



Effect of International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) on Community-Based Development Programme on Rural Livelihood in Katsina State, Nigeria

Muntaka M.* , Ibrahim M., Ali A.

*Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, Department of Animal Science, Federal University, Dutsin-Ma, P.M.B 5001, Dutsin-Ma, Nigeria.

*Correspondence author: Ibrahim M; Email: mibrahim22@fudutsinma.edu.ng

Received: 23 Jul 2024; Received in revised form: 25 Aug 2024; Accepted: 03 Sep 2024; Available online: 10 Sep 2024

©2024 The Author(s). Published by Infogain Publication. This is an open-access article under the CC BY license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

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 effect of IFAD Community-Based Agricultural and Rural Development Programme on Rural Livelihood in Katsina State, Nigeria. Specifically, the study described the socio- economic characteristics of respondents; identified and described the basic infrastructure provided; determined the effect 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 278 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.



Keywords— Rural development, Economic prosperity, poverty alleviation, IFAD-CBARDP

I. INTRODUCTION

Majority of the world's population live in rural areas where they are engaged in agriculture (Taimi, 2018). 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, 2017). 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, 2019).

According to Thor *et al.* (2015) rural transformation denotes a rapid improvement in the life of rural man and his physical environment. Whereas Smith (2013) 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 lives of rural dwellers.

Similarly, Iro (2018) reported that, some of the rural development focused programs 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 favored at the expense of members of other parties. Presently with Maduagwu's (2017) comment that Nigeria has over the years embarked on many poverty alleviation programs 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 Program (IFAD-CBARDP); is an integrated agriculture and rural development program 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 program is jointly funded by International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN), and seven participating States -Borno, Jigawa, Katsina, Kebbi, Sokoto, Katsina and Zamfara; Sixty-nine (69) 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).

Objectives of the Study

The broad objective of the study was to examine the effect of IFAD-CBARDP on rural livelihood in Katsina 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 effect 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.

vi. Description of study area

This study was conducted in Katsina State, one of the 36 States in Nigeria. The State lies between latitude 11 0 7' and 13 0 22' North and longitude 6 0 52' and 9 0 2' East of the Equator. It is situated within the Sahel-Sudan agro ecological zone of Nigeria. The National population census of 2006 put Katsina State at 5,792,579 people. At 3.2% growth rate projection, by 2013 when data were collected, Katsina State's population was expected to have increased to about 7,223,346 people. The number of farmer's families is 882,692 constituting 12.22% of the total population (NPC, 2006).

Sampling Procedure and Sample size

The study was carried out in three (3) Local Governments of Katsina Senatorial Zone namely Kaita, Jibia and Kusada LGA.

In order to examine the effect 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 IFAD-CBARDP benefiting LGAs in Katsina state. These were Kaita, Jibia and Kusada LGAs. 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 Yanhoho and Yandaki Kaita LGA, Dutsin Safe Daddara in Jibia LGA, Kofa and Yashe in Kusada LGA. Thirdly, the sample size was determined using raosoft calculator at 5% error margin as shown in the table below.

Table 1: Distribution of Sample Size by Local Government Areas

Local Government Areas	Beneficiary Villages	No. of Household Heads	Respondents 5%
Kaita	Yanhoho	180	54
	Yandaki	160	46
Jibia	Dutsin Safe	180	52
	Daddara	160	32
Kusada	Kofa	180	50
	Yashe	140	44
Total		1,000	278

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.

Inferential statistics (t-test)

The t- test was used to determine the effect of infrastructure provided on the livelihood of respondents before the program and after the program 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:

\bar{t} = t-value

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

\bar{x}_2 = the mean sample of respondent's income in

benefitting communities after initiating the IFAD-CBARDP.

S^2 = sample standard deviation for respondents' income in benefitting communities before initiating the program.

S^2 = sample standard deviation for respondents' income in benefitting communities after initiating the program

n_1 = sample size of respondent's income in benefitting communities before the program.

n_2 = sample size of respondent's income in benefitting communities after initiating the program.

II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

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.

