

**IMPACT OF IFAD COMMUNITY-BASED AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME ON RURAL LIVELIHOOD IN YOBE STATE,  
NIGERIA**

**BY**

**Mohammed GALADIMA  
M.Sc /Agric/10739/2008-2009**

**BEING A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF POSTGRADUATE  
STUDIES, AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY ZARIA, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER OF SCIENCE  
DEGREE IN AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION AND RURAL  
SOCIOLOGY**

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS AND  
RURAL SOCIOLOGY  
FACULTY OF AGRICULTURE  
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA  
NIGERIA**

**MARCH, 2014**

**DECLARATION**

I hereby declare that this Thesis titled “**Impact of IFAD Community-Based Agricultural and Rural Development Programme on Rural Livelihood in Yobe State, Nigeria**” has been written by me and it is a record of my research work. No part of this work has been presented in any previous application for another degree or diploma at any institution. All borrowed ideas have been duly acknowledged in the text and a list of references provided.

---

**Mohammed GALADIMA**  
Student

---

**Date**

**CERTIFICATION**

This Thesis, entitled “**Impact Of IFAD Community-Based Agricultural and Rural Development Programme On Rural Livelihood In Yobe State, Nigeria**” by Mohammed **GALADIMA**, meets the regulations governing the award of degree of Master of Science of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

---

**Prof. T.K. Atala**  
Chairman, Supervisory Committee

---

Date

---

**Dr. M.O. Akinola**  
Member, Supervisory Committee

---

Date

---

**Prof. Z. Abdulsalam**  
Head, Department of Agricultural  
Economics and Rural Sociology

---

Date

---

**Prof. A. A. Joshua**  
Dean, Postgraduate School

---

Date

**DEDICATION**

This research work is dedicated to ALLAH Sub-hanahu-wata'ala and to those whom I most admire, those whose wisdom lifted me up, my beloved parents, Ummi Aisha Ibrahim and Malam Galadima Alhaji Shuiabu Dagona; and of course to my siblings, wife and the children.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the name of ALLAH Most Gracious and the Merciful; Master in the day of resurrection. From Him we came and on to Him we shall return. May peace and blessing be upon our noble prophet Muhammad (S.A.W), his Family and Companion. I most therefore, be grateful to ALLAH for having the protection, strength, wisdom and guidance throughout the period of this thesis work.

I would like to express my infinite gratitude and appreciation to my Supervisors Prof. T. K. Atala, Chairman supervisory committee and Dr. M.O. Akinola, member supervisory committee whose attitudes, wisdom and rich substance of ingenuity conveyed the spirit of adventure throughout the period of this research work. May you all be rewarded abundantly. Also, gratitude and appreciation goes to my internal examiners Prof. E. I. Ikani and Dr. M.W. Musa, to them I owe my gratitude for tapping their wisdom of Knowledge. I remained indebted to my lecturers and staff in the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Ahmadu Bello University Zaria for their words of encouragement; Prof. Z. Abdulsalam (HOD), Prof D.F. Omokore, Prof. J.G. Akpoko, Prof. Ben Ahmed, Prof. Shehu Abdurrahman, Dr. M.A. Damisa, Dr. M.W. Musa, Dr. Yusuf Oseni, Mr. N.M. Sadiq, Mr. I. A. Akaa, M. Samaila and numerous well wishers whose names do not appear, may you all be blessed.

My warmest and infinite gratitude goes to my tentacles, my beloved siblings for their tireless words of encouragements, prayers and financial support, sister Hasiya, Hajiya Aisha, Khadija, Brother Adams who is always with me; Badamasi, Musa, Ustazu Ibrahim, Fatima (Nana), Hassan, Abdurrahman, Mualim, Aisha Kalila, Maina Audu, Sultan, Alhaji Karami, Hauwa and on to those who have gone but, fondly remembered, my late siblings Salma and Fahtima may both of them be admitted into Jannatul Firdausi.

My heartfelt and endless gratitude goes to my beloved wife “Adama” for her patience, tireless prayers and endurance. And of course on to my children Mamman, Aisha, Fahtima, Farida (Granny) and little Adams for their patience as at the time when I was away for the programme, may you all be blessed. My Father in-law Malam Sherrif Ali Dagona, his wife and the entire family members were to be appreciated for their prayers. I also, wish to thank all well wishers, friends and relatives more especially Mammadu Engineer, Dr. Sani Isa, A. Makinta, Ya Prof. (Gabaju), Baba Shehu Abubakar Dagona Ahmed A. Dagona, Baba Kachallah, Ya Kobilan, Baba Umaru, Baba Dori, M. Manzo Dagona, M. Hassan Kaku, My late uncle Muhammad Adamu Dagona and late Adamu Sherrif Dagona. Others are M. Abbas, Garba Madu Dagona, Hussaini Hon. Adamu Saleh Kachallah, Musa Bomo, Dr. Kura, Zakari Prof. M. Usman Potiskum and Isa, Shelly, Khuram and Family, Usman Bidas, Hon. Waya Dagari, Agojaji Dagona, my colleagues in the Department of Sociology, Yobe State University, Damaturu, Nigeria. My relatives and well wishers in Majalisan Dickson, my neighbors at home and the rest. My gratitude also, goes to my class mates Mr. Khalid Bello, Farouk, Chief Kyari, A. Abubakar, Mr. Bakut, Mrs. Gunn, Fatsuma and the rest. I am sincerely, indebted to State coordinator IFAD-CBARDP, Malan Ibrahim Bello, Musa Garba, Adamu Mato, Desk officer Karasuwa and that of Fune, Bursari respectively. My biggest thanks and blessing go to Mr. James Nandi for his tireless valuable suggestions to the successful completion of this thesis. Finally, I would like to thank all individuals who have helped or contributed in one way or other for the successful completion of this research work, may you all be rewarded infinitely. Amin.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
Title Page.....	i
Declaration.....	ii
Certification.....	iii
Dedication.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	v
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Tables.....	xi
List of Appendices.....	xii
Abstract.....	xiii
<b>Chapter 1</b> .....	<b>1</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Background of the Study .....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3. Objectives of the Study .....	6
1.4 Justification for the Study .....	7
1.5 Hypothesis:.....	8
<b>Chapter 2</b> .....	<b>9</b>
LITERATURE REVIEW .....	9
2.1 Concept of Impact.....	9
2.2 Previous Findings on the Studies of Impact.....	10
2.3. Rationale for IFAD Operations in Nigeria.....	12
2.3.1 Impact of IFAD Funded Operations .....	13

2.3.2	Relevance of IFAD Funded Operations.....	14
2.4	IFAD-CBARDP in Perspective .....	16
2.5	Previous Findings on Socio-economic Characteristics of the Beneficiaries in Agriculture and Rural Development Programmes.....	17
2.6	Perspectives on Rural Infrastructure Strategy for Socio-economic Development.....	19
2.6.1	Rural Physical Infrastructure .....	20
2.6.2	Rural Social Infrastructure.....	20
2.6.3	Rural Institutional Infrastructure.....	21
2.7	Previous Findings on Constraints to the Effective Performance of Agriculture and Rural Development Programme.....	21
2.8	Perspectives on Rural Development .....	22
2.9	The Concept of Livelihood .....	25
2.10	Theoretical Framework .....	27
2.10.1	Theories of Social Change .....	27
2.10.2	Social Intervention Theory .....	28
2.10.3	Social Impact Assessment (SIA) Perspective .....	29
<b>Chapter 3</b>	.....	<b>31</b>
METHODOLOGY	.....	31
3.1	Description of the Study Area.....	31
3.2	Sampling Techniques and Sample Size .....	32
3.3	Method of Data Collection.....	33
3.4	Analytical Techniques.....	33
3.4.1	Descriptive Statistics.....	34
3.4.2	Inferential Statistics ( t-test).....	34



3.5	Operational Indices .....	35
<b>Chapter 4</b>	.....	<b>37</b>
<b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>	.....	<b>37</b>
4.1	Socio-economic Characteristics of Respondents .....	37
4.1.1	Gender.....	37
4.1.2	Age.....	37
4.1.3	Marital Status.....	38
4.1.4	Household Size .....	38
4.1.5	Level of Education.....	38
4.1.6	Membership of Cooperative Society .....	38
4.1.7	Experience in the IFAD-CBARDP .....	39
4.1.8	Accessibilty to Credit.....	39
4.2	Infrastructure Provided by IFAD-CBARDP.....	41
4.3	Impact of IFAD-CBARDP on the Assets of the Beneficiaries.....	42
4.3.1	Hypothesis Testing.....	43
4.3.2	Employment Opportunities Provided by IFAD-CBARDP .....	44
4.4	Respondents Level of Satisfaction with Infrastructure Provided.....	45
4.4.1	Provision of Farm Inputs .....	45
4.4.2	Vocational Centres.....	45
4.4.3	Provision of Water/Borehole .....	46
4.4.4	Health Facilities Provided.....	46
4.4.5	Provision of Schools .....	46
4.4.6	Credit Facilities.....	47
4.5	Constraints Faced by Respondents in IFAD-CBARDP.....	48

<b>Chapter 5</b> .....	49
<b>SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	49
5.1 Summary .....	49
5.2 Conclusion .....	51
5.3 Recommendations .....	51
5.4 Suggestion for Further Studies.....	52
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	53
<b>Appendices</b> .....	59

**LIST OF TABLES**

<b>Table</b>		<b>Page</b>
Table 1:	Distribution of Sample Size by Local Government Areas.....	33
Table 2:	Socio-economic Characteristics of Respondents.....	40
Table 3:	Distribution of Infrastructure provided in order of respondents benefits	42
Table 4:	Distribution of Respondents According to Assets possessed.....	43
Table 5:	Impact of IFAD-CBARDP on the income of Respondents.....	44
Table 6:	Employment Opportunities Provided by IFAD-CBARDP.....	45
Table 7:	Respondents Level of Satisfaction with infrastructure provided....	47
Table 8:	Constraints Encountered by Beneficiaries of IFAD-CBARDP.....	48

## LIST OF APPENDICES

<b>Appendix</b>	<b>Page</b>
Appendix i: Baseline Analysis on Infrastructure before IFAD-BARDP .....	59
Appendix ii: Baseline Analysis on Assets possessed by Respondents before IFAD-CBARDP .....	60
Appendix iii: Baseline Data on Respondents annual Income before IFAD-CBARDP .....	61
Appendix iv: Baseline Analysis on Employment opportunities before IFAD-BARDP .....	65
Appendix v: Distribution of respondents according to their level of satisfaction on infrastructure provided .....	66
Appendix vi: Weighted Scores of level of satisfaction with infrastructure Provided .....	66
Appendix vii: Research Questionnaire .....	67

## ABSTRACT

Rural development is a veritable tool for fighting poverty and achieving economic prosperity at the grassroots level. The major thrust of this study was to examine the impact of IFAD Community-Based Agricultural and Rural Development Programme on Rural Livelihood in Yobe State, Nigeria. Specifically, the study described the socio-economic characteristics of respondents; identified and described the basic infrastructure provided; determined the impact of infrastructure provided on livelihood of respondents; determined the satisfaction level with the infrastructure provided in the communities and identified and described the constraints to effective performance of IFAD-CBARDP in the study area. A-structured questionnaire was used to elicit primary data from 160 respondents. Secondary data were the baseline data of IFAD-CBARDP. Descriptive and inferential statistics (t-test) were utilized for analyses. The findings revealed that, majorities (51%) of respondents were males, with average age of 40 years. About 97% were married, having a household size of between 5-10 persons, with about 68% of the respondent having an educational attainment of primary and secondary school. The result revealed that IFAD-CBARDP had impacted significantly ( $P < 0.1$ ) on the income of respondents at 10% level of probability. The programme had also recorded an increase in the number of assets and employment opportunities provided, after the first phase of the Programme implementation. Satisfaction level of respondents with the infrastructure provided was generally satisfactory. Nevertheless, low level of awareness, cultural factors and inadequate capital were the major constraints to effective performance of the Programme. It is therefore recommended that IFAD-CBARDP should be replicated in other Local Government Areas of the State for wider livelihood improvement. Programme planners and implementers should intensify awareness creation among rural dwellers and adopt the use of Community Driven Development approach (CDD) in the execution of Rural Development projects with poverty alleviation thrust as in the case of IFAD-CBARDP.

## Chapter 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Background to the Study

Majority of the world's population live in rural areas where they are engaged in agriculture (Taimi, 2003). Developing countries and their rural areas in particular are characterized by poverty, unemployment, unequal distribution of resources, acute shortage of social, physical institutional infrastructure and increasing rural-urban drift (Williams, 1978). While Poverty is real, endemic and devastating, Nigeria's rural population accounts for over 70 percent of poor households - more than 98 million people, and about 17 million households. The 2003-2004 Nigeria living standard survey indicated that States in the Sahel region recorded the highest incidence of poverty, with about 80 per cent of the population described as poor (IFAD, 2010). Nigeria's rural people are the most deprived of all Nigerians, having least access to services such as health, educational facilities, and access to modern agricultural input. In essence, infrastructural and institutional arrangements are deficient at the local level where most people who need them live (Voh, 1983).

According to Thor *et al.* (2001) rural transformation denotes a rapid improvement in the life of rural man and his physical environment. Whereas Smith (1973) opined that rural development is almost synonymous with agricultural development, which has been broadened recently to encompass the equitable and balanced transformation of complex social, economic, institutional, political, other relationships and process of rural development, including but not limited to agriculture, education, employment, health care and nutrition, voice in decision-making and actions that affect the live of rural dwellers.

Ijere (1988) contended that for rural development programme to succeed one of its major concerns should be to reflect the realities, needs and aspirations of the rural people. Similarly, Olukosi (2002) is equally of the opinion that for any development project to succeed there is

need to not only involve the community on development projects in a bottom-up manner but, empowering them to initiate projects based on their felt needs and priorities, plan by themselves and implemented by themselves with outsiders as facilitators. Participation of the rural people is thus considered a powerful instrument for meeting this concern.

