synonymous with agricultural development, especially in the 60s and 70s, a lot studies were conducted on rural development in relation to agriculture. It is in this direction, that Adepoju and Timothy (2013), undertook a study titled "Increasing Agricultural Productivity Through Rural Infrastructure, Evidence from Oyo and Osun States, Nigeria". The study found that infrastructure is known to impact welfare in three basic respects. It has basic consumption value that affects utility derivable from existing and budgeted incomes, its availability affects productivity and capacity to earn income, and it also affects households and national stock in real wealth in the entire economy and it has multiple effects on health and quality of life.

Simultaneously, Pawa, (2014) in a similar study titled Agribusiness as a veritable tool for rural development in Nigeria. The study found that agricultural sector is the highest employer of

the rural labour force. Improving the commercial value of agriculture would certainly culminate into a serious agrarian change that would impact on the greater number of people and the rural sector.

Similarly, Obayelu (2014) studies effect of rural infrastructure on profitability and productivity of cassava based farms in Odogbolu local governments Ogun State Nigeria. The study found that economic efficiency in the developed area is better of compare to their counterpart in the underdeveloped area. Similarly, the negative sign of the coefficient of infrastructural facilities of 0.742 at $p < 0.05$ observed in the study area is capable of Jeopardizing effort at improving the productivity of cassava-based farms.

From the above empirical studies, its evidence that infrastructure plays a very important role to nation development, for example results in a study by Ale, (2011) reveals that, the level of infrastructure development in rural Nigeria is nothing but poor and that is why there is the crisis of food security and city congestion in Nigeria. Prawakar, (2014) supported this claim in a study titled China's growth story: The role of physical and social infrastructure. The study revealed that infrastructure stock, labour force, public and private investment play an important role in economic growth in China. The study also revealed that there was unidirectional causality between infrastructure development and output growth justifying China's high spending on infrastructure development since nineties.

Conventionally, infrastructure is the main apparatus for rural development, according to Madu (2007), the importance of rural infrastructure provision lies in its capacity to sustain daily activities, quality of life and economic base in the rural areas, in other words, the quality of life and means of livelihood of the rural dwellers can be assessed by analysing the availability of infrastructural facilities at their disposal. In the same vein, Ogunowo (2012) found out that, a

rural community with poor socio-economic background cannot sustainably manage their infrastructure and may thus remain perpetually poor and under-developed for quite a long time.

In a review of rural development programme in Nigeria, Akpan (2012) found that, despite its contribution to the national economy and GDP, rural areas in Nigeria remain very poor and deeply neglected. Investments in physical, social and economic infrastructures have been focused largely on the cities. As a result, the rural population has extremely limited access to services such as schools and health centres, while the highest number of the populace lacks access to safe drinking water. In the Nigerian context, the rural areas are associated with poverty and, as such, not attractive to live. A study conducted by Modupe (2012) found out a long run relationship between the growth of the economy and government expenditure in agric, education, security and transport. Also, Nwankwoala, (2011) found that governance, government policies and priorities as responsible for poor service in terms of infrastructure.

Basically, in a related study, Paul's (2011) observed that an interesting characteristic of infrastructure investment is its spatial dimension. It involves choices concerning the selection of rival locations for equipment and processes and connections for energy, since it is an input for firms and household's consumption and investment decisions. The location of infrastructure will affect patterns of behaviour such as the decision to migrate and locate a business. Idira (2014) argues that, the challenges of rural development and opportunities for providing sustainable livelihood in the rural areas are lack of infrastructure which compels the rural dwellers to struggle to earn a living or to migrate to urban areas. In a similar study by Vincent (2014), it was found out that, half of the population in Lagos that live outside their local government were of the belief that good infrastructure will make them live in their respective locality in Lagos.

From the literature reviewed, it has shown that most previous studies concentrate on

single variable such as road, agric, credit facility, electricity, market, or communication. for instance, the work of Spencer, 2002; Poulton*etal*, 2005; Lipton, 2005, Omoke (2007), , Akpa (2008), Shaheed (2010)., Yahaya, (2010), Olagunju (2014), Kefle (2012), Adenuga, (2012), Adedeji, (2013), Olafiaji ,(2014), Adegboyega (2011), Adepoju,(2013), Timothy (2013), Olaseni (2012), Obayelu (2014), Nair ,(2014), Ale ,(2011), Adetunji ,(2013), Prawakar (2014), Akpan (2012), Adesoji(2013) Modupe(2012),Nwankwoala,(2011), Paul (2011), Econg (2013) Abiodun (2014), Ogunowo, (2012), Idira (2014), Stephen (2012), Atchoargrena (2012), Adesoji (2013),Vincent (2014),and Aveni(2012). However, this study has integrated some infrastructural variables such as schools, electricity, market, road, and healthcare infrastructure in a single study which is a gap that this study has filled.

2.4 Theoretical Framework

The overall aim of rural development efforts is geared towards the improvement of the lives of the rural population. However, several approaches aimed at arresting the ugly under-development situation in rural areas have been put forward which they include the following:

2.4.1 Top-Down Approach

The Top-down approach was propounded in the late 70s along with bottom-up. Goggin (1984) was among the proponents of the theory. The top-down approach is comprehensive in scope and strictly follows a formal process (Marsden, 1994). In this approach government plan and implement programmes of rural development directly or through a contract or without consulting the local people (Anderson, 1999). Since its inception during the early 1970s, the approach to rural development from this perspective consisted of top-down planning, implementing and monitoring of activities. Top-down approach was not very successful for

most programmes of rural development because of too much bureaucracy as experience has shown that centralized 'top-down' planning and implementation can only be effective when bureaucratic bottle-neck are removed which allow speedy planning execution(Farrington & Lobo (1997) Also many rural development programmes failed because they have been top-down, fixed or rigid technology solutions geared to replace, instead of complement local initiative (Peraz and Tschinkel, 2003). Furthermore, top-down was applied on without the local people capability rather than capacity as well as their need (Peraz and Tschinkel, 2003).

2.4.2 Bottom-Up Approach

Robert (1983) was among the profounder of bottom-up model, the bottom-up approach is the opposite of the top-down approach in which the local people initiate the planning. It is built-up on the principle of devolution of power and authority to local communities for management and monitoring of rural development effort (Balogun, 2000). Although decentralization efforts in developing countries go back to the early 1960s, most efforts to introduce democratic components emerged in the later 1980s (Blair, 2000). Bottom- up approach is practical for managing natural resources provided authority and empowerment is not confined to the local life as frequently tends to be the case. Farrington and Baumann (2003) as well as Knickel (2009) exposed the dangers of decentralization, which often simply empowered the local elites and perpetuated existing poverty and inequality.

2.4.3 Sectoral Approach

Sectoral approach can be understood as activities targeted for particular sectors such as natural resource management. During the early period of 70s and 80s in developing countries, both non-government and government agencies had sectoral narrow approach. The objective was to implement development projects in a particular sector with the aim of improving it a lone which

in turn may affect other sectors. The holistic nature of an ecosystem requires holistic approach to development since one sector's activity will not necessarily affect another sector. Sectoral approach is unsuitable for the rural development, especially at the local and state level. The sectoral approach is no longer appropriate (Shah and Schreier, 1995) in rural development because each sector constitutes independent entities that need to be developed simultaneously within the context of rural development.

2.4.4 Multi-sectoral Approach

Concentrating development efforts on one sector while at the same time, neglect the other sector does not argue well for a nation that is thriving to foster sustainable rural development. Even though the argument put forward the sectoral scholars was that development one can have multiplier effects that work through to other sectors. But multi-sectoral scholars argued that it is not always that the development of one sector may subsequently lead to the development of other sectors. This suggests an alternative approach to rural development which is multi-sectoral approach.

The relatively small contribution of agriculture to many rural areas means inevitably that other economic sectors have come to play an increasing role in the rural economy, health, infrastructure, road, recreation and tourism and education has to be given priority in rural development strategy. While it was recognized that multi-sectoral was not a new phenomenon, it gained an increased policy relevance. However, as noted by Salisu (2014) the goals of rural development might be pursued more effectively by encouraging ways of reducing poverty and employment which are completely unrelated to a single approach. The Multi-sectoral approach was criticized on the ground that when you take so many sectors at the same time coordination

becomes difficult and in the long run the objective is also lost or unattainable.

2.4.5 Territorial Approach

The territorial approach to rural development may help to implement sector strategy and to attain the goal of aid effectiveness. This approach to rural policy formulation and implementation promotes joint action among rural agents coordination between the different level of governments and articulation among different sector policy addressing the problems rural areas such as education, healthcare, infrastructure and employment such approach could contribute to shape a new generation of public policy for fighting poverty in rural areas.

Rural development must be in a variety of different circumstances and facing quite different types of problem. But given the variety of circumstances found in rural areas, we may then suggest that most generalizations about the character of rural areas will be wrong (Hodge and Monk, 2002). Rural areas in the United Kingdom generally have performed relatively well in economic terms (Lowe and Ward, 2007) but particular areas continue to suffer from problems of low wages and underemployment. The territorial approach model focus on territorial variety rather than generalization, it embraces a variety of different processes of varying importance across different localities. A major driving force behind the territorial approach is the facts that rural areas differ from territory to territory which call for a variety of approach to rural development.

2.4.6 Local Approach

Local approach was based on the principle that resources need to be directed towards particular problems at the individual household or business level. This is clearly an impossible task for a central or federal government and indicates the requirement for decentralization of decision-

making. But it may still not be feasible for a regional government and may demand an even more localized approach. A sectoral approach required little institutional development at the sub-national level. However, the move towards a territorial, and especially to a local approach, involves a much greater degree of choice and discretion in the ways in which public resources might be applied. This complexity makes far greater demands on information and local institutional developments are required in order to handle it.

2.4.7 Integrated Rural Development (IDR)

Integrated rural development is an improvement on the Sectoral approach where in the integrated approach sectors are carry along in the development effort involving outside intervention and local aspirations aiming to attain the betterment of groups of people living in rural areas and to sustain and improve rural values through the distribution of central resources, reducing comparative disadvantages for competition and finding new ways to reinforce and utilize rural resources. The model is widely upheld and favored by international development agencies and donors like World Bank and United Development Programme (UNDP). It is integrated in the sense that as opposed to central development, it is controlled and managed locally, but opposed to local development besides local resources it also leans on the professional and financial support of the centre (Ruttan, 1984). In other words, integrated rural development could be called the theory of the 'new rural development paradigm' which tries to identify how local development and/or their configuration of rural resources can be helped by the centre for the benefit to of rural localities at the same time maintaining rural values for the future. Integrated rural development systems in this understanding, are particular set ups of central and local institutions such as, administration, knowledge, information and decision-making systems, social networks, working in coherence

and so being able to realize the ideas of integrated rural development theory (Chambers, 2014).

2.4. 8 Underpinning Theory

Theory of Infrastructure and Commons Management (2007)

Brett Frischmann propounded the theory of infrastructure and is adopted as the theoretical framework for this study. The theory explains the importance of public accessibility to infrastructure. Frischmann (2007) argued that, public access to infrastructure would generate values for a society. A major thrust of the theory is the fact that, open access to infrastructure would generate significant positive result for a society. Infrastructure is known to impact welfare in three basic respects. It has basic Consumption value, and, as such, affects utility derivable from existing and budgeted incomes. Its availability affects productivity and capacity to earn income, which is of concern in rural agriculture. It also affects households and national stock real wealth in the entire the economy, it has multiple effects on health and quality of life (Adepoju, 2013). The theory also stipulates that infrastructure should be utilized productively to promote development because it is critical to the nation fabric of a society. In line with Frischmann theory of infrastructure, the state is generally responsible for the provision of the infrastructure through diverse revenue sources including state resources, and tax from citizen and organizations.

Though, private provision of infrastructure is not known until in the 19980s when privatization was introduce as alternative to public enterprise, the state is often responsible for welfare services to the majority people of the state. The liberal theory stipulates that, the state is require to perform some function such as law and order, administration of justice and erection and maintenance of public works which may be beneficial to the society but which the private sector funds cannot provide. It was on the basis of private participation that the theory was criticised on

the ground that the state alone cannot provide the required needed infrastructure so private organization and individuals needs to pool resources to gather in order to meet up with the challenge of lack of infrastructure (Smith, 2012; Kura, 2014). The most essential component of theory is that infrastructural resources should be socially and economically shared in an open and non-discriminately manner when possible, i e not to privatize its ownership and control.

i. That the value of infrastructure extend well into the future and should not be neglected because of its complexity technologically and economically.
ii. That infrastructure has important spill over effect that accrues to the third party in accidental, incidental and unexpected ways.
iii. That, infrastructure induce people's empowerment.
iv. That, infrastructure constitute very important resources on which society should place a very high value on public access.
v. That, many infrastructures act as input into a wide range of variance socially and economically valuable activities which include the production of goods and service and non-market goods.

The Applicability of this theory to the study is based on the assumption that infrastructure such as schools, market, road, communication water and electricity when sufficiently provided could serve as input that can metamorphose into value in the productive processes either in the form of final goods for human consumption or as input for industrial processes. Infrastructure has spill over effect that in the long run that affect almost all aspect of human endeavour for example provision of electricity will lead to the stimulation of economic activities such operation of grinding machine, barbing services as well as irrigation farming.

Similarly, provision of road and market has a chain reaction that affect the life of a

community positively, for example provision of road facilitate conveying of goods from home to market which allows economic exchange to take place. The economic activities that are facilitated due to provision of road and market will invariably induce socio-economic activities which foster better service delivery and by extension stimulate development. Whilst the rural people are empowered through the provision of socio-economic infrastructure to engage into varieties of socio-economic activities that will improve their living standard, the ministry strived to provide the necessary socio-economic infrastructure adequately in order to speed the pace of rural development in Katsina State.

