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ABSTRACT

International development agenda under the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) has recorded remarkable achievement in poverty reduction and uplifting the standard of living of the poor people throughout the developing countries. However, the progress of poverty reduction was limited in Nigeria. The Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project (LEEMP) was introduced as a new Community Driven Poverty Reduction Programmes under MDGs. This study aims to examine and evaluate the effectiveness of LEEMP and the factors that determine its performance. A total of 36 villages were selected through multistage sampling techniques in nine local government areas in Adamawa State of Nigeria. The samples selected for the study include 30 villages that implemented the infrastructure components projects of LEEMP and six villages that implemented economic components of LEEMP. The main data for the analysis was collected from household surveys covering 500 respondents for the evaluation of the infrastructure components projects and 300 respondents for the evaluation of the economic components projects. Apart from that, focus group discussions and in-depth interviews were also carried out with 42 stakeholders and six key informants respectively in five selected villages for deeper insights of the factors for ineffective participation and weakness in the implementation of LEEMP. The analysis for determining the impacts of LEEMP were based on the comparison of the changes that occurs to the targeted outcome before and after implementation of LEEMP using paired sampled t-test. The analysis of participation and the factors for the performances of LEEMP were based on descriptive analysis of the opinions of the respondents whereas data from focus group discussions and in-depth interviews were analysed through conversational matrix and content analysis separately. The study found that the LEEMP improved existing rural infrastructures by 54% in achieving the targeted provision of the infrastructure components. Moreover, LEEMP also shows progress in improvement in the local economy such as increased in crop production, livestock production, family income but not successful in improving the income beyond poverty level. There is positive correlation between the impact of infrastructure components and level of community participation. Generally, the short fall is due to lack of community participation, low accountability of institutions, and high level of poverty and illiteracy of participants. This study suggests incorporating and empowering more the participating community in the implementation of LEEMP.
ABSTRAK