It should be noted that, most past policies, strategies and interventions failed to achieve their objectives as a result of poor design (Tomori *et al.*, 2005). According to Ukpong (1989) the over-centralised strategy of the top-down approach which conceives development process as a paternalistic charity of the Government is no longer tenable or appropriate. Indeed, Government of Nigeria in the past has engaged in poverty reduction programmes though; many of them were not successful. These programmes had faulty backgrounds, riddled with corruption, no political will to do what is right and follow programmes to a logical conclusion. In some cases the programmes ended up enriching the political and military oligarchy with little or no benefit for the poor (Okeke, 2008).

Similarly, Iro (2008) reported that, some of the rural development focused programmes embarked upon by the Federal Government of Nigeria in the last three decades either lacked ecological and institutional focus and framework or members of the ruling party were favoured at the expense of members of other parties. Presently with Maduagwu's (2007) comment that Nigeria has over the years embarked on many poverty alleviation programmes but majority of these have had appreciable impact, one wonders if true poverty alleviation will not continue to be a mirage.

However, International Fund for Agricultural Development; Community-Based Agriculture and Rural Development Programme (IFAD-CBARDP); is an integrated agriculture and rural development programme aimed at improvement of livelihood and living conditions of the

rural poor with emphasis on women and other vulnerable groups, especially physically challenged and dejected people. The programme is jointly funded by International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN), and seven participating States -Borno, Jigawa, Katsina, Kebbi, Sokoto, Yobe and Zamfara; Sixty nine Local Government Councils (LGCs) in the seven states, where two hundred and seven (207) village areas (VAs) have been selected from the participating Local Government Councils and World Bank (WB) is the cooperating institution (IFAD, 2007).

According to Tijjani (2007) IFAD-CBARDP puts rural people in the driving seat when it comes to spending public money for local development. In Nigeria, the first phase of the programme came into being in January 2003 and elapsed in March 2010. The Yobe state programme was declared effective on the 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2003 following the fulfilment of loan covenants set forth for effectiveness. The programme had been implemented in Nine Local Government Areas of the State namely; Karasuwa, Yusufari, Bursari, Nangere, Yunusari, Tarmuwa, Machina, Fika, Fune and their respective 27 village areas. Hence, the need to examine the programme on how it impacted on the livelihood of the beneficiaries in the study area is very imperative.

## **1.2 Statement of Problem**

The issue of poverty in Nigeria has been described as “widespread and severe” (CBN/World Bank, 1996). This is in spite of the country’s vast resources. Thus, poverty situation of rural poor and vulnerable groups in developing countries like Nigeria, and the need for its improvement as a means of empowering the beneficiaries, has led to the conceptualization of various targeted and non-targeted poverty alleviation programmes worldwide (Babatunde, 2006). An example of such programme is IFAD-Community Based Agricultural and Rural Development Programme (IFAD-CBARDP), which was



design to address this problem of poverty by improving the livelihood, and living condition of rural poor dwellers, using Community Driven Development (CDD) approach, which was seen as efficient and effective approach to poverty alleviation in Nigeria and subsequently, in the implementation of IFAD-CBARDP

It is factual that, majority of the people in Nigeria live in rural areas with low level of education, inadequate infrastructure, poor health delivery services, insufficient agricultural inputs, poor road network among other things. Poverty in the rural areas is as a result of inadequate or poor infrastructure such as: processing, storage, packaging, credit, health and educational facilities. Others include: roads, water, electricity supply and marketing services. These multidimensional causes of material and non-material deprivation make poverty to be very endemic in Nigeria, federal office of statistics (FOS, 1996). It is therefore, contended that the supplies of communication facilities, electricity, vocational schools and water in rural communities, for example, improve the quality of rural life as well as promotes socio-economic integration (Voh, 1983).

However, despite all the effort made by government and non-governmental organizations in Nigeria, there have been stagnant levels of socio-economic development, especially in the rural and semi rural areas. This has led Nigerian government to devote its attention in the implementation of various policies and rural poverty alleviation programmes. Note that, most past policies failed to achieve desired objectives due to top-down policies in which development programmes are forced on people regardless of their felt need (Ijere, 1992).

Since, the concept of IFAD-CBARDP was primarily meant to improve the livelihood and living condition of rural poor dwellers in benefitting communities. Nonetheless, this study

intends to visualise the impact of the programme on three major components (awareness/capacity building and community infrastructure) which had not been investigated; whereas, impact assessment studies of other programmes had been carried out by Simonyan and Omolehin (2012) on the Analysis of impact of Fadama II on Beneficiary Farmers Income in Kaduna State: A Double Difference Approach; Agbiokoro (2010) also carried out a study on the Impact of National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) on Economic Development of Nigeria; Kudi *et al.* (2008) also, conducted a study on the Analysis of the Impact of National Fadama Development Project (NFD II) in alleviating Poverty among Farmers in Giwa Local Government Area of Kaduna State and Othman (2006) Conducted a similar Study on the Impact of Community- Based Organizations on Rural Development in Kano State, Nigeria, all of which were carried out to ascertain if the programmes improved the livelihood of the beneficiaries or not. They all reported positive impact of the programme to the beneficiaries. All the studies conducted on assessment of IFAD operations neglected the aspect of livelihood (Ahmadu *et al.*, 2012, Galadima, 2013), making these studies incomplete, hence, creating a gap for further studies. After the first phase of the programme it was not empirically clear on to what extent IFAD Community-Based Agriculture and Rural Development had impacted on the livelihood of benefitting rural communities in Yobe State. It was against this background that this research intended to address the following questions:

- i. what are the socio-economic characteristics of respondents in the benefiting communities?
- ii. What are the levels of accessibility of basic infrastructure provided to the communities by the IFAD-CBARDP?
- iii. what are the impact of infrastructure provided by IFAD-CBARDP on the livelihood of people in the study area?

- iv. what is the level of peoples' satisfaction with infrastructure provided by IFAD CBARDP to the communities in the study area?
- v. what are the constraints to the effective performance of IFAD-CBARDP in the study area?

### **1.3. Objectives of the Study**

The broad objective of the study was to examine the impact of IFAD-CBARDP on rural livelihood in Yobe State, Nigeria. The specific objectives were to:

- i. describe the socio-economic characteristics of respondents in benefitting communities;
- ii. identify and describe the level of accessibility of basic infrastructure provided to the communities by the IFAD-CBARDP;
- iii. determine the impact of infrastructure provided by IFAD-CBARDP on the livelihood of the communities;
- iv. determine respondents' level of satisfaction with infrastructure provided by IFAD-CBARDP in the communities; and
- v. identify and describe the constraints to the effective performance of IFAD-CBARDP in the study area.

### **1.4 Justification for the Study**

Rural development is a veritable tool for fighting poverty and achieving economic prosperity at grass root level. It is a means of providing basic amenities, infrastructure, improved agricultural productivity, extension services and employment generation for the rural dwellers (Idachaba, 2000). He further stress that, it is an integrated approach to food production, provision of physical, social and institutional infrastructures with an ultimate goal of bringing about good health care delivery system, affordable and quality

education, improved and sustainable agriculture. This study intends to throw light on the impact of IFAD-CBARDP on the livelihood of benefiting communities in the study area. The findings would therefore, help to objectively review the impact of IFAD-CBARDP on the target group as a basis for policy formulation and programme design, particularly on rural livelihood. In addition, this could bring comprehensive knowledge of the performance of such organizations to the stakeholders to know whether the programme had made positive impact on the beneficiaries or not. Also, policy makers at all levels of government would benefit from the information gathered in the study. Finally, the study could serve as bases for further research on the perception of IFAD-CBARDP.

### **1.5 Hypothesis**

The following hypothesis was tested in a null form:

Ho: “IFAD-CBARDP has not improved the livelihood of people in the benefiting communities of the study area”.

## Chapter 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1 Concept of Impact

Impact according to IAEG (1999) can be broadly defined as target attainment of long term economic, social and environmental effects resulting from research findings. Similarly, Sanginga *et al.* (1999) stated that impact analysis deals with the investigation of the changes that occurred or likely to occur on the people's life as a result of a programme. They further stress that, impact assessment tries to find out how far the introduction of technology has been successful in meeting the socio-economic objectives and how well agricultural technologies have satisfied the needs and priorities of household and other units in the target population. It is a special form of evaluation that deals with the effect of intervention programme output on the target beneficiaries. Thus, impact of a programme can be seen in relation to what services actually do to people who receive them. In the same manner, Hilton and Lunsdaine (1975) suggested that programmes should be assessed considering the desirability of the goals or outcome sought and the extent to which the goals are furthered by demonstrable effect. Alene *et al.*, (2006) therefore are of the opinion that, impact studies is of great importance in agriculture and rural development researches because, it is used to identify alternative

technologies that would address the major production constraints while at the same time taking into consideration farmers preferences and farming conditions.

From the foregoing, Gilbert *et al.* (1975) observed that, social intervention may have more than one goal, which may affect the choice of criteria in assessing impact. Under these circumstances of multiple goals, it is desirable to use more than one outcome as a measure of impact. For instance, the overall objective of IFAD-CBARDP development programme is to promote the adoption of Community Driven Development (CDD) Approach in solving poverty, land degradation and agricultural output in the programme area. This will lead to the improvement of livelihood and upgrading of the living standard of rural poor in benefitting communities.

It should be noted that, in conducting impact assessment, researchers often use “with and without” impact method, while others use the “before” and “after” method. The “with and without” approach to impact study involves the study of population, villages or communities that benefitted or did not benefit from the execution of a project. Manyong *et al.* (2001) opined that, impact assessment of agricultural development projects is a continuous process and therefore being a process, it is better conceptualised to use the before and after impact assessment approach. For the purpose of this research, the before and after was used. This is because using the approach may likely give much proper assessment on the impact of IFAD-CBARDP on rural livelihood in the study area.

## **2.2 Previous Findings on the Studies of Impact**

Various researches have been conducted on the study of impact and other related impact assessment studies. A research carried out by Simonyan and Omolehin (2012) on “Analysis of Impact of Fadama II Project on Beneficiary Farmers Income in Kaduna State:

A Double Difference Method Approach'' revealed that, during Fadama II project, the income of the beneficiary farmers increased significantly more than before the project and also more than the non-beneficiaries' income. Double difference analysis result further proved the fact that, the increase in income realized by the beneficiary farmers was attributed to their participation in Fadama II project based on the positive mean income value obtained which was significant at  $P < 0.1$  % level of probability. The study recommends intensive advisory services by the KADP Fadama II project on resource allocation and utilization and other means of increasing farmers' beneficiary income further.

Similarly, a research was carried out by Kudi *et al.* (2008) on the Analysis of the Impact of National Fadama Development Project II (NFDP II) in Alleviating Poverty among Farmers in Giwa Local Government Area of Kaduna State, Nigeria. The findings revealed that, the efficiencies were positively and significantly correlated with years of irrigation farming, number of visits by extension agents, level of education, household size and ownership of water pump. The findings of the study therefore revealed that Fadama Development Project II had positive impact on the participating farmers in Giwa Local Government Area. The programme had also increased the income of the participants, enhanced their access to farm inputs at subsidized rate and increased training and knowledge and thus, had the potential for alleviating rural poverty.

Furthermore, research on impact was carried out by Agbiokoro (2010) on the Impact of National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) on Economic Development of Nigeria. The study revealed that while the awareness level of NAPEP and her programmes were successful, the implementation level remained very minimal; NAPEP helped in improving the standard of living of Nigerians in the rural areas. Most people believe that the

operations of NAPEP could boost economic development in Nigeria. The report concluded that notwithstanding the problems encountered by previous poverty eradication programmes in Nigeria, the National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) still had impacted significantly on the economic development of Nigeria.

A study was also, conducted by Othman (2006) on the impact of Community Based Organizations on Rural Development in Kano State, Nigeria revealed that Community Based Organizations played a key role in the provision of infrastructure such as feeder road rehabilitation, provision of water for domestic purposes, building of class rooms and other social courtesies. However, the major constraints to the effective implementation were inadequate funding, politics, and lack of capacity building/ training. Also, Barnabas (2011) conducted a study on the impact of Millennium Village Project (MVP) in Pampaida Saulawa District of Ikara Local Government Area of Kaduna State. The research revealed that, age, income, extension contact and gender, were among the major factors that influence the participation of beneficiaries in MVP. He further revealed that drugs and farm inputs greatly increased the output and income of respondents. Research was also carried out by Adeolu *et al.* (2004) on the impact of the National Fadama Facility in Alleviating Poverty and Enhancing Agricultural Development in South-Western Nigeria, revealed that the programme had some positive impact on the participating farmers in the study area. The result further indicated that, there were positive increased in assets base of participants as well as their income by about three times, enhanced access to farm inputs, increased training and knowledge base of the participants in low-land irrigation farming. The programme had ensured high level of technical efficiency of participants. Therefore, these results suggested that, the programme had a positive impact on the participants and brought about wider potentials of alleviating rural poverty in the study area,

### **2.3. Rationale for IFAD Operations in Nigeria**



The Country Programme Evaluation Report (CPE) of IFAD (2010) revealed that, Nigeria is one of the world's largest producers of oil. Its Gross Domestic Product (GDP) has increased fivefold since 1990 and stands in 2007 at 140 billion US Dollars, given a GDP per capita of 10% per annum. Hence, Nigeria's 140 million populations are still among the poorest in the World. The country was ranked 158<sup>th</sup> in the world out of 177 Nations in Human Development Index (HDI) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and 80<sup>th</sup> out of 108 in the Poverty Index (PI). Apart from the oil sector, the economy is agrarian based and the bias of poverty is to the rural areas (IFAD, 2010)

### **2.3.1 Impact of IFAD funded operations**

According to IFAD (2010) the evolution of the portfolio of the programme in Nigeria from 1985 to 2006 followed a logical pattern of synergy of coverage and content, building on and expanding successful aspects of previous projects. This is best seen in the community-driven development (CDD) modality and Local Government Area (LGA) involvement; in capability-building from Katsina and Sokoto Projects being incorporated in the Community - Based Agricultural and Rural Development Programme (CBARDP) and Community-Based Natural Resources Management Programme (CBNRMP); and the latter drawing lessons also from the Cassava Multiplication and Artisanal Fisheries Development Projects. Synergy in the portfolio also contributes to performance, coinciding on strong themes of enhancing social facilities and services and improving food security and incomes of poor rural households. The new Rural Financial Institution Building Programme (RUFIN) and Rural Micro Enterprise Development Programmes (RUMEDP) take IFAD into a different spectrum of development as to content, institutional framework for implementation and some new States.