Another relevancy of the Frischmann theory to this study lies on the on its total view of infrastructure and the relatedness of infrastructure to rural development as asserted by Smith (2012) and a couple of other scholars. In line with the Frischmann theory of infrastructure, the state is generally responsible for the provision of infrastructure at all governmental levels through diverse revenue sources including state resources, tax from citizen and corporate organization both indigenous and foreign one.

Katsina State is characterized by all the problems highlighted in the statement of the problem, such as lack of infrastructural facilities, human development and capacity building, adequate healthcare facilities, educational facilities, clean water and the rest. Frischmann theory is widely accepted as a tool for infrastructural development model in tackling multi-facet issues such as rural development for uplifting the rural dwellers from their miserable condition to a better life and improved standard of living.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This Chapter looked at the methodology of the study, sources of data collections as well as method of data analysis. Similarly, the population of the study, sample size, and sampling technique were highlighted, also the statistical tools adopted for the study for data analysis and test of hypothesis was discussed.

3.2 Research Design

The research design for this study is a survey research, which serves as a blue print for carrying out this research work. Thus, a research design can be viewed as a plan on how to study what has been earmarked for the study to investigate (Ngu, 2005; Bhatti, 2014). This research was designed to examine the effect of socio-economic infrastructure on rural development in Katsina State Nigeria. To achieve this, infrastructural variables such as school, electricity, market, road and healthcare are independent variables were analysed with a view to establish their relationship with dependent variable which is rural development.

3.3 Source of Data

This study mainly relied on primary data as the main sources of data for the study which include questionnaire, interview and observation.

3.3.1 Primary sources

Basically, primary source of data collection allows the researcher to get first-hand information that relate to the subject matter which is of interest to the researcher from the stakeholders

(Kothari, 2004). The following instrument for primary data was utilized.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire for this study comprises of two sets one for the staff of the ministry of social, youth and rural development Katsina State and the other one for the rural respondents from three local government areas of Katsina State which was developed by the researcher to generate data.

ii. Interview

Interview was utilized in this study in order to supplement the questionnaire for the purpose of accuracy and reliability. As for this study interview was conducted to the staff of the ministry of social and rural development management staff, while another interview was conducted to the rural people of two selected local government areas Dandume and Mani.

iii. Observation

In order to ascertain the condition of the existing socio-economic infrastructure in the study areas, observation techniques were used to assess the condition of the infrastructure. Some selected infrastructures were observed as it not possible to observe the entire infrastructure due to time constraint.

3.3.2 Secondary sources

The secondary instruments used by this study include, available records, Gazettes, published materials from the government and its agencies such as ministry of social and rural development Katsina State, and other publications from international organization such as United Nations, and World Bank ,reports, textbooks, internet, newspaper, magazines, unpublished research thesis as journal as well as scholarly.

3.3.3 Administration of questionnaire

This study administered a total of 420 questionnaires to the respondents, comprising three local governments' areas Batagarawa, Mani, and Dandume. The questionnaires were distributed to the respondents by personal interaction on face to face basis.

3.4 Population Size

Population refers to the entire group of people, event, or things of interest to the researcher. The population for this study comprises the 3 local governments of the state from the three senatorial zones. Thus, the study has a population of 510,683 as population size of the study.

3.5 Sample Size

In order to avoid incorrect sampling size and ensure accuracy in the process of determining a representative sample size for the study, a more rigorous method was adopted to which was suggested by Saunders (2007. Thus, given the population size of the study, the sample size was computed using the following formula.

$$n = \frac{N(p)\ (1-p)}{(N-1)\left(\frac{B}{c}\right) + (p)(1-p)}$$

$$\frac{(510{,}683)(0.5)(1-0.5)}{(510{,}683-1)\left(\frac{0.05}{1.95}\right)^2 + (0.5)(1.05)}$$

$$\frac{(510{,}683)(0.5)(0.5)}{(510{,}683)0.000651 + (0.5)(0.5)}$$

$$\frac{123013.5}{320.327 + 0.25}$$

$$\frac{123013.5}{383.577}$$

= **383.725283**

APPR. 384.

However, the staff sample size was determined thus:

$$n = \frac{N(p)\ (1-p)}{(N-1)\left(\frac{B}{c}\right) \quad + (p)(1-p)}$$

$$\frac{(172)(0.5)(1-0.5)}{(172-1)\left(\frac{0.05}{1.95}\right)^2 + (0.5)(1.05)}$$

$$\frac{(172)(0.5)(0.5)}{(172)0.000651 + (0.5)(0.5)}$$

$$\frac{123013.5}{320.327 + 0.25}$$

$$\frac{123013.5}{383.577}$$

= **118**

APPR: 118

Table 3.1 Population and Sample Distribution

Senatorial Zones	Population size	Sample Size
Zone A Katsina		
Batagarawa	189,059	
Zone B Daura		
Mani	176,301	
Zone C Funtua		
Dandume	145,323	
Total	**510,683**	**383**
Staff	**172**	**118**

Source: Researcher's Survey 2016

From the statistical analysis the sample size is therefore 383, Similarly, to ensure that non-responses bias and non-response rate do not affect the result and to have a high rate of return, an additional 56 numbers of samples were added to the computed number making the sample to be **420** as suggested by (Salkind, 1997; Phokwang, 2008; Sindhu and Pookboomee, 2001; Ringim, Razali and Hassan, 2012).

3.6 Sampling Techniques

Simple random sampling techniques allows a researcher to select his sample from a population without bias, every element in the population has an equal chance of being selected. This method was used in selecting the local governments that formed the sample frame of this study, and subsequently the sample size was selected.

3.7 Method of Data Analysis

The SPSS package was employed in analyzing the primary data drawn from questionnaires using the 16 version, regression analysis was used in determine the relationship between the dependent and the independent variables. According to Ragin (2014) qualitative interpretative

communication process include interview, minutes of meeting, television broad cast, etc. As for this study, the interview data collected was synthesis, transcribed and coded and analyzed using content analysis method to support findings, also observation was used to compliment the findings.

CHAPTER FOUR

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF KATSINA STATE

4.1 Introduction

Katsina, was one of the pre-jihad Hausa City States which was conquered and annexed into the Sokoto caliphate by Mallam Urnmarun Dallaji in the early part of the 19th Century. After the British colonial conquest in 1903, the erstwhile Katsina and Daura emirates became Katsina Province of the former Northern region of Nigeria. Later, Katsina and Zaria Provinces together formed the North Central State under the Gowon regime's twelve state structure. North Central State was left intact in 1976 when the numbers of states were increased to nineteen under the new name of Kaduna State. It has a population of 5,801,584 comprising 2,948,279 males and 2,853,305 females, based on 2006 census final results. The State lies between latitudes 11°08'N and 13°22'N and longitudes 6°52'E and 9°20'E and occupies an area of about 24,194 square kilometres.

Katsina State came into existence on the 23rd of September, 1987 covering the same area of the former Katsina Province of the defunct Northern Region. Its creation along with Akwa lbom State raised the number of states from nineteen to twenty one under the then Babangida military administration. Thence forth, the agitation for the creation of Katsina State, which dated back to over a decade under the umbrella of Movement for the Creation of Katsina State, came to rest (Udo and Mamman, 1993).

Indigenous Structure: This is headed by the Katsina and Daura Emirate Councils which are headed by the Emirs. Each emirate is subdivided into districts, which are headed by district heads (hakirnai). Each district is also made up of villages headed by village heads (or dagatai). Further, towns wards and hamlets are headed by the Masu anguwa or ward/hamlet heads.

The administrative and political structure of Katsina State is not different from what is obtainable in other States of Nigeria. The State Governor is the Chief Executive and Chairman of the State Executive Council. The Executive Council is made up of Deputy Governor, Commissioners, and Secretary to the State Government and other key Government functionaries. The Commissioners are in charge of the day-to-day running of the Ministries. There are 13 Ministries, and 46 Extra- Ministerial Departments/ Parastatals in the State.While the Legilature is headed by the speaker of the house, house wiing. Administratively, the State is divided into thirty - four (34) Local Government Areas (LGAs), mapped into three Senatorial Districts, namely: Daura, Funtua and Katsina.

4.1.1 Economy

Katsina state has large deposit of kaolin and asbestos and other needed minerals for good industrial take off. Katsina is one of the few states in the country where crops are grown all the year round. Apart from farming during the rainy season, dry season farming is done along river banks and along the numerous dams built by the State and Federal Governments. Due to its vast arable land, it is currently playing a leading role in commodity/food production namely: cotton, groundnut, millet, guinea corn, maize, rice, wheat and vegetables. Government's encouragement and general incentives to both large and small scale as well as peasant farming From the 17th to the 18th century, Katsina was the commercial heart of Hausaland and became the largest of the seven Hausa City-states.

4.1.2 Industries in the State

The State Government has establishment of viable industrial ventures in the State. They include Dana formally called (Katsina rolling mill), Cotton Ginneries, Oil and Flour Mills, Kaolin Processing Factories and Fertilizer Blending Plants in Funtua, Safana, Sandamu and Batsari. The

Funtua Burnt Bricks ,the Plastic and Rubber Processing Companies, Northern Diaries and Hamada Carpets which also participate in oil extraction companies in Malumfashi, Industrial Mineral Ltd in Katsina and Kankia Metal Works. Processing, the Plant in Katsina is expected to produce 1,000 metric tons of organic fertilizer and 400 metric tons of pesticide. The state has large deposits of untapped kaolin and asbestos as well as other needed materials for good industrial take-off.

4.1.3 Education

Katsina is known in history as the 'cradle of learning'. There have been in existence Islamic schools and other centres of scholarship as far back as the 14th century. The famous Gobarau Islamic Learning Centre and Mosque (Gobarau Minaret) was constructed during the reign of Sarkin Katsina Muhammadu Korau (1348-1398).It was the center of learning for the whole of Western Sudan. With the advent of Western Education, Katsina also took the lead in Northern Nigeria with the establishment of one of the earliest Education centres, the Katsina Training College, in 1922. Currently, the State has 2,188 primary schools with pupils' enrolment of 1,351,032 (825,120 males and 525,912 females), 172 Junior Secondary Schools and 160 Senior Secondary Schools) with an enrolment of 156,979 (100,967 males and 56,009 females) and 96,899 (73,706 males and 23,193 females), respectively. There are also 13 Special Science, Technical and Vocational Secondary Schools and 13 Tertiary Institutions which include three Universities (SME, 2015).

4.1.4 Tourism

Katsina city is a tourist attraction because of the wall that surrounds it with its seven different gates. The wall was built about 900 years ago during the reign of King Murabus. The Emirs palaces in Katsina and Daura are also tourist attractions because of their unique architectural structure. The Katsina Teacher's College built in 1922 is the oldest institution of learning in the

northern states. Its main attraction is the red-baked city mud with which it was built. Another important tourist attraction is the Gobarau Minaret built about 300 years ago. It was built of baked clay and mud and has been a thing of wonder to the inhabitants of the city.

The Katsina Royal Palace Gidan Korau' is a huge complex located in the center of the ancient city. It is a symbol of culture, history and traditions of Katsinawa. According to historical account, it was built in 1348 AD by Muhammadu Korau who is believed to be the first Muslim King of Katsina. This explains why it is traditionally known as 'Gidan Korau' (House of Korau). It is one of the oldest and among the first generation Palaces in Hausa land. The rest are that of Daura, Kano and Zazzau. The Palace was encircled with a rampart Ganuwar Gidan Sarki (which is now extinct). The main gate which leads to the Palace is known as Kofar Soro while the gate at the backyard is called Kofar Bai.

4.2 Structure, Function and Objectives of Ministry of Rural and Social Development

The Ministry of Rural and Social Development is a social service oriented organ of the Government .Its main functions is to provide social services to the people of the state on behalf of the Government especially in providing infrastructural facilities in the rural areas.

4.2.1 Structure of the Ministry

The Ministry is headed by the Honourable Commissioner, Alhaji Abdu Habu Dankum who is the chief executive of the Ministry,while Saminu Aliyu Dankamais the Permanent Secretary and Accounting Officer of the ministry.The Ministry is presently structured into six departments as Followed:

I-Administration

II-Finance

III-Social Welfare

IV-Community Development

V-Rural Development

4.1.2 Objectives of the Ministry

a Offering of social welfare services to families less privilege, children, elderly, and other members of the society particularly those in distress

b. Provision of infrastructure in the rural areas, e.g. feeder road, electrification and small dams.

c. Mobilization of communities to execute community development project self-help.

d. Responsible for all social welfare programmes in the state

4.1.3 Function of the Ministry

a. Providing matching grant to communities to encourage communal effort and initiative in improving socio-economic condition of the rural communities.

b. Offering of social development training courses in adult education, home-economics, social welfare, community development and youth development

c. Selection and presentation of working material to seven zonal units located in Mani, Katsina, Funtua, Dutsinma, Kankia and Malumfashi

CHAPTER FIVE

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

5.1 Introduction

This Chapter presents the analyses and interpretation of the data generated through primary and secondary sources in the course of the research. Thus, the chapter is structured into seven sections according to the sun topics of the chapter. The first section introduces the chapter and the details of the questionnaire administration. Section two discusses the background information of respondents including their demographic variables. The third section is a detailed analysis of the data relating to the effect of socio-economic infrastructure on rural development which is the first hypothesis of the study. Section four analyzes data on the issue of coordination of rural development activities by the ministry of rural development which formed the second hypothesis of the study. The fifth section relates to the funding of socio-economic infrastructure by the State which is the third hypothesis of the study. The Sixth section analyses and interprets the hypotheses tested for the study. Finally, this chapter also contains discussion of findings of the study as well as major findings. However, as it was earlier stated the study utilizes both primary and secondary data with as such questionnaire, interview and observations were used as tools for generating the primary data while the secondary data were generated from various publications. In analyzing the data presented, regression analysis was used to analysis the numerical data which has the advantage of analyzing the extent of relationship between two whereas correlation will only tell about the existence of the relationship without the extent.

