

RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES; HOW ACTIVE ARE YOUTH IN AKINYELE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF OYO STATE, NIGERIA

Adebayo, Oyefunke Olayemi

Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso

ABSTRACT: *The research examines Youth Participation in Rural Development Programme in Akinyele Local Government Area of Oyo State, Nigeria. A total of 110 respondents were selected for study through multistage random sampling techniques. Simple descriptive statistics such as frequency counts and percentage as well as inferential statistics such as Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) were used to analyze data collected. Result of analysis shows that majority of the respondents were between 21-30 years, male (53.6%), married (70.9%) and had formal education (81.9%). Majority (84.5%) contributed money, time, material and labour to rural development programmes. The programmes participated in includes; construction of town hall (2.43), construction of market stall (2.40), and construction of bus stop (2.31). Half (51.8%) of the respondents participated moderately in community development programmes. Constraints faced by respondents were poor leadership style (80.9%), inadequate funding (76.4%), lack of incentive (71.8%) among other. The result of PPMC analysis reveals that there is significant relationship between level of participation and; occupation ($r=0.434$, $p=0.05$), membership of social organization ($r=0.267$, $p=0.05$), educational level ($r=0.403$, $p=0.05$) and years of residence ($r=0.342$, $p=0.05$). The study therefore is concluded that youth participation in community development programmes was moderate in the study area. There is need to empowered youth financially to enable them complement government efforts in rural development programmes.*

KEYWORDS: Youth, Participation, Rural, Development, Programme

INTRODUCTION

The nature and scope of rural development are very important factors upon which the dimensions of development in rural communities are based (Adedoyin 1997). The importance of the youth to national development is without doubt because the various programmes directed to them by government at various times gives credence to this Agumagu et al (2006).

According to Ogolo (1996), youths make up a significant portion of the workforce in both rural and urban communities. They have assumed wider community development roles through formation of youth associations. Also Onuekewusi and Effiong (2002) view youth as a concept and defined it as the period in an individual life which runs between the end of childhood and entry into the world of work.

However, United Nations (1985) postulated that youth are those young people between the age brackets of 12-24 years .According to Jibowo *et al* (1988) rural youths are both young male and female between the age of 15 and 30, who own their existence and identity to the rural areas and whose family life depends directly on agriculture, that is those who live and function in rural setting.

Similarly Adeleke (1991) defined youth as the time person's latent power and attributes are exploited to their highest potential i.e. when intellects is at its sharpest and energy is at its most promising hence he describe people between the ages of 16-36years as youth. Odebode (2000) reported that rural youths also constitute a strong and very important labour force in development activities in rural communities. As noted by Geodkoop *et al* 2004 young people have a natural disposition for innovation and for learning new skills.

However, the study aimed at examining the participation of youth in rural development programme in Akinyele Local Government Area of Oyo State and specifically the study attempts to:

- i. identify the socio economic characteristics of the respondents in the study area
- ii. ascertain the level of participation in community development programmes
- iii. determine youth roles in community development programmes
- iv. identify various constraints affecting youth in participation in community development programmes in the study area.

Hypothesis of the study

There is no significant relationship between socio economic characteristics of the respondents and level of participation in community development programmes.

METHODOLOGY

The study was carried out in Akinyele Local Government Area of Oyo State, Nigeria. The people are predominantly farmers and the crops grown include yam, cassava, rice, maize etc. Others non agricultural jobs include civil service, trading, processing and craftsmanship.

The population of the study consists of all rural youth in the area. Multistage sampling technique was used. This include

- i. Random selection of five wards from the LGA
- ii. Two communities were randomly selected from each of the five wards giving a total of 10 communities
- iii. From each community selected, eleven respondents were selected making a total of one hundred and ten (110) respondents. This constituted the sample size for the study.

Data for the study was obtained using structured questionnaire with both open and closed ended questions. This was pretested and administered to elicit information from the respondents. Analytical tools such as frequency counts, percentages, mean score ranking order and Person Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) was adopted.

Measurement of Variable

Respondents were to indicate his/her participation in 13 listed community development programmes which were available in the study area with options of high participation (3), moderate participation (2) and low participations (1). The maximum score obtainable was 39 and minimum score was 13.

However, youth participation was also measured as a discrete choice variable of Yes (1) and No (0). The maximum score here is 13 and minimum score is 0. This was later used to categorize as low participation (0-4) moderate (5-8) and high participation (9-13).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio Economics Characteristics of Respondents

Gender

Table 1 shows that half (53.6%) of the respondents were male, while 46.4% were female. This indicates that male were more involved in community development programme in the study area.

Age

Majority (65.5%) of the respondents was between the ages of 21- 30 years and only few (7.3%) were 15-20years and 17.2% were 31-40 years. The mean age of respondents was 28.5years. This implies that youth in the study area are still young and agile this is the time their latent power and attributes were exploited.

Marital status

Majority (70.9%) of the respondents was married and 29.1% single. The high percentage of married youth is an indication of more responsibility in the study area. This indicates that respondent's married earlier and become involved in adult responsibility.

