



## **Social Infrastructure and Community Participation in Rural Areas of Katsina State, Nigeria**

**Abdullahi Garba, Ph.D**

**Department of Public Administration  
Hassan Usman Katsina Polytechnic  
Katsina – Nigeria  
(abdulgom@yahoo.com)**

### **ABSTRACT**

The objective of this research study is to assess the contributions of Community Participation in the provision of social Infrastructure in rural Katsina State, Northern Nigeria. The methodology employed by the research is triangulation method in which quantitative and qualitative instruments were used. Data collected was mainly based on primary and secondary sources. The findings of the research study indicated that community participation said to be high. This was as a result of various factors such as democracy at the community level, other factors include, and traditional institutions in the area are well committed to the issue of participation, colonial experience by the rural populace, awareness among the rural populace on the needs of the community participation as a basis for their development. Social infrastructure (health facilities in particular) in Katsina state, Northern Nigeria is ironically meagre and efforts made to improve them have not yielded desired results. Though it has recorded some improvement during the period under review, but generally their availability was found to be low. Some of the recommendations of the research include efforts should be made to sustain the tempo in which community participation would be used in achieving development at grassroots' level, more awareness should be made to rural populace on the provision of social infrastructure like health facilities, increase in funding by the government and nongovernmental in the provision of social infrastructures at rural level.

**Keywords:** Social Infrastructure, Community Participation, Rural Areas.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Community participation is not only an instrument for solving specific community problems, but also for more general activities, such as democratic procedures, voluntary cooperation, and community empowerment so on. This localities development approach emphasized the whole local system's capacity for building and maintaining a solid community, in which a fundamental network structure should be built up by establishing cooperative relationships among groups, creating a self-help community problem-solving system and stimulating residents' interest and participation in community affairs. These goals of locality development emphasized community participation and the harmonious interrelationships among them. According to Rifkin and Kangere (2001) community participation has been a constant theme in development dialogues for the past 50 years. In the 1960s and 1970s, it became central to development projects as a means for seeking sustainability and equity, particularly for the poor. World Bank (2006) asserted that the reasons for community participation at local or international level consist of the following;

- i. Local people have a great amount of experience and insight into what works, what does not work and why.
- ii. Involving local people in planning projects can increase their commitment to the project.
- iii. Involving local people can help them to develop technical and managerial skills and thereby increase their opportunities for employment.
- iv. Involving local people helps to increase the resources available for the programme.

- v. Involving local people is a way to bring about 'social learning' for both planners and beneficiaries. 'Social learning' means the development of partnerships between professionals and local people, in which, each group learns from the others.

### **Literature Review**

The way community participation is defined on the context in which it occurs. According to Oxford English Dictionary defined participation as "to have a share in" or "to take part in" thereby emphasizing the rights of individuals and the choices that they make in order to participate. Arnstein (1969) in Burns (2004) states that the idea of citizen participation is a little like eating spinach, no one is against it in principle because it is good for you. Community participation is that process which can lead to a consensual mission statement for which there is wide support and ownership (Chambos 2005). Community participation would imply the involvement of a significant number of persons in situations or actions that enhance their wellbeing, for example, their income, security, or self-esteem (Chowdhury, 1996). He further states that the ideal conditions contributing towards meaningful participation can be discussed from three aspects: What kind of participation is under consideration? Who participates in it? How does participation occur?

United Nations (2005) viewed community participation as the creation of opportunities to enable all members of a community to actively contribute to and influence the development process and to share equitably in the fruits of development. community participation is essential in order to establish economic and political relationship within the wider society and it is not just a matter of involvement in project activities but rather the process by which rural people are able to organize themselves, ability to identify their own needs, share in design, implement, and evaluate participatory action (Kumar 2003). Armitage (1988) asserted that community participation as a process by which citizens act in response to public concerns, voice their opinions about decisions that affect them, and take responsibility for changes to their community. Westergaard (1986) maintained that community participation is a "collective efforts to increase and exercise control over resources and institutions on the part of groups and movements of those hitherto excluded from control". According to the World Bank, (1995) community participation is "a process through which stakeholder's influence and share control over development initiatives, and the decisions and resources which affect them". In line with this Muzaare (2012) sees community participation as an active process of decision making where the beneficiaries influence the direction and implementation of development programmes, rather than merely receiving a share of development programmes. Community participation is a rich concept that varies with its application and definition. For some, it is a matter of principle; for others, practice; for still others, an end in itself (World Bank 1995). Indeed, there is merit in all these interpretations as Rahnema (1992) notes that community participation is a stereotype word like children use Lego pieces, like Lego pieces the words fit arbitrarily together and support the most fanciful constructions. They have no content, but do serve a function. As these words are separate from any context, they are ideal for manipulative purposes. 'Community participation' belongs to this category of word.