5.1 Rate of return of questionnaire

Two sets of questionnaires were administered to the sample respondents, one to the rural people across the selected three Local Government Areas in the State, and the other set to the staff of the

ministry of rural development. Thus, a total sampling of 400 respondents from the rural areas and 120 from the ministry of rural development were derived at, using the multi-stage and simple random sampling techniques as was contained in the methodology chapter of the study. In view of the above 420 questionnaires were administered to the rural respondents and 130 to the staff of the ministry of rural development out of which 400 and 120 were duly completed and returned as was indicated in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1: Rate of Questionnaires Returned

Categories	Questionnaire Administered	Questionnaire returned	Percentage
Rural respondent	420	400	95%
Staff respondent	130	120	92%

Source: Researcher's Survey, 2016

A total of 420 respondents from the rural people constituted one sample for this study, while 130 respondents from the staff of rural development ministry constituted the other sample of the study. From table 5.2 above, it has shown that out of 420 questionnaires distributed to the rural people 400 were returned representing 95% rate of return, while for the ministry staff a total of 130 questionnaires were distributed and 120 were returned representing 92% rate of return. The rate of returned for both the two sets of questionnaires put together is 94 % , this is considered acceptable and sufficient as argued by Sekaran (2015) that 50% is suitable for a survey. Similarly, the current response rate for this study is regarded adequate going by the suggestion that a sample size should be between 5 to 10 times the number of variables under study for regression type of analysis to be undertaking (Hair, *et al* 2010).

5.2 Demographic Information of the Respondents

This section discusses the demographic variables of the respondents from both rural people and staff categories. The issues discussed include the gender, marital status, highest educational level, occupation and length of service. These are discussed in subsequent parts of the section:

5.2.1 Gender of the respondents

For the study to determine the composition of the respondent in term of their gender both from the rural people and ministry staff they were asked to specify their sexes and the responses were tabulated in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2 Gender of the Respondents

Gender	Rural Respondents	Percentage	Staff	Percentage
Male	331	82.80%	78	65%
Female	69	17.30%	42	35%
Total	400	100	120	100

Source: Researcher's Survey, 2016

From Table 5.2 it has indicated that of the total respondents from the rural people 331 are male representing 82.8% while 69 are female representing 17.3 %.While from the staff respondents 78 are male and 42 are female representing 65% and 35% respectively. While this analysis indicated an opinion that cut across both the male and female sexes, it has also shown that female need to work hard in order to get more placements in the ministry as male are the majority by a wide margin.

5.2.2 Marital Status

Respondents were asked to indicate their marital status and their responses were indicated in Table 5.3.

Table 5.3 Marital Status of Respondents

Status	Rural Respondents	Percentage	Staff	Percentage
Single	56	14%	9	
Married	340	85%	81	67.50%
Divorce	4	1%	3	2.5
Widow	0	0%	6	5%
Total	400	100	120	100

Sources: Researcher's Survey, 2016

From Table 5.3, it can be seen that 56 respondent from the rural people are singles, 340 are married,4 are widow representing 14%, 85, and 1% respectively, while from the staff respondents 9 are singles, 81 married, 3 divorce, 6 widow representing 67%, 2.5%, and 5% respectively. This analysis has shown that married people constituted the majority of the respondents both from the rural people and the staff respondent ,one possible explanation for this phenomenon could be the fact that in the northern part of Nigeria people get marry early than those from the southern part of the due to religious inclination.

5.2.3 Age of Respondents

Respondents were asked to indicate where their age bracket falls and their responses were presented in Table 5.4.

Table 5.4 Ages of Respondents

Age Range	Rural Respondents	Percentage	Staff	Percentage
18 to 25	196	49	6	5
26 to 33	105	26.3	26	21.7
34 to 41	44	11	31	25.8
42 to 49	36	9	15	12.5
50 and above	19	4.8	42	35
Total	**400**	**100**	**120**	**100**

Sources: Researcher's Survey, 2016

From table 5.4 above, it has shown that from the rural respondents 196 are from the age bracket

of 18-25,105 from 26- 33 ,44 respondents from 26-33 age bracket,36 respondents from 42-49 age bracket and 19 respondents from 50 and above age bracket representing 49%,25.3%,11%,and 4.8% respectively. While from the staff respondents 6 are from the age bracket 18-25,26 respondent from the age bracket 26-33,31 respondents from the age bracket 34-41,15 respondents from the age bracket 42-49,and 42 respondents are from the age bracket 50 and above representing 5%,21.7%,25.8%,12.5%,and 35% respectively. This analysis has confirmed the 2006 census which indicated that the Nigerian youth population constitutes more than half of the total population of the country, this analysis has also indicated that the work force in the rural development ministry is ageing as 35 % of the total work force is from 50 years of age and above.

5.2.5 Educational Level of the Respondents

Respondents were asked to indicate their educational attainment and their responses were indicated in table 5.5.

Table 5.5: Educational Level of Respondents

Educational Level	Rural Respondents	Percentage	Staff	Percentage
PG	20	5%	58	48.30%
DEGREE	62	15%	11	9.20%
NCE	221	55%	20	16.70%
PRIMARY	93	23%	15	12.50%
ISLAMIC	3	8%	16	13.30%
Others	1	3%	0	0%
Total	**400**	**100%**	**120**	**100**

Sources: Researcher's Survey, 2016

From Table 5.5 above it can be deduced that, from the rural respondents 20 have obtained post graduate qualification, 62 respondents obtained degree, 221 respondents got NCE, 93 respondent got primary school certificate, 3 respondent got Islamic education,1 respondent got other form of

education which is not specified representing 5%,15%,55%,23%,8%,and 3% respectively. While from the staff respondents 58 respondents got postgraduate education,11 respondents got degree, 20 respondents got NCE,15 respondent got primary certificate representing 48.3%, 9.2%,16.7%,12.5%,13, and 3% respectively. This analysis shows that there has been an indication that the rural people are somehow educated as 5% obtained postgraduate qualification while 55% obtained NCE which a good indication in the level of education of the rural people, similarly, 48.3% of respondents from the ministry got postgraduate qualification which a good indication of the quality staff the ministry has in terms of educational attainment.

5.2.6 Occupation of Respondents

Respondents were asked to indicate their type of occupation they are engage in and their responses were shown in Table 5.6.

Table 5.6: Occupation of the Respondents

Occupation	Frequency	Percentage
FARMING	18	4.5
CIVIL SERVANT	104	26
SELF-EMPLOYED	62	15.5
UN-EMPLOYED	179	44.8
Student	37	9.3
Total	**400**	**100**

Sources: Researcher's Survey, 2016

From Table 5.6 it can be seen that, 18 respondents from the rural areas are farmers,104 are civil servant, 62 self-employed, 179 un-employed and 37 are students representing 4.5%, 26.0%, 15.5%, 44.8%, 9.3%, respectively. This analysis has indicated that the rate of un-employed

people is in the rise as this same rate is indicated by NBS (2016) as the rate of un-employment among the youth in the country.

5.2.7 Length of service of staff

Respondents were asked as to the number of years they service as staff of the ministry and their responses were indicated in Table 5.7.

Table 5.7: Length of Service of Staff Respondents

Years	Frequency	Percentage
1-6YR	19	15.8
7-13	49	40.8
14-20	10	8.3
21-27	15	12.5
28-34	27	22.5
Total	**120**	**100**

Sources: Researcher's Survey, 2016

From Table 5.7 above it could be inferred that, 19 respondents from the ministry have served from the range of 1-6 years,49 from 7- 13 years ranges,10 respondents from 14-20 years,15 respondents from 21-27 years,27 respondents from 28-34 years representing 15.8%,40.8%,8.3%,12.5%22.5% respectively. This analysis shows that those that service from 7-13 years are the majority and they constituted large portion of the staff strength which is a good indication that for some years to come the ministry will still have experience staff in the ministry.

5.3 Provision of Socio-Economic Infrastructure

Provision of socio-economic infrastructure is the main catalyst for rural development, adequate provision of the socio-economic infrastructure or otherwise has an effect on rural development in order to ascertain whether there is adequate provision of these infrastructures a hypothetical

postulations was formulated which stated that there is no significant relationship between socio-economic infrastructure and rural development empirical data were generated as regard the postulation where respondents were asked to indicate their views on the provision of socio-economic infrastructure in their rural community and their responses were shown in this section as well as testing the hypothesis.

5.3.1 School infrastructure

Respondents were asked to indicate their opinion on the provision of school infrastructure in their rural community and their responses were presented in Table 5.8.

Table 5.8: Views of Respondents on School Infrastructure

S/N	Item	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total	Mean	STD	Decision
1	There is enough schools Infrastructure in your community	118	193	31	48	10	400	2.09	1.026	Disagree
2	There is relationship between school infrastructure and rural development.	7	18	20	274	81	400	4.01	.770	Agree
3	Adequate provision of school Infrastructure induces rural development	8	15	18	248	111	400	4.10	.804	Agree
4	There will be no development in the rural areas without adequate provision of school Infrastructure	15	15	7	279	84	400	4.01	.848	Agree
5	The condition of school infrastructure in the rural areas is good	68	258	25	39	10	400	2.16	.904	Disagree
	Total	**216**	**499**	**101**	**888**	**296**	**400**	**3.27**	**4.35**	**Agree**

Source: Researcher's Survey, 2016

As indicated Table in 5.8 above, item1 with mean values of 2.09 that said there is enough schools Infrastructure in your community, and item 5 with mean value of 2.16 that says the condition of school infrastructure in your rural community is good were not agreed upon as their mean value is less than 3.00 which is the value for accepting or rejecting a statement, while item 2,3,4,with mean value of 4.01,4.10, and 4.01 which states that there is relationship between school infrastructure and rural development, adequate provision of school infrastructure induces rural development, and there would be no development in the rural areas without adequate provision of school infrastructure have therefore, agreed. Furthermore, this analysis has indicated that more needs to be done in terms of provision of schools in the rural areas as some communities does not have school nearby they have to trek for a distance to access education, this is also attested from the interview conducted with the rural people. Based on the overall mean value of 3.27 for assessing the provision of school infrastructure, and despite inadequate provision of school infrastructure there is positive and significant relationship between school infrastructure provision and rural development.

5.3.2: Electricity infrastructure

Respondents were asked to indicate their opinion on the provision of electricity infrastructure in their rural community and their responses were presented in Table 5.9.

Table 5.9: Views of Rural People on Electricity Infrastructure

S/N	Item	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total	Mean	STD	Decision
1	There is electricity in your community	12	26	12	330	20	400	3.80	0.756	Agree
2	There is relationship between electricity and rural	10	14	9	334	33	400	3.92	0.681	Agree

	development									
3	Adequate provision of electricity induces rural development	5	14	9	240	132	400	4.20	0.753	Agree
4	There will no rural development without adequate provision of electricity	5	57	6	192	140	400	4.01	1.025	Agree
5	There is regular supply of electricity in your community	22	286	25	58	8		2.36	0.871	Disagree
6	The transformers in your community are in a good condition	15	192	95	88	10	400	2.72	0.933	Disagree
7	Provision of electricity boost economic activities	2	8	9	57	324	400	4.73	0.65	Agree
	Total	71	597	165	1299	667	400	3.69	1.13	Agree

Source: Researcher's Survey, 2016

As shown Table in 5.9 above, item1 with mean values of 3.80 that said there is electricity in your community, item 2 with mean value of 3.92 that there is relationship between electricity and rural ,item 3 with mean value of 4.20 that says adequate provision of electricity induces

rural development, item 4 with mean value of 4.01 that says there will no rural development without adequate provision of electricity, and item 7 with mean value of 4.73 that says provision of electricity boost economic activities were agreed upon as their mean value is up to 3.00 value which is the value for accepting or rejecting a statement, while item 5 with mean value of 2.36 that says there is regular supply of electricity in your community, and item 6 with mean value of 2.72 states that, the transformers in your community are in a good condition were disagree.

Based on the overall mean value of 3.69 for assessing the provision of electricity infrastructure, analysis shows that provision of electricity infrastructure is satisfactory despite the irregular supply as opined by respondents.

5.3.3: Market Infrastructure

Respondents were asked to indicate their opinion on the provision of market infrastructure in their rural community and their responses were presented in Table 5.10.

Table 5.10: Views of Rural People on Market Infrastructure

S/N	Item	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total	Mean	STD	Decision
1	There is market Infrastructure in your community	5	20	29	253	93	400	4.03	0.786	Agree
2	The market provided in your community is adequate	1	253	33	99	14	400	2.68	0.967	Agree
3	Adequate provision of market Infrastructure induces Rural Development	3	13	14	308	59	400	4.03	0.619	Agree

4	There will be no development in the rural areas without adequate provision of market Infrastructure	5	18	9	241	147	400	4.17	0.78	Agree
5	The condition of market infrastructure in your areas is good	77	336		27	15	400	2.16	0.933	Agree
	Total	91	640		130	928	400	3.41	0.82	Agree

Source: Researcher's Survey, 2016

As indicated in Table 5.10 above, item1 with mean values of 4.03 that said there is market infrastructure in your community, item 3 with mean value of 4.03 that said adequate provision of market infrastructure induces rural development, item 4 with mean value of 4.17 that said there will be no development in the rural areas without adequate provision of market infrastructure were agreed upon as their mean value is up to 3.00 value which is the value for accepting or rejecting a statement, while item 2 with mean value of 2.68 that said the market provided in your community is adequate, and item5 with mean value of 2.16 that said the condition of market infrastructure in your areas is good were disagree. The analysis indicated that more market needs to be provided in the rural areas as opined by the respondents

Based on the overall mean value of 3.41 for assessing the provision of market infrastructure, analysis shows that provision of market infrastructure there is positive relationship between market infrastructure and rural development.

5.3.4 Road infrastructure

Respondents were asked to indicate their opinion on the provision of road infrastructure in their rural community and their responses were presented in Table 5.11.