Table 2: Socio economic characteristics

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	185	66.5%
Female	93	33.5%
Total	278	100%
Age (Years)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
20 – 29	22	7.91
30 – 39	89	32.01
40 – 49	97	34.89

50 – 59	54	19.42
60 – 69	16	5.76
Total	278	100%
Status	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Single	89	32.01%
Married	175	62.95%
Widow	14	5.04%
Total	278	100%
Size	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1 – 5	62	22.30
6 – 10	142	51.08
11 – 15	37	13.31
16 – 20	23	8.27
21 – 25	14	5.04
Total	278	100%
Level	Frequency	Percentage (%)
No Education	81	29.14
Adult Education	54	19.42
Primary	133	47.84
Secondary	109	39.21
Tertiary	15	5.40
Others	27	9.71
Total	278	100
Years	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1 – 3	97	34.89
4 – 6	147	52.88
7 – 9	34	12.23
Total	278	100%
Years	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1 – 3	59	21.22
4 – 6	191	68.71
7 – 9	28	10.07
Total	278	100%
Status	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Accessible	113	40.65
Not Accessible	165	59.35
Total	278	100%

Source: Field work (2023)

From the Table above, the data revealed that 185 which constitutes 66.5% of the respondents were males and 93 of the respondents representing 33.5% were females. This showed that both genders were adequately represented in the IFAD-CBARDP, with slight variation in favor of male respondents.

The age of the respondents ranged between 30 to 49 years have the highest response. This implies that, the respondents were middle aged and still active and could participate adequately in development programs. 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.

It was also observed that most of the respondents were married which consist of 175 representing 62.95%. This shows that most of the respondents would have greater responsibility than the single or widow, which may encourage respondents to be committed towards their participation in IFAD- CBARDP. Perez-Morales (2011). 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.

The house hold indicate that about half (51.08%) of the respondents had 6-10 people in their households, while, 22.30% had household size of less than 5 people. 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.

On educational qualification more than half (78%) 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 22%, of the respondents.

The 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 53% while 35% had 1-3 years of membership of cooperative society. 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.

The result in the above table revealed that, the majority (69%) of the beneficiaries had between 4 and 6 years of experience in IFAD-CBARDP activities in the programme. Whereas 21% of the respondents had experience of 1 to 3 years and the lowest percentage was (10%) which falls within 7 to 9 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.

It was also observed in the table above that 59% 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 3: Distribution of infrastructure Provided in order of respondent's benefits (n=278)

Infrastructure	*Frequency	Percentage	Ranking
Water/Borehole	256	92.09	1 st
Schools	224	80.58	2 nd
Health centre	202	72.67	3 rd
Para vet clinic	76	27.34	4 th
Culvert	41	14.75	5 th
Market shade	37	13.31	6 th
Vocational Centre	21	7.56	7 th
Latrine	18	6.47	8 th
Staff Quarters	9	3.24	9 th

*Multiple responses

The table above shows that provision of water/borehole ranked 1st among the infrastructure provided by IFAD-CBARDP in the study area accessible to about 92% of the respondents. Schools provided ranked 2nd among the infrastructure provided accessible to 80% 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 (72%), Para vet clinic (27%), culvert (14%) and Market shade (13%) which were ranked 3rd and 4th. Staff quarters was the least accessible infrastructure to the respondents and ranked 9th 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.

Effect of IFAD-CBARDP on Assets of the Beneficiaries

Table 4: Distribution of respondents according to assets possessed (n = 278)

Assets owned by respondents	*No of items owned before Prog.	*No of items owned after Prog.	Differential
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**

The result in the Table above 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 program income of the respondents increased. This indicated that,

IFAD-CBARDP had been able to have positive effect 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 program reported a concrete positive change 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.

Hypothesis testing

Table 5: *Effect of IFAD-CBARDP on the income of respondents (n= 278)*

	N	Before	After	Differential
Mean annual Income	278	₦155, 613	₦ 241, 603.8	₦ 85,990.8
Variance		3.597E+10	9.75E+10	
t – Cal		1.98*		
t – Critical		1.65		

*Significant at (p< 0.1%) level of probability

The results as presented in the Table above revealed the respondents mean annual income before the program (₦155, 613) and after the program implementation (₦241, 603.8) per annum, with a differential amount of ₦85, 990.8. The data were also tested using t-test independent sample. 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.