Agenda pembangunan antarabangsa di bawah Millennium Development Goals (MGDs) telah mencatatkan pencapaian yang memberangsangkan dalam meguarangi kemiskinan dan meningkatkan taraf hidup penduduk miskin di negara membangun. Walau bagaimanapun, kemajuan dalam membasmi kemiskinan adalah terbatas di Nigeria. Projek Pengupayaan Tempatan dan Pengurusan Persekitaran (LEEMP) diperkenalkan sebagai inisiatif baru Program Pengurangan Kemiskinan Berteraskan Komuniti di bawah MDGs. Kajian ini bertujuan untuk menilai keberkesanan LEEMP and faktor yang menentukan prestasinya. Sejumlah 36 desa dipilih melalui teknik persampelan pelbagai peringkat di sembilan kawasan kerajaan tempatan di Adamawa State Nigeria. Sampel yang telah dipilih untuk kajian ini termasuk 30 desa yang melaksanakan komponen infrastruktur LEEMP dan enam desa yang melaksanakan komponen ekonomi LEEMP. Data utama dalam analisis dikumpulkan melalui kajiselidik isi rumah, merangkumi 500 responden diambil bagi menilai projek komponen infrastruktur dan 300 responden diambil bagi menilai projek komponen ekonomi. Selain dari itu, kajian ini turut melaksanakan perbincangan berkumpulan, dan temu bual secara mendalam terhadap 42 pemegang tanda dan enam informan yang dipilih di lima kampung yang dipilih untuk perbincangan berkumpulan dan temu bual secara mendalam. Analisis bagi menentukan impak LEEMP adalah bersasarkan analisis perbandingan terhadap sasaran hasil LEEMP sebelum dan selepas pelaksanaan beserta ujian-t sampel berpasangan. Analisis terhadap penyertaan dan faktor prestasi LEEMP adalah bersasarkan analisis deskriptif pendapat responden, manakala penjelasan yang diperolehi dalam perbincangan berkumpulan dan temu bual secara mendalam dianalisis bersaing dengan melalui matriks dan analisis kandungan. Hasil kajian mendapati LEEMP lebih berjaya dalam mencapai sasaran penyediaan komponen infrastruktur iaitu sebanyak 54% daripada sasaran. LEEMP juga telah menunjukkan pencapaian positif dalam penambahbaikan ekonomi tempatan, seperti peningkatan dalam pengeluaran pertanian, penternakan dan pendapatan keluarga, tetapi peningkatan pendapatan tidak berjaya melepasi paras kemiskinan. Terdapat korelasi positif antara tahap pencapaian penyediaan komponen infrastruktur dan penglibatan komuniti. Umumnya, kegagalan dalam pencapaian LEEMP dalam penurunan kemiskinan berkaitan dengan tahap penyertaan komuniti yang rendah, institusi kurang bertanggungjawab, tahap kemiskinan dan tahap hutang yang tinggi dikalangan peserta. Kajian ini mencadangkan keperluan untuk menyepadukan dan meningkatkan penyertaan komuniti dalam pelaksanaan LEEMP.
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<td>Agricultural Development Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFDB</td>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADBG</td>
<td>African Development Bank Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADR</td>
<td>The Assessment Development Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEO</td>
<td>African Economic Outlook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>African Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Arithmetic progression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATV</td>
<td>Adamawa Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLFRWP</td>
<td>Better Life for Rural Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Community Based Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDDA</td>
<td>Community Driven Development Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDD</td>
<td>Community Driven Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDP</td>
<td>Community Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHPS</td>
<td>Community Based Health Programme Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPMC</td>
<td>Community Project Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPRP</td>
<td>Community Based Poverty Reduction Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>Community partnership Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSDP</td>
<td>Community and Social development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCED</td>
<td>Donor Committee for Enterprise Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFRRI</td>
<td>Directorate of Food Roads and Rural Infrastructures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPI</td>
<td>Expanded Programme of Immunization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agricultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCT</td>
<td>Federal Capital Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FADAMA</td>
<td>Low Land Irrigation Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGN</td>
<td>Federal Government of Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>Frequency Modulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMRRD</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of Regional and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPAC</td>
<td>Federal Project Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPAC</td>
<td>Federal Programme Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPSU</td>
<td>Federal Project Supporting Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRRDAC</td>
<td>Federal Regional and Rural Development Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>Global Environment Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLO</td>
<td>Golobacom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>Geometric progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSM</td>
<td>Global System for Mobile Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus and Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IADP</td>
<td>Integrated Agriculture Development Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBRD</td>
<td>International for Remonstration and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRW</td>
<td>International Centre for Research on Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDA</td>
<td>International Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPAG</td>
<td>Institut de Préparation à l'Administration Générale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFRA</td>
<td>Institute for Rural Advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITD</td>
<td>Inlet Temperature Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED</td>
<td>Local Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED</td>
<td>Local Empowerment and Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEEMP</td>
<td>Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEEMPUUG</td>
<td>LEEMP User Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA</td>
<td>Local Government Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGRC</td>
<td>Local Government Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAMSER</td>
<td>Mass Mobilisation for Social Justice and Economic Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDIC</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary implementation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIT</td>
<td>Multi Sectoral Implementation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary implementation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTN</td>
<td>Maxi Telecommunication of Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPCI</td>
<td>Mean per Capita Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACB</td>
<td>National Agricultural and Co-Operative Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBS</td>
<td>National Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACCIMA</td>
<td>National Association of Chambers of Commerce Mines and Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NADP</td>
<td>National Fadama Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFP</td>
<td>National Accelerated Food Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPAP</td>
<td>National Poverty Alleviation Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPEP</td>
<td>Nation Poverty Eradication Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDE</td>
<td>National Directorate of Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEEDS</td>
<td>National Economic Empowerment and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Electric Power Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGN</td>
<td>Nigerian Naira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NITEL</td>
<td>Nigerian Telecommunication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOA</td>
<td>National Orientation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORAD</td>
<td>Norwegian Agency for Development Co-operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPC</td>
<td>National Population Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIPOST</td>
<td>Nigeria Postal Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NILEC</td>
<td>National Integrated Local Empowerment Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTA</td>
<td>National Television Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSC</td>
<td>National Youth Service Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of The Study