Community participation may take the form of involvement with religious or charitable institutions, voluntary associations, neighbourhood associations and informal social activities (Gottlieb 1981). Community participation is based on the activities that allow people to work cooperatively towards a common goal (Zimmerman, 2000). People who participate in community activities display greater involvement with their community and enhance their sense of belonging to the place (Chavis and Wandersman, 1990) in (Tajuddin 2011). In his words Shepher (2008) said community participation includes attitude change, understanding, humility, flexibility and patience. He further states that community participation includes political support, decentralization, traditions of community organization, availability of good leaders and managers and helpful procedures, technologies which promote autonomy and self reliance and so on. The governments and nongovernmental organizations calls for people involvement in development process that direct affect their life. Community may participate in different development activities such as building infrastructures such as roads, health services and education development. In his words Mbithi, (1974) asserted that community participation in development of local needs, and conception formulation and of any project in order to develop the necessary self reliance and self confidence needed among the rural people for accelerated development. It is important to note that without community participation, no meaningful

development can be achieved especially in the provision of social infrastructure in the rural areas of the case study.

To Ogunna (2007) community participation is an extension of the principle of mass participation is people initiative, the people themselves are to be allowed free hand to initiate any rural project that represents their felt needs through their own political and administrative machinery, make a detailed and purposeful plan of these needs and finally use their resources for the execution of their plan. According to World Health Organization (2001), suggested that community participation can be interpreted in three ways; participation as contribution, as organization and as empowerment. When a community participates in programs by contributing labour, cash or materials, this is contributive participation. Participation as organization means creation of appropriate structure which facilitates participation. Empowering participation occurs when people develop the capability to solve their problems without waiting for help from outside. However, in order not to make this concept cumbersome, community participation may be used interchangeably with community involvement. WHO, (2000) maintained that community participation is “the process by which individuals and families assume responsibility for their own health and welfare and for those of the and develop the capacity to contribute to their and community’s development” By knowing (understanding) their circumstances better, they are then motivated to solve their common problems because they would therefore become agents (participants) of their own development. Kumar, (2002) states that community participation means different thing to different people. The way community participation is defined largely depends upon the context and background in which participation is applied. Aref and Redzuan (2009) asserted that community participation as the voluntary and democratic involvement of people in contributing to the development effort, sharing equitably in the benefits derived there from and decision making in respect of setting goals, formulating policies and planning and implanting economic and social development programmes. Reid (2000) viewed community participation in terms of power sharing and organized efforts to increase control over resources and regulative institutions. In this sense, community participation is viewed as an active process in which the participants take initiatives and actions that are stimulated by their own thinking and deliberations over which they exert effective control. Raniga and Simpson (2002) remarked that community participation might mean that communities are allowed direct and ultimate control in taking decision concerning their affairs. Theron (2005) pointed out that there are different shades of opinion on either citizen or public participation and it related to the process of giving people more opportunities to participate effectively in development activities by empowering them to mobilize their own creative potentials, manage the resources, make decisions and control the activities that affect their lives.

In his contribution Burkey (2000) states that community participation includes group membership is voluntary, and groups are homogeneous have a common interest and belong to the same socio-economic category, small groups allow open and intensive discussion, a higher quality of participation, leaders are elected, and leadership rotates, decisions should be taken by collective deliberation, regular meetings, savings and credit funds activities help build unity and cohesion, all decision (what to do, how to do it) are taken by the group, external agents should only provide advice when asked; among poor people activities are initially directed at improving livelihoods. Community Participation is the heart that pumps the community’s life blood, its citizens into the community’s business.