Employment Opportunities provided by IFAD-CBARDP

Table 6: *Employment Opportunity Provided by IFAD-CBARDP (n =278)*

Employment opportunities	*Frequency	Percentages(%)
Trading	221	79.45
Carpentry	220	79.14
Blacksmithing	178	64.03
Food processing	224	80.58
Tailoring	235	84.53
Embroidery making	188	67.63
Knitting	188	67.63
Bricklaying	163	58.63
Fishing	161	57.91

***Multiple responses**

From the above Table, it was observed that among the employment opportunities provided by IFAD CBARDP, most respondents (84%) participated in tailoring, followed by food processing (80%), trading (79%), carpentry (79%), knitting and embroidery making (67%), blacksmithing (64%), and fishing was the least (57%) participated employment opportunity by respondents. As evident from the result in the Table, 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.

Respondents' Level of Satisfaction with the Infrastructure Provided

Table 7: Respondents' satisfaction level with infrastructure provided (n=278)

Infrastructure	Total weighted scores	Mean weighted scores	Overall perception
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

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 4.14). From the result, the respondents may experience improvement in farm productivity as well as encouragement in the area of farming and other related activities.

Vocational skills/ training centres

Result presented in Table 4.14 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

Provision of water/borehole

It was observed in Table 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.

Health Facilities Provided

The weighted mean (\bar{X}) for health facilities provided by the programme was presented in

Table 4.12. 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.

Provision of Schools

The result in Table 4.13 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.

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 4.13), 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 effect 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.

Constraints Faced by Respondents in IFAD-CBARDP.

Table 8: Constraints encountered by beneficiaries of IFAD-CBARDP (n=278)

Constraints	*Frequency	Percentages	Ranking
Low awareness	161	57.91	1 st
Cultural barrier	152	54.68	2 nd
Inadequate capital	143	51.44	3 rd
Illiteracy	120	43.17	4 th
Inadequate facilities	120	43.17	4 th
Inadequate mobility	16	5.76	5 th
poor leadership	13	4.68	6 th

***Multiple responses**

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 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th respectively (Table 4.14) 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.

III. CONCLUSION

This study was aimed at providing useful and basic information on the effect 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

Katsina State, Nigeria.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adekunle, A. A., Olowu, T.A. and Ladele, A. (2012). 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.
- [2] Adeolu, B., Ayanwale, O. and Taiwo, A. (2014). The Effect 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.
- [3] Agbiokoro, T.C (2019). The Effect of National Poverty Reduction Programme (NAPEP) on Economic Development of Nigeria, Publication of World Economics, April, 20.
- [4] 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
- [5] Alene, A.D., V.M. Manyong, J. Gockowski, O. Coulibaly, and S. Abele. (2016) A framework for conceptualizing impact assessment and promoting impact culture at IITA. *IMPACT*, IITA, Ibadan, Nigeria.
- [6] Anderson, J.R. and Thampapillai, J. (2020). *Soil Conservation in Developing Countries: Project and Policy Intervention*. Washington D.C.: World Bank.
- [7] 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.
- [8] Ayoola, G. B. (2011). *Essays on the Agricultural Economy: A Book of Readings Agricultural Policy and Administration*