International development agenda, under the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) has recorded remarkable achievement in poverty reduction and uplifting the living standard of the poor people. According to the Millennium Development Goals Report 2015 (UN, 2015), the proportion of people in developing countries who lived on less than USD1.25 a day dropped from about 50 percent in 1990 to 14 percent in 2015. Globally, the number of people living in extreme poverty has declined by more than half; falling from 1.9 billion in 1990 to 836 million in 2015. The proportion of under-nourished people in developing regions has fallen by almost half since 1990; from 23.3 percent in 1992 to 12.9 percent between 2014-2016. The MDGs were also successful in improving primary school enrolment rate, improvement in the health sector and access to clean drinking water in developing regions. Outstanding progress was achieved in post-2000 with global mobilization of efforts to eradicate poverty under MDGs. However, the achievement of poverty reduction and uplifting of standard of living of the poor has been uneven with the persistence of poverty being overwhelmingly concentrated in some parts of the world, particularly India, Nigeria, China, Bangladesh and the Democratic Republic of Congo (UN, 2015). The agenda of poverty eradication is not yet finished and continues in the development era under new international agenda of the Sustainable Development Goals (2016-2030) (UNDP, 2015).
Infrastructure development is considered the main driver for poverty reduction, and empowerment; it is also a critical factor for economic growth in Africa (Segun et al. 2008). Despite the robust economic growth in the continent, the World Economic Growth Forum Global Competitiveness Index Report 2012-2013, ranked the continent as the least competitive region in the world (AFDB 2013). Uneven distribution of infrastructure has been analyzed as one of the most serious problems facing the continent. The poverty reduction strategies failed to make significant progress in the continent partly due to the inadequacy of infrastructure. The African economy has been stagnant between 1980 and 2000, but during the present decade, the continent’s economic growth has been accelerated, yet there was no remarkable progress in poverty reduction (Collier, 2007). On average in the period between 1960 and 1980, the African annual growth rate of per capita annual GDP was a mere 0.1 percent during the period between 1980 and 2000, 5.2 percent in the last decade (2000-2010) (Lopes, 2012) and declined to 3.6 percent in 2010-2013, but has rose slowly to 3.7 percent in 2016 (AEO, 2016). The problems of inappropriate economic policies, improper implementation of economic reforms, poor leadership, misappropriation of funds, and fluctuation of national currencies are major issues affecting successful poverty reduction programs on the continent (UN, 2002; Ndulu et al. 2008; Lopes, 2012; AM, 2012; ADBG, 2013; Chandy, 2015; and AEO, 2016).

In Nigeria, uneven distribution of infrastructures has been a serious problem affecting the well-being of the people. About 50% of the population living in 18 out of the 36 States in Nigeria has no access to electricity in 2015 (Ohiare, 2015). Apart from the inadequate distribution of infrastructures, poverty is also widely spread in the six geopolitical zones of the country and 94.6 million or 51.9 percent of the Nigerian population lived in rural areas in 2015 (UN, 2016). The poverty in the country increased from 28.1 percent in 1980 to 46.3 percent in 1985 and 65.6 percent in 1995. The poverty level decreased slightly to 54.5 percent in 2005 but increased to 69 percent in 2010 (NBS, 2010) and 62 percent in 2015 (UN, 2015a).

Development strategies and programmes (such as Community Based Poverty Reduction Program (CPRP), National Fadama Development Programme (NFDP), National Poverty Eradication Program (NAPEP) and LEEMP) in Nigeria under the
Millennium Development Goals, (MDGs) recorded some achievements in goals 2 and 3 of the programme (i.e. improving the net school enrolment rates by 80%) and it was also successful in the promotion of gender equality under which, the trend of girls to boys net school enrolments increased by 90%, and there was good progress in goals 4 and 5 (reduction of child mortality and improving maternal health). According to the Millennium Development Report 2013 (MDG, 2013a) the proportion of child mortality rates marginally improved from 61 deaths per 1000 live births in 2000 to 30.3 deaths per 1000 live births in 2013. The proportion of skilled health personnel and antenatal coverage, also improved from 30 and 32 percent respectively in 2000 to 53.6 percent and 67.7 percent respectively in 2013. However, there was no significant progress in the implementation of goals 1, 6 and 7 (i.e. poverty eradication, combating HIV and malaria and environmental sustainability). The proportion of Nigerians who lived below poverty line increased from about 54.1 percent in 2000 to 62.6 percent in 2013. There were many programs being implemented for poverty reduction, however the rate of poverty in the country did not reduce significantly.