5.11 Views of Rural People on Road Infrastructure

S/N	Item	SA	A	N	D	SD	Total	Mean	STD	Decision
1	There is enough road Infrastructure in your community	10	32	25	268	63	400	4	2.345	Agree
2	There is relationship between road infrastructure and rural development.	6	17	14	168	195	400	4.32	0.852	Agree
3	Adequate provision of road Infrastructure induces rural development	4	23	10	131	232	400	4.41	0.871	Agree
4	There will be no development in the rural areas without adequate provision of road Infrastructure	5	15	8	187	185	400	4.33	0.799	Agree
5	The condition of road infrastructure in the rural areas is good	61	52	32	222	33	400	3.29	1.244	Agree
	Total	**86**	**139**	**89**	**975**	**708**	**400**	**4.07**	**1.22**	**Agree**

Source: Researcher's Survey, 2016

As indicated in Table 5.11 above, item1 with mean values of 4.00 that said there is enough road infrastructure in your community, item 2 with mean value of 4.32 that said there is relationship

between road infrastructure and rural development, item 3 with mean value of 4.41 that said adequate provision of road Infrastructure induces rural development, item 4 with mean value of 4.33 that said there will be no development in the rural areas without adequate provision of road Infrastructure, and item 5 with mean value of 3.29 that said the condition of road infrastructure in the rural areas is good were agreed upon as their mean value is up to 3.00 value which is the value for accepting or rejecting a statement. The analysis indicated that more there is improvement in the provision of in Katsina State as this is further confirm by the observation of this study refer to appendix X

Based on the overall mean value of 4.07 for assessing the provision of road infrastructure, analysis shows that provision of road infrastructure satisfactory and is positively related rural to rural development.

5.3.6: Health Infrastructure

Respondents were asked to indicate their opinion on the provision of healthcare infrastructure in their rural community and their responses were presented in Table 5.13.

5.12: Views of Rural People on Health Infrastructure

S/N	Item	SA	A	N	D	SD	Total	Mean	STD	Decision
1	There is healthcare Infrastructure in your community	4	11	13	300	71	400	4.06	0.642	Agree
2	The healthcare infrastructure is enough to cater for your community	102	216	34	38	9	400	2.12	1.378	Disagree
3	The distance to a health center is far	10	220	39	124	6	400	2.75	0.984	Disagree

4	The healthcare facilities are functional	6	31	66	282	12	400	3.74	1.654	Agree
5	The healthcare facilities are absolute	13	108	78	196	4	400	3.23	1.421	Agree
6	The healthcare center has a laboratory	14	301	20	52	12	400	2.35	0.858	Disagree
7	The healthcare center is stock with drug	27	263	18	87	4	400	2.43	0.937	Disagree
8	The healthcare do immunization services	10	13	14	337	26	400	3.9	0.658	Agree
9	The healthcare do provide family planning services	18	39	22	307	13	400	3.65	0.866	Agree
10	The healthcare center in your community has competent health personnel	20	272	40	56	12	400	2.4	0.886	Disagree
11	The health care center has a doctor	24	262	18	59	37	400	2.55	1.103	Disagree
12	There is relationship between provision of healthcare infrastructure and rural development.	7	14	16	149	212	400	4.38	0.857	Agree

13	There will be no development in the rural areas without adequate provision of healthcare Infrastructure	7	30	7	140	216	400	4.33	0.95	Agree
14	The condition of healthcare infrastructure in the rural areas is good	71	241	45	33	10	400	2.16	.891	Disagree
	Total	326	2021	430	2160	643	400	3.16	2.52	Agree

Source: Researcher's Survey, 2016

As shown in table 5.13 above, item1 with mean values of 4.06 that said there is healthcare Infrastructure in your community, item 4 with mean value of 3.74 that said the healthcare facilities are functional the borehole in your community is functional, item 5 with mean value of 3.23 that says the healthcare facilities are absolute, item 8 with mean value of 3.90 that said the healthcare do immunization services, item 6 with mean value of 4.09 that said provision of clean water is catalyst for rural development ,item 9 with mean value of 3.65 that says the healthcare do provide family planning services, item 12 with mean value 4.38 that said there is relationship between provision of healthcare infrastructure and rural development, item 13 with mean value of 4.33 that said there will be no development in the rural areas without adequate provision of healthcare Infrastructure were agreed upon as their mean value is up to 3.00 value which is the value for accepting or rejecting a statement, while item 2 with mean value of 2.12 that said the healthcare infrastructure is enough to cater for your community, 3 with mean value of 2.25 that said the distance to a health centre is far, item 6 with mean value of 2.35 that says the healthcare centre has a laboratory, item 7 with mean value of 2.43 that said the healthcare centre

is stock with drug, item 10 with mean value of 2.40 that said the healthcare centre in your community has competent health, and item 14 with the mean value of 2.16 that said the condition of healthcare infrastructure in the rural areas is good were therefore, disagreed. The analysis indicated that despite the improvement in the provision of healthcare centres in Katsina State, there more to be done as some of the centres lacks competent personnel and some equipment were obsolete that need to be change or replace with modern equipment such as scanner machine and some other important tools.

Based on the overall mean value of 3.61 for assessing the provision of healthcare infrastructure, analysis shows that provision of water infrastructure satisfactory and is positively related to rural development.

5.6 Rural development dependent variable

Rural development is a multifaceted concept that has different meaning to different people in order to capture the basic element of rural development a construct was developed and respondents were asked to indicate their opinion as it relate to the questions and their Table 5.18.

Table 5.13: Views of Rural People on Rural Development

S/N	Item	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total	Mean	STD	Decision
1	The income of your rural community has increased over the years	114	203	0	65	18	400	2.18	1.146	Disagree
2	Poverty has been reduced in your rural community over the years	114	203	0	65	18	400	2.18	1.146	Disagree

3	There has been improvement in the provision of healthcare services in your rural areas over the past years	17	182	0	201	0	400	2.96	1.063	Disagree
4	Life expectance has increased in your rural areas over the past years	46	125	190	39	0	400	2.56	.821	Disagree
5	There has been improvement in the provision of electricity in your rural community	0	63	0	314	24	400	3.74	.789	**Agree**
6	Water supply has improved over the years	85	63	64	165	23	400	2.95	1.285	**Disagree**
7	The road provided in your rural community is connected to the market and amphoe	0	63	165	32	0	400	3.22	.776	**Agree**
8	Sanitation in your rural community has improved over the years	226	95	18	18	20	400	1.79	1.148	**Disagree**
9	Most houses in your rural community has decent toilet	226	118	18	18	20	400	1.72	1.079	**Disagree**

10	The people gaining employment in your rural community has increased over the years	300	0	18	18	64	400	1.87	1.550	**Disagree**
11	There has been increased agricultural productivity in your rural community due to government intervention	249	68	0	62	21	400	1.85	1.302	**Disagree**
12	There has been increased in access to different channels of communication over the years	270	68	0	41	21	400	1.69	1.210	**Disagree**
13	Access to basic education in your community has increased	46	102	0	231	21	400	3.20	1.211	**Agree**
14	Youth gaining admission to higher education has increased in your rural community over the years	259	102	0	18	21	400	1.60	1.069	**Disagree**
	Total	**1726**	**1455**	**473**	**1255**	**271**	**400**	**6.70**	**2.88**	**Disagree**

Source: Researcher's Survey,2016

As indicated in table 5.18 above, item1 with mean values of 2.18 that said the income of your

rural community has increased over the years, item 2 with mean value of 2.18 that said poverty has been reduced in your rural community over the years, item 3 with mean value of 2.96 that said there has been improvement in the provision of healthcare services in your rural areas over the past years, item 4 with mean value of 2.56 that said life expectance has increased in your rural areas over the past years, item 6 with mean value of 2.95 that said water supply has improved over the years, item 8 with mean value of 1.79 that said sanitation in your rural community has improved over the years, item 9 with mean value of 1.72 that said most houses in your rural community has decent toilet, item 10 with mean value of 1.87 that said the people gaining employment in your rural community has increased over the years, item 11with mean value of 1.85 that said there has been increased agricultural productivity in your rural community due to government intervention, item 12 with mean value of 1.69 that said there has been increased in access to different channels of communication over the years, and item 14 with mean value of 1.60 that says youth gaining admission to higher education has increased in your rural community over the years were therefore agree as their mean value reaches 3.00 which is the agreed point, while item 5 with mean value of 3.74 that said there has been improvement in the provision of electricity in your rural community, item 7 with mean value of 3.22 that said the road provided in your rural community is connected to the market and amp hoe , item 13 with mean value of 3.20 that said access to basic education in your community has increased have therefore been agree as their value is up to 3.00

The analysis has shown that infrastructure such as healthcare, water, communication were lacking in the rural areas as opined by the rural people, similarly, another area of concern is in the level of as some respondent could have not afford to own a radio or phone due poverty, whereas in the area of electricity, road and school construction there has an improvement even

though there is room for improvement especially in schools where some facilities were dilapidated due to neglect.

Based on the overall mean value of 3.86 for assessing rural development, analysis indicated that the rural development as opined by the rural respondent is not satisfactory, therefore more need be done in area of infrastructural provision in order to achieve the desire rural development objectives.

5.7 Staff View on Socio-Economic Infrastructure

Respondents were asked to indicate their opinion on the provision of socio-economic infrastructure in their rural community and their responses were presented in table 5.19 below

Table 5. 14: Staff views on socio-economic infrastructure

S/N	Item	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total	Mean	STD	Decision
1	The government gives priority to the development of rural areas	13	69	23	12	3	400	2.36	.896	**Disagree**
2	The objective of providing socio-economic infrastructure in rural areas is to develop the rural areas	5	23	14	37	41	400	3.72	1.238	**Agree**
3	There is relationship between socio-economic infrastructure and rural development.	35	39	18	17	11	400	2.42	1.294	**Disagree**

4	Adequate provision of socio-economic infrastructure induces rural development	11	29	22	19	39	400	3.38	1.391	**Agree**
5	Socio-economic infrastructure plays a significant role in improving the standard of living of rural people	3	35	21	22	39	400	3.49	1.283	**Agree**
6	The State provide socio-economic infrastructure sufficiently	12	47	26	13	22	400	2.88	1.278	**Disagree**
7	There will be no development in the rural areas without adequate provision of socio-economic Infrastructure	3	13	9	38	57	400	4.11	1.098	**Agree**
	Total	**82**	**255**	**133**	**175**	**212**	**400**	**4.47**	**1.69**	**Agree**

Source: Researcher's Survey,2016

As indicated in table 5.16 above, item1 with mean values of 2.36 that said the government gives priority to the development of rural areas, item 3with mean value of 2.42 that said there is relationship between socio-economic infrastructure and rural development, item 6 with mean value of 2.88 that said the State provide socio-economic infrastructure sufficiently were not agreed, while item 2 with mean value of 3.72 that says the objective of providing socio-economic infrastructure in rural areas is to develop the rural areas, item 4 with mean value of

3.38 that said Adequate provision of socio-economic infrastructure induces rural development, item 5 with mean value of 3.49 that said socio-economic infrastructure plays a significant role in improving the standard of living of rural people, item 7 with mean value of 4.11 that said there will be no development in the rural areas without adequate provision of socio-economic Infrastructure were agree as they reach 3.00 mean value.

Based on the overall mean value of 3.86 for assessing socio-economic infrastructures, analysis shows that provision socio-economic infrastructure as opined by the staff respondents is low, therefore more infrastructure need to be provided in order to achieve the desire rural development objectives.

5.8 Hypotheses Testing

In order to test the hypotheses of the study, regression analysis was employed, and before performing the regression analysis, there are certain assumption that has be met so as to establish the reliability of the instrument and the normality of the data.

5.8.1 Normality test

There are two method of testing the normality of data, one is through graphic analysis and the other one is by statistical analysis. This study used the statistical method where skewness and kurtosis were used to establish the normality of the data as shown in the table below

Table 5.15: Skewness and Kurtosis Test Result

Variables	N statistics	Skewness	Kurtosis
School	400	.058	-974
Electricity	400	.592	-076
Market	400	-288	.665
Road	400	.270	.340
Healthcare	400	-2.388	5.434
RD	400	-1.425	1.154

Source: Researcher

5.8.2 Reliability Test

Reliability test is another condition for using regression analysis, the instrument must be reliable in measuring what it intends to measure. There are ways in which reliability of an instrument can be tested and the most common one is the Cronbach's alpha coefficient. Cronbach's alpha test the consistency of an instrument to ascertain whether all items of the instrument measure the same thing. The reliability test for each of the variables in the instrument as indicated table in the table below shows that the result ranges from 0.07 to 0.09, indicating the reliability of the construct which is above the minimum acceptable value of 0.6 as suggested by (Hair et al., 2010).

Table 5.16: Reliability of the Instrument

Variables	No of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
School	5	0.845
Electricity	7	0.773
Market	5	0.829
Road	5	0.820
Healthcare	14	0.952
RD	14	0.921

Source: Researcher

5.8.3 Test of Hypothesis I

The first hypothesis state that:

HO: There is no relationship between school infrastructure and rural development

H1: There is relationship between school infrastructure and rural development

Table 5.17: Result of hypothesis i testing

Variable	**STD**	**Beta**	**T**	**Sig**
Sch	.361	.033	7.723	000

Dependent Variable: RD

Decision Rule: Based on the beta value of .033, t value of 7.723, and p value of .000,the null hypothesis that says there is no significance relationship between school infrastructure and rural development is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted (See Appendix 8A)

5.8.4 Test of Hypothesis II

The first hypothesis state that:

HO: There is no relationship between electricity infrastructure and rural development

H1: There is relationship between electricity infrastructure and rural development

Table 5.18: Result of hypothesis ii testing

Variable	STD	Beta	T	Sig
Elect	.361	.383	8.282	000

Dependent Variable: RD

Decision Rule: Based on the beta value of .383, t value of 8.282, and p value of .000, the null hypothesis that says there is no significance relationship between electricity infrastructure and rural development is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. (See Appendix 8B)

5.8.5 Test of Hypothesis III

The first hypothesis state that:

HO: There is no relationship between market infrastructure and rural development

H1: There is relationship between market infrastructure and rural development

Table 5.19: Result of hypothesis iii testing

Variable	STD	Beta	T	Sig
Market	.044	.615	15.542	000

Dependent Variable: RD

Decision Rule: Based on the beta value of .615, t value of 15.542, and p value of .000, the null

hypothesis that says there is no significance relationship between market infrastructure and rural development is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. (See Appendix 8C)

5.8.6 Test of Hypothesis iv

The first hypothesis state that:

HO: There is no relationship between road infrastructure and rural development

H1: There is relationship between road infrastructure and rural development

Table 5.20: Result of hypothesis iv testing

Variable	STD	Beta	T	Sig
Road	.030	.269	5.563	000

Dependent Variable: RD

Decision Rule: Based on the beta value of .269, t value of 5.563, and p value of .000, the null hypothesis that says there is no significance relationship between road infrastructure and rural development is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. (See Appendix 8D)

Table 5.24 has indicated the relationship between the independent and the dependent variable which has shown school coordination, funding ha strong relationship, communication, has a moderate relationship, water, health, road and market has a weak relationship.