However, the prevailing pattern of funding of earlier projects was planned as follows:

i) Funding of IFAD Operations in Nigeria:

- IFAD = 40-60 %

- FGN = 12-15 %
- States and LGAS= 3-4 %
- Beneficiaries can contribute either in Labour, or similar activities.

ii. Actual out –turns of IFAD operations in Nigeria.

- IFAD = 60-70 %
- FGN = 5 %
- States / LGAS = 15- 16 %

iii. Recent programmes funding

- IFAD = 40 %
- Federal, States and Local Governments = 60 %

### **2.3.2 Relevance of IFAD funded operations**

The first measure of relevance is comparison of project content with the key elements of the Country Strategic Opportunities (COSOP). On this count, there is a large degree of agreement on other factors of relevance, including orientation to poverty, livelihood, and implementation. Most of the interventions recorded positive results; the major exception is the second phase of Roots and Tuber Expansion Programme, RTEP, which is promoting an approach to cassava processing, is of questionable viability. The Country Strategic Opportunities (COSOP) observed a considerable range of implementation progress across the portfolio, but has particular concerns about the prospective performance of RTEP, phase-2, RUFIN and RUMEDP. The determination of efficiency is more complex. In Nigeria, the crucial constraints of the long duration of project preparation and the prevalent delays and denials of funding militate against efficient performance. Despite these factors, individual projects have reported progress in the construction of social infrastructure.

The rural poverty impact of the country programme is assessed primarily on the results of Katsina State Agricultural and Community Development Project, KSACDP, Sokoto State Agricultural and Community Development Project SSACDP and the first phase of RTEP; CBARDP and RTEP Phase-2, the discernible likely impact is also taken into account. The IFAD (2010) found out that, outreach to the targeted population has been less than planned. Nevertheless, there has been positive change in the predicament of direct and indirect beneficiaries across all in terms of enhanced household food sufficiency, as well as modest increases in family incomes; better accessibility to health, education and transport services; and a marked change in community and women's confidence and self-reliance.

Nonetheless, notable impacts have been attained in the enhancement of physical and financial assets, social capital and empowerment, and food security. Less impressive impacts have been recorded in agricultural productivity, environment and common resources, and market access. The sustainability of impact is mainly determined by project design and implementation effectiveness, but also by the government emphasis on funding for agriculture. Thus, the political, economic and social facets of sustainability are reasonably assured, while institutional sustainability is less certain. IFAD interventions have clearly been innovative, as demonstrated by the replication and scaling up to 26 States of the cassava productivity activities during the first phase of RTEP. RUFIN and RUMEDP have been designed to be replicated and scaled up.

The performance of partners in delivery of the country programme has been overshadowed by the inappropriate time taken for project preparation and implementation, the problems of inconsistent fund flows and the lack of urgency and decisiveness in taking action to resolve problems and improve progress. These factors impinge on the performance of all parties.

IFAD's performance has been constrained by lack of an in-country presence and the complexities of dealing with government without field presence and relying on cooperating institutions for supervision. The performance of federal government agencies has been variable. It is unclear whether the present arrangement with the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources (FMAWR) and the National Food Reserve Agency (NFRA) will be sufficient for developing more diverse programmes (IFAD, 2010)

#### **2.4 IFAD-CBARDP in perspective**

IFAD Community-Based Agriculture and Rural Development programme is an integrated agriculture and rural development programme aimed at improvement of livelihoods and living conditions of the rural poor and other vulnerable groups. The vulnerable groups in question are those made to feel less important in the scheme of things in the community and are deprived from several material resources such as land ownership and other resources. The groups includes: women; youths, physically challenged, individuals living with HIV/AIDS, and People who are suffering from the consequence of HIV/AIDS, orphans as well as the old. According to Chikwendu (2005) the needs of these groups are usually not considered when development issues are discussed, they are voiceless. The programme is jointly funded by International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN), and seven participating states, Sixty nine Local Government Councils (LGCs), where two hundred and seven (207) village areas (VAs) have been selected. Thus, the programme had an effective period of seven years. It ensures community participation in the design and implementation of the project activities and sustainability, by providing the institutional support that will enable service providers to participate effectively, and more responsive to the desires of the rural village areas (RVAs) using 'Community Driven Development' (CDD) approach, which was seen as efficient and effective approach to poverty alleviation in Nigeria and subsequently, in the implementation of IFAD-CBARDP (PCU, 2006).

The programme was however implemented through eight components: Sustainable Agric Development (SAD), Community Infrastructure(CI), Community Driven Development(CDD), Rural Enterprise Development and Financial Linkage Support (RDFLS), Gender and Vulnerable Group Development(GVD), Capacity Building Management and Training (CBMT), Monitoring and Evaluation (M &E) and Finance. The major objective of IFAD-CBARDP is to promote the adoption of community-based approach (CDD) in addressing the problems of poverty and agricultural output.

## **2.5 Previous Findings on Socio-economic Characteristics of the Beneficiaries in Agriculture and Rural Development Programmes**

A study conducted by Othman (2006) in Kano State, Nigeria on the impact of Community Based Organizations on rural development indicates that, 92% of participants were males, while their age ranges between 21-30 with (26%), 31-40 (9%), 40 and above (65%), with an average of 45 years. That means the findings revealed that in most rural communities there were more elderly people residing in the rural areas because of rural- urban migration by youth. The level of education of the respondents shows that they had formal educations. On their occupational status, farming is their major occupation with a total of 85 percent.

A research was equally conducted in Ghana by Emmanuel *et al.* (2006) which revealed that farmers, participation on irrigation projects had some formal education. Most of them fall between the ages of 35 to 45 years. Adekunle *et al.* (2004) also reported that in Katsina project, most farmers were male and involved in mixed farming. The findings revealed that, there was a higher income for participant than non participant in the irrigation project. Similarly, Sharma *et al.* (2003) reported in a study of Indian farm households that all were male-headed with an average family size did not vary significantly across the regions where the study was conducted. Likewise average age of household heads was above 40 years old

and the average age of commercial farmers was lower compared to other farm size categories, which indicates that younger farmers have strong preference for productivity. The result further revealed that, income level, farm size, social participation, extension contact, number of information sources used to introduced practices and extent of awareness are significantly related to the adoption of recommended farm practices.

According to Angba *et al.* (2009) in a study titled “effect of socio-economic factors on rural youth and their attitudes towards participation in community projects in River State Nigeria” revealed that some relationships exist between socio-demographic characteristics such as being indigenous to a community, length of residence in a community, gender, age, occupation, educational level and attitudes of youth towards community development projects.

## **2.6 Perspectives on Rural Infrastructure Strategy for Socio-economic Development**

This could be seen as a subject of the overall economic development strategy of developing countries. In essence, the rural infrastructure strategy is not an alternative to other poverty alleviation strategies for economic development, but an extension and natural revolution. According to Idachaba (1989) the general notion underlying the rural infrastructure strategy is that; it is difficult for the rural sector to contribute significantly to the economic progress in the absence of basic facilities that also enhance their living standards. Ayoola (2001) is also of the opinion that, the world approach is to launch massive attack on rural poverty, which will benefit the urban economy in the long run. In this connection, rural infrastructural build-up is considered as the primary requirement of the rural people to manifest their full economic potentials.

Ekong (2003), view infrastructure as those underlying basic physical, social and institutional terms of capital which enhance rural dwellers’ production, distribution and consumption

activities and ultimately the quality of their life. Often these include structures which cannot be privately provided and so call for large capital outlay on the part of the government.

The facilities were however, described under the three categories:

- (i) Rural physical infrastructures;
- (ii) Rural social infrastructure and
- (iii) Rural institutional infrastructure

### **2.6.1 Rural physical infrastructure**

- Rural roads; which cause accelerated delivery of farm input, reduce transportation costs and enhance spatial agricultural production efficiency.
- Storage facilities; which help to preserve foods in the farms that consumers need them and to the time they need them. On–farm storage also helps to stabilize inter- seasonal Supplies.
- Irrigation facilities; which assure farm water supply and stabilize food production by protecting the farm production system against uncontrollable and undesirable fluctuation in domestic food production.
- Building of schools and equipments
- Health centres
- Postal services, housing and recreational facilities.

### **2.6.2 Rural social infrastructure**

- Clean water, decent housing, environmental sanitation, personal hygiene and adequate nutrition which help to improve the quality of life.

- Formal and informal education which promote rural productivity by making the farmer able to decide agronomic and other information so as to carry out other desirable modern production practices; basic education also promotes feeding quality, dignity, self respect,- sense of belonging as well as political integration of the rural people.

### **2.6.3 Rural institutional infrastructure**

- Farmers unions and cooperatives which facilitates economics of scale and profitability of rural people.
- Agricultural extension which improves technological status of the farm business.

## **2.7 Previous Findings on Constraints to the Effective Performance of Agriculture and Rural Development Programme**

Research findings on the constraints to the effective performance of Agriculture and Rural Development Projects revealed that, most past policies, strategies and interventions failed to achieve their objectives as a result of poor design (Tomori *et al.*, 2005). In Nigeria, most of those policies were not successful due to “top-down policy in which development was forced on people regardless of their “felt needs” (Ijere, 1992). It was also revealed that, lack of understanding the socio-economic and socio-cultural factors of the communities or participants by projects’ implementers’ were stumbling block to the effective performance of Agriculture and Rural Development Projects (Wallace, 1979).

Bhagyalakshmi (2004) argued that empowerment and information go hand in hand; without information, no development can take firm root. The new opportunities can only



be provided when all the information needs of the community can be met to stimulate their awareness and better their capabilities. It was also revealed that, lack of education among women, linkages with Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), problem of leadership, politics, funding and awareness on the activities; capacity building and training were among the constraints that, limits the impact of community based organizations on rural development (Othman, 2006).

According to Verhelst (1990), rural development is however, meaningful when applied with the traditional knowledge and cultural values of the community. Imposition of external impetus serves to exacerbate or worsen the problems. Similarly, Ega *et al* (1989) opined that Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) shortfall on rural development programme is not due to lack of effort on the parts of them but, it is more of the paradoxes of their performance; it thus commonly noted in Nigeria that so far, the most successful element in rural development initiatives in the country is the propensity to failure.

## **2.8 Perspectives on Rural Development**

In an attempt to review all about the concept of “Rural Development” effort is being made to look at development as a concept. It can be safely argued that, development as a concept is a multi-dimensional or many- sided process. To some, it is merely quantitative change; meaning economic growth, while others see it as qualitative change, which means improvement in terms of living standard of people. According to Michael (2008), development is a multi-dimensional process involving changes in social structures, popular attitudes and national institution as well as the acceleration of economic growth, reduction of inequality and eradication abject poverty. Similarly, Todaro (1977) perceived development as a multi dimensional progress involving re- organization and re-orientation of the entire economic and

social system. This involves in addition to improvement of income, radical changes in institutional, social and administrative structures as well as people. From the foregoing, one can deduce that development as a concept is context –bounded and multi-faceted process. Therefore, any approach on development must be concerned with a peculiar type of social change with numerous dimensions, all of which are oriented towards making life better for all the citizens of a social and political community.

Rural Development as the central point of discussion is viewed as a process by which a set of technical, social, cultural and institutional measures are implemented with and for the inhabitants of rural areas with the aim of improving their socio-economic conditions in order to achieve harmony and balance both on the regional and national levels (Ekong, 2003). On the other hand, Williams (1979) is of the opinion that, rural development is a programme of change aimed at the elimination of poverty of rural dwellers and ultimate enhancement of their quality of life and general well-being. This entails the attainment of many related objectives.

These include:

- i. integrations of marginalised population into main stream of development process;
- ii. provision of basic human needs, including health, portable water, food, education and housing.
- iii. improvement in basic infrastructure such as roads, rural electricity and public facilities.
- iv. equitable distribution of resources, especially income.
- v. access to productive resources like land and credit facilities.
- vi. generation of employment opportunities;
- vii. provision of opportunities for selfless and dignified living through acquisition of skills and development of human resources.
- viii. transformation of fundamental institutions and organizations; and

- ix. opportunities for participation in decisions and actions affecting the lives of rural people.

He further stressed that, lessons from the past rural development programmes are that these objectives are hardly attained partly because of lack of initiatives or commitment of huge budgetary resources to the enterprise. Obinne (1997) also asserted that, rural development is a process of creating and widening opportunities for individuals to realize full potential through education and share in decisions and action which affect their lives. Olayide (1980) opined that, rural development as a process whereby concerted efforts are made to facilitate significant increase in rural resources and productivity with the central objective of enhancing rural income and creating employment opportunities in rural communities for rural dwellers. Hence, it is 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.

Thus, rural development is a cyclical process which is characterised by four main activities as reported by European Rural Development, ERD (2005): Analysis: what is the current situation? Policy: who are the main actors and what do they want? Modelling: which developments are possible? Implementation: which measures should be used? These four activities could be found in all kinds of development process and each nation will therefore, have to look inward to design an appropriate strategy on the basis of its peculiarities and developmental antecedents.