Ibok and Daniel (2014) suggested that the main objectives of any development projects should be the attainment of satisfaction in human needs and development targets. However, in developing countries such as Nigeria, many development projects were illusively implemented and the beneficiaries were poorly targeted leading to low outcome targets (Nel, 2001; Chandy, 2015). Rural poverty and inequalities are on the widespread among the citizenry, thus the natural ecology is prone to exploitation. These abuses are to enable the rural poor attains his own basic needs. The rural populace in Nigeria, especially in the Northern region, depends largely on subsistence farming and animal husbandry for their survival; over the years however their activities have resulted in environmental degradation and consequent environmental change in the Northern region (Liman and Ngah, 2015). Also, Borokini, et al. (2012) articulated that Nigeria lost 57.7 percent of its natural forest between 2000 and 2005 due to the activities of farm expansions, fuel-wood harvesting, poaching and excessive logging for timber wood. In view of the complex interrelationship of poverty with infrastructure, social relations, economic and environmental issues, LEEMP was introduced as a new initiative under poverty eradication program to address the poverty problems in an integrated manner.
LEEMP, introduced in 2004, was an effort to reduce poverty and ensure the involvement of communities in its poverty eradication program as well as to address environmental degradation. The Federal Government of Nigeria managed to obtain loan from the International Development Association (IDA) and grant from the Global Environment Facility, which make a total of USD 78 million to implement LEEMP within 6 years period (2004-2010). Nine pilot states in Nigeria were selected for the first phase of the project and to ensure effective continuation of the project for the subsequent phases, an assessment on the success and shortfall in the implementation of the project is imperative.

1.2 Statement of Research Problem

The study was undertaken in view of the need to evaluate the achievement of Adamawa State LEEMP’s contribution to rural development and in particular, poverty reduction. The latest MDG report of 2015 estimated that 62.60 percent of Nigerians are living in poverty (MDG Report 2015a). Rural infrastructure in Nigeria has long been neglected, while investment in health, education, and water supply has largely been focused on towns and cities. As a result, the rural population has extremely limited access to services and social infrastructures, such as rural electricity, schools and health services. Poverty in Nigeria is more prevalent in the rural areas than urban areas. The rural poverty increased from 28.3 percent in 1980 to 51.4 percent in 1985, rose to 69.3 percent in 1995 but recorded a decline to 62.2 percent in 2005 and increase to 69 percent in 2010. On the other hand, urban poverty rates were 17.2 percent in 1980, 37.8 percent in 1985, 58.2 in 1995, 43.1 in 2005 and declined to 30.1 percent in 2010 (Fakayode et al., 2008; UN, 2013).

Although many programmes had been implemented to eradicate poverty in rural Nigeria, the percentage of rural people living below USD 1 a day did not change much (World Bank, 2016). Rural areas continue to experience rapid increase in population, lack of employment opportunities, inadequate access to education, clean drinking water and sanitation, health, electricity and rural roads, deforestation and
environmental degradation and inadequate community participation. It shows that Government’s intervention, such as those under World Bank development projects (i.e. community driven development (CDD) approach including Fadama II, (low land irrigation facility), community based poverty reduction project (CPRP), and local empowerment and environmental management project (LEEMP)) are not successful in eradicating poverty (Oluwa, 2012). Egwemi (2013) discussed that about 70% of the Nigerian population living in the rural areas in 2012, has limited access to safe drinking water, education, and medical attention. Sachs (1997) also expressed that the failure of successive generation of imported, western development strategies and models to deliver meaningful reduction in poverty and achieve basic needs in Africa, has raised question of performance of the western concepts of development theories and models in the continent. Burkey (1993) advocated for studies that focused attention among practitioners and NGOs on strategies which build upon local knowledge, skills and resources. Such strategies absorbed more on culturally unique aspirations and objectives, rather than striving to impose an inflexible, strange set of ideologies and goals.