Educational level

A few (19.1%) of the respondents had no formal education while 24.5%, 30.0% and 26.4% had primary, secondary and tertiary education respectively. This high level of education of respondents is suggestive of their potential capacity for community development programmes. Education will enhance their understanding of the community development programmes.

Occupation

This is the source of income of respondents. Farming is the highest employer of labour (24.5%), this is closely followed by government salaried job (23.6%) while others are engaged in the informal sectors. Only 19.1% were students. This corroborates Ugwoke *et al* (2005) who reported that youths engaged in farming activities. Also Fasina and Okunola (2005) confirmed this by stating that youths are major clientele group needed for agricultural transformation in Nigeria.

Years of Residence

Table 1 also shows that majority (77.3%) of the respondents had stayed in the area between 12-18 years. Only few (7.3%) had stayed in the area between 19-25 years. This suggests that respondents will be more knowledgeable about their environment and this will improve their sense of belongingness in any community development programme in the area.

Membership of organization

Majority (80.9%) of the respondents belonged to social organization while (18.1%) did not belong to any.

Types of Contribution to Community Development Programmes

Tables 2 show that majority (84.5%) of the respondents contributed time, material and labour. This closely followed by contributed money only (77.3%). Also (65.5%) of respondents contributed money and materials, 53.6% contributed labour only, while 41.8% serve as member of implementation committee. This suggests high level of interest in community development programme.

Participation in Community Development Programmes

Table 3 shows ranking order of community development programme. The respondents participated in the following community development programmes construction of town hall (2.40) construction of bus stop (2.31) Rehabilitation of school (2.25), Child immunization (2.03) and vigilante group (2.02) while they had low participation on rural electrification (1.21) and construction of roads (1.07). This is in line with Adesope et al (2007) that youth participation in real and concrete activities which include self help endeavors, environmental sanitation, and renovation work has been reported.

Categorization of respondents' level of participation

Table 4 shows categorization of respondents half (51.8%) of the respondents recorded moderate level of participation in community development programmes. Only 21.8% recorded high level of participation. This suggests that respondents are probably aware of the needs for community development programme in the study area but hindered with some constraints as revealed in table 5. This implies that a lot is still needed to be done in terms of raising the participation of respondents in community development programmes.

Constraints to participation in Community Development Programmes

Table 5 shows that constraints to participation of youth in community development programme was hindered by various problems as revealed by result on table 5. Eight constraints were identified in this study. Poor leadership style (80.9%), inadequate funding (76.4%), lack of cooperation among youth (74.5%), lack of necessary information (66.4%), inadequate logistic support (58.2%), also poor decision making 51.8% and inadequate motivation from community. This suggests that respondents in the study area were faced with one constraint or the other and this will hindered their maximum participation in community development programmes.

Result of Correlation between socio economic characteristics and level of participation

Table 6 shows that there is significant relationship between some selected socio economic characteristics of respondents and level of participation. These are occupation ($r= 0.434$), membership of social organization ($r=0.267$) educational level ($r=0.403$) and years of residence ($r=0.342$) were significant.

This result suggests that occupation will have some influence on respondents' participation.

Also membership of social organization correlates positively and significant with level of participation. The implication of this is that the more the respondents remain in social organization the high their level of participation.

Also education level correlates significant and positive with level of participation. This implies that the higher the level of education the higher the level of participation in community development programmes. However education is a major determinant of effective participation in community development projects. The educated would most likely appreciate community development better than the less education Angba et al 2009

Years of residence were significant with level of participation. This implies that the longer the years of residence the higher the level of participation. However an indigene of a community would better appreciate the condition of this community.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Constraints to participation in community development programmes had adversely affected the level of participation. However major occupation was farming and civil service job. The major community development programme embark upon in the study area include construction of town hall, construction of health centre and construction of market stalls.

Majority was discovered to have moderate level of participation. Significant relationship exists between occupation membership of social organization, educational level and years of residence and level of participation. Based on the findings it is recommended that rural growth should be empowered financially to enable them complement government efforts in rural development.

There should be growth mobilization towards development programmes. Incentive should be made available to rural growth toward their participation this will boost their morale and continues participation in development programmes.

Table 1 Distribution of socioeconomics characteristics of respondents

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
15-20	8	7.3
21-25	30	27.3
26-30	42	38.2
31-35	17	15.4
36-40	13	11.8
Gender		
Male	59	53.6
Female	51	46.4
Marital status		
Single	32	29.1
Married	78	70.9
Educational level		
No formal education	21	19.1
Primary education	27	24.5
Secondary education	33	30.0
Tertiary education	29	26.4
Occupation		
Farming	27	24.5
Trading	14	12.7
Civil servant	26	23.7
Artisan	22	20.0
Student	21	19.1
Membership of organization		
Yes	87	80.9
No	21	19.1
Years of residence		
5-11	17	15.5
12-18	85	77.5
19-25	8	7.2
Survey Field: 2011		

Table 2 Distribution of respondents based on the types of contribution to community development Program

Types of contribution	Frequency	Percentage
Contributed money only	83	77.3
Contributed time, Material labour	65	59.1
Contributed labour money and material	72	65.5
Contributed labour only	59	53.6
Serve as member of implementation Committee	46	41.8
Contribution money, time, material and labour	93	84.5

Source: Field Survey 2011.