## **2.9 The Concept of Livelihood**

The term livelihood attempts to capture not just what people do in order to make a living, but the resources that provide them with capability to build a satisfactory living, the factors they must consider in managing their resources, the institutional and policy context that either helps or hinders them in their pursuit of an improved living. According to Kimble (1960), Prandit (1965) and Freeman (1975) describe livelihood as the ways in which people make a living; it mainly points to the economic resource base people have at their disposal to achieve. According to Frankkenberger and McCaston (1998) view the concept of livelihood; as the sustainable access to resources to meet basic needs including adequate access to food, portable water, health facilities, educational opportunities, housing, time for community participation and social integration. Ellis (1998) view livelihood as activities, the assets, and access that jointly determine the living gained by an individual or household. Furthermore, Dekker (2003) opined that, the current livelihood studies have concentrated on the actions and strategies of people trying to make a living in adverse circumstances such as economic and political adversity. He further, stated that the concept of livelihood is used mostly to address the issue of poverty that aims to be people – oriented, non-sectional and grounded in multidimensional reality on daily life. In essence, livelihood in this respect may be look into in terms of quality of life, level of living or way of life. Indeed, the concept of livelihood differs from one individual to another; likewise the index of livelihood varies from one context to another depending on the individual mode of life.

According to Anderson and Thampapillai (1990) livelihood indices are of five different assets upon which individuals draw to build their livelihoods. These are:

- Natural capital – land, water, vegetation, biodiversity, etc. and environmental services.
- Social capital – social resources (networks, groups, trust, social relations).
- Human capital – skills, knowledge, good health and ability to labour.

- Physical capital – basic infrastructure (transport, shelter, communication, energy).
- Financial capital – financial resources (savings, access to credit, bank loans, remittances, pensions).

They further asserted that, rural people maintain their livelihoods by accessing and drawing down on capital assets. It is by building up their stock of capital assets that rural people are able to enhance their livelihoods. Hence, how and how far they can do this is determined by the types of policies, structures and institutions (transforming structures and processes) they face, and the modifications which can be made to these. Close understanding is therefore needed of: processes (policies, laws, rules and incentives); structures (organisations, from layers of government through to the private sector); institutions (regularised patterns of behaviour structured by the rules and norms of society) which define individual livelihood options. A wide range of policies and institutions may impact on decisions to invest.

IFAD-CBARDP programme is therefore, one among the rural development policies aimed at improving the livelihood of rural poor and other vulnerable groups. It should be noted that, livelihood outcomes are the end result of the different combinations of livelihood strategies that people choose to follow. It is therefore, difficult for an outsider to judge what constitutes a positive or negative outcome. Hence, the outcomes people aspire to will vary greatly at all levels – within households, within communities, within regions and so on. At a broad level, common livelihood outcomes might include: more income; increased well-being; reduced vulnerability; improved food security; and more sustainable use of the natural resource base. For this study livelihood outcome were judge in terms of assets in form of (ownership of household asset, houses and means of transportation), income,

employment opportunities and respondents satisfaction level with the infrastructure provided by IFAD-CBARDP in the study area.

## **2.10 Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework and perspectives that was adopted for this study were social change theory; with emphasis on social intervention theory and social impact assessment (SIA) perspectives.

### **2.10.1 Theories of social change**

The concept of societal change may be summarised under three main headings: economic, political and cultural. Marx is perhaps the most famous proponent of the notion that societies forms of social organisation are largely determined by economic factors and in particular the impact of industrial capitalism. Among political influences the state – government – now plays a very large role in social life and change in industrial societies. Cultural influences clearly play an important part in social change. For example, secularization and the development of science have had major effects on the way in which we think, attitudes to legitimacy and authority, and have thus also influenced social structures, systems and values (Giddens and Duneier, 2000).

However, if these are the key factors in societal change, intervention agencies wanting to effect change at this level need to focus on changing economic, political or cultural structures and processes. According to Ekong (2003) social changes can be planned or unplanned. A planned change involves direct human intervention in directing the change towards predefined goals. An unplanned change on the other hand includes an accidental change that happens suddenly and is beyond human control.

### **2.10.2 Social intervention theory**

Social intervention as a perspective guiding this research lays out the plan for exercising influence. The ideology of the perspective specifies the agents (who should intervene), the target (whose actions are to be changed), the mechanism (how to intervene) and the time and place (when and where an intervention takes place). Agents of intervention are assumed to have the power and the capability coupled with the resources to intervene. Hence, Selection of targets – those whose actions are to be changed – also presents problems. When targets are powerful, numerous and very different from one another it is likely to be more difficult to find a way of getting all of them changed, and the costs are likely to be higher than when the targets are small in number or homogeneous. Moreover, if the target actors themselves have limited control over their behaviour, developing an effective intervention may also be difficult. In some cases, for example, it may be necessary to target/change structures and practices before it is possible to change individual and group behaviour (Diana, 2005). Thus, agencies need to devise perspectives on intervention in full awareness of not the target's own past, present and future actions, but also those past, present and future interventions by others such as government, business and other agencies. Agencies also, need to be aware of competing and complementary or reinforcing influences from everywhere and, attempt to overcome the potential effects of intervention fatigue; where participants in the process come to regard every intervention as just another passing fad of little consequence.

According to Hog wood and Gunn (1984), for successful implementation of policy, the rational model requires: no insurmountable external constraints, adequate time and sufficient resources, required combinations, valid theory, good design, minimal dependency relationships, agreed objectives, correct sequence of tasks, clear communication and understanding as well as compliance. This perspective however, gave an insight into this

research; since intervention agencies are design to handle specific social problems, particularly poverty alleviation programme and other developmental programmes.

### **2.10.3 Social impact assessment (SIA) perspective**

It is the desire of any organization to know if it is meeting its set objectives, to see if they are on the right path or not. However, there are three areas in any social impact assessment, viz: socio-cultural feasibility, spread effects and distribution impact. Socio-cultural feasibility should ascertain that, the assessment is based on accurate understanding of the social organization of production activities, which should find out how the intended beneficiaries have access to make use of and exercise control over natural and production resources available in the area. Spread effects refer to the likelihood that the new technology introduced to the initial target group will be diffused among others. Distribution impact is concerned with the differential impact of technology and the distribution of benefits/burden upon different categories of people. That is, it should find out who benefits from technology and in what ways (Moore, 1963).

In this case, social impacts are changes that have occurred for rural communities at large as a result of IFAD-CBARDP. Emphasis however, is solely on observable impact on the livelihood of respondents' in terms of assets, income, employment opportunities and satisfaction level with infrastructure provided in the benefitting communities as a result of the programme implementation.



## Chapter 3

### METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 Description of the Study Area

The study was conducted in Yobe State, Nigeria. Yobe is located in the North East zone of Nigeria and mainly an agrarian state with its headquarters at Damaturu. It was created in August, 27<sup>th</sup> 1991, with a total of seventeen (17) Local Government Areas (LGAs). It lies between latitude 12<sup>o</sup> 00'N and longitude 11.30<sup>o</sup> E, covering a land area of about 45,502 square kilometres (km<sup>2</sup>), with an estimated population of two million, three hundred and twenty one thousand, five hundred and ninety one (2,321,591) people (NPC, 2006). The projected population of the State for 2014 using an annual growth rate of 3% is therefore two million, nine hundred and fourteen thousand, one hundred and eighty four (2,914,184 ). The State shares boundaries with Borno State to the East, Bauchi to the South and Jigawa to the West. It also, shares international borders with the Republic of Niger to the North. Yobe State lies mainly in the dry savannah belt; it is therefore, dry and hot for most part of the year except in the southern part of the state which has a milder climate. The soil type is generally sandy and the annual temperature ranges between 39<sup>o</sup>C to 40<sup>o</sup>C. The rainy season begins in June, with mean annual rainfall between 900mm - 1500mm which spread up to October, depending on the year and the hot season is between February –May.

The climate favours the production of a wide variety of crops, which include legumes (groundnuts and beans); Cereals (maize, millet, sorghum and rice), solanecious crops (peppers, tomato, garden eggs). The State was said to have one of the largest cattle markets in West Africa. Animals like; camel, sheep, goats, and poultry are also kept. Yobe, apart from its agricultural orientation, it has a rich fishing grounds and mineral deposits of gypsum, kaolin, and quartz. The major ethnic group living in the State were Fulani, and other ethnic

communities include: Kanuri, Kare-Kare, Bolewa, Ngizim, Bade, Hausa, Ngamo and Shuwa (YSGHP, 2012)

### **3.2 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size**

The study was carried out in all the three senatorial zones of the State namely Northern Senatorial, Central and South Zones.

In order to examine the impact of IFAD-CBARDP on rural livelihood of the respondents, a multistage sampling technique was employed to get the respondents. In the first stage, three Local Government Areas were selected purposively, out of the nine IFAD-CBARDP benefiting LGAs in Yobe state. These were Karasuwa in Northern zone, Bursari in Central and Fune in South. The selection was based on easy accessibility, familiarity and spread. In the second stage, simple random sampling technique was used to select two benefiting villages from each Local Government Area, making a total of six villages. These are Guba and Kariyari in Bursari LGA, Daura and Alagarno in Fune LGA, Karasuwa G. Guna and Wachakal in Karasuwa LGA. Thirdly, 10% of the total household heads was randomly selected from each village, which form the sample size of 160 for the study (Table 1).

Table 1: Distribution of Sample Size by Local Government Areas

<b>Zones</b>	<b>Local Government Areas</b>	<b>Beneficiary Villages</b>	<b>No. of Household Heads</b>	<b>Respondents 10%</b>
Central	Bursari	Guba	280	28
		Kariyari	260	26
Southern	Fune	Daura	320	32
		Alagarno	220	22
Northern	Karasuwa	Karasuwa G. Guna	280	28
		Wachakal	240	24
<b>Total</b>			<b>1600</b>	<b>160</b>

### 3.3 Method of Data Collection

The study made used of primary and baseline data. The primary data was collected through the administration of a structured questionnaire with the aid of verbal interview to the respondents. Specific information that was collected included: socio-economic characteristics of benefiting respondents (gender, age, marital status, household size, educational level, years of experience as member of cooperative societies, and years of experience in IFAD-CBARDP programme). Others include: access to basic infrastructure, credit, subsidies on inputs, training and respondent's satisfaction level on the infrastructure provided by the programme. Information on livelihood impact variables indicated by assets, income, employment opportunities and respondents satisfaction level on infrastructure provided by the programme was also collected. The secondary data were the baseline data of IFAD-CBARDP.

### 3.4 Analytical Techniques

The following analytical and statistical tools such as: Descriptive statistics and inferential Statistics (t –test) were utilized to capture the stated objectives of the study.

### 3.4.1 Descriptive statistics

Descriptive statistics such as means, percentages and frequency distribution were used to analyse socio-economic characteristics of respondents (objective i), identify and describe the accessibility of infrastructure provided (objective ii) determine the satisfaction level of respondents with infrastructure provided (objective iv) and identify and describe the constraints to effective performance of the programme in the study area(objective v).

### 3.4.2 Inferential statistics (t-test)

The t- test was used to determine the impact of infrastructure provided on the livelihood of respondents “before the programme and after the programme implementation in the study area and to test the hypothesis of the study at (P< 0.1%) level of significance.

The general formula of the t-test is given as:

$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2 + s_2^2}{n_1 + n_2}}}$$

Where:

$t$  = t-value

$\bar{x}_1$  = the mean sample of respondents income in benefitting communities before initiating the IFAD-CBARDP.

$\bar{x}_2$  = the mean sample of respondents income in benefitting communities after initiating the IFAD-CBARDP.

$S_1^2$  = sample standard deviation for respondents income in benefitting communities before initiating the programme.

$S_2^2$  = sample standard deviation for respondents income in benefitting communities after initiating the programme

$n_1$  = sample size of respondents income in benefitting communities before the programme.

$n_2$  = sample size of respondents income in benefitting communities after initiating the programme.

### 3.5 Operational indices

#### 3.5.1 Impact

Impact refers to the outcome, long-term effect or resultant situation of the programme implementation on the livelihood of respondent in benefitting communities. Thus, to determine the impact of the programme on livelihood of respondents, “before” and “after” concept was used. The baseline data collected by IFAD-CBARDP were used for data “before” the programme and the data collected through the use of structured questionnaire was used as the data “after” the programme implementation. The impact variables were measured as follows:

**Livelihood:** Frankenberger and McCaston (1998) view the concept of livelihood; as sustainable access to resources to meet basic needs including adequate access to food, portable water, health facilities, educational opportunities, housing, time for community participation and social integration. For this study the indicators of positive livelihood would be manifested on increased assets, increased income, improved employment opportunities and satisfaction level of respondents with infrastructure provided after the first phase of IFAD-CBARDP. The indicators were measured as follows:

**Income:** Refers to the proceeds, returns, earnings. Therefore, income as livelihood indicator refers to the total revenue generated by the respondent per annum as a result of participation in IFAD-CBARDP. It was measured in naira (₦), in terms of mean income of respondents before and after the IFAD-CBARDP implementation in the study area

**Assets:** In this study has to do with valuable goods and properties owned by respondent which include: ownership of household asset, houses and means of transportation of respondents. It was measured in terms of the number (No) and quality of assets owned by respondents before the programme and after the IFAD-CBARDP implementation in the study area.

**Employment opportunities:** This refers to available employment opportunities /economic engagement that a respondent was involved to improve his livelihood. This was measured based on the available source of job opportunities before and after the implementation of IFAD-CBARDP in the study area.

**Level of satisfaction:** It refers to the level of respondent's perception on the infrastructure provided by IFAD-CBARDP. This was measured by asking the respondent to rate in qualitative terms, his/her level of satisfaction using the 5 point likert-type scale which was scored as; Very high = 5; High = 4; Fairly High = 3; fair = 2; and Low = 1. The mean level of satisfaction was obtained by adding together  $1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 = 15$  which was later divided by 5 to get a mean score of 3. The respondents' mean score was obtained on each item. Therefore, any mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) scores  $\geq 3.0$  indicate high satisfaction, while scores  $< 3.0$  indicate low satisfaction.

## **Chapter 4**

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This section presents the results and discussion of the data obtained from IFAD-CBARDP beneficiaries on their socio-economic characteristics, infrastructure provided, impact on livelihood, satisfaction level of respondents with infrastructure provided and the constraints faced by respondents.

#### **4.1 Socio-economic Characteristics of Respondents.**

The socio-economic characteristics of the respondents identified were: gender, age, marital status, household size, educational level, membership of cooperative societies, experience in IFAD-CBARDP and accessibility to credit are presented in Table 2 and explained below.