LEEMP is chosen for the study since this is one of the latest approach introduced under the poverty reduction programs in Nigeria. This approach, apart from focusing on community participation or community driven development; also incorporate environmental protection components in the project. Low level of community participation and low performance of LEEMP in poverty eradication has also motivated the needs for this study. This study shall contribute in exploring the better concepts of community participation in rural development, dealing with the local issues peculiar to the study area and finding room for improving Community Based Poverty Reduction (CBPR) projects in Nigeria and indeed Africa. In many parts of the world in recent times, there has been increased interest for the evaluation of poverty reduction programs as preferred strategy to improving development programmes in developing countries. Since the early 2000, the evaluation of community driven poverty reduction programme has occurred in many regions especially developing countries (Table 1.1). The reasons for the growing interest in the evaluation of poverty reduction programmes relate to the issues of the shortfall in their implementation and to create room for improving the existing programmes, as well as improving the living conditions of rural dwellers in developing nations (Mohammed 2015).
From existing literatures, the discourse about the impact of the evaluation of Community Based Poverty Reduction projects ranges from various disciplines/dimensions; from micro economic experts, rural infrastructures, environmental management to rural development studies (Orji, 2005; Timothy, 2007; Gine and Perez-Foguet 2008; Derkzen et al. 2009; Kudi et al. 2009; Bature et al. 2013; Maphosa 2015; Tung, 2015; Mohammed, 2015; Onwe, 2015; Utange, 2016). Among the issues that are related to the evaluation in poverty reduction projects that have been discussed in previous studies include, inequality, poverty, health problems, unemployment, and inequitable distribution of infrastructures, improper households’ participations and ecological problems. The study by Kudi et al. (2009) focused on the evaluation of the UNDP microfinance programme in three selected local government areas of Kaduna State of Nigeria. Through descriptive and analytical methods, the analysis revealed that UNDP microfinance focused on poverty reduction and unemployment and improvement of local economy of rural Kaduna. Bature et al (2013) focused on the evaluation of the implementation of National Fadama Development project in Abuja through descriptive and analytical methods. Some of the problems of the implementation of Fadama project included limited funding and inadequate farming inputs, low participation and low skills of the farmers. The latest study on Community Based Poverty Reduction Project in Kebbi State, Nigeria was conducted by Utange (2016) using Structural Equation Modeling to evaluate poverty reduction in the project. The study revealed marginal improvement in participants’ quality of life over non-participants in participating communities and households in non-participating communities. The study identified lack of innovative participation and inclusion of other community niche products in the implementation of poverty reduction projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Problems and concern of the research</th>
<th>Context of the study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timothy (2007)</td>
<td>An Evaluation of Poverty Reduction on Youth empowerment ) in Rural Kaduna</td>
<td>Evaluation of the performance of Youth Empowerment Programme in Rural Kaduna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drekzenp et al, (2009)</td>
<td>Integrated rural development policy in context: a case study of integration and sectoring in Netherlands</td>
<td>Evaluating the impact of community participation in the implementations of some rural development projects in rural Netherlands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the review of past studies, it is very clear that a comprehensive study that assessed the implementation of a community driven approach of all components of rural development project and their links to community participation is still lacking and this aspect is under-examined. Other similar studies that carried out evaluation on poverty programmes such as those highlighted in Table 1.1 focused on evaluation of the impact of poverty reduction programmes in rural development. The studies revealed the various degrees of performance of the poverty reduction programmes in scope of socio economic, social infrastructures as well as rural governance and policy in developing countries. These studies also highlighted some implementation issues and also provided relevant recommendations for improving these programmes. However due to the diverse nature of ecological, cultural, political, economic and social backgrounds of the rural settings in different nations, hardly is there a unique single comprehensive evaluation study offering inclusive applications to solutions for the shortfalls of implementations of poverty reduction programmes in an integrated manner in developing countries. Since LEEMP covers many components of poverty related factors, including environmental, this study provides insights on various aspects of government intervention in Poverty Reduction Programmes. The following section highlights the key questions to be examined in the thesis.

1.3 Research Questions

The specific research questions here are:

I  To what extent is the LEEMP able to achieve the targeted outcome in terms of transforming the development of rural infrastructures and socio-economic empowerment of the rural areas?

II  To what extent did the LEEMP protect environmental degradation in rural areas?

III  What are the factors that influence the achievement of LEEMP?

IV  To what extent has community participation influenced the outcome of the LEEMP projects in Adamawa State?
V What are the perceptions of the local people to the outcome of the implementation of LEEMP projects?