5.8.7 Testing Hypothesis v

The first hypothesis state that:

HO: There is no relationship between healthcare infrastructure and rural development

H1: There is relationship between healthcare infrastructure and rural development

Table 5.21: Result of hypothesis v testing

Variable	STD	Beta	T	Sig
Healthcare	.067	.361	7.723	000

Dependent Variable: RD

Decision Rule: Based on the beta value of .361, t value of 7.723, and p value of .000, the null hypothesis that says there is no significance relationship between healthcare infrastructure and rural development is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. (See Appendix 8E)

6.1 Discussion

The major objective of this study was to examine the effect of socio-economic infrastructure on rural development in Katsina State. In order to achieve the specific objective of the study, five hypotheses were postulated and tested in line with the research questions. The result of the hypotheses testing indicated that, all the null hypotheses were rejected and the alternate ones were accepted which implies that there is significant relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. This result is in consistent with previous studies such as Ikechukwu (2012), Akpan (2012), Musa (2013), Olawepo (2012), Tersoon (2014) who found that, there is strong relationship between socio-economic infrastructure and rural development. The results of the five hypotheses tested were discussed below.

The first hypothesis of this study which is in line with the first objective of the study stated, that there is no significant relationship between school infrastructure and rural development. The statistical result of the hypothesis indicated that, there is positive and significant relationship between school infrastructure and rural development which implies that providing more schools in the rural areas can bring about rural development. This findings is in line with previous findings such as (Amadi, 1988; Kirubi, 2009; Obayelu, 2014; Adedeji, 2014;

Claudius ,2014; Aggarwal ,2014;Asher, 2014;Amadi, 2015).

The second hypothesis of this study which is in line with the second objective of the study stated, that there is no significant relationship between electricity infrastructure and rural development. The statistical result of the hypothesis indicated that, there is positive and significant relationship between electricity infrastructure and rural development which implies the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis was accepted. This result implies that when electricity is provided in the rural areas that will boost economic activities which in turn will improve the income of the rural dwellers and by extension their standard of living is also improved. This finding is inconsistent with previous findings such as (Cook, (2013; Olagunju, 2012).

The third hypothesis of this study which is in line with the third objective of the study states, that there is no significant relationship between market infrastructure and rural development. The statistical result of the hypothesis indicated that, there is positive and significant relationship between market infrastructure and rural development, this implies that the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis was accepted. This result implies that adequate provision of market in the rural areas influences rural development as it facilitate economic activities This finding is inconsistent with previous findings such as (Kefle, 013; Francis, 2012).

The fourth hypothesis of this study which is in line with the fourth objective of the study stated that, there is no significant relationship between road infrastructure and rural development. The statistical result of the hypothesis indicated that there is positive and significant relationship between road infrastructure and rural development which implies the null hypothesis was

rejected and the alternate hypothesis was accepted. This result implies that when road is provided in the rural areas that will boost economic and social activities which in turn improve the income of the rural dwellers and thereby improve the standard of living of the rural people. This finding is inconsistent with previous findings such as (Tunde, 2012; Lulit ,2012; Ogbuli ,2012;).

The fifth hypothesis of this study which is in line with the second objective of the study stated that, there is no significant relationship between healthcare infrastructure and rural development. The statistical result of the hypothesis indicated that there is positive and significant relationship between healthcare infrastructure and rural development, which implies the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis was accepted. This result implies that, when healthcare is provided in the rural areas that will boost the health status of the rural people thereby improving both social and economic activities. This finding is inconsistent with previous findings such as (Cook, (2013; Olagunju, 2012).

5.2 Major Findings

Based on the data analyzed and interpreted in the previous sections, the study made the following findings:

From the observation made as one of the method of data collection for this, the study found that, the number of basic schools in most of rural areas were not adequate enough to accommodate the teeming number of school age children, as such more primary and secondary schools need to be provided especially in some remote rural areas as there was insufficient number of school in some those areas especially in Mani local government area. In terms of school facilities such classes, furniture and teaching aid, study found that most of the schools in the rural areas lack good facilities as most of the facilities were dilapidated and in some schools they were non-

existence as was shown in appendix 4

Finding made by this study also indicated that, there were a lot of rural communities that were not connected with electricity and those who were connected, the supply was not constant. Similarly, the transformers installed in majority of the areas were over loaded as they are not adequate enough for the population.

Another major finding was related to market infrastructure, it was revealed that market infrastructure was not mostly provided by the government, rather in most of the rural areas the rural people provide for themselves shops and market where they perform their economic activities.

In terms of road infrastructure, the government of Katsina State had done well in providing tired and feeder road that connects majority of the rural areas with other areas.

Another finding is related to healthcare infrastructure, which this study found to be lacking in most communities in the rural areas. The study also found that, the available healthcares infrastructures in the rural areas were mostly not in a good condition and the lack qualified medical personnel.

CHAPTER SIX
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

6.1 Summary

The aim of this study was to examine the effect of socio-economic infrastructure on rural development in Katsina State, Nigeria. The background of the study was made to give a description of the area of concern. However, certain problems were identified under the statement of the problem which include among others, lack inadequate provision of school and market infrastructures as well as dilapidation of the existing infrastructures. Three hypotheses were postulated and were all rejected based on the statistical result. The scope of the study was confined to socio-economic infrastructures as the subject scope (main variables) of the study, while and Batagarawa, Mani, and Dandume.

The significance of this study can be seen from the practical and theoretical perspectives which could serve as a basis for policy formulation for the government at all levels, it could also serve as reference for the academia. The methodology of the study centre's on triangulation method of data collection, similarly quantitative method of data analysis was utilized using the SPSS packaged. A cluster multi-stage sampling was adopted as sampling techniques.

Under administration of questionnaires close ended were adopted, literature review was examined, the researcher endeavour to look at various author and scholars on the field of the study. The infrastructure theory as propounded by Frischmann 2007 was adopted to serve as the theoretical frame work of the study, an insight into the historical background of Katsina state was highlighted as well as the organizational structures of rural development ministry of the State

were highlighted, data collected were presented and analysed using SPSS. Chapter Six contains summary conclusion and findings of the study.

6.2 Conclusion

The main objective of this study was to examine the relationship between socio-economic infrastructure and rural development in Katsina State. Five hypotheses were formulated to for the study. The result of the regression analysis indicated that all the five null hypotheses were rejected and the alternate ones were accepted which implies that there is significance relationship between socio-economic infrastructure and rural development (school, electricity, market, road, and healthcare infrastructure). Conclusively, findings of this study have shown that socio-economic infrastructures model is a viable mechanism for rural development. The study recommends adequate provision of socio-economic infrastructure in the rural areas as means of achieving rural development. The study specifically recommends that:

6.3 Recommendation

Base on the findings of the study the following recommendations were made.

The study recommend that government should provide more school in the rural areas and school facilities such classes, furniture and teaching aid should also be provided by the government in collaboration with NGOs and other donors organization.

More rural communities should be provided by electricity in order to boost their social and economic activities for improved standard of living.

Government should provide more market infrastructure in the rural areas in order to facilitate economic activities so as to increase the income of the rural people thereby developing the rural

communities.

Government should provide a mechanism for maintaining the existing road in the state both the feeder and the tired road.

Government in collaboration with NGOs and private sector should provide more healthcare facilities in the rural areas as well as providing qualified medical personnel.

REFERENCES

Abdullahi, T. Z. (1987) Rural development and economic update. *Nigerian Journal of Contemporary Policy Issues*, 1, (26).

Abiodun, O. E., Olarenwaju, T. O., & Oyelami, N. L. (2014). Effect of rural infrastructure on profitability and productivity of cassava-based farms in Odogbolu local government area, Ogun state, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Sciences, Belgrade*, 59(2), 187-200.

Abosedra, S., Dah, A., & Ghosh, S. (2009). Electricity consumption and economic growth, the case of Lebanon. *Applied Energy*, 86,(4), 429-432.

Achimigu,H.; Abubakar,Y.A.; Agboni,J.U;Orokpo,J.O.(2012) Rethinking poverty reduction and sustainable development in Nigeria: an advocacy of bottom top paradigm. *Canadian Social Sciees*, 8, (6), 78-90

Adedapo, A. D., Osude, Y. O., Adedapo, A. A., Moody, J. O., Adeagbo, A. S., Olajide, O. A., & Makinde, J. M. (2009). Blood pressure lowering effect of Adenanthera pavonina seed extract on normotensive rats. *Records of Natural Products*, *3*(2), 82-89.

Adedeji, O.A (2013).An assessment of rural development. *British Journal of Environmental Science* 2, (1), 34 – 48

Adegboyega, O. and Taiwo, M. (2011). Contribution of corporate social responsibility to agricultural and rural development in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 13, (4), 1520-5509.

Adenipekun, M.T. (2010). Conservation of natural resources in Nigeria: a pragmatic solution to socio- economic and environmental crisis. *Paper presented at the 2010 National Conference of the Department of Estate Management, Yaba College of Technology, August.*

Adenipekun, M.T. (2013). Sustainable rural infrastructural development in Nigeria within the context of Vision 20:2020. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, 2, (1) 254-269

Adenuga, A.H., Babatunde, R.O; Olagunju, F.I; Oladajo A.O. (2012). Effect of road infrastructure on farm production in Oyo State. *Journal Of Economic Development*, 37, (1) ,32-40

Adepoju, A. A.; Salman, K .k. (2013). Increasing agricultural productivity through rural infrastructure: evidence from Oyo and Osun States, Nigeria. *International Journal of Applied Agricultural and Apicultural Research*.1, (10)10-20

Adesoji A. A (2013).The effect of internally generated revenue on rural development. *A Journal Of Education And Social Research*, 3, (2).

Adewumi, M. A., Supon, S. B., & Fairchild, N. (1987). Measurement and analysis of the pressure drop in a vertical annulus in a simulated air drilling operation. *Journal of Human Ecology*, *18*(2), 121-128

Adeyemo,A.M.(1989). Spatialvariationin accessibilitytosecondary school facilitiesinOyo State, *Unpublished PhDThesis,GeographyDepartment, University of Ibadan,Nigeria*

African Monitor (2012). Rural Infrastructure in Africa unlocking the African moment. Development. *Support paper series No* 1

Agagba, N.C. (2008) Fast-tracking rural development imperative for wealth and employment creation. *Nigerian Journal of Development Studies*.9, (7), 25-30

Aggarwal, C., Gupta, M., Gao, J., Han, J. (2014). Outlier detection for temporal data. *Synthesis Lectures on Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, *5*(1), 1-129.

Aigboka,B. E. (1999).EvaluatinginvestmentonbasicinfrastructureinNigeria. *Proceedings ofthe Eighth AnnualConference ofthe ZonalResearchUnits(Organised byResearch Dept.,CentralBankofNigeria,at Hamdala Hotel,Kaduna,11 –15 June,1999),p.208*

Akpa, A. (2008). The Effect of Corruption on Revenue Generation At The Local Government Level: Paper Presented At Workshop Organized By Hagaz International Limited in Kogi State

Akpan, N. S. (2012). From agriculture to petroleum oil production: what has changed about Nigeria's rural development. *International Journal of Developing Societies* 1, (3), 97-106

Akpan, N. S. (2012). Rural development in Nigeria: A review of pre-and post-independence practice. *Journal of Sociological Research,* 3(2), 146-159.

Alaji, B. S. (2010). Poverty situation in Nigeria: An over view of rural development. *Pakistani Journal of Social Sciences*, 7, (5).

Ale, M.O.; Abisuwan, O. T.A. (2011). Rural infrastructural development, food security and city congestion in Nigeria. *Jorind* ,9, (1).

Allahmagani, M.D (1986). Community participation as a Strategy for rural development. A case study of Kaduna State. *Un-Published Msc Thesis .Geography Department. Ahmadu Bello University Zaria*.

Amadi, B. C. (1988). The impact of rural road construction on agricultural development: An empirical study of Anambra state in Nigeria. *Agricultural Systems*, *27*(1), 1-9.

Amadi, S., Ukpaka, C., Wami, E. (2015). Effect of pollution on metal corrosion: a case study of carbon steel metal in acidic media. *Current Science Perspectives, 1*, 107-111.

American Heritage Dictionary of English Language: :https://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=Wilipedia&btn.Retrieved on 25 August 2015

Anaeta,S. G. and Anaeta,M.S .(2010). Rural community Newspaper: principle and practice. Ibadan: Stirling Horden Publishers.

Anaeto, L. Moemeka,S .G. (1985) *Local radio community education for rural development*. Zaria: A. B.U. Press.

Anaeto,F.C.(2003).Concept of rural development in Nigeria ,issues, prospect, problems and solution.4,(2),

Anderson, J., Clément, J., & Van Crowder, L. (1999). Pluralism in sustainable forestry and rural development: an overwiew of concepts, approaches and future steps.Development Review,23,(9).23-40

Anwar, S. (1992). Dynamics of public infrastructure, industrial productivity and profitability, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 74, (1).