##### **4.1.1 Gender**

From Table 2 the data revealed that 51% of the respondents were males and 49% were females. This showed that both gender were adequately represented in the IFAD-CBARDP, with slight variation in favour of male respondents.

##### **4.1.2 Age**

The data in Table 2 revealed that the age of the respondents ranged between 20 and 65 years with an average of 40 years. This implies that, the respondents were middle aged and still active and could participate adequately in development programmes. The age distribution as evident in the data was expected to have positive influence on the respondent's participation in IFAD-CBARDP, which invariably meant better livelihood.

##### **4.1.3 Marital status**

It was observed in Table 2 that 97% of the respondents were married and 3% were single. This shows that most of the respondents would have greater responsibility than the single, which may encourage respondents to be committed towards their participation in IFAD-CBARDP. Perez-Morales (1990). There is a trend for rural youth to start work responsibilities at an earlier age than urban youth. He further stated that normally, young people in rural areas get married earlier than their peers in urban zones. It means that rural youth become involved in adult responsibilities before urban youth.

#### **4.1.4 Household size**

The result in Table 2 indicates that about half (49%) of the respondents had 5-10 people in their households, while, 31% had household size of less than 5 people. The average numbers of dependants were (8). This implies that respondents had dependents to cater for and their participation in programmes like IFAD-CBARDP could help in engaging them on the farm and improving their livelihood.

#### **4.1.5 Level of education**

Table 2 reveals that more than half (68%) of the respondents had educational qualifications mostly primary and secondary school level. Such level of education may facilitate the respondents' participation in the IFAD-CBARDP. The respondents with no formal education were about 32%, of the respondents.

#### **4.1.6 Membership of cooperative society**

From (Table 2), Participants of IFAD-CBARDP belong to cooperative society; the maximum number of years spent as members of cooperative society was 9 years and a minimum of 1 year. The result revealed that, respondents with 4 – 6 years of membership duration constitute 61% while 23% had 1-3 years of membership of cooperative society



with an average of (5yrs). With this level of membership duration, it could be said that majority of the respondents have had long duration of experience as members of cooperative group which can facilitate understanding of the programme due to interaction among members.

#### **4.1.7 Experience in the IFAD-CBARDP**

The result in Table 2 revealed that,, the majority (63%) of the beneficiaries had between 4 and 6 years of experience in IFAD-CBARDP activities, with an average of (5yrs) experience in the programmme. Whereas 24% of the respondents had experience of 7 to 9 years and the lowest percentage was (13%) which falls within 1to 3 years of experience in IFAD-CBARDP. These years of experience in the programme were expected to translate into better utilization and understanding of the programme which may invariably result into better income as well as standard of living.

#### **4.1.8 Accessibility to credit**

It was observed in Table 2 that 56% of the respondents had no access to credit facilities. This low access to credit could be attributed to the fact that IFAD-CBARDP seldom grants financial credit to participants. Rather, participants are trained in entrepreneurial development. Ekong (2003) asserts that credit is a very strong factor that is needed to acquire or develop any enterprise; its availability could determine the extent of production capacity.

Table 2: Distribution of respondents socio-economic characteristics (n= 160)

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Frequenc y</b>	<b>Percentages</b>	<b>Mean</b>
-----------------	-----------------------	--------------------	-------------

---

<b>Gender</b>		
Male	82	51.2
Female	78	48.9
<b>Age (years)</b>		
20-29	19	11.9
30-39	52	32.2
		<b>(40)</b>
40-49	54	33.8
50-59	34	21.2
60-69	1	0.6
<b>Marital status</b>		
Married	156	97.5
Single	4	2.5
<b>Household size</b>		
1- 5	49	30.6
6-10	78	48.8
11-15	29	18.2
		<b>(8)</b>
16-20	3	1.9
21-25	1	0.6
<b>Level of education</b>		
No education	51	31.9
Adult education	21	13.1
Primary	34	21.2
Secondary	38	23.8
Tertiary	5	3.1
Others	11	6.9
<b>Membership of cooperative society (yrs)</b>		
1 -3	37	23.1
4 -6	97	60.6
		<b>(5)</b>
7 -9	26	16.2
<b>Experience in IFAD-CBARDP (yrs)</b>		
1 -3	21	13.1
4 -6	100	62.5
		<b>(5)</b>

---

7 -9	39	24.4
<b>Access to credit</b>		
Accessible	71	44.4
Not accessible	89	55.6

#### 4.2 Infrastructure Provided by IFAD-CBARDP

Table 3 shows that provision of water/borehole ranked 1<sup>st</sup> among the infrastructure provided by IFAD-CBARDP in the study area accessible to about 91% of the respondents. Schools provided ranked 2<sup>nd</sup> among the infrastructure provided accessible to 78% of the respondents. This could improve the level of literacy in the area of study and subsequent economic development. Other infrastructure accessible to the respondents were health centres (64%), Para vet clinic (16%), culvert (13%) and Market shade (11%) which were ranked 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>. Staff quarters was the least accessible infrastructure to the respondents and ranked 9<sup>th</sup> with 3% of the sampled respondents highlighting accessible to the infrastructure. Hence, the functional status of these amenities provided may bring about income savings stemming from reduced expenditure on the items which can be diverted to other areas of consumption such as food which may improve the feeding standard of the respondents. Thus, the infrastructure in question may bring about development to the area of study which may transform the lives of the residents as well as improve their livelihood.

Table 3: Distribution of infrastructure Provided in order of respondents benefits (n=160)

<b>Infrastructure</b>	<b>*Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Water/Borehole	146	91.2	1 <sup>st</sup>
Schools	124	77.5	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Health centre	102	63.7	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Para vet clinic	26	16.2	4 <sup>th</sup>
Culvert	21	13.1	5 <sup>th</sup>
Market shade	17	10.6	6 <sup>th</sup>
Vocational Centre	11	6.9	7 <sup>th</sup>
Latrine	6	3.7	8 <sup>th</sup>
Staff Quarters	4	2.5	9 <sup>th</sup>

**\*Multiple responses**

### **4.3 Impact of IFAD-CBARDP on Assets of the Beneficiaries**

The result in Table 4 revealed that, there was an increase in information asset acquisition (radio, 24; TV, 17 and Compact disc, 22) by respondents after the first phase of IFAD-CBARDP. This is an indication that the level of awareness and enlightenment among the respondents is on the increase. There were increases in the number of houses purchased and built as well as household property such as refrigerator. Generally, there was a significant improvement on the rate at which the respondents acquired properties. This is an indication that over the years of the programme income of the respondents increased. This indicated that, IFAD-CBARDP had been able to impact positively to the respondents' livelihood in terms of ownership of assets by respondents. This is in line with the report of IFAD (2011) on Women's Empowerment Mainstreaming And Networking (WEMAN) under IFAD where, the programme reported a concrete positive changes on women in terms of secure access to land, division of labour between women and men, increased quality of produce, equal sharing of benefits and increasing incomes of the participants.

Table 4: Distribution of respondents according to assets possessed (n = 160)

<b>Assets owned By respondents</b>	<b>*No of items owned before Prog.</b>	<b>*No of items owned after Prog.</b>	<b>Differential</b>
Radio	58	82	24
TV	36	53	17
VCD	36	58	22
Refrigerator	20	48	28
House purchased	16	23	7
House Built	22	35	13
Bicycle	10	19	9
Motorcycle	25	32	7
Car	3	9	6
Lorry	2	6	4
Pick up Van	8	14	6

\* Multiple responses

#### 4.3.1 Hypothesis testing

The results as presented in Table 5 revealed the respondents mean annual income before the programme (₦155, 613) and after the programme implementation (₦241, 603.8) per annum, with a differential amount of ₦85, 990.8. The data were also tested using t-test. The result indicated that, t-cal (1.98) was greater than the t-critical (1.65). Therefore, the mean difference on the income of respondents before and after the IFAD-CBARDP implementation was significant at ( $p < 0.1$ ) level of probability.

Table 5: Impact of IFAD-CBARDP on the income of respondents (n= 160)

		Before	After	Differential
	N			
Mean	annual	₦155,	₦ 241,	₦ 85,990.8
income	160	613	603.8	
Variance		3.597E+10	9.75E+10	
t – Cal		1.98*		
t – Critical		1.65		

\*significant at (p< 0.1%) level of probability

#### 4.3.2 Employment opportunities provided by IFAD-CBARDP

From Table 6, it was observed that among the employment opportunities provided by IFAD CBARDP, most respondents (78%) participated in tailoring, followed by food processing (77%), trading (75%), carpentry (75%), knitting and embroidery making (62%), blacksmithing (61%), and fishing was the least (39%) participated employment opportunity by respondents. As evident from the result in Table 6, the programme had various packages of employment opportunities' that really engaged the respondents in relevant areas of specialization. Involvement of the respondents in various activities of the programme could generate more income thereby improving the livelihood of respondents. Lawanson (2012) revealed the universality of informal economic activities particularly home based enterprises, as a major source of employment and income in urban and rural areas.

Table 6: Employment opportunity provided by IFAD-CBARDP (n =160)

<b>Employment opportunities</b>	<b>*Frequency</b>	<b>Percentages</b>
Trading	121	75.7
Carpentry	120	75.0
Blacksmithing	98	61.2
Food processing	124	77.5
Tailoring	125	78.1
Embroidery making	99	61.9
Knitting	99	61.9
Bricklaying	81	50.6
Fishing	63	39.4

**\*Multiple responses**

#### **4.4 Respondents Level of Satisfaction with Infrastructure Provided**

##### **4.4.1 Provision of farm inputs**

It was observed that the respondents recorded high satisfaction with provision of farm inputs provided by IFAD-CBARDP as indicated by the weighted mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) which exceeds the mean score of 3.9 which is  $>3$  (Table 7). From the result, the respondents may experience improvement in farm productivity as well as encouragement in the area of farming and other related activities.

##### **4.4.2 Vocational skills/ training centres**

Result presented in Table 7 revealed that the respondents' perception with vocational skills/centres provided by IFAD-CBARDP was high because weighted mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) of 3.8 was recorded. This result may mean that provision of vocational skills has created employment / skills acquisition opportunities for the benefitting respondents which may have resulted to higher income generation and invariably better livelihood.

#### **4.4.3 Provision of water/borehole**

It was observed in Table 7 that provision of water by IFAD CBARDP recorded high satisfaction to the respondents with weighted mean of 3.7 which exceeds the mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) score of 3. Therefore, the respondents were satisfied with the water/ borehole provided by the programme. Water, a necessity of life is provided by the programme to aid level of living and minimise scarcity. Thus, provision of water had brought about improvement in water supply which minimizes cost of water procurement in benefitting communities.

#### **4.4.4 Health facilities provided**

The weighted mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) for health facilities provided by the programme was presented in Table 6. It revealed high satisfaction with a weighted mean of 3.5 implying an overall perception of satisfaction with health facilities provided because the weighted mean was greater than the mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) score of 3. The result therefore indicates that provision of health facilities would upgrade the health status of the benefitting respondents. Provision of health facilities in the area also implies that diseases can easily be eradicated, thereby improving the health status of benefitting communities for improved labour force.

#### **4.4.5 Provision of Schools**

The result in Table 7 revealed high satisfaction with provision of schools in the area. The weighted mean of satisfaction level obtained from the respondents was 3.4, exceeding the mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) score of 3. Provision of schools may bring about upgrading of the educational status of the residents in benefitting communities, which invariably reduce the level of illiteracy, improvement in the enrolment of pupils as well as saving of income which could



have been used for taking the pupils to other places for education. Formal education serves as a spinning factor for adoption and participation of individuals in programmes.

#### 4.4.6 Credit facilities

Result for the level of satisfaction for credit facilities provided by the programme indicated a weighted mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) of 2.8 which is lower than the mean score ( $\bar{X} = 3$ ) of satisfaction perception by the respondents (Table 7), meaning that provision of credit facilities have not met the satisfaction level of the respondents. This implies that, the beneficiaries need other forms of credit to boost their productivity which would bring about improved standard of living. If credit is invested into an enterprise it is expected that it should lead to higher levels of output and better standards of living, but in case the credit is not accessed on time and inadequate, it may, more often than not, lead to misapplication of funds. Hence, the expected impact of such funds will not be felt on the enterprise. Also, if the credit is invested in consumption purpose, it may not likely lead to an improvement of output or livelihood.

Table 7: Respondents' satisfaction level with infrastructure provided (n=160)

<b>Infrastructure</b>	<b>Total weighted scores</b>	<b>Mean weighted scores</b>	<b>Overall perception</b>
Farm inputs	4455	3.9	High
Voc. Centres	4040	3.8	High
Water/ Borehole	4317	3.7	High
Health facilities	4575	3.5	High
Schools	4642	3.4	High
Credit facilities	5617	2.8	Low

#### 4.5 Constraints Faced by Respondents in IFAD-CBARDP.

This section analysed the constraints faced by the beneficiaries of the programme. Various factors such as low level of awareness, cultural barriers, inadequate capital and illiteracy were ranked 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> respectively (Table 8) as factors affecting the programme. Information creates awareness, which can lead to development. Most of the respondents were noticed to be married women, according to the culture, they are not supposed to associate with other people especially men. This impedes information and participation of an individual in a programme.

Table 8: Constraints encountered by beneficiaries of IFAD-CBARDP (n=160)

<b>Constraints</b>	<b>*Frequency</b>	<b>Percentages</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Low awareness	61	38.1	1 <sup>st</sup>
Cultural barrier	52	32.5	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Inadequate capital	43	26.9	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Illiteracy	20	12.5	4 <sup>th</sup>
Inadequate facilities	20	12.5	4 <sup>th</sup>
Inadequate mobility	6	3.7	6 <sup>th</sup>
poor leadership	3	1.8	7 <sup>th</sup>

**\*Multiple responses**

## SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1 Summary

This study was designed to analyse the impact of IFAD Community Based Agricultural and Rural Development Programme on rural livelihood in Yobe State, Nigeria. specifically, the study described the socio-economic characteristics of respondents; identified and described the basic infrastructure provided; determined the impact of the infrastructure provided on the livelihood of respondents in terms of assets, income, employment, and respondents' satisfaction level with the infrastructure provided; and identified and described the constraints to effective performance of IFAD-CBARDP in the study area.