1.4 Aim and Objectives of the Study

The aim of this study is to examine and evaluate the effectiveness of LEEMP and factors that determine its performance.

The objectives of this study are as follow:-

i. To examine the impact and performance of the LEEMP in relation to the target outcome.

ii. To examine the factors that affect the achievement of LEEMP’s target outcome.

iii. To determine the level of community satisfaction with the process of delivery of LEEMP by the key actors in the development process.

iv. To create an appropriate framework for effective community driven development.

1.5 Conceptual Framework

Figure 1.1 presents the framework for the evaluation of LEEMP which includes the components of LEEMP, the methods of assessment, the factors for the achievement of LEEMP outcome target and recommendation. The impact and performance of each of these components will be assessed by comparing the actual change and the targeted outcome of LEEMP. The outcome targets of LEEMP to be assessed include the development of rural infrastructures, socioeconomic improvement and environmental management.
The study also considers the perception and satisfaction of the rural communities in terms of delivery of LEEMP services. Ahmad et al. (2014) argue for the review of the satisfaction of community to determine the outcome of the implementation of development project as a basic tool for improving the empowerment project. In recent years, there has been growing discourse regarding theories of community participation in rural development both at urban and regional planning, Sociology, Geography, Agricultural Science, Psychology, and Economics. The framework revises the factors that influenced the LEEMP targets outcome and they included the following; good governance, transparency, accountability, effective participation and the delivery of the socially inclusive projects to the community. These factors were reviewed along with the effective process of the plan implementation by policy design. Jain (1985) describes rural development as part of a larger process of national development of a society, stressing that growth in rural development should contribute to the overall goal of National development. On his own part, Singh (1992) argued that rural development as a concept connotes and provides the overall development to improving the quality of lives of rural people. In this case, it is comprehensive and multidimensional and encompasses the development of agriculture and its allied activities, villages and cottage industries, craft, infrastructure, and human resources. Access to infrastructure services such as electricity, water supply, sewage, market and rural transport, telecommunication, health and education are key factors of development in every society (Mensah et al. 2014).

1.6 Scope of the Study

The context of this study focuses on the impact and performance of LEEMP in rural development of Adamawa state. The term LEEMP refers to the local empowerment project supervised by World Bank in Nigeria. The community participation in the implementation of the LEEMP project was deliberate. The study covers 36 rural communities in Adamawa State, which before LEEMP, were characterized by inadequate distribution of rural infrastructure, over exploitation of environmental and natural resources, and the widespread of poverty among households. The rural people were mostly characterized by primary level of production
including, farming, fishing and livestock rearing. While few others, on the contrary practice some petty trading, civil services and wood extraction.

The study investigates the impact and performance of LEEMP in rural areas of Adamawa state. The effects of the distribution of social infrastructures, such as water supply, rural feeder roads and schools, primary health care, and rural electrification were analyzed, while the intervention in economic activities including farming, rearing and fishing were evaluated after the project. The study looks at the perception of residence based on the outcome of the implementation process in their societies. The study finally proffers some recommendations on how best to improve the community participation in the implementation of LEEMP rural development projects.

1.7 Significance of the Study

Over the decades, the population of the rural areas in Nigeria is increasing and there is no corresponding increase in the distribution of basic rural infrastructures, poverty reduction and youth empowerment. Human activities in the rural areas are mainly through primary production such as farming, rearing and fishing; and has resulted in the over exploitation of natural resources such as mass falling of trees, that is gradually leading to environmental change and global warming. The study is significant in providing feedback of the implementation of LEEMP in some rural areas of Adamawa state. According to Fwah (2009), local empowerment and environmental management project is one of the initiative which aimed at tackling environmental degradation using a non-beneficial approach that incorporates direct community participation in poverty reduction. Fwah (2009) also added that the best way to implement poverty reduction strategy is through Community Driven Development (C.D.D.). The C.D.D. approach gives control of decision and resources to community based groups. The C.D.D. is the bottom-up approach to development; it places the community members on the driver’s seat and sees them as locomotive of development.
Figure 1.1 A Conceptual Framework for Review of LEEMP Project
According to Areavey (2006), partnership is nowadays the main instrument for delivering integrated rural development policy, as such, studying the politics of partnership at micro level is vital to improving the understanding of what constitutes effective rural development. Then again, this assessment may also play a significant role in rural development planning; it may be able to adopt many different contexts in planning for rural development whether in developing or developed countries. It serves as a veritable development tool for multilateral donor agencies like the World Bank and United Nation Development Programme (U.N.D.P.), to mention but a few. Their host governments and communities can review their own rural development plans and ensure sustainability in the rural development plans. The research suggests the holistic framework, mixed funding and innovative approach in rural development planning (Kanji, et al. 2012). Therefore, the findings of this study would be able to help the government’s national agenda in Nigeria in their disposition to diversifying national income through rural development and solid minerals exploration, more especially with the era of unstable prices of oil in the global market.