Anyebe. (2014). *Readings in development administration*. Zaria: Salaam Publishers.

Ariyo, A., & Raheem, M. I. (1991). Effect of fiscal deficit on some macroeconomic aggregates in Nigeria. *In Final report presented at AERC workshop, Nairobi*.

Aschauer D. A., (1989). Is public expenditure productive. *Journal of Monetary Auditor, Paper Presented At The 34 Auditor General Annual Conferences Hosted By Benue State Government At Benue Hotel Makurdi*.

Asema ,E. S.(2013). Rural development in Nigeria: prospect and challenges. *International Journal of Art and Humanities Bahir Dar Ethiopia*, 2, (1), 17-35

Asema,E. S.(2011). *Mass media in contemporary society*. Jos: University Press

Asema,E.S.;Anum,V.;Edegoh,L.(2010). Radio as a tool for rural development in Nigeria: prospect and challenges. *International Journal of Art and Humanities Bahir Dar Ethiopia*, 2, (1), 17-35

Asher, R. E., Koerner, E. F. K., &. (Eds.). (2014). *Concise history of the language sciences: from the Sumerians to the cognitivists*. Elsevier.

Ataka, T. K. (1993) Inter-organizational coordination: agricultural and rural development In Nigerian, *Journal of Agric. Extension Volume* 8 (1 &2).

Atchoargrena, D. (2003).*Education for rural development: toward a new policy*. *Unesco and FAO* 2003.

Atchoargrena,D. (2011).*Education for rural development: toward a new policy*. Unesco and FAO 2003.

Aveni, A. and Shina. (2012).Improving learning infrastructure and environments for sustainable quality practice in secondary schools in Ondo state. *International Journal Of Research Studies In Education*, 1, (1) , 61 – 68.

Awojobi,O.N.(2014). Sustaninable rural development in Nigeria within the context of millennium development goals. *International Journal of Contemporary Applied Sciences*,1,(1),2308-1365

Babbie, E. (2010). *The practice of social research* (10th ed.). Belmont. California: 278 Wad worth Publishing.

Bambale, A.J. (2013). *The mediating effect of psychological ownership on the relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behaviours in Kano*

Ban, S. H. Pal Yong Moon, and Dwight H. Perkins (1980). *Rural development*, Cambrige: Mass Harvard

Baran, P. (1957). The Political Economy of Growth. *New York Monthly Review Press,1,(9),90-95*

Bernart, J. Lewis, P., V. Ellef, and Robert, J. M. (1993). Public infrastructure and rural development in forested areas of the lake states: a review and an assessment of information need. Staff Paper Series, 1, (90).

Bhartti, M.A; Sundram, V.P.K (2015).*Business research qualitative and quantitative methods*. Malaysia: Pearson Sdn Bhd

Blair,H., (2000).Participationandaccountabilityintheperiphery:DemocraticlocalGovernanceinSix countries.*WorldDevelopment*28,21-39.

Bolis, I., Morioka, S. N., & Sznelwar, L. I. (2014). When sustainable development risks losing its meaning. Delimiting the concept with a comprehensive literature review and a conceptual model. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 83,* 7-20.

Brookfield, H. (2012). *Interdependent development*.London: Routledge.

Buchanan, N.S & Ellis, H.S (1955). *Approaches to economic development*. New York: The 20 Century Fund Inc

Bureau for Statistics (2010). Federal Government of Nigeria. Abuja: FME.

Byoungki K. (2006). Infrastructure development for the economic development in developing countries: lessons from korea and japan. *GSICS Working Paper Series*, 250.

Chenery, H. (1974). *Development patterns among countries and overtime*. London ,Oxford University Press.

Chenery, H.B. (1974). *Redistribution with growth.* London: Oxford University Press.

Chinweke,N.(2015).Impact of rural development programmes on the social and economic welfare of the rural dwelers in Nigeria. *Microtheme Review*,4,(1),51-55

Chukwuemeka K. Obetta &Charity C. Okide (2013) Rural development trends In Nigeria: problems and prospects. Retrieved from http/web/World Bank. Org, WBSI on 20 december 2016

Claudious, A. (2014). Enhancing rural condition of living through micro-credit scheme. *Review. Journal of tissue engineering and regenerative medicine*, *8*(12), 925-936.

Clinton, B. (1996). Report of the President of the United States on the Status of Federal Critical Infrastructure Protection Activities. Critical Infrastructure Assurance Office.

Coker,M.A., Obo,U.B.,(2012). Problems and prospect of implementing rural transformation programmes in Odukpani local Government Areas of Cross River State, Nigeria. *World Young Research,* 2,(2),26.

Cook, P. (2013). Infrastructure, rural electrification and development. *Energy for Sustainable Development Journal*, 15(3), 304-313.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: qualitative & quantitative approaches.* London:

D'Silva, B.C and Raza, M.R (1980). Integrated rural development in Nigeria: the Funtua project Nigeria's *Food Policy*, 5, (4)

Dilruba, K. and Roy BC (2012). Rural livelihood diversification in west Bengal" Determinants and construct . *Agricultural Economic Research review*, 25, No (1)

Diso,L.I (1994) Information policies and government guidance in Nigeria :what hope for communities? *Resource Sharing and Information Network*, 9, (2), 149-151

Doctor, et al. (2011). Critically ill children during the 2009–2010 influenza pandemic in the United States. *Pediatrics*, *128*(6), e1450-e1458.

Doma,K;Muhammad,I (2012). Self reliance key to sustainable rural development in nigeria. *ARPN Journal of Science*.12, (6).

Dudly,S.(1977). The Meaning of development. *International Labour Review* , xx, (2), -2-7

Dupe O. (1975) *Nigerian's neglected rural majority*. Ibadan: oxford university press. Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research (NISER)

Econg,C.(2013) Impact of road and bridges on socio-economic development of Aka-Ibom. *Nigerian Journal of Environmental Studies and Management*, 9(2), 197-201.

Egunjobi, O. A. (1987). An integrated control strategy for a nematode pest of maize in Nigeria. *International Nematology Network Newsletter*, 4(4), 40-49.

Ekpo, A. H., & Olaniyi, O. (1995). *Rural development in Nigeria: analysis of the impact of the Directorate for Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI) 1986-93. rural development in Nigeria: concepts, processes and prospects*. Enugu: Auto-Century Publishing Company.

Elijah, A.; Onisha, T; Waju, O.; Oyelamu N. L. (2014). Effect of rural infrastructure on profitability and productivity of cassava based farms in Odogbolu local governments Ogun State Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 59, (2), 187 – 200.

Emma I. O. and Vincent N. (2004). Rural development in Nigeria issues and facts. *International Journal of Sustainable Development*, l1, (3)

Emma,E.C.C.(2013) Enhancing rural development in Nigeria, pericoping the impediment and exploring imperative measures. *Singaporean Journal of Business Economics and Management Studies*.1, (8).

Emmanuel and De K. and Gavin W. (1976). *Sociology and development*. London: University Printing Press House.

Enefiok, I.; Ekong, D. (2013). The impact of rural road and bridges on the socio- economic development ofAkwa- Ibom State, Nigeria: An Evaluation. *Global Journal of Political Sciences*. 1, (1), 27-36

Eneh, O. C. (2011). Nigeria's vision 20: 2020-issues, challenges and implications for development management. *Asian Journal of Rural Development*, 1(1), 21-40.

FME Federal Ministry of Education (2014). National Policy on Education. Abuja: FME.

Ford, R. and P. Poret (1991). Infrastructure and private-sector productivity. *OECD Economic Studies No*. 16

Francis, N. F; David, A. K .(2012).The challenges of agriculture and rural development in Africa: The case of Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development* 1, (3)

Francis,N.F., David, A.K. (2012). The challenges of agriculture and rural development in Africa: The case of Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*,1,(3), 2226-6348

Frank, A., Raper, J., & Cheylan, J. P. (Eds.). (2003). Life and motion of socio-economic units*: GISDATA* 5, (8)

Frischmann, B. M., & Lemley, M. A. (2007). Spillovers. *Columbia Law Review*, 106, 257-301.

GIZ (2004). Road Maintenance, the Foundation of Development. Retrieve from www.giz.de on 21-7-2016

Gray, R. M.; Gersho, A., (2012). Vector quantization and signal compression. *Springer Science & Business Media*, 159

Goggin,M.(1984). Top-down and bottom-up approaches to implementation research**:** American Political Research,2(3),45-50.

Habibu, A.(2007). Strategy for accelerated rural development at local Government. *in the Nigerian Journal of Administrative Studies* ,l5, (3)

Hair, J., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* , (ed.). Uppersaddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education International.

Harande,Y.I (2009). Information Services for Rural Community Development in Nigeria.Library Philosophy and Practice. E journal paper 271.

Hassine, K. B.,et al. (2010). Effect of the growing area conditions on differentiation between chemlali and chetrum. Journal of olive oils. Food Chemistry, 119(1), 220-225.

He, C. (2012). *Introduction to modernization science*. Heidelberg: Springer Berlin.

Hicks, J (1957). Learning about economic development. *Oxford Economic Paper* 8, (6)

Hodge, I., Dunn, J., Monk, S., & Fitzgerald, M. (2002). Barriers to participation in residual rural labour markets. *Work, Employment & Society*, *16*(3), 457-476.

Ibitoye, F. I., & Adenikinju, A. (2007). Future demand for electricity in Nigeria. *Applied Energy*, *84*(5), 492-504.

Ibok, E., & Daniel, E. (2013). The impact of rural roads and bridges on the socio-economic development of Akwa Ibom state, Nigeria: an evaluation. *Global Journal of Political Science and Administration*, 1(1), 27-36.

Idachaba, F.S (1985) *Rural infrastructure in Nigeria*. Ibadan: university of Ibadan press.

Idira, N.(2014). Challenges of rural development and opportunities for providing sustainable livelihood. *Impact International Journal Of Research In Applied Natural And Social Sciences, 2, Issues* (5), 111 – 118.

Idoma,K;Ismail,M.(2013).Self Reliance as Key to Rural Development. *ARPN Journal of Science and Technology*.3, (6).

Ige,O.A.(2013) Education infrastructure for rural development. *Social Science Review* 4, (2) 23-30

Indira, N.(2014). Challenges of Rural Development and Opportunities for Providing Sustainable livelihood .*Impact international journal of research in applied Natural and social sciences,* 2, (5), 111 – 118 2014.

Ismail, T.O. (1987). The Nature of Property Maintenance in Modern Nigeria. *Paper Presented of the 17th Annual Conference of the Nigeria Institution of Estate Surveyor and Valuers held at Enugu, March 1987*.

Iwayemi, A. (2008). Investment in electricity generation and transmission in Nigeria: Issues and Options. *International Association for Energy Economics,* 7,(8), 37-42.

J.M.A. Opio-Odongo. (1986). The Inertia Of rural development In hausa-land and explication of a structural incongruence hypothesis. *Nigerian Journal of Agricultural Extension*. 1, (2),

Janvry, A . (1999). *Rural development and rural policy*. Berkeley: University of California and The World Bank.

Jhigan, M.L (1980). *The economics of development planning*. London: Vikas Publishing House.

Kamar,Y.M.et al.(2014). Rural development in Nigeria problems and prospect for sustainable development .*The International Journal of Engineering and Sciences*,3,(2),24-29.

Kastsina State Rural Electrification Authorirty (2015). Annual report 2,8/100 (KSREA,2015).

Katsina State (2014) Universal basic education board annual report. 7, (5),78-85

Katsina State Ministry of Social and Rural Development (2015) .Annual report on rural development .5,10/005. (KMSRD, 2015)

Kefle. A (2012). "Rural Roads and Development: Evidence from Ethiopia" . Wondemin and Jogn Weiss EJYT IR vol 12, no 4 pp 2012 417 .

Kessides C. (1993). The contribution of infrastructure to economic development a review of experience and policy implication. *World Bank Discussion Paper No.213. Washington DC*

Kibiru, S. K.,et al. (2009). Influence of prices on market participation decisions of indigenous poultry farmers in four districts of Eastern Province, Kenya. *Journal of Agriculture and Social Research (JASR), 12*(1), 1-10.

Knickel, K., Brunori, G., Rand, S., & Provost, J. (2009). Towards a better conceptual framework for innovation processes in agriculture and rural development: from linear models to systemic approaches. *Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension,* 15(2), 131-146.

Kola, O. (2004). Rural development via education. *Nigerian Journal of Administrative Studies,* 2, (1) .

Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques*. New Age International.

Kura, K. (2014). The correlation between education and political participation in Nigeria: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Political Science*. 2, (46), 275-282.

Leigh, N. G., & Blakely, E. J. (2013). *Planning local economic development: Theory and practice*. SAGE Publications, Incorporated.

Leipziger, D., Fay, M., Wodon, Q. T., & Yepes, T. (2003). Achieving the millennium development goals: the role of infrastructure. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper, (3163).

Lele,U. (1975). The Design of Rural Development Lession from Africa. Balmore: Holt Rinbert

Likert, R. (1961) *New Patterns of Management* . New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lipton, E., et al . (2005). Breakdowns marked path from hurricane to anarchy. The New York Times, 11.

Lowe, M. (2007). Research note: Hofstede's consequences: A study of reviews, citations and replications. *Organization studies*, *15*(3), 447-456.

Lucit, M. (2012). Implications of economic crises on the on rural development. Rural Development Review,4,(8),45-50

Mabogunje, A.L. (1980). "Development Process": A Spatial Perspective. London: Hutchinson and Co

Madu, I.A. (2007). "The Underlying factors of Rural Development Patterns in Nsukka Region of South Eastern Nigeria". Journal of Rural and community Development Vol 2,No1, pp.110-122

Malaysia.