Social infrastructure support sustains both social and economic growth and improves quality and living conditions of the community. Social infrastructures remain the core element of rural welfare. Thus efforts to raise rural welfare must necessarily go beyond the traditional and limited approved of raising per capita income through agricultural development projects to the provision of rural basic needs in term of health and medical facilities, potable water and schools. Fourie, (2006) observed that economists and urban planners distinguish two types of infrastructure; economic infrastructure and social infrastructure. Economic infrastructure is defined as the infrastructure that promotes economic activity, such as roads, highways, railroads, airports, sea ports, electricity, telecommunications, water supply and sanitation. Social infrastructure (such as schools, libraries, universities, clinics, hospitals, courts, museums, theatres, playgrounds, parks, fountains and statues) is defined as the infrastructure that promotes the health, education and cultural standards of the population activities that have both direct and indirect impact on the welfare. All of these institutions entail capital goods that have some public use. This research is more concerned with the social

infrastructure (health infrastructure in particular). According to Casey (2005) social infrastructures are provided in response to the needs of communities. They enhance the quality of life, equity, law and order, stability and social well being through community support, safety and security, sports, recreation and culture, justice, housing, health and education. Social infrastructure provision requires a consideration and assessment of the full range of services and facilities that are required to address the needs of local communities. Such an assessment needs to be directly informed by the views and experiences of local residents. This is a challenging, time consuming and resource intensive exercise.

**General Objective of the Study:**

The study was conducted to assess the contributions of Rural Community Development in the provision of Social Infrastructure in Katsina State, Nigeria

**Specific Objectives of the Study:**

To assess the role of community participation in the provision of social infrastructure in rural areas of Katsina State, Nigeria.

**Research Question:**

What is the role of community participation in the provision of social infrastructure in rural areas of Katsina state, Nigeria?

**METHODOLOGY**

The research study employed triangulation research approaches (quantitative and qualitative) in nature. ‘A technique involved in collecting and analysing data from both quantitative and qualitative strategies (Amin, 2005). It is quantitative because of both independent and dependent variables are numerical in nature (both variables were measured in number). It is Qualitative because it has employed interview as an option of collecting data. An analysis of documented evidence was also employed in the research to give out evidence of existing situation in the case study area. It is Correlational and partly historical since a period of 10 years (2006 – 2016) was involved. It is partly longitudinal (survey) in nature. According to Shadish, Cook and Campbell (2002) accessed on 7 May 2016; a longitudinal survey is a correlational research study that involves repeated observations of the same variables over a long period of time, often many decades. It is often a type of observational study, although they can also be structured as longitudinal randomized experiments. Longitudinal studies track the same people and so the differences observed in those people are less likely to be the result of cultural differences across generations. Longitudinal studies thus make observing changes more accurate and are applied in various other fields.

**Table 1. Selected Local Government Areas and Respondent involved in the Research Study**

Local Government Areas	Total Target population		Sample Size	
	Target Population	Sample Size	Rural Households	Government Officials
Bakori	149,516	38	27	11
Faskari	194,400	49	34	15
Jibiya	167,435	42	29	13
Kaita	182,405	46	32	14
Kankara	243,259	62	43	19
Kurfi	116,700	30	21	09
Mashi	171,070	43	30	13
Sandamu	136,944	35	25	10
Zango	156,052	39	27	12
Total	1,517,781	384	268	116
Target Population	1,517,781		Sample Size 384	

**Source: Researchers’ Sample Computation (2016).**

**Table 2: Percentage Distribution of Respondents**

<b>Respondent Gender</b>	<b>Items</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
	Male	237	61.7
	Female	147	38.3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Respondents Age</b>	20 - 25years	106	27.6
	26 - 30 years	70	18.2
	31 - 35years	86	22.4
	36 - 40years	68	17.7
	41 - 45 years	54	14.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>House hold Size</b>	0 – 5	252	65.6
	6 – 10	86	22.4
	11 -15	24	6.2
	16 – 20	22	5.7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Marital Status</b>	Single	138	35.9
	Married	246	64.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Educational Qualification</b>	Primary Education	1	.3
	Secondary Education	104	27.1
	Tertiary Education	279	72.7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Occupation</b>	Farming	73	19.0
	Civil Servant	207	53.9
	Trading	104	27.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Nationality</b>	Nigerian	384	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: Field study, 2016

**Interpretation of the level of variables using Likert Scale:**

The research study adopted four point Likert scale to measure both dependents and independent variable responses with scoring as follows:

1. Strongly disagree    2. Disagree    3. Agree    4. Strongly agree

The interpretation of the above is as follows;