1.8 Research methodology

In evaluating the impact of LEEMP, the main approach of the research is to compare the changes that occur in relation to the targeted outcome before and after implementation of LEEMP. The study proceeds to reviewing the factors influencing the LEEMP performance as well as examines the level of community participation and satisfaction in terms of delivery of the project.

The research employed three strategies of data collection which include questionnaire surveys, focus group discussions and in-depth interviews. The study adopted the initial questionnaires surveys using multistage sampling technique to evaluate the impact of infrastructure and economic components of LEEMP respectively. This is to evaluate the impact of the project in the 30 selected rural communities of 9 local governments for the infrastructure component and 6 selected villages for the economic component separately. This is followed by focus group discussion interviews to review the factors of ineffective community participation and
Lastly by the in-depth interview sessions to review the factors for the weakness of implementation of the LEEMP. In focus group discussion interviews, the study engaged the purposeful sampling techniques to select 42 participants among three sets of stakeholders in 5 selected villages to dialogue with them on the focus themes of participation in LEEMP. This is to identify the causes for ineffective community participation with the view to finding recommendations for improvement of LEEMP with the stakeholders. During the in-depth interview sessions, the study employed the purposeful sampling techniques to re-select 6 key informants among the policy makers from the FGD participants to review the factors responsible for the weakness of the implementation of the projects. This is to complement the findings of the focus group interview. These in-depth interview sessions reviewed the implementation of policy with the policy makers and established some factors for the weakness in the implementation of the project in the 5 re-selected villages where the FGD is held and the LEEMP agency in Yola.

The analysis for determining the impacts of LEEMP using paired sample T-test is based on the comparison of the changes that occur in relation to the targeted outcome before and after the implementation of LEEMP. While the analysis of the level of participation and factors for the performances of LEEMP was based on descriptive analysis of the opinions of the respondents, the result from focus group interview was analyzed using conversation analysis matrix and problem tree analysis whereas the outcome of in-depth interviews was analyzed using thematic content analysis.

1.9 Structure of the Thesis

Conceptualization of this study is divided into eight chapters. Chapter 1 begins with general introduction to the thesis and background of the study. It outlines the statement of the research problem, research questions, aim and objectives of the study and the research hypothesis. The chapter also provides information on the significance of the study, conceptual and research framework and brief explanation of the methodology. Chapter 2 provides an overview of rural development, issues of rural
poverty and deprivation, the nature of poverty reduction programmes and poverty reduction evaluation. Chapter 3 presents the discussion on LEEMP project. The chapter starts by introducing the background of LEEMP comprising of the concepts, component and the target objectives of the project. This is followed by the implementation frameworks of national and state implementation schemes. The background to the study area outlines the profile of Adamawa state including a brief description of the physical and socio-economic characteristics of the state. Chapter 4 deals with the research methodology that is employed for the study; it explains the quantitative and qualitative approaches used in the study. It begins with the introduction of six areas of the study. The Data analysis chapters are chapter 5 and 6. In each of these cases, the chapters begin with discussions of the demographic profiles of the respondents, which include a review of the community participation in infrastructure component of LEEMP. Chapter 5 presents the analysis on the impact and performance of the infrastructure component of LEEMP. Likewise, chapter 6 presents the analysis on the impact and performance of economic component of the LEEMP project. Chapter 7 presents the analysis of focus group discussion and interview. Chapter 8 presents the discussion, summary, implication for policy planning and the conclusion of the study, while some potential directions for future study are also advocated.
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