Household heads were randomly selected from six villages across the three senatorial zones of the State. A structured questionnaire was used to elicit primary data from 160 respondents. Secondary data were baseline data obtained from IFAD-CBARDP. Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics (t-test) were used for analyses. The findings revealed that out of 160 respondents, majorities (51%) were males with an average of 40 years. About 97% were married, having a household size between 5-10 persons. About 68% had educational attainment of primary and secondary school level. More than half of the respondents (61%) had spent 4-6 years as members of cooperative societies and (63%) had between 4 and 6 years of experience with IFAD-CBARDP while, 56% had no access to credit facilities. The result for the provision of basic infrastructure by IFAD-CBARDP based on respondents' benefit indicated that water/borehole, provision of schools, Health centres were recorded as 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> infrastructure provided and accessible to the respondents in the study area. others are Para vet clinic, culvert, market shade, vocational centres, latrine which were ranked as 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup> and staff quarters had the lowest rank and recorded as 9<sup>th</sup> infrastructure by respondents .

Results on assets owned by respondents revealed that, there were increased in the acquisition of information and household assets by the respondent to a difference of 24% for radio, 17% for TV, 22% for VCD and 28% for refrigerators. Results on the income of participant revealed that, the mean annual income before and after the implementation of the first phase of IFAD-CBARDP was significant at ( $p < 0.1\%$ ) level of probability.

Findings for the satisfaction level of respondents on the infrastructure provided by IFAD-CBARDP indicated in descending order revealed that, provision of farm inputs, vocational centres, water/borehole, health facilities, schools recorded high satisfaction. Whereas, credit facilities recorded a low satisfaction by respondents. The programme had also recorded an increased in employment / skills acquisition opportunities, as respondents were trained in tailoring; food processing enterprise, trading; carpentry and knitting respectively.

Nevertheless, respondents highlighted various constraints encountered in the programme in order of severity as low awareness, cultural factors, inadequate capital and illiteracy. Others include inadequate infrastructural facilities, inadequate mobility and poor leadership. These constraints served as impediments to the respondents' participation in IFAD-CBARDP.

## **5.2 Conclusion**

This study was aimed at providing useful and basic information on the impact of IFAD-CBARDP on the livelihood of the participants. It was found that rural infrastructure provided was beneficial and mostly satisfactory to the beneficiaries of the programme. Hence, the assets and income of participants' as well as employment/ skills acquisition

opportunities had also increased as a result of the programme intervention. Respondents' satisfaction level on infrastructure provided by IFAD-CBARDP was high. The null hypothesis which stated that "IFAD-CBARDP have not improved the livelihood of people in benefitting communities in the study area" was rejected and the alternative accepted. Meaning that, IFAD-CBARDP had improved the livelihood of people in benefitting communities of the study area. It was therefore concluded that, IFAD-CBARDP had impacted positively on the lives of the beneficiaries in Yobe State, Nigeria.

### **5.3 Recommendations**

In view of the major findings of this study, the following recommendations were made:

- i. Since, IFAD-CBARDP had impacted positively on the livelihood of the respondents in Yobe State; it was recommended that, the project be replicated in other non- IFAD-CBARDP benefitting Local Government Areas of the state in order to record a livelihood improvement.
- ii. In order to eliminate the cultural factors which impeded effective performance of the programme, mass sensitization should be adopted as a tool for curbing the cultural constraints in the study area.
- iii. IFAD-CBARDP beneficiaries should be encouraged to diversify their sources of employment in order to increase their income status and livelihood.
- iv. Since, inadequate capital was one of the major constraints to participation in the programme; beneficiaries should be encouraged to form cooperative groups in order to pool their resources together to improve their financial capability.

- v. Programme planners and implementers should intensify awareness creation among rural dwellers and adopt the use of community driven development approach (CDD) in the execution of rural development projects with poverty alleviation thrust as in the case of IFAD-CBARDP.

### **5.3 Suggestion for Further Studies**

The research was conducted in only three Local Government Areas across the three senatorial zones of Yobe State, Nigeria. It is suggested that, a similar study should be conducted in the other IFAD-CBARDP participating Local Governments to provide a more comprehensive picture of the impact of the project in the state.

## **REFERENCES**

- Adekunle, A. A., Olowu, T.A. and Ladele, A. (2004). Bridging the gap between farmers and researchers, the effect of resource centres on the productivity of farmers in Katsina, Katsina State of Nigeria. IITA Publication, pp 46.
- Adeolu, B., Ayanwale, O. and Taiwo, A. (2004). The Impact of the National Fadama Facility in Alleviating Rural Poverty and Enhancing Agricultural Development in South-Western Nigeria, *Journal of Social Sciences* 9 (3): 157-161.
- Agbiokoro, T.C (2010). The impact of National Poverty Reduction Programme (NAPEP) on Economic Development of Nigeria, Publication of World Economics, April, 20.
- Ahmadu, S., Ahmad, N. and Hamsan, H. H. (2012): "Perspective on Beneficiaries" Experiences of Participation in Community-Based Agriculture and Rural

Development Program in Guba, Northern Nigeria”, *Asian Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development Economic and Financial Review* 2 (1):39-45

Alene, A.D., V.M. Manyong, J. Gockowski, O. Coulibaly, and S. Abele. (2006) A framework for conceptualizing impact assessment and promoting impact culture at IITA. *IMPACT*, IITA, Ibadan, Nigeria.

Anderson, J.R. and Thampapillai, J. (1990). *Soil Conservation in Developing Countries: Project and Policy Intervention*. Washington D.C.: World Bank.

Angba, A. O., Adesope, O. M., and Aboh, C. L. (2009). Effects of Socio-economic Characteristics of Rural Youth on their Attitudes Towards Participation in Community Development Projects. *International NGO Journal*. 4(8): 348-351.

Ayoola, G. B. (2001). *Essays on the Agricultural Economy: A Book of Readings Agricultural Policy and Administration in Nigeria*. Ibadan, Nigeria:TMA Publishers.

Babatunde, O. (2006). Differential Poverty Reduction Impact of Small- Scale Irrigation Development between its Beneficiaries and Non-Beneficiaries in Nigeria. Technical Report on the Agro polis Award.

Barnabas, M. T. (2011). Impact Assessment of Millennium Village Project (MVP) in Pampaida in Saulawa District of Ikara Local Government Area, Kaduna State Nigeria. Unpublished M.sc Thesis, Department Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology; Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.

Bhagyalakshmi, J. (2004). “*Rural Development through Women’s Participation and Electronic Media*,” India, Pointer Publisher xvii, 364.

Chikwendu, D. O. (2005). Report on Identification and Sensitization of Marginalized and Vulnerable Groups for Participation in Fadama II Development Projects in Kaduna State, Submitted to Kaduna State Fadama Development office, Kaduna, Nigeria.

CBN/World Bank. (1996). *Collaborative Study on Nigeria’s Prospects for Development: Proceedings of a Workshop* April 15-17.

Cruz, H. S. (1983). *The Three Tiers of Basic Needs for Rural Development*. New York U.S.A: Longman Inc.

Dekker, M. (2003). “Resettlement and Livelihood: Support Network and Crises Situation”. Paper Presented at Albany Summer School. U. S. A. June

Diana, L. (2005). Theories of Social Change. *The INSP Tool Manual*. Bertelsmann Stiftung. 4:2-16

Ega, L.A.; Atala T. K. and Baba, J.M. (1989). Developing rural Nigeria; Problems and Prospects. *Journal of Nigerian Rural Sociological Association*. 3, 49-82

Ekong, E.E. (2003). *Introduction to Rural Sociology: An Introduction and Analysis of Rural Nigeria* (Second Edition), Uyo, Nigeria: Dove Educational Publishers Limited, pp 369.

- Ekong, E. E. (2003) *Poverty and Rural Development in Nigeria: An Introduction to Rural Sociology* Uyo, Nigeria: Dove Educational Publishers Limited, pp 340-371.
- Ellis, F. (1998). 'Survey Articles: Household Strategies and Rural Livelihood Diversification'. *The Journal of Development Studies* 35(1): 1-38.
- Emmanuel, O., Keraita, B., Danso, G., Amoah, P., Cofie, O.O., Raschid-Sally, L. and Drechsel, P. (2006). *Irrigated Urban Vegetable Production in Ghana: Characteristics, Benefits and Risks*. IWMI-RUAF-CPWF, Accra, Ghana: IWMI, 150.
- ERD (2005). *European Rural Development: Dimensions of Rural Development*.  
[htt: // www.iiasa.ac.at/reasearch/ERD/RC/rc10.htm](http://www.iiasa.ac.at/reasearch/ERD/RC/rc10.htm)
- FOS (1996). *Federal Office of Statistics: Socio-Economic Profile of Nigeria Lagos: Federal Office of Statistics*.  
[www.ijbssnet.com/./jsd/17.pdf](http://www.ijbssnet.com/./jsd/17.pdf) (Accessed 10 June, 2010)
- Frankkenberger, T.R. and McCaston, M .K. (1998). *Household Livelihood Security: CARE, U.S.A*. Pp11.
- Freeman, D. B. (1975). *Development Strategies in Dual Economics: A Kenyan Example*. *African Studies Review*. 18(2):17-33.
- Galadima, M. (2013). *Constraints of Participants to the Effective Performance of Agriculture and Rural Development Programs in Nigeria: YOBE IFAD-CBARDP Experience*. *The International Journal Of Humanities & Social Studies*, 1(6): 32-35.
- Giddens, A. and Duneier, M. (2000). *Introduction to Sociology (3rd edition)*. New York and London: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc.
- Gilbert, P., Levin, J. and Joel, P. (1975). *Effectiveness of Agricultural Extension Services in Reaching Rural Women: A synthesis of Studies in Five African Countries*. Prepared for FAO, Rome, September.
- Hilton, E. and Lumsdaine, A. A. (1975). *Field Trial Designs in Gauging the Impact of Fertility Planning Programs*." In: Carl A. Bennett and Arthur A. Lumsdaine (eds.), *Evaluation and Experiment*. New York: Academic Press, 319-408.
- Hogwood, B. W. and Gunn, L. A. (1984). *Policy Analysis for the Real World*. London: Oxford University Press.
- IAEG (1999). *Impact Assessment of Agricultural Research: Context and Art. Paper presented at ASRE CA/E CART/CTA Workshop on Impact Assessment of Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa*. Entebbe, Uganda. 16-19, November
- Idachaba, F. S. (2000) *Desirable and Workable Agricultural Policies for Nigeria*. Ibadan, Nigeria: University Press.



- Idachaba, F. S. (1989). *Strategies for Achieving Food Self-sufficiency in Nigeria Key note Address, 1<sup>st</sup> National Congress of Science and Technology*, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- IFAD (2007). *IFAD Community-Based Agricultural and Rural Development Programme, Yobe State: December, Annual Progress Report*.
- IFAD (2009). *IFAD Community- Based Agricultural and Rural Development Programme, Community Infrastructure Manual (CIIM)*.
- IFAD (2010). *International Fund for Agriculture Development, Federal Republic of Nigeria: Country Strategy Opportunity Programme. Report Review of Executive Board, Ninety-ninth Session, Rome, April 21st-22<sup>nd</sup>*
- IFAD (2011). *International Fund for Agricultural Development, Gender Justice in Pro-poor value chain Development. Final report IFAD Small grant R1161 (June 2009 – June 2011). Women’s Empowerment Mainstreaming and Networking (WEMAN) for Gender Justice in Economic Development. Oxfam Novib.*  
<http://www.wemanresources.info/documents/Page2GALS/110822final%20report%20Oxfam%20Novib-IFAD%20R1161.pdf> (Accessed January, 2010)
- Ijere, M. O. (1988). “ A Critical Assessment of the suitability of Self-Help Groups for the cooperative Movement” A paper delivered at the Conference on Restructuring Cooperative Movement for Rapid Rural and National Development held at Owerri, Imo State, Nigeria, March 3-7.
- Ijere, M. O. (1992). *Leading issues in Rural Development*, Enugu, Lagos, Los Angeles: Acena Publishers.
- Iro, S. I. (2008). *Empowering the Rural Poor: An Appraisal of Microfinance and Other Development Interventions in Nigeria. Paper Presented at the 2008 Rural Development Seminar in Imo State University, Owerri, March 19-21.*
- Kimble, T. (1960). *Tropical Africa, I. Land and Livelihoods II. Society and Polity*. New York Twentieth Century Fund, 90-94.
- Kudi, T. M., Usman, I., Akpoko, J. G and Banta, A. L. (2008). *Analysis of the Impact of National Fadama Development Project II (NFDPII) in Alleviating Poverty Among Farmers in Giwa Local Government Area of Kaduna State. Ozean Journal of Applied Sciences*, 1(1):1-7
- Lawanson, T. (2012). *Poverty, Home Based Enterprises and Urban Livelihoods in the Lagos Metropolis. Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa* 14(4): 2012  
[www.isd-africa.com/sda/vol14No4-su](http://www.isd-africa.com/sda/vol14No4-su) (Accessed 20<sup>th</sup> October, 2012)
- Michael, O. U. (2008). *Community Development; Socio Economic Dimension*. Anambra Nigeria: Candela Print Ltd 108.
- Maduagwu, A. (2007). *Growing up in Oguta: The Economics of Rural Poverty in Nigeria*. Unpublished work.