- |                      |   |                   |
|----------------------|---|-------------------|
| 1. Strongly disagree | - | Very Poor         |
| 2. Disagree          | - | Poor              |
| 3. Agree             | - | Satisfactory      |
| 4. Strongly agree    | - | Very Satisfactory |

**Table 3: Descriptive statistics of the variables**

<b>Community Participation</b>			
<b>Item</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
Community participation promotes efficiency in project design and implementation	2.8906	1	High
Community participation promotes stability	2.8828	2	High
Community participation ensures sense of belonging	2.8698	3	High
Community participation promotes productivity	2.8620	4	High
Community participation allows group creativity	2.8516	5	High
Community participation is necessary for provision of social infrastructure.	2.8359	6	High
Community participation ensures project's completion	2.8177	7	High
Community participation enhances performance	2.8151	8	High
Community participation serves as a gateway for successful project execution in rural Katsina State	2.8125	9	High
Community participation allows for democracy to prevail	2.7943	10	High
<b>Average Mean</b>	<b>2.8432</b>		<b>High</b>

**Table 4:  
The Influence of Community Participation on Social Infrastructure:**

Model	B	Std Error	T Value	Beta	Sig.
Constant	2.142	0.216	18.117	-	0.000
Social Infrs	0.413	0.141	9.810	0.378	0.000
$R^2 = 0.211$ Adjusted $R^2 = 0.216$ Dependent Variable = Community Participation					

**DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS**

The second construct under the dependent variable is community participation. Community participation promotes efficiency in project design and implementation has the highest (mean = 2.8906) which means high. Community participation promotes stability in rural community development has a (mean = 2.8828) which means high also. Community participation ensures sense of belonging to all community members recorded a (mean = 2.8698) which is high on Likert scaling. We need to understand that community participation is the heart of rural projects. Moreover, community participation promotes rural projects in rural Katsina state has recorded a (mean = 2.8620) high. Group or community creativity in project execution related to community participation has a (mean = 2.8516) which is high. Participation in rural community development necessary has a (mean = 2.8359) High. Participation also ensures speedy execution of rural projects has a (mean = 2.8177) High, it's ensures community performance in project execution with a (mean = 2.8151) high. According to Abubakar, (2016) in an interview asserted '*we are engaged in community participation in in providing rural project especially provision of drugs to child and maternal clinic so as to develop our areas, with ourselves, resources and so on.* Participation allows for democracy to prevail in rural community development with a (mean = 2.7943) which means high. From the table four (4) the sig value is 0.0000 which less than 0.05 indicating the significance of the predictor of social infrastructure on Community Participation.  $R^2 = 0.211$  indicating that Social Infrastructure explain 21.1% of the variance in Community Participation. From the available data it shows the sig. value of 0.0000 which was less than 0.05 showing that social infrastructure is a significant predictor of community participation.  $R^2 = 0.211$  indicating that Social Infrastructure explain 21.1% of the variance in Community Participation. It is interesting to note that about (21.1%) gained enlightenment

about the communal participation as a means of achieving social infrastructure in rural areas of Katsina State. While some population engaged themselves in consultation with people in political powers in order to lobby assist in the developmental projects in the case study area. It is obvious that collective bargaining and execution of projects would assist the community participation to achieve greater heights.

### CONCLUSION

On the basis of the foregoing discussions, a conclusion could be reached that community participation was said to be high. This is as a result of various factors such as democracy at the community level or democracy which prevails at rural Katsina state. Other factors associated with the success include, traditionally, the area is used to rural project which they call (Aikin Gayya) meaning (rural community development project). Traditional institutions in the area are well committed to the issues related to community participation; colonial experience by the rural populace, awareness among the rural populace on the needs of the community participation as a basis for their development, high value attached to community participation by the rural populace; sense of maturity among community members and so on.