Martins T. A. (2013). Sustainable rural infrastructural development in Nigeria within the context of Vision 20:2020. International Journal of Development and Sustainability 2 (1) , 254-269

Mary M. F (2012). "Effect of government expenditure on infrastructure on the growth of the Nigerian economy 1977 – 2009" . International journal of economics and finance issues vol 2, no 4 pp 513

Meaning of infrastructure : https://scholar.google.com/scholar?q=Wilipedia&btn.Retrieved on 25 August 2015

Ministry for National Planning (1980). Rural Development Through Integrated Rural Development Approach. Lagos MNP.\

Modupe M. F (2012). Effect of government expenditure on infrastructure on the growth of the Nigerian economy 1977 – 2009 . International journal of economics and finance issues , 2, (4), 513-520

Momodu,O.M.(2012). Rural Librarise and Community Development in Nigeria. International Journal of Basic Applied and Innovative ResearchVol 1, No 3 pp91-97

Monisola,T.A.(2012). Harnessing Tourism Potentials for Sustainable Development. A case of Owu waterfalls in Nigeria.Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa.Vol 14 ,No 1

Muhammad A. S (2012). The impact of Socio-Economic factors on Small Scale Business Success. Journal of Society and Space vol 8, no 1

Munnell, A.H. (1992). Policy Watch. Infrastructure Investment and Economic Growth. Journal of Economic Perspectives, Vol. 6.

Musa, N. (2013). Agricultural and Rural Development Programmes in Nigeria: Trends and Constraint. Daily Independent.20 August 2013.

Nair, I.(2014). Challenges of rural development and opportunities for providing sustainable livelihood. Impact international journal of research in applied Natural and social sciences, vol 2, issues 5 pp 111 – 118 2014.

National bureau of Statistics (2010). Report of the national literacy survey 2010. *Abuja: National Bureau of Statistics.2, (5),45-50*

NBS (2012). The Nigeria poverty profile 2010 report of the national bureau of statistics Harmonized Nigeria Living Standard Survey (HNLSS).

NBS (2013). The Nigeria poverty profile 2010 report of the national bureau of statistics Harmonized Nigeria Living Standard Survey (HNLSS).

Ncube,M.,Shantayanan,D (2011).African infrastructure knowledfe and programme.Infrastructure Consortium for Africa.African Development Bank.

Need Assessment (2011). Need Assessment Report 2011.Federal Ministry of Education Abuja.

Ngu, S. M. (2005). Research Methodology made sample for social and behavioural Sciences; Zaria: Shereef Salam Press.

Nigeria. An unpublished PhD thesis submitted to OYAGSB University Utara

Nnaji, C. E., Chukwu, J. O., & Nnaji, M. (2008). Electricity Supply, Fossil fuel Consumption, Co2 Emissions and Economic Growth: Implications and Policy Options for Sustainable Development in Nigeria. International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy, 3(3), 262.

NSeabasi S. Akpan (2012).”From Agriculture to Petroleum Oil Production; What Has Change About Nigeria’s Rural Development” . international journal of developing societies vol. 1, no 3, pp 97 – 106.

Nwanegbo,C.J;Odigbo,J (2013) “International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 3,No 3,285-291.

Nwankwoala,H.O. (2011).Localizing the Strategy for Achieving Rural Water Suppy and Sanitation in Nigeria.African Journal of Environmental Science and Technology. 5, (13).1170-1179

Nwosu,I.E.(1990). “The Rural Press as Vital Component of Rural Information Information System.(Ed) Mass Communication Development.Aba Frotier Publisher Limited.

Obadare, E. (2006). Playing politics with the mobile phone in Nigeria: civil society, big business & the state. *Review of African political economy*, 33(107), 93-111.

Obayelu, O. A., Agboyinu, O. M., & Awotide, B. A. (2014). Consumers' Perception and Willingness to Pay for Organic Leafy Vegetables in Urban Oyo State, *Nigeria. European Journal of Food Research & Review*, 4(2),120- 127.

Ogbuli, L. N. (2012). The Impact of Transportation on the socio-economic Development of Rural Areas of Gwagwalada Area Council, Nigeria. *Confluence Journal of Environmental Studies, 7*.

Ogbuozobe.(1997).InfrastructuraldevelopmentinNigeriain2010.Phillips,A.,&Titilola,S.T.(Eds), *Nigeria Institute ofSocialand Economic Research* (pp. 163-193), Ibadan.

Ogidefa, I. (2010). Rural development in Nigeria: concept, approaches, challenges and prospect Retrieved on 20,july,2015.http://socyberty.com/issues/rural-development-in-nigeria-concept-approaches-challenges-and-prospcct/.

Ogun, T. P. (2010). Infrastructure and Poverty Reduction: Implications for Urban Development in Nigeria, United Nations: University-World Institute for Development Economic Research, Working Paper No. 2010/43 (pp. 1-14).

Ogun, T. P. (2010, August). Infrastructure and poverty reduction: Implications for urban development in Nigeria. *Urban Forum 21, (3), 249-266.*

Ogunowo, O.O., Oderinde, F.O. (2012) Sustainable development and management of infrastructure for effective transformation of rural communities in Nigeria. Implication for food security. *Ozean Journal Of Social Science*, 5, (3).

Oguzor, S. (2012).A spatial analysis of infrastructure social services in rural Nigeria: implication for public policy. *GeoTropico*, 8, (5), 55 – 38.

Ojonemi,P.S.,Ogwu,S.O.(2013). Rural development policies and the challenges of realizing milleniuum development goals in Nigeria.

Okoye and D. Ayichi (Eds.); *Rural development in Nigeria: concepts, processes and prospects*. Enugu: Auto-Century Publishing Company.

Olafiaji E.M.; Adedeji, O .A; Omole, F.K.; Olanibij A; Yusuf Lukman (2014). An assessment of the impact of road transport on rural development: A case study of Obokun local Government area of Osun State. *British Journal of Environmental Science* 4 (3) 50 – 60

Olagunju, F.I. Ayunde, O. Adewumi, M.o; Adesiji, C.A.(2014). Effect of rural road and markets infrastructure on income of farming house hold in Osun States implication for sustainable development . *Ethiopian Journal of Research and Development,* 2 , (4).

Olarenwaju S. A, (1992). *Rural development problems in Nigeria*. Lagos: Avebury Publishers Book

Olaseni, M., & Alade, W. (2012). Vision 20: 2020 and the challenges of infrastructural development in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 5(2), 63-66.

Olatunbasun, D. (1975). *Nigerian neglected rural majority*. Ibadan: Oxford University Press

Olatunbosun, U. (1975). *The design of rural development lessons from Africa*. Baltmore:Holt Rinbert.

Olawepo,R.A.(2012).Commercialagricultureandruraldevelopment:evidencefromtheZimbabwe.*The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 74, (1).

Oluwa,D.(2012). Institutional Approach to Rural Infrastructural Development in Nigeria. *The Quaterly Journal of Administration*, xx, (3&4), 153-8

Oluwayomi,D.A.(1996).Overcoming rural underdevelopment in Nigeria.*Quaterly Journal of Administration,* xx, (3&4), 137-9

Olyiwola,L.M.,Adeleye,O.A.(2003).Rural infrastructure development in Nigeria between 1960-1990,problems and challenges. *Journal of Social Sciences*,11,(2),91-96.

Omoke, C. P. (2007). The causal relationship among financial development, trade openness and economic growth in Nigeria. *International Journal of Economics and Finance*, 2(2), 137-140

Onokerhoray, A. E.(2014). Planning for Rural Development in Nigeria: A spatial approach. Retrieved on 20,july,2015 http://cdj.oxfordjournals.org/

Palanithurai,G.R.R.(2010). *Globalization and rural development*. Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.

Paul ,C.(2011) .Infrastructure, rural electrification and development. *Energy for Sustainable Development*, 15,-304-313..

Pawa,(2014). Agribusiness as a veritable tool for rural development in Nigeria *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 14, 26-36

Pearce, D., Barbier, E., & Markandya, A. (2013). *Sustainable development: economics and environment in the Third World*. London: Routledge.

Pendse, D. R. (1980). Energy Crisis and Its Impact on Energy Consumers in Third World: *Economic and Political Weekly*, 175-184.

Peraz,C.and H.Tschinkel, (2003).Improving watershed management in developing countries: A Framework for PrioritizingSitesandPractices.U.K:AgricultureResearchandExtensionNetwork.

Phokwang, K. . (2008). Apparel brand endorsers and their effects on purchase intentions: a study of philippine consumers. *Philippine Management Review, 15*.8,90-95

Poulton, R. Hancox, R. J., Milne, & B. J., (2005). Association of television viewing during childhood with poor educational achievement. Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent *Medicine,* 159(7), 614-618.

Prawakar, S.; Ranjan K . D; Geethanjali, N. (2014). China's growth story:- The role of physical and social infrastructure. *Ethiopian journal of environmental studies and management* 7, (2) 177-180

Ragin, C.C. (2014).*The Comparative Method Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. California: University of California Press.

Retrieved At htt//www.out/publication/RD/Jos-02-4PDF.(Accessed on 15 july 2015)

Ringim, K. J. (2012). Effect of business process reengineering factors and information. PhD Dissertation University Utara Malaysia.

Ringim, K. J. (2012*). Effect of Business Process Reengineering Factors and Information technology Capability on Organizational performance.* Unpublished Thesis. University

Rogers, E. M (1969). Modernization and Peasant. New York: Holt Inc

Roscoe, J. T (1969) *Fundamental of Research Statistics for Behavioral Sciences*. New York, Holt Rinehart and Wiston inc.

Rostow, W.W. (1960). *Stages of economic growth*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Ruttan, V. W. (1984). Integrated rural development programmes: A historical perspective. *World Development*, *12*(4), 393-401.

Salisu,A. K.(2016).Socio-economic infrastructure and national development: an analytical assessment from Nigerian perspective, *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 21, 10, 21,(10),36-42

Salisu,A.K..et al.(2016).The state of socio-economic infrastructure and national development in Nigeria. *Yar'adua University Journal of Social and Management Sciences,* 1,(1).

Salkind, N. J. (1997). *Exploring research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sanusi, L. S. (2010). The Nigerian banking Industry: what went wrong and the way forward. *Annual Convocation Ceremony lecture At Bayero University, Kano held on, June, 2010*

Saunders,M., Thornhill,A.,Lewis,P. (2007).*Research method for business students*.Edingburg: Paerson Education Limited.

Seer, D. (1969). The Meaning of development. *International Development Review.* 19, (3)

Sekaran, Bougie, R (2013).*Research methods for business skill building approach*. United Kindom,Jonh Wiley and Sons Ltd.

Shah,P.B.and H.Schreier, (1995).Maintaining oil fertility in agriculture and forestry. Paper presentedattheChallengesinMountainResourcesManagementinNepalProcessTrendand DynamicsinMiddleMountainWatersheds,Kathmandu,Nepal,pp171-182

Shaheed, F. (2010). Contested identities: gendered politics, gendered religion. *Pakistan. Third World Quarterly*, 31(6), 851-867.

Shiru,J.J.(2008). Agricultural Mechanism for Rural Development. *Bida Journal of Management and Technology*, 1, (1).

Shumpeter, J. (1934) *The Theory of economic development*. Cambridge: Mass Harvard University Press.

Sindhu, P. S., Frailong, J. M., Curry, D. J., Nafarieh, A., & Kletter, D. (2001). *U.S. Patent No. 6,175,650.* Washington, DC: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

Singer, H. (1970). Dualism Revisited. *Journal of Development Studies* ,4, (67)

Spencer, L. & Ritchie, J., (2002). *Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research.* The qualitative researcher's companion, 573, 305-329.

Sriniv G. B (2013). Infrastructure development and economic growth: prospect and perspective. *International Journal Of Business Management And Social Science Research*, 2, (1).

Stephen I N; Geoge M. O; Bonaventure W. K.(2012). Collective efficiency and its effect on infrastructure planning to development for small enterprise in Kenya. *International Journal Business And Public Management*, 1, (1), 75-80.

SUBEB (2014).State universal basic education board.Annual report 2013/14.

Tersoo,P.(2014).Agribusiness as a veritable tool for rural development in Nigeria. *International Letters of Social and Humanities Science,* 14,-26-36

Timothy. O (2013). Challenges and prospects of agriculture in Nigeria: The way forward. *Journal of Economic and Sustainable Development* 4, (16),

Timothy. O (2013). Challenges and prospects of agriculture in Nigeria: The way forward. *Journal of Economic and Sustainable Development* , 4, (16), 78-85

Todaro M. P., Smith S. C. (2012). *Economic development*. India: Pearson Education Ltd.

Tsuneaki Yoshida (2000). Japan's Experience in Infrastructure Development and Development Cooperation. *JIBC Review, 2, (3).*

Tunde, A. M., & Adeniyi, E. E. (2012). Impact of road transport on agricultural development: A Nigerian example. *Ethiopian Journal of Environmental Studies and Management*, 5(3), 232-238.

Udo, M., Wakayoshi, K., Yoshida, T, Harada, T., Moritani, T., Mutoh, Y., & Miyashita, M. (1993). Does critical swimming velocity represent exercise intensity at maximal lactate steady state?. *European journal of applied physiology and occupational physiology*, *66*(1), 90-95.

UNDP (2012) .Rural development for developing economies. *TheUnitedNationsDevelopment Programme,Washington DC.*

UnegboV.E. (2012).Infrastructure as the bane to rural-urban migration in local government in Nigeria. *Kuwait Journal of Business and Management Review*,2, (3), 24-30

UNESCO & International bureau of education (2010).World data on education, 7th Edition, 2010/11. http://www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/WDE/2010/pdf-versions/Nigeria.

United Nation (2003). An assessment of the private sector in Nigeria. The Bank Group, Washington D. C., Retrieved from: http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/nigeria 19, March,2015

United Nation (2006). Employment and rural development. .Food and Agricultural Organization of United Nation Policy Issues in Development.