- in Nigeria. Ibadan, Nigeria:TMA Publishers.
- [9] Babatunde, O. (2016). Differential Poverty Reduction Impact of Small- Scale Irrigation Development between its Beneficiaries and Non-Beneficiaries in Nigeria. Technical Report on the Agro polis Award.
- [10] Barnabas, M. T. (2015). 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.
- [11] Bhagyalakshmi, J. (2014). "Rural Development through Women's Participation and Electronic Media," India, Pointer Publisher xvii, 364.
- [12] Chikwendu, D. O. (2015). 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. (2006). *Collaborative Study on Nigeria's Prospects for Development: Proceedings of a Workshop* April 15-17.
- [13] Dekker, M. (2013). "Resettlement and Livelihood: Support Network and Crises Situation". Paper Presented at Albany Summer School. U. S. A. June
- [14] Diana, L. (2015). Theories of Social Change. *The INSP Tool Manual*. Bertelsmann Stiftung, 4:2-16
- [15] Ega, L.A.; Atala T. K. and Baba, J.M. (2015). Developing rural Nigeria; Problems and Prospects. *Journal of Nigerian Rural Sociological Association*. 3, 49-82
- [16] Ekong, E.E. (2013). *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.
- [17] Ellis, F. (2013). "Survey Articles: Household Strategies and Rural Livelihood Diversification". *The Journal of Development Studies* 35(1): 1-38.
- [18] Emmanuel, O., Keraita, B., Danso, G., Amoah, P., Cofie, O.O., Raschid-Sally, L. and Drechsel, P. (2014). Irrigated Urban Vegetable Production in Ghana: Characteristics, Benefits and Risks. IWMI-RUAF-CPWF, Accra, Ghana: IWMI, 150.
- [19] ERD (2015). European Rural Development: Dimensions of Rural Development. <http://www.iiasa.ac.at/research/ERD/RC/rc10.htm>
- [20] FOS (1996). Federal Office of Statistics: Socio-Economic Profile of Nigeria Lagos: Federal Office of Statistics. www.ijbssnet.com/./jsd/17.pdf
- [21] Frankkenberger, T.R. and McCaston, M .K. (2018). Household Livelihood Security: CARE, U.S.A. Pp11.
- [22] Freeman, D. B. (2015). Development Strategies in Dual Economics: A Kenyan Example. *African Studies Review*. 18(2):17-33.
- [23] Galadima, M. (2013). Constraints of Participants to the Effective Performance of Agriculture and Rural Development Programs in Nigeria: KATSINA IFAD-CBARDP Experience. *The International Journal Of Humanities & Social Studies*, 1(6): 32-35.
- [24] García-Romero, D., Portela, C. V., & Peixoto, A. (2023). Talking about Rural Environments, Education and Sustainability: Motives Positions and Practice of Grassroots Organizations. In *International Journal of Rural Development, Environment and Health Research* (Vol. 7, Issue 5, pp. 01–14). AI Publications. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijreh.7.5.1>
- [25] Giddens, A. and Duneier, M. (2010). *Introduction to Sociology (3rd edition)*. New York and London: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc.
- [26] Gilbert, P., Levin, J. and Joel, P. (2012). Effectiveness of Agricultural Extension Services in Reaching Rural Women: A synthesis of Studies in Five African Countries. Prepared for FAO, Rome, September.
- [27] Hilton, E. and Lumsdaine, A. A. (2010). Field Trial Designs in Gauging the Effect of Fertility Planning Programs." In: Carl A. Bennett and Arthur A. Lumsdaine (eds.), *Evaluation and Experiment*. New York: Academic Press, 319-408.
- [28] Hogwood, B. W. and Gunn, L. A. (2014). *Policy Analysis for the Real World*. London: Oxford University Press.
- [29] IAEG (2009). 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
- [30] Idachaba, F. S. (2019) Desirable and Workable Agricultural Policies for Nigeria. Ibadan, Nigeria: University Press.
- [31] Idachaba, F. S. (2013). Strategies for Achieving Food Self-sufficiency in Nigeria *Key note Address, 1st National Congress of Science and Technology*, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- [32] IFAD (2007). IFAD Community-Based Agricultural and Rural Development Programme, Katsina State: December, Annual Progress Report.
- [33] IFAD (2009). IFAD Community- Based Agricultural and Rural Development Programme, Community Infrastructure Manual (CIIM).
- [34] 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-22nd
- [35] 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>
- [36] Ijere, M. O. (2016). "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.