Multiple responses recorded.

Table 3 Distribution of respondents according to participation community development programmes.

Community development programmes	Mean score	Rank order
Constriction of town hall	2.43	1 st
Construction of market stall	2.40	2 nd
Construction of bus stop	2.31	3 rd
Rehabilitation of school	2.25	4 th
Child immunization	2.03	5 th
Vigilante group	2.02	6 th
Environmental sanitation	1.99	7 th
Campaign against HIV/AIDS	1.85	8 th
Campaign against tuberculosis	1.85	9 th
Family planning programmes	1.78	10 th
Exclusive breast feeding complain	1.44	11 th
Rural electrification	1.21	12 th
Construction of roods	1.07	13 th

Source: Field survey 2011.

Table 4: categorization of respondent according to level of participation.

Categorization by scores	Frequency	Percentage
1-4 Low	29	26.4
5-8 Moderate	57	51.8
9-13 High	24	21.8
Total	110	100

Source: field survey 2011.

Table 5 Distribution of respondents by constraints to participation

Constraints	Frequency *	Percentage
Poor leadership style	89	76.4
Inadequate funding	84	76.4
Lack of incentive	79	71.8
Inadequate logistic support	64	58.2
Lack of necessary information	73	66.4
Inadequate cooperation from other youth	82	74.5
Poor decision making	57	51.8
Inadequate motivation from community member	50	45.5

Source: field survey 2011

*multiple response recorded

Table 5 Correlation between socio economic characteristics of respondents and level of participation

Variables	r-value	Remark
Occupation	0.434**	S
Member of social organization	0.267**	S
Educational level	0.403**	s
Years of residence	0.342**	

Source: field survey 2011

s- significant at 0.01level.

REFERENCE

- According to Jibowo et al (1988) oral youths are both young Male and Female between the age of 15 and 30, who own their existence and identity to the rural areas and whose family life depends directly on agriculture, that is those who live and function in rural setting.
- Adedoyin, S.F (1997): Essentials of General Studies, Culture Computer, Agriculture, Roles on the Nature and Scope of Rural Development CESAP.
- Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye 2-40.
- Adeleke, I.1991 Youths and National Developments, Daily Sketch.
- Adesope O.M, Agumagu AC, Nwankwo C(2007) importance of youths in community development: perspectives of agricultural extension. In
- Agumagu, A.C et al (eds) contemporary issues in Agricultural extension and development studies series one. Port Harcourt Molsufem United services.
- Agumagu AC, adesope O.M, Mathews-Njoku E.C.(2006)attitude of youth corpers towards the community Development service of NYSC in Nigeria. J Agriculture Soc. Res, 6(i) 70-75.

- Angba A.O, Adesope O.M, and Aboh C.L (2009) Effect of socioeconomic characteristics of rural youths on their attitude towards participation in community development projects. *International N90 Journal* Vol 4(8) pp 348-351 august.
- Fasina O.O and odunola J.O (2005) Impact of youth agricultural programme on food production in Ondo State proceedings of the 9th annual conference of Nigerian Rural sociological association (8/11March 2004).
- Eremie, S (2003) Youth A Stronghold for sustainable agricultural extension delivery and development proceeding of the Eight Annual National conference of the agricultural extension of Nigeria (AESON). Sept 16-19 2002, held in Beinn city Edo state.
- Goed koop J. Roa MC, Sang JI, Barahama J.M, and Menendez JL (2004) Youth and research: experiences from Honduras and Columbia. *Low External Input and Sustainable Agriculture magazine (LEISA)* 20:p2.
- Jibowo, A.A, P.A Ladipo and A. Awoyinka, (1988) The place of Rural youth in Home economics and community Development. A paper presented at the Symposium on rural youth organized by the federal ministry of agriculture, Water, Resources and Rural Development, Abuja.
- Odebode, S.O (2000) Youth participation in Rural Development Oyo state. *Development of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development*, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.
- Ogolo M.B.(1995) "Grassroots participation in Rural Development: A study of Selected Infrastructure In some Communities of Rivers state Nigeria"
Unpublished PHD Dissertation, department of Agricultural extension services, university of Ibadan Nigeria pp 270.
- Onuekwusi, G.C and E.O Effung, (2002) Youth Empowerment in Rural Areas through participation in Rabbit production A case of Akwa Ibom state, Nigeria. *J. Rural social.* 4.95-99.
- United Nations (1985) Economics and social Development series of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization's Training for Agricultural and Rural Development. *International youth years and Rural youth work* (1985).
- Ugwoke F.O Adesope O.M ibe FC (2005) youth participation in farming activities in rural areas of Imo state, Nigeria Implication for extension. *J. Agric Exl.* 8:136-142.