- Manyong, M., Douthwaite, B., Coulibay, O., and Keatinge, J.D.H. (2001). Participatory Impact Assessment at the international Institute of Tropical Agriculture, Function and Mechanism (Annex). The future of Impact Assessment in the CGIAR: Needs, Constraints and Options. Proceedings of a workshop Organised by the Standing Panel on Impact Assessment of Technical Advisory Committee, 3-5 MAY, FAO, Rome Italy 69-74.
- Mamder, J. (1986). Youth Employment in Rural Areas: Situation and Prospect. In: Youth Employment Promotion in African countries. ILO Report on the Regional Workshop held on November, 24-28, Buena, Cameroon. pp. 187-190.
- Moore, W.E. (1963). Social Change. Englewood Cliff, Prentice Hall Inc.
- National Population Commission NPC (2006). National Population Census Report for Nigeria, Abuja, Nigeria. .
- Obibuaku, L. O. (1983). *Agricultural Extension as strategy for Agricultural Transformation*. University of Nigeria Press UNN, 24
- Obinne, C.P. (1997). Fundamentals of Agricultural Extension. First Edition, Ibadan, ABIC Publishers, pp, 9-13.
- Okeke V.U. (2008). Managing Environmental Resources through Poverty reduction Programmes in Nigeria. *Paper presented at the Post-graduate seminar in the Department of Geography and Environmental Management, Imo State University, Owerri, March.*
- Olayide (1980). "Agricultural Technology and Nigeria's Small Farmers". Nigeria's Small farmers problems and prospects in integrated rural development. Centre for agricultural and rural development (CARD). University of Ibadan, Nigeria. Pp. 52-55.
- Olukosi, J. O. (2002). The Application of Community Driven Development Approach in Nigeria. Lead paper Sensitization/Mobilization Workshop for Federal, State and Local Government Staff in the FGN/IFAD Community Based Agricultural and Rural Development Programme (CBARDP) in Nigeria.
- Othman, Y. (2006). Impact of Community Based Organizations on Rural Development in Kano State. Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Ahmadu Bello University Zaria, Nigeria.
- Praandit, D. P (1965). *Earning Ones Livelihood in Mahuva House, Bombay*: Asia Publishing House, Bombay India.  
Libopac.tiss.edu/slim/wslxRSLT.php% (Accessed 10 July, 2010)
- Perez, M.R. (1990). Youth Policy and Resources Related to Rural Youth Programmes. In: Expert Consultation on Extension Rural Youth Programmes and Sustainable Development. Rome: F.A.O, pp. 101-108.
- PCU (2006). Project Coordinating Unit. IFAD Community-Based Agricultural and Rural Development Projects Implementation Manual, IFAD-CBARDP.

ifadcbardp.org.ng/wp-content/upload (Accessed 10 October 2010.)

- Sanginga, P.C., Adesina, A.A., Manyong, V.M., Otite, O. And Dashier, K.E. (1999). Social Impact of Soyabean in Nigeria's Guinea Savannah, Nigeria: IITA and meg-comm. Network.
- Sharma, P.V., Stall, S., Delgado, C. and Singh, R.V. (2003). *Policy, Technical and Environments and Implication of Scaling-up of Milk production in India. Annex in Research Report of international Food policy Research institute (IFPRI) Food and Agriculture Organization. Livestock industrialization project Phase II* Washington DC, IFPRI.
- Simonyan J.B and Omolehin, R.A (2012) Analysis of Impact of Fadama II Project on Benefiary Farmers Income in Kaduna State: A Double Difference Method Approach, in *International Journal of Economics and Management Sciences*, 1 (11): 01-07.
- Smith, D.A. (1973). *The Geography of Social Well being in the United State*: New York, McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Taimi, K. K. (2003). Strategy for Professionalization of Rural Development. *Tamindu Journal of Development*, 9: 269-304.
- Todaro, M. P. (1977). *Economic for a Developing World*. London: Longman Ltd.
- Thor, E. A, Madison, P. and Green, H. (2001). Cooperatives and Rural Population of the American Southwest. *American Journal of Rural Development and Integration*, 4(1): 2-4.
- Tijjani, (2007). *An Overview and Key note Address, Presented at IFAD-CBARDP Staff Orientation Course, Organised by Agricultural and Rural Management Training Institute (ARMTI) Ilorin*, 3rd December.1-3th
- Tomori, S., Akano, O., Adebisi, A., Isola, W., Lawanson, O. and Quadri, O. (2005). Protecting the Poor from Macroeconomic Shocks in Nigeria: An Empirical Investigation and Policy Options. A study Commissioned by the Global Development Network (GDN) under the auspices of an International Research Project on Macroeconomic Policy Challenges of Low Income Countries. Nigeria, January, 27<sup>th</sup>. 1-64( Accessed 4<sup>th</sup> July, 2011.
- Ukpong, E. A.(1989). The Repercussions of Policy Misplacement on Rural Development in Developing Rural Nigeria. In: Ega, L A, Atala T K and Baba, J. M. (eds) *NRSA. Periodical Journal for Social Development in Africa*, (008) 1-72  
Arhive.lib.msu.edu/DMC/African%252 (Accessed 2<sup>nd</sup> January 2012).
- Verhelst, T. G. (1990). *No Life without Roots: Culture Development*, London: Zed Books publishers.
- Voh, J. P. (1983). Farmers Levels of Satisfaction with Rural Infrastructure in Selected Communities in Kano State. *Proceedings of the Seminar on Quality of Life in Nigeria held at the Agricultural and Rural Management Training Institute (ARMTI) Ilorin, Nigeria*: July 6-7 Atoto Press Ltd. Ilorin.

Wallace, T. (1979). *Rural Development through Irrigation: A Tour on Kano River Project*, Centre for Social and Economic Planning Report No. 3. Ahmadu Bello University Press Limited, Zaria.

Williams, S. K. T. (1979). *Developing Rural Nigeria*. Ile-Ife Nigeria: University of Ife press.

Williams, S. K. T. (1978). *Rural Development in Nigeria*. Ile-Ife Nigeria: University of Ife press.

Yobe State Support office IFAD-Community Based Agriculture and Rural Development Programme (2011). IFAD-CBARDP Baseline Analysis.

Yobe State Government Home Page (YSGHP)", Online Nigeria, (Accessed on 3 August 2011). <http://www.onlinenigeria.com/map>.

### Appendix i

#### Baseline analysis on infrastructure before IFAD-CBARDP.

Infrastructure	*Frequency	Percentage
Water	100	62.5
Schools	90	56.2
Health centre	72	45.0
Para vet clinic	18	11.2
Culvert	17	10.6
Market shade	12	7.5
Vocational Centre	08	5.0
Latrine	3	3.7
Staff Quarters	2	2.5

#### \*Multiple responses

Source: Yobe State (2011). IFAD-CBARDP Baseline Analysis.

## Appendix ii

## Baseline analysis on respondents' assets owned before IFAD-CBARDP

Assets owned By respondents	*No of items owned before Prog.	Percentage
Radio	58	36.2
TV	36	22.5
VCD	36	22.5
Refrigerator	20	12.5
House purchased	16	10.0
House Built	22	13.8
Bicycle	10	6.2
Motorcycle	25	15.6
Car	3	1.9
Lorry	2	1.2
Pick up Van	8	5.0

\* Multiple responses

Source: Yobe State (2011) IFAD-CBARDP Baseline Analysis

## Appendix iii

Baseline data on respondents' annual income before IFAD-CBARDP in the study area.

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Local Government Areas (BURSARI L.G.A.)</b>	<b>Beneficiary Village (Guba)</b>	<b>Sources of Income before</b>	<b>Annual income before (per annum)</b>
1	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 134,600
2	✓	✓	✓	₦ 125,400
3	✓	✓	Craftsmanship	₦ 140,616
4	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 155,602
5	✓	✓	✓	₦ 145,625
6	✓	✓	✓	₦ 155,624
7	✓	✓	✓	₦ 105,500
8	✓	✓	Petty trading	₦ 130,500
9	✓	✓	Fishing	₦ 135,400
10	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 123,625
11	✓	✓	✓	₦ 140,618
12	✓	✓	✓	₦ 145,113
13	✓	✓	✓	₦ 130,613
14	✓	✓	✓	₦ 138,110
15	✓	✓	✓	₦ 146,112
16	✓	✓	Petty trading	₦ 147,303
17	✓	✓	Tailoring	₦ 132,613
18	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 146,000
19	✓	✓	✓	₦ 134,413
20	✓	✓	✓	₦ 145,500
21	✓	✓	Craftsmanship	₦ 155,716
22	✓	✓	✓	₦ 125,963
23	✓	✓	✓	₦ 142,663
24	✓	✓	Petty trading	₦ 155,843
25	✓	✓	Fishing	₦ 135,733
26	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 140,173
27	✓	✓	✓	₦ 130,258

28	✓	✓	✓	₦ 145,400
<b>Respondents</b>		<b>Kariyari</b>	<b>Sources of Income before</b>	<b>Annual Income per annum</b>
29	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 135,671
30	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 130,000
31	✓	✓	✓	₦ 150,213
32	✓	✓	Craftsmanship	₦ 155,510
33	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 150,600
34	✓	✓	✓	₦ 100,617
35	✓	✓	✓	₦ 135,431
36	✓	✓	✓	₦ 125,300
37	✓	✓	Petty trading	₦ 129,628
38	✓	✓	Fishing	₦ 145,613
39	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 155,623
40	✓	✓	✓	₦ 110,700
41	✓	✓	✓	₦ 135,543
42	✓	✓	✓	₦ 120,602
43	✓	✓	✓	₦ 155,000
44	✓	✓	✓	₦ 155,613
45	✓	✓	Petty trading	₦ 125,793
46	✓	✓	Tailoring	₦ 130,400
47	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 100,393
48	✓	✓	✓	₦ 145,683
49	✓	✓	✓	₦ 124,642
50	✓	✓	Craftsmanship	₦ 140,684
51	✓	✓	✓	₦ 155,742
52	✓	✓	✓	₦ 148,724
53	✓	✓	Petty trading	₦ 135,673
54	✓	✓	Fishing	₦ 130,662
<b>Respondents</b>	<b>FUNEL.G.A</b>	<b>Daura</b>	<b>Sources of income before</b>	<b>Annual income per annum</b>
55	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 100,364
56	✓	✓	✓	₦ 145,710
57	✓	✓	Craftsmanship	₦ 125,600
58	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 106,513
59	✓	✓	✓	₦ 144,300
60	✓	✓	✓	₦ 155,613
61	✓	✓	✓	₦ 138,610
62	✓	✓	Petty trading	₦ 148,210
63	✓	✓	Craftsmanship	₦ 150,301
64	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 145,160
65	✓	✓	✓	₦ 155,600
66	✓	✓	✓	₦ 105,635
67	✓	✓	✓	₦ 145,516
68	✓	✓	✓	₦ 100,656
69	✓	✓	✓	₦ 137,120

70	✓	✓	Petty trading	₦ 166,065
71	✓	✓	Tailoring	₦ 156,905
72	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 168, 925
73	✓	✓	✓	₦ 146,616
74	✓	✓	✓	₦ 135,600
75	✓	✓	Craftsmanship	₦ 140, 726
76	✓	✓	✓	₦ 155,316
77	✓	✓	✓	₦ 145,361
78	✓	✓	Petty trading	₦ 135, 163
79	✓	✓	Craftsmanship	₦ 138,331
80	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 145,681
81	✓	✓	Tailoring	₦ 148,600
82	✓	✓	✓	₦ 155, 620
83	✓	✓	✓	₦ 146, 531
84	✓	✓	Petty trading	₦ 110,300
85	✓	✓	✓	₦ 150, 312
86	✓	✓	✓	₦ 146,130
<b>Respondents</b>		<b>Alagarno</b>	<b>Source of income</b>	<b>Annual Income per annum</b>
87	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 152,500
88	✓	✓	✓	₦ 125,427
89	✓	✓	Craftsmanship	₦ 153,332
90	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 154, 600
91	✓	✓	✓	₦ 135,910
92	✓	✓	✓	₦ 145,865
93	✓	✓	✓	₦ 155,013
94	✓	✓	Petty trading	₦ 146, 530
95	✓	✓	Craftsmanship	₦ 156,351
96	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 150,136
97	✓	✓	✓	₦ 140, 690
98	✓	✓	✓	₦ 148,894
99	✓	✓	✓	₦ 156,315
100	✓	✓	✓	₦ 138,616
101	✓	✓	✓	₦ 144,613
102	✓	✓	Petty trading	₦ 146,400
103	✓	✓	Tailoring	₦ 154,163
104	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 130,136
105	✓	✓	✓	₦ 150,316
106	✓	✓	✓	₦ 144,361
107	✓	✓	Craftsmanship	₦ 146,341
108	✓	✓	✓	₦ 155,314
<b>Respondents</b>	<b>KARASUWA L.G.A</b>	<b>Karasuwa G.Guna</b>	<b>Source of Income before</b>	<b>Annual Income per annum</b>
109	✓	✓	Petty trading	₦ 144,631
110	✓	✓	Craftsmanship	₦ 156,134
111	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 148,413
112	✓	✓	✓	₦ 165, 143



113	✓	✓	✓	₦ 146,083
114	✓	✓	✓	₦ 156,613
115	✓	✓	✓	₦ 138,420
116	✓	✓	Petty trading	₦ 157,063
117	✓	✓	Craftsmanship	₦ 145,813
118	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 138,090
119	✓	✓	✓	₦ 120, 092
120	✓	✓	✓	₦ 166, 910
121	✓	✓	Craftsmanship	₦ 140, 912
122	✓	✓	✓	₦ 166,865
123	✓	✓	✓	₦ 100,500
124	✓	✓	Petty trading	₦ 145,130
125	✓	✓	Tailoring	₦ 130,600
126	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 158,163
127	✓	✓	✓	₦ 148, 000
128	✓	✓	✓	₦ 151,563
129	✓	✓	Craftsmanship	₦ 136,531
130	✓	✓	✓	₦ 152,536
131	✓	✓	✓	₦ 162 600
132	✓	✓	Petty trading	₦ 151,653
133	✓	✓	Knitting	₦ 159, 573
134	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 148, 500
135	✓	✓	✓	₦ 133,516
136	✓	✓	✓	₦ 157, 710
<b>Respondents</b>		<b>Wachakal</b>	<b>Source of Income before</b>	<b>Annual Income per annum</b>
137	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 153, 150
138	✓	✓	✓	₦ 148,061
139	✓	✓	Craftsmanship	₦ 144,313
140	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 145,303
141	✓	✓	✓	₦ 150,200
142	✓	✓	✓	₦ 135,634
143	✓	✓	✓	₦ 165,788
144	✓	✓	Petty trading	₦ 155,738
145	✓	✓	Fishing	₦ 145,676
146	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 155,710
147	✓	✓	✓	₦ 138,000
148	✓	✓	✓	₦ 140, 414
149	✓	✓	✓	₦ 155, 694
150	✓	✓	✓	₦ 147,000
151	✓	✓	✓	₦ 155,750
152	✓	✓	Petty trading	₦ 139,613
153	✓	✓	Tailoring	₦ 158,070
154	✓	✓	Farming	₦ 147,665
155	✓	✓	✓	₦ 159,000
156	✓	✓	✓	₦ 149,690
157	✓	✓	Craftsmanship	N 169,660
158	✓	✓	✓	₦ 154, 000