United Nation (2009). Agricuture and rural development. .Food and Agricultural Organization of United Nation Policy Issues in Development.

United Nation (2013). Rural infrastructure in developing countries, challenges and prospects . The Bank Group, Washington D. C., Retrieved from: http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/nigeria 20 June, ,2015

United Nation Statistics Division (2012). Gender parity index in primary level enrollment http://data.un.org/data.aspx?q=nigeria&d=MDG&f=seriesRowID%3A611%3BcountryID%3A566#MDG.

Usman (2004) The Effect of Local Government Expenditure on Rural Development: *The Nigerian Journal of Administrative Studies* 2 , (1),

Utara Malaysia.

Vincent E. Unegble(2014). Infrastructure as avenue to rural urban migration in local government areas in Nigeria. *Arabian journal of Business management review*,2, (3).

Wallman, S. (1969). *Perception of Development*. London: Vikas Publishing House.

Walter R. (1972). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle Lourer Publication

Wiliams, S.K.T . (1975). *Rural development in Nigeria*. Ile-Efe: University Press.

William (2010). Rural Development is design to improve the social and economic condition of the rural communities. *World Bank World Development Report, Oxford University Press.*

Williams, G. (1976). *Nigerian Economy And History*. London: Recollius.

World Bank (2010). Agriculture and rural development.

World Bank (2012). Agriculture and Rural Development. *Ethiopian Journal of Environmental Studies and Management*, 6, (2) 20-28

World Bank (20210). Agriculture and rural development. *Ethiopian Journal of Environmental Studies and Management* . 6 ,(8),89-96

World Bank, (2002). An Assessment of the private sector in Nigeria, *The Bank Group, Washington D. C.*

World Bank, (2014). An assessment of the private sector contribution to rural development in Nigeria, *The Bank Group, Washington D. C.*,

World Bank, (2014). Effect of education on rural development in Nigeria. The Bank Group, Washington D. C., Retrieved from: http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/nigeria 25, April, 2015

Yahaya, S., Ahmad, N., & Abdullah, R. F. (2010). Multicriteria analysis for flood vulnerable areas in Hadejia-Jama'are River basin, *Nigeria Administrative Review,* 4 , (7)

Yusuf,M,O.(2007).Private pector initiatives and infrastructure development in Nigeria.

Robert, C. (1983). *Rural development: Putting the last first*. London: Gage

APPENDIX IA

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE RURAL COMMUNITY KATSINA STATE

TO

The respondent

This Research questionnaire is on the "Effect of Socio-Economic Infrastructure on Rural Development in Katsina State".

This questionnaire is intended to collect data on the above topic for an MPHIL/ADMIN/871/2011-2012 certificate. We need your kind cooperation in filling out the questionnaire by ticking and commenting where necessary. Finally, we assure you of utmost confidentiality with regards to the information you will give us.

Thank You

Salisu Ahmed Kabiru

Section A: Socio-Demographic Variables of the Respondent

1. **Sex:**

   a. Female [ ] b.Male [ ]

2. **Marital status**

   a. Single [ ] b. Married [ ] c.Divorced [ ] d. Widow [ ]

3. **Age**

a. 18-25 [ ] b.26-33 [ ] c.34-41 [ ] d.42-49 [ ]d.50 and above [ ]

4. **Level of Educational Qualification**

a. PG [ ] b. Degree [ ] c..NCE [ ] d.SSCE/NECO [ ] f.Primary Cert [ ] e.Islamic [ ]

5. **Occupation**

   a. Farming [ ] Civil Servant [ ] Self-employed [ ] Unemployed [ ]

Section B: Question in Relation To Educational Infrastructure

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements below by ticking the appropriate column.

	School	**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Agree**	**Strongly agree**
SI.1	There is enough schools Infrastructure in your community					
SI.2	There is relationship between school infrastructure and rural development.					
SI.3	Adequate provision of school Infrastructure induces rural development					
SI.4	There will be no development in the rural areas without adequate provision of school Infrastructure					

SI.5	The condition of school infrastructure in the rural areas is good					

Section C: Questions in relation to electricity infrastructure: Please indicate your opinion as regard the following statement based on scale below

	Electricity infrastructure	**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Agree**	**Strongly agree**
E.1	There is electricity in your community					
E.2	There is relationship between electricity and rural development					
E.3	Adequate provision of electricity induces rural development					
E.4	There will no rural development without adequate provision of electricity					
E.5	There is regular supply of electricity in your community					
E.6	The transformers in your community are in a good condition					
E.7	Provision of electricity boost economic activities					

Section d: Questions in relation to market infrastructure : Please indicate your opinion as regard the following statement based on scale below

	Market infrastructure	**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Agree**	**Strongly agree**
M.1	There market Infrastructure in your community					
M.2	The market provided in your community is adequate					
M.3	Adequate provision of market Infrastructure induces Rural Development					
M.4	There will be no development in the rural areas without adequate provision of market Infrastructure					
M.5	The condition of market infrastructure in your areas is good					

Section e: Questions in relation to road infrastructure: Please indicate your opinion as regard the following statement based on scale below

	Road infrastructure	**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Agree**	**Strongly agree**
R.1	There is enough road Infrastructure in your community					

R.2	There is relationship between road infrastructure and rural development.					
R.3	Adequate provision of road Infrastructure induces rural development					
R.4	There will be no development in the rural areas without adequate provision of road Infrastructure					
R.5	The condition of road infrastructure in the rural areas is good					

Section f: Questions in relation to healthcare Infrastructure: Please indicate your opinion as regard the following statement based on scale below

	Healthcare infrastructure	**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Agree**	**Strongly agree**
H.1	There is healthcare Infrastructure in your community					
H.2	The healthcare infrastructure is enough to cater for your community					
H.3	The distance to a health center is far					
H.4	The healthcare facilities are functional					
H.5	The healthcare facilities are absolete					
H.6	The healthcare center has a laboratory					
H.7	The healthcare center is stock with drug					
H.8	The healthcare do immunization services					
H.9	The healthcare do provide family planning services					
H.10	The healthcare center in your community has competent health personnel					
H.11	The health care center has a doctor					
H.12	There is relationship between provision of healthcare infrastructure and rural development.					
H.13	There will be no development in the rural areas without adequate provision of healthcare Infrastructure					

H.14	The condition of healthcare infrastructure in the rural areas is good					

Section k: Questions in relation to DV rural development: Please indicate your opinion as regard the following statement based on scale below

	Rural Development	**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Agree**	**Strongly agree**
RD.1	The income of your rural community has increased over the years					
H.2	Poverty has been reduced in your rural community over the years					
H.3	There has been improvement in the provision of healthcare services in your rural areas over the past years					
H.4	Life expectance has increased in your rural areas over the past years					
H.5	There has been improvement in the provision of electricity in your rural community					
H.6	Water supply has improved over the years					
H.7	The road provided in your rural community is connected to the market and amphoe					
H.8	Sanitation in your rural community has improved over the years					
H.9	Most houses in your rural community has decent toilet					
H.10	The people gaining employment in your rural community has increased over the years					
H.11	There has been increased agricultural productivity in your rural community due to government intervention					
H.12	There has been increased in access to different channels of communication over the years					
H.13	Access to basic education in your community has increased					

H.14	Youth gaining admission to higher education has increased in your rural community over the years					

APPENDIX 1B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS OF MINISTRY OF SOCIAL AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT KATSINA STATE

TO

The respondent

This Research questionnaire is on "Effect of Socio-Economic Infrastructure on Rural Development in Katsina State".

This questionnaire is intended to collect data on the above topic for an MPHIL/ADMIN/871/2011-2012 certificate. We need your kind cooperation in filling out the questionnaire by ticking and commenting where necessary. Finally, we assure you of utmost confidentiality with regards to the information you will give us.

Thank You

Salisu Ahmed Kabiru

Section A: Socio-Demographic Variables of the Respondent

1. **Sex:**

a. Female [ ] b.Male [ ]

2. **Marital status**

a. Single [ ] b. Married [ ] c.Divorced [ ] d. Widow [ ]

3. **Age**

a. 18-25 [ ] b.26-33 [ ] c.34-41 [ ] d.42-49 [ ]d.50 and above [ ]

4. **Level of Educational Qualification**

a. PG [ ] b. Degree [ ] c..NCE [ ] d.SSCE/NECO [ ] f.Primary Cert [ ]

5. **Lengths of service**

a. 5-10 years [ ] b.11-16 [ ] c.17-22 [ ] d.23-28 [ ]e. 28-35 [ ]

SECTION B: Questions in relation to socio-economic infrastructure

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements below by ticking ( )

S/NO	ITEM	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
SE.1	The government gives priority to the development of rural areas					
SE.2	The objective of providing socio-economic infrastructure in rural areas is to develop the					

	rural areas					
SE.3	There is relationship between socio-economic infrastructure and Rural Development.					
SE.4	Adequate provision of socio-economic infrastructure induces rural development					
SE.5	Socio-economic infrastructure plays a significant role in improving the standard of living of rural people					
SE.6	The State provide socio-economic infrastructure sufficiently					
SE.7	There will be no development in the rural areas without adequate provision of socio-economic Infrastructur					

APPENDIX 2A

GROUP INTERVIEW SCHEDULE AND CHECKLIST FOR THE RURAL PEOPLE

TO

The respondent

This Research Interview is on the "Effect of Socio-Economic Infrastructure on Rural Development in Katsina State".

This questionnaire is intended to collect data on the above topic for An MPHIL/ADMIN/871/2011-2012 Certificate. We need your kind cooperation in filling out the questionnaire by ticking and commenting where necessary. Finally, we assure you of utmost confidentiality with regards to the information you will give us.

Thank You

Salisu Ahmed Kabiru

Time of the Interview----------

Place of the Interview----------

Date of the Interview----------

Interviewee----------

Question in Relation To Educational Infrastructure

1. What is rural development?----------

---

2 How do you see rural development in katsina state?----------

---

3. Do you think what the government is doing in terms of provision of socio-economic infrastructure is enough to develop the rural areas?----------

---

4. Do you think the government meet your aspiration in terms of rural development ----------

---

5. Does the government provide water, electricity, road, schools and healthcare infrastructure sufficiently to cater for the teeming number of rural people----------

---

6. How can you describe the effects of socioeconomic infrastructure on rural development?----------

---

7. How do you describe the condition of socio-economic infrastructures in your areas ? ----------

---

8. Does adequate provision of socio-economic infrastructure brings about rural development?----------

---

9. What do you think can be done in order to improve the provision of socio-economic infrastructure in order to develop the rural areas----------

10. Do you think the funding of socio-economic infrastructure by the state is adequate? ----------11.What others means do you think government can use in order to develop the rural areas ?----------

---

12. Do you think government alone can provide needed socio-economic infrastructure for rural development----------

---

APPENDIX 2B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR STAFF OF MINISTRY OF SOCIAL AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT.

TO

The respondent

This Research Interview is on the "Effect of Socio-Economic Infrastructure on Rural Development in Katsina State".

This questionnaire is intended to collect data on the above topic for An MPHIL/ADMIN/871/2011-2012 Certificate. We need your kind cooperation in filling out the questionnaire by ticking and commenting where necessary. Finally, we assure you of utmost confidentiality with regards to the information you will give us.

Thank You

Salisu Ahmed Kabiru

Time of the Interview----------

Place of the Interview----------

Date of the Interview----------

Interviewee----------

Question in Relation To Educational Infrastructure

1.What is rural development?----------

2.Can you describe the quality of your staff----------3.What objectives your ministry has been designed to achieve----------

---

4.How efficient is your ministry in discharging its duty in developing the rural areas----------

---

5. How available the following infrastructures water, electricity, road, schools, healthcare and are they sufficiently supply in order to develop the rural communities----------

6.How can you describe the effects of socioeconomic infrastructure on rural development?----------

7. How do you describe the condition of socio-economic infrastructures in the rural areas ? ----------

8. In your opinion what are the major problems of rural development ----------

9. What do you think can be done to over the problems----------

10. How do you coordinate the activities of the ministry with those involve in rural development----------

11. How effective is the collaboration between your ministry and other agencies who are involve in rural development----------

12.Do you think the funding of socio-economic infrastructure by the state is adequate ?----------

13. What is your overall assessment of rural development effort in the state.----------

APPENDIX 3

CHECK LIST FOR OBSERVATION

1 Condition and availability of infrastructure in schools in the selected areas

2 Condition and availability of road infrastructure in the selected areas

3 Condition and availability of market infrastructure in the selected areas

4 Condition and availability of road infrastructure in the selected areas

APPENDIX 4



The Picture above depicted dilapidated classroom where students are seated on the floor in government junior secondary school in Dandume

APPENDIX 5



The Picture above depicted a shop among the block of shops constructed by Mani local Government.

APPENDIX 6



The Picture above depict a non-functional borehole in Dandume area of Katsina state.

APPENDIX 7



The Picture above depict a one of road recently constructed by Katsina state Government

APPENDIX 8 A

OUTPUT RESULT FOR HYPOTHESIS 1

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.588	.136		11.680	.000
	Sch	.252	.033	.361	7.723	.000

a. Dependent Variable: RD

APPENDIX 8 B

OUTPUT RESULT FOR HYPOTHESIS 2

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.457	.166		8.794	.000
	Elect	.330	.040	.383	8.282	.000

a. Dependent Variable: RD

APPENDIX 8 C

OUTPUT RESULT FOR HYPOTHESIS 3

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.017	.183		5.560	.000
	Market	.683	.044	.615	15.542	.000

a. Dependent Variable: RD

APPENDIX 8 D

OUTPUT RESULT FOR HYPOTHESIS 4

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.975	.119		16.616	.000
	Road	.169	.030	.269	5.563	.000

a. Dependent Variable: RD

APPENDIX 8 E

OUTPUT RESULT FOR HYPOTHESIS 5

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.726	.179		15.193	.000
	Healthcare	.517	.067	.361	7.723	.000

a. Dependent Variable: RD