- [37] Ijere, M. O. (2020). *Leading issues in Rural Development*, Enugu, Lagos, Los Angeles: Acena Publishers.
- [38] Iro, S. I. (2018). 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.
- [39] Kimble, T. (2008). *Tropical Africa, I. Land and Livelihoods II. Society and Polity*. New York Twentieth Century Fund, 90-94.
- [40] Kudi, T. M., Usman, I., Akpoko, J. G and Banta, A. L. (2013). Analysis of the Effect 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
- [41] 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
- [42] Michael, O. U. (2018). *Community Development; Socio Economic Dimension*. Anambra Nigeria: Candela Print Ltd 108. Maduagwu, A. (2017). Growing up in Oguta: The Economics of Rural Poverty in Nigeria. Unpublished work.
- [43] Manyong, M., Douthwaite, B., Coulibay, O., and Keatinge, J.D.H. (2011). 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.
- [44] National Population Commission NPC (2006). National Population Census Report for Nigeria, Abuja, Nigeria. .
- [45] Obinne, C.P. (2017). *Fundamentals of Agricultural Extension*. First Edition, Ibadan, ABIC Publishers, pp, 9-13.
- [46] Okeke V.U. (2018). 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.
- [47] Olayide (2018). "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.
- [48] Olukosi, J. O. (2020). 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.
- [49] Othman, Y. (2016). Effect 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.
- [50] Praandit, D. P (2015). *Earning Ones Livelihood in Mahuva House, Bombay*: Asia Publishing House, Bombay India. Libopac.tiss.edu/slim/wslxRSLT.php
- [51] Perez, M.R. (2011). Youth Policy and Resources Related to Rural Youth Programmes. In: Expert Consultation on Extension Rural Youth Programmes and SustainableDevelopment. Rome: F.A.O, pp. 101-108.
- [52] PCU (2010). Project Coordinating Unit. IFAD Community-Based Agricultural and Rural Development Projects Implementation Manual, IFAD-CBARDP.ifadcbardp.org.ng/wp-content/upload
- [53] Sanginga, P.C., Adesina, A.A., Manyong, V.M., Otite, O. And Dashier, K.E. (2016). Social Impact of Soyabean in Nigeria's Guinea Savannah, Nigeria: IITA and meg-comm.Network.
- [54] Sharma, P.V., Stall, S., Delgado, C. and Singh, R.V. (2013). *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.
- [55] Simonyan J.B and Omolehin, R.A (2014) Analysis of Effect of Fadama II Project on Beneficiary Farmers Income in Kaduna State: A Double Difference Method Approach, in *International Journal of Economics and Management Sciences*, 1 (11): 01-07.
- [56] Smith, D.A. (2013). *The Geography of Social Well being in the United State*: New York, McGraw Hill Book Company.
- [57] Srinivas, Ch., & Singh, Dr. G. (2023). Traditional Plant uses and Indigenous Knowledge in Ethnobotany. In *International Journal of Horticulture, Agriculture and Food science* (Vol. 7, Issue 5, pp. 01–05). AI Publications. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijhaf.7.5.1>
- [58] Taimi, K. K. (2018). Strategy for Professionalization of Rural Development. *Tamindu Journal of Development*, 9: 269-304.
- [59] Todaro, M. P. (2017). *Economic for a Developing World*. London: Longman Ltd.
- [60] Thor, E. A, Madison, P. and Green, H. (2015). Cooperatives and Rural Population of the American Southwest. *American Journal of Rural Development and Integration*, 4(1): 2- 4.
- [61] Tijjani, (2015). *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
- [62] Tomori, S., Akano, O., Adebisi, A., Isola, W., Lawanson, O. and Quadri, O. (2017). 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, 27th. 1-64
- [63] Ukpong, E. A.(2008). 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
- [64] Verhelst, T. G. (2020). No Life without Roots: Culture

Development, London: Zed Books publishers.

- [65] Voh, J. P. (2019). 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.
- [66] Wallace, T. (2013). 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.
- [67] Williams, S. K. T. (2012). *Developing Rural Nigeria*. Ile-Ife Nigeria: University of Ife press.
- [68] Williams, S. K. T. (2017). *Rural Development in Nigeria*. Ile-Ife Nigeria: University of Ife press.
- [69] Katsina State Support office IFAD-Community Based Agriculture and Rural Development Programme (2011). IFAD-CBARDP Baseline Analysis.
- [70] Katsina State Government Home Page (YSGHP)", Online Nigeria. <http://www.onlinenigeria.com/map>.