159	✓	✓	✓	₦ 132,620
160	✓	✓	Petty trading	₦ 148,000

Source: Yobe State (2011) IFAD-CBARDP Baseline Analysis

**Key:** The sum total annual income before is = 24898082 of 160 respondents.

Then, the average mean income was obtained by dividing  $24898082 \div 160$

= 155613.025 or 155,613

#### Appendix iv

##### Baseline analysis on employment opportunity before IFAD-CBARDP

Employment opportunities	*Frequency	Percentages
Trading	63	39.4
Carpentry	59	36.9
Blacksmithing	53	33.1
Food processing	56	35.0
Tailoring	62	38.7
Fishing	50	31.2
Embroidery making	37	23.1
Knitting	64	40.0
Bricklaying	47	29.4

##### \*Multiple responses

Source: Yobe State (2011) IFAD-CBARDP Baseline Analysis

## Appendix v

Distribution of respondents according to their level of satisfaction on infrastructure provided

<b>Infrastructure</b>	<b>Very high (5)</b>	<b>High (4)</b>	<b>Fairly high (3)</b>	<b>Fair (2)</b>	<b>Low (1)</b>
Farm inputs provided	64	79	03	06	08
Vocational skills/centres	67	82	03	05	03
Water/Borehole	65	80	02	07	06
Health facilities	65	75	03	08	09
Schools provided	60	75	08	08	09
Credit facilities	45	68	08	23	16

## Appendix vi

Weighted scores of respondents satisfaction level with infrastructure provided (n=160)

<b>Infrastructure</b>	<b>Very high (5)</b>	<b>High (4)</b>	<b>Fairly high (3)</b>	<b>Fair (2)</b>	<b>Low (1)</b>	<b>Total</b>
Farm inputs provided	1280	1975	100	300	800	4455
Vocational skills/centres	1340	2050	100	250	300	4040

Water/Borehole	1300	2000	66.7	350	600	4317
Health facilities	1300	1875	100	400	900	4575
Schools provided	1200	1875	267	400	900	4642
Credit facilities	900	1700	267	1150	1600	5617

Appendix vii: *Questionnaire*

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRIC ECONOMICS AND RURAL SOCIOLOGY,  
FACULTY OF AGRICULTURE, AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA,  
NIGERIA**

Dear Respondent,

This questionnaire will be used by a student of Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Faculty of Agriculture, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. Please, respond or tick where necessary. All information given would be treated with utmost confidentiality and will strictly be used for the purpose of research only.

NO: \_\_\_\_\_

**Background Information**

1. Zone: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Local Government Area \_\_\_\_\_
3. Town/ Village: \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION A. Socio-economic Characteristics of Respondents in Benefitting Communities.**

4. Sex of respondent: (a) Male [ ] (b) Female [ ]
5. Age of respondent \_\_\_\_\_
6. Marital Status: (a) Single [ ] (b) Married [ ]
7. Household Size ----- [ ]
8. Highest level of Education
  - (a) None ----- [ ]
  - (b) Adult education----- [ ]
  - (b) Primary education ----- [ ]

- (c) Secondary education----- [ ]
- (d) Tertiary education----- [ ]
- (e) Others (specify):-----  
-----

9. Are you a member of any cooperative society?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

10. If yes, what are names of the cooperative society?

- i -----
- ii-----

iii-----

11. How many years have you spent as a member

- i -----
- ii-----
- iii-----

**SECTION B. Infrastructure Provided by IFAD-CBARDP.**

12. How long have you participated in IFAD-CBARDP Programme in your area. ----- [ ] years.

13. Did IFAD-CBARDP provides accessible basic infrastructure in your community?

(a) Yes [ ] No [ ]

14. If yes, list the basic accessible infrastructure provided by IFAD-CBARDP in your community.

- i. -----
- ii. -----
- iii. -----
- iv. -----
- v. -----
- vi. -----
- vii. -----
- viii. -----
- ix. -----

- x. -----
- xi. -----

15. Are those infrastructure provided by the programme based on the community felt need?

(a) Yes [ ] No [ ]

16. If No, what are the preferred ones?

- (i)-----
- (ii)-----
- (iii)-----
- (iv)-----
- (v)-----

17. Do you have access to the infrastructure provided by IFAD-CBARDP ?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

18. Has IFAD-CBARDP provided vocational skills training in your area?

(a) Yes [ ] (b) No [ ]

19. If yes, what type of vocational skills/ training has IFAD-CBARDP provided in your community?

- a) Carpentry [ ]
- b) Knitting [ ]
- d) Tailoring [ ]
- e) Others specify i-----
- ii -----

20. Did you complete the IFAD-CBARDP vocational skills/ training provided above?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

21. If yes, which of them are you practicing? i -----

ii -----

22. If No, why not? -----  
-----

23. Did IFAD-CBARDP provides farm inputs subsidy to your community?

(a) Yes [ ] or (b) No [ ]

24. If yes, which type of input subsidy provided by IFAD-CBARDP did you benefit from?

a. Fertilizer [ ]

b. Seeds [ ]

c. Agro chemicals [ ]

d. Farm equipments [ ]

e. Livestock drugs [ ]

f. others specify -----

25. Do you have access to Credit facilities?

Accessible [ ] Not Accessible [ ]

### SECTION C. Impact of IFAD-CBARDP on Livelihood of Respondent.

26. Comment on the impact of IFAD-CBARDP with respect to the following indicators of livelihood (Assets)

	INDICATORS	(Tick)	Number Owned	Estimated Current Value in naira(₦)
<b>2.</b>	<b>Ownership of Household Assets</b>			
A	Radio only			
B	TV only			
C	Tape recorder only			
D	Radio/ Tape recorder			
E	Radio/ TV			
F	TV/Tape recorder			
G	Refrigerator			

H	TV/Radio/Tape recorder/Refrigerator			
I	None			
<b>3.</b>	<b>Ownership of Houses</b>			
A	Inherited			
B	Purchased			
C	Built			
D	Rented			
E	Pledged			
F	Others			
<b>4.</b>	<b>Ownership of Means of Transportation</b>			
A	Bicycle only			
B	Motorcycle only			
C	Car only			
D	Lorry			
E	Pick up Van			
F	Others			

29. Comment on the extent to which availability and accessibility to the following infrastructure and Services have impacted on your livelihood

		<b>Responses</b>					
	<b>Infrastruc ture</b>	<b>Impact variables</b>	<b>Very (5)Hi</b>	<b>High (4)</b>	<b>Fairly High</b>	<b>Fa ir (2)</b>	<b>Low (1)</b>



			gh		(3)	)	
	Boreholes/ Wells	i. Provides access to portable water					
		ii. water for irrigation and domestic use					
		(iii) irrigation of crops					
		iv. empowerment for youth					
	Educational facilities (schools)	i. Promote feeding quality among pupils.					
		ii. pupils/student enrolment					
	Postal services	Enhances rural -urban communication exchange.					
	Social Canters/ recreational centres'	i. Increases respondent level of awareness					
	Markets	i. Easy access to marketing outlets					
	Storage facilities	i. Help to preserve on farm and off farm food.					
	Roads	i. Easy delivery of farm input					
		ii. Reduce transportation cost					
	Irrigation Facilities	i. Stabilize food production					
	Health centres	i. Increases respondent health status					
		ii. Enhances personal hygiene.					

	Housing	Stabilize accommodation problems.					
	Electricity	i. increases productivity of agro-processors					
	Vocational centres'	i. Enhances economic engagement					
	Para vet clinic	Enhances livestock health care delivery services					
	Public toilets	Enhances sanitary conditions.					

#### SECTION D. Level of Satisfaction with Infrastructure

**KEY:** **HS**= highly satisfied **MS** =moderately satisfied **UD** = Undecided **FS**= fairly satisfied

**NS**= not satisfied.

30. Did IFAD-CBARDP provides boreholes/wells in this community?

(a) Yes [ ] or (b) No [ ]

31. Are you satisfied that, the provision of borehole/wells by IFAD-CBARDP has led to the following?

		<b>Very (5)High</b>	<b>High (4)</b>	<b>Fairly High (3)</b>	<b>Fair (2)</b>	<b>Low (1)</b>
a.	Available sources of potable water					
b.	Water for domestic use					
c.	Ease distance/ trekking to sources of portable water					
d.	Water for irrigation of crops					
e.	Employment of youth					

31. Did IFAD-CBARDP provides schools to your community?

(a) Yes [ ] (b) No [ ]

32. What type of schools has IFAD-CBARDP) provided?
- a. Primary schools
  - b. Secondary schools
  - c. Vocational Training centre (VTC)
  - d. Others (specify) -----  
-----

33. Are you satisfied that, the provision of educational facilities/ schools by IFAD-CBARDP has led to the following?

		<b>Very (5)High</b>	<b>High (4)</b>	<b>Fairly High (3)</b>	<b>Fair (2)</b>	<b>Low (1)</b>
a.	Pupils /student enrolment					
b.	Ease long distance/ trekking					
c.	Improve moral behaviour among pupil/students					
d.	Personal hygiene among pupils/student					
e.	Employment opportunities					

34. Did IFAD-CBARDP provides healthcare centres to your community?

(a) Yes  or b) No

35. What type of healthcare centres were provided by IFAD-CBARDP in your community?

- a. Dispensary
- b. Maternal care facilities
- c. Leprosy health care facilities
- d. Mobile health care facilities
- e. Private clinic

36. Are you satisfied that, the provision of health care centres by IFAD-CBARDP has brought about the following?

		<b>Very (5)High</b>	<b>High (4)</b>	<b>Fairly High (3)</b>	<b>Fair (2)</b>	<b>Low (1)</b>
a.	Free medical care					
b.	Family hygiene					
c.	Vaccination for children					
d.	Ante-natal care					
e.	Access to mosquitoes net					
f.	Care for HIV/AIDS victims					

37. Did you obtain Credit from IFAD-CBARDP during 2010 farming season?

- (a) Yes [ ]                      (b) No [ ]

38. If yes, state the amount of Credit you received in naira ₦-----

39. Are you satisfied that, the provision of Credit by IFAD-CBARDP has led to the following?

		<b>Very (5)High</b>	<b>High (4)</b>	<b>Fairly High (3)</b>	<b>Fair (2)</b>	<b>Low (1)</b>
a.	Increase in occupational status					
b.	More farms for production and other income generated activities					
c.	Timely access to loan for farming					
d.	Marry more wives					

40. Did IFAD-CBARDP provide farm input subsidy to your community?

- (a) Yes [ ]                      (b) No [ ]

If yes, what type of input subsidy provided by IFAD-CBARDP did you benefitted from?

- a. Fertilizer [ ]  
 b. Seeds [ ]  
 c. Agro chemicals [ ]  
 d. Farm equipments [ ]  
 e. livestock drugs [ ]  
 f. others specify-----  
 -----

42. Are you satisfied that, the provision farm input subsidy has led to the following?

		<b>Very (5)High</b>	<b>High (4)</b>	<b>Fairly High (3)</b>	<b>Fair (2)</b>	<b>Low (1)</b>
a.	Timely access to farm input					
b.	Enhanced farm productivity					
c.	Reduce livestock disease spread					
d.	Encourage farmers to produce					

43. Did IFAD-CBARDP provides vocational skills/training in your community?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

44. If yes, what type of vocational skills/ training is provided by IFAD-CBARDP in your community?

- a. Knitting [ ]
- b. Blacksmithing [ ]
- c. Food processing [ ]
- d. Tailoring [ ]
- e. Others specify-----  
-----

45. Are you satisfied that, the provision of vocational skills/training has led to the following?

		<b>Very (5)High</b>	<b>High (4)</b>	<b>Fairly High (3)</b>	<b>Fair (2)</b>	<b>Low (1)</b>
a.	Self employment					
b.	Minimize crime					
c.	Increases income					
d.	Improve farm productivity					
e.	Minimize youth rural-urban drift					

46. Has IFAD-CBARDP programme increased employment opportunities in your community?

(a) Yes [ ] No [ ]

47. What type of employment opportunities do you think IFAD-CBARDP Programme has brought in the area?

- a. Trading [ ]
- b. Master carpentry [ ]
- c. Blacksmithing [ ]
- d. Food processing [ ]
- e. Tailoring [ ]
- f. Fishing [ ]
- g. Embroidery making [ ]

- h. Knitting [ ]
- i. Bricklaying [ ]
- j. Others (specify) -----  
-----

48. Which of the employment programme provided by IFAD-CBARDP are you engaged in?

- i -----
- ii-----

50. Has your total income been improved as a result of your participation on IFAD-CBARDP ?

- a) Yes [ ]      b) No [ ]

51. Estimate the total amount of income generated as a result of IFAD-CBARDP in a year?

~~N~~-----

**SECTION E. Constraints to the Effective performance in IFAD-CBARDP.**

52. What specific constraints do you face as a result of your participation on IFAD-CBARDP?

- i. -----
- ii -----iii ---
- 
- iv -----
- v -----

53. What are your Suggestions on how to solve these problems, so as to better your livelihood and the community?

- i -----
- ii -----
- iii -----

**Thank you very much.**