Social infrastructure (health facilities in particular) in Katsina state, Northern Nigeria is ironically meagre and efforts made to improve them have not yielded desired results. Though it has recorded some improvement during the period under review (2006 – 2016) especially on the government site, but generally availability of such infrastructure community participation was found to be low. This is as a result of many factors such as poor funding on the part of the government to controlled health centres and poor funding to rural community development associations. Another reason is attitudes of the community's, towards provision of such facilities, households, associations, practitioners and other development partners in the area are not fully mobilise and engaged in the provisions of such facilities. It was also established that there is inefficient drugs, poor administration of the drugs and so on.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

- i. Awareness should be encouraged among rural populace on the need to participate at all level to develop their areas. These should not only centre on helping other on occasions but should centre on provision of basic social infrastructure (health facilities in particular).
- ii. There is the need to mount campaign or reawaken the peoples' consciousness on the importance of community participation. These make them rethink from their former belief on rural community development. Agencies such as MAMSER (Mass Mobilization for Social and Economic Reconstruction), NOA (National Orientation Agency) be empower to campaign for change of attitude towards rural community development in rural areas of Katsina state, northern Nigeria.
- iii. Community participation should also be encouraged at all level especially in the grassroots level to allow for integration of all citizens for national unity. Nigeria been a society in which each community or state is different from other, community participation can be used as a tool for national integration were people would live side by side, participating in communal work to form a viable nation with nationhood in mind.
- iv. Plans should be provided by the governments and development partners (WHO, WB, Bill Gates Foundation, Dangote Foundation and so on) at all level as a road map for the attainment of a successful community participation. This road map should also provide commitment in terms of resources by the rural communities, government, nongovernmental organizations operating in the area so that collective effort can be achieve. Such plans should also be provided by the governments, communities and nongovernmental.
- v. Competition should be introduced for the best area with high turnover in community participation in the provisions of social infrastructures in rural Katsina state, northern Nigeria.
- vi. Award can be given to the best community or local government area with high community participation to boost their moral.

## REFERENCES

- Aref, F., and Ma'rof, R. (2008). "Barriers to community leadership in Tourism Development in Shiraz, Iran", *European Journal of Social Sciences*,
- Burns, D., Heywood, F., Taylor, M., Wilde, P. & Wilson, M. (2004). *Making community participation meaningful*: Bristol: The policy press
- Burkey, S. (2000). *People First: A Guide for Self Reliant Participatory Rural Development*: London: Zed Books.
- Gottlieb, B. H. (1981). *Social networks and social support in community mental health*. In B. H. Gottlieb (Ed.), *Social networks and social support*. London: Sage.
- Kumar, S. (2002). *Methods for community participation. A complete guide for practitioners*. London: ITDG Publishers.
- Mashi, S.A. (2015). Security and National Integration in Nigeria: Towards Getting the Geographic Mix Right, A paper Presented at 9<sup>th</sup> National Conference, HUK Polytechnic 2<sup>nd</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> May, 2015
- Mbithi, (1974). Rural sociology and rural development: Its Application in Kenya, *Community Development Journal Vol. 20. No.1*
- Ogunna, A.E.C. (2007). *Basic issues in community development and local Government*. Umuahia: Versatile Publishers.
- Okam, C.C. (1991). Using Social Studies as an instrument for citizenship education: An Educology for the mobilization of students for national awareness and understanding on the Nigerian Education Scene. *International Journal of Educology*
- Reid, J. N. (2000). Community participation "how people power brings sustainable benefits to communities" USDA Rural development office of community development
- Rifkin S.B. and Kangere M. (2001). *Partners in Planning: information, participation and Empowerment*. London and Oxford: Macmillan/TALC.
- Shadish, William R.; Cook, Thomas D.; Campbell, Donald T. (2002). *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company at <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/longitudinal>
- Sharp, J., Agnitsch, K., Ryan, V., & Flora, J. (2002). Social infrastructure and community economic development strategies: The case of self-development and industrial recruitment in rural Iowa. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 18(4),
- Shepherd, A. (2008). *Sustainable rural development*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Raniga, T. & Simpson, B. (2002). Community participation: rhetoric or reality. *Social work: A Professional Journal for the Social Worker*,
- Tajuddin, R.M. (2011). *Social capital and rural community self-development: Understanding community satisfaction and its impact on entrepreneurial climate and community outcomes*, Iowa State University, Digital Repository@ Iowa State University.
- Theron, F. (2005). *Public participation as a micro-level development strategy*, in Davids, F. Theron and K. J. Maphunye. *Participatory development in South Africa. A development management perspective*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- United Nations, (2005). A division for sustainable development. *Indicators for sustainable development: Review and assessment, background paper*, New York
- World Health Organization, (2000). *Primary health care report of the international conference on primary health care: Alma-Ata USSR*
- World Bank (2006). *Participation Sourcebook* Washington, D.C.: The World Bank
- World Bank, (2006). *Participation source book*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank