

Achieving Project Sustainability Through Community Participation

G. Ademola Olukotun

*Department of Finance and Banking, Faculty of Management Science,
Kogi State University, Anyigba, Nigeria
Telephone: 234(0) 8062995674, E-mail: olukgaby@yahoo.com*

KEYWORDS Community; development; participation; project sustainability

ABSTRACT Rural communities have over the years lived together and do things in common. They eat and sleep together; they go to their farms together, help the weak on the farm, during marriage and in home construction. In fact, the way their houses are built gives room for the sharing of ideas and for consultation. They have for their common benefits constructed roads, schools, health centres and also made bridges through manual labour and personal contributions. Having lived a life of togetherness and of sharing of ideas over a long period of time, it sounds strange, if not unacceptable to some of them that they will find projects in their communities without the slightest idea about it either in conception or in implementation. They therefore do not see the projects as part of them. The projects in most cases, therefore suffer abandonment or at best low maintenance. For projects to be sustained, the communities must be carried along during conception and implementation. More importantly, however there must be government support either in cash or in kind. Community leaders must also accept the challenge for project sustainability.

I. INTRODUCTION

Community participation in community development activity is as old as man itself. Men have had to work individually and collectively to make life better for them. Prior to the onset of colonial administration, communities had engaged in communal efforts as a mechanism for mobilizing community resource to provide physical improvement and functional facilities in the socio, political and economic aspects of their lives. The use of community labour was paramount in this period. There was a para-scientific response of a community lacking all relevant trappings of modern technology, capital and management resources to the media and exigencies of development. Para-Scientific here refers to the attempt by the communities to use approaches and methods that are not exclusively rural or scientific but a blend of rurality and science.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Participatory development has its origin in the fact that people have need for:

- (i) Self reliance and small scale development
- (ii) Unity to find a way to improve their destinies

More impetus was added to this participatory development when it was discovered that many large scale government intended development programmes, from schooling to health, to credit,

to irrigation systems were performing poorly while rapidly degrading common pool resources were creating significant negative environmental and poverty impacts. These complaints therefore re-awakened interest in the local management of resources and decisions (Mansari and Rao, 2004).

It was therefore important that participatory ideas be applied to small scale development in ways that would allow the poor to be informed participants in development with external agents acting mainly as facilitator and sources of funds (Chambers, 1997). Arguments for participatory development as advocated by Chambers (1997) and others have led to the inclusion of participation as a crucial means of allowing the poor to have control over decisions. The inclusion of participatory elements in large scale development assistance came quickly at the World Bank, in social investment funds and other forms of assistance.

Most often elected representatives do not always take care of the interest of the poor, local councils lack the capacities to articulate peoples development agenda, ownership and sustainability are ephemeral- case not based on the interest of the people. Therefore, communities must be empowered through ACTIVE PARTICIPATION FOR SUSTAINABILITY (Stanley, 2003). This challenge they have accepted.

Participation can therefore be said to be a sort of partnership which is built upon the basis of dialogue among the *various actors* during

which the agenda is *jointly set* and *local views* and *indigenous knowledge* are *deliberately sought* and *respected*.

The general principles of participatory approach include among others the following;

- Encouraging communities to take responsibilities
- Promote participation for all
- Reconcile different interests
- Listen to the community
- Examine the situation/problem from different points of view and then
- Adapt to local situations.

For many years people gathered themselves to construct town halls, palaces, markets, feeder roads, bridges and also prepare farmlands for cultivation together. People have always believed in the idea of self-help (which is the best help).

This agrees with the view of the United Nations (1956) which sees community development as a process by which the efforts of the people themselves are united with that of the government authorities to improve the economic, social and cultural conditions of the communities.

In other words, rural communities generally have over the years been involved in community development activities for their individual and collective benefits through one organization or the other. Most often this is more of a voluntary organization i.e an organization that members enter freely without coercion and leave freely at will. Members are not paid for being members but are happy to be part of like-minded people to perform social services, to advance some course or to seek self-help through such organizations (Woodard, 1987). According to Ohiani and Oni (1987), people saw the need for economic progress, they gather themselves into cooperatives to cultivate large farms for each member of their co-operation so as to be able to have surplus for sale. Also in education, people requested from the government or the voluntary agencies for permission to build schools. Furthermore as people saw the need for roads, dispensaries, post offices, courts, town halls etc, they participated in constructing them.

These, the people do without force or coercion but through collective agreement and individual's willingness. This is the view of Hillman (1960) who sees community development as a method of helping local communities to become aware of their needs, to assess their resources more realistically, to organise

themselves and their resources in such a way as to satisfy their needs and in so doing, acquire the attitude, experiences and cooperative skills for repeating this process again and again on their own initiative. This is however contrary to the view expressed by Olson (1973) that without coercion or some other special device to make individuals act in their own interest, rational self-interested individuals will not act to achieve their common or group interests.

The rural communities cannot afford to fold their arms and wait for the government to bring all the facilities to them. They also struggle on their own to live a life of ease. This is because, according to Ihimodu (1997), the people in their own little communities have their own dreams just like the elites at the centre. Their dream of the quality of life they would want to have, the environment and the facilities, which they would want to have, the kind of society, which they envisage for their children-obviously, better than their own.

The impetus for development should therefore come from the bottom or rather it is important to feel the pulse of the average person in the community and in that spirit, elicit from him, his/her vision of development and how the development can be sustained. Put differently, it is not only enough to identify their vision of development, it is also important to get their views of their plans to achieve their dreams or vision. This is because people will change only if they participate in the decision about the change.

According to Okafor (2005) what we observe when communities participate in their own projects include the followings:

- Empowering communities improve efficiency
- Local participation yields better projects , better outcomes
- Greater transparency and accountability enhances service delivery
- Community participation can kick start local, private contractors, service providers
- It also encourages donors harmonization

Communities who are the beneficiaries of the projects should not be seen as targets of poverty reduction efforts but should be seen as *assets* and *partners* in the development process.

In fact, experience has shown that given clear rules of the game, access to information and appropriate support, poor men and women (

communities) can effectively organize to provide good and services that meet their immediate priorities. This is because communities have considerable capacity to plan and implement programmes when empowered i.e given power to decide and negotiate (Tade, 2001).

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

There can be no sustainable development if we expect other people to come and develop our communities for us. The mobilization of the people to effectively participate in the process of achieving their vision is politically and economically imperative, Ihimodu (1997).

The objectives of the paper among others include the following:-

- i) To review past participatory efforts in our communities
- ii) To highlight why communities must be involved in projects that affects them
- iii) To highlight the benefits of community participation and how participation leads to sustainability
- iv) Finally, to highlight the conditions for achieving sustainability through community or participation.

IV. PAST PARTICIPATORY EFFORTS IN OUR COMMUNITIES WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO AMURO COMMUNITY IN THE MOPAMURO LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF KOGI STATE, NIGERIA

Before the advent of modern civilization, most of our communities were closely knit together and they were all involved in one participatory activity or the other. The present day modern schools, hospitals, roads etc did not exist.

In the olden days, many of the roads that reached the communities were bad and non-motorable with dilapidated bridges. Most often the roads were very bad and the bridges collapsed. Through community efforts however, these roads were repaired and maintained. School building were repaired through this process and dispensaries were also constructed.

In the Amuro district of Kogi State, a day is usually chosen by the community usually Tuesday. This is the day that community work is done. The job is titled 'ISE-ILU' i.e village work. The work is usually accompanied with drumming

and feeding and every member of the community willingly participates as it obtains in Dafur, Sudan. While men removed stores, women provided food and drinking water Musa (2002). In other words, the communities organised a big community mobilization involving the entire village during which they cleared the roads using manual tools in the first stage. We grew up to know this and the issue of absenteeism was totally NIL.

If it involves the purchase of anything, the villagers are levied or the money taken from the account of the community (if they have). Through these, many government schools, roads, dispensaries have been maintained and sustained. Many of the roads we use today started like these rural ones and people feel more relaxed walking on these roads. These roads connected villages and made it less difficult to reach other severely remote ones. In fact, in the olden days, many relationships were started on these roads. Because of the poor resources of the communities, when they have to maintain the road, according to Musa (2002), they could contribute two third of the total cost and lobby the government which then contribute the remaining one third. The community contributed unskilled labour, food and water.

Up till today, many of the houses in our rural communities are not fenced. People walk freely to their neighbour's house to discuss with them. The issue of theft or armed robbery does not exist. During the hot weather, people from various houses in a compound all go to one house to sleep. Doors were not locked, yet, nothing happened to peoples properties. When people come back from the farm they (household heads) gather in one person's house and they all eat together there. As at today, October 2006, only two houses are fenced in my community. The fences are even not high.

Farming in the olden days was also participatory in the sense that many people in the community go to the farm in the same area. They also cook together in turn. When it is time for food, the cook for the day will make a sound called 'WU' (a shout to call people). Ten to fifteen farmers and their children could come together to eat and then go back to work. When it is time to go home, they go together. Their problems and ideas are shared as they walk home.

In most cases, during the rainy season, if there's any river or stream on the way, they gather to make a culvert. If it is a river, the whole group

of farmers or the community (as the case may be), come together to make a bamboo bridge called “OKIKO” across the river. This guarantees easy access to their farms.

Up till today in most of our rural communities, there’s this idea of mutual giving out of food by women in the community when sharing the family food in the evening. Every family has at least between four and seven other families that they will give food to. This is called “IJUO” in Amuro district of Kogi State. It is the food given by one family to the other whenever they cook except during festivities.

As you give food to one family, they also give to you. Generally, every family receives at least four plates of “IJUO” per day. In fact, in most cases, before your mother’s food is ready, you have to make do with those ones. The issue of food poisoning does not arise. Following from the above, children of different parents eat their food together moving from one house to the other in turn to eat their shares. If your parents send you on an errand and you see a group of elders eating, they will call you and give you out of what they are eating. You dare not reject it. In fact, it is almost a taboo to reject it. You must eat the food. It is called “ETU” - i.e small food given by an elderly person from his own share to a younger person. When you finish eating it, they wish you well and send warm greetings to your parents through you. This attitude encouraged giving, oneness and love for one another.

Another form of the “ETU” is when an elderly person is coming from the farm and he/she carries yam. A younger person who meets the elderly man MUST carry the yam from him/her to the house. The younger person that carries the yam is entitled to a tuber of yam from what he carried for the elderly person.

In the olden days, also in many of our communities, if you were passing through somebody’s farm and you were hungry, if the farmer has maize or yam on the farm, you could take either or both and cook on the farm without taking anything away from the farm. You only need to cook and satisfy your hunger. It was acceptable. If you see the farm owner you could inform him you cooked out of his farm products. If you do not, you have not committed any offence. It was a common practice.

In the same way in the olden days, a shop or kiosk owner can open his shop with the prices of the items placed on them or in some cases, known

by the villages- through regular purchases. If the shop owner is not there, the article is purchased and the money is dropped in the shop. The shop owner only comes to pick his money later. This was the practice for a long period of time. In most cases, the person that purchased the good will tell the shop owner he/she purchased an item for a given amount and has dropped the money. Where there is price differential, it is rectified.

Another act of participatory co-existence was usually evident when a family is giving his child out in marriage. Women in the community fetch water for them and they are adorned in same cloth. Men cut firewood which is also carried by the women to the house of the people involved.

In the same way, if averagely poor people wants to build their houses, the artisans in the community comes together to help them. All the bricklayers in the community will work for them in turn and same for the carpenters. All they need do is to buy the materials and feed them. In such a way, it was difficult for anybody to be lagging behind. The community comes to their aid and their inadequacies are not evident.

In the olden days, people in the rural areas also engage in trading, hunting, gathering etc apart from farming which is their major pre occupation. When they (traders) are going to buy their goods they go together. Anybody that’s unable to go for one reason or the other would send his money through a colleague with the list of what he/she intends to buy without any doubt whatsoever. When they are going to hunt or fish, the people go together also. Whatever is killed or caught are shared together. Infact, if for any reason any member couldn’t go (known to his other group members) he shares equally with the people that went.

Then, the big one, “OKO-OWE”, - community farming for an individual. This involves the whole community going to one person’s farm to work for one whole day or two as the case may be. While men clear the land, make heaps, plant yam etc, the women also engage in their own work. As many as twenty-forty people could go to work for one person on his farm. All he needs do is to provide the food they would eat. In this way, it becomes very difficult, if at all possible for anybody in the community not to be able to feed or pay school fees. This is also very important to people that have no children-since children constitute a greater percentage of the farms labour

force. In this way, their childlessness is made up for (in a way).

The list is in exhaustible. No wonder then that all these spirit of communalism gave rise to cooperative movements in our communities. The present day co-operative movements in our cities started from the rural communities under different names i.e Ajo, Adachi, Esusu etc. Ajo, Adachi, Esusu are the Yoruba, Igala and Ibo names for daily, weekly or monthly contributions by individuals. The money is given to an individual at the end of an agreed time, usually a month. The olden day's co-operative movements were stronger because, they were based on mutual trust, co-existence and confidence.

According to Igboeli (1992) one of the most significant events that took place in major urban and rural areas in Nigeria has been the citizens' participation in the physical, societal and political development of their areas and this participation actually started from time immemorial.

A study in Pategi Emirate in Kwara State (Nigeria) revealed that the number of primary schools in the Emirate executed through self help increased from 11 in 1975 to 50 in 1984 and the average population of pupils rose from 2,634 in 1975 to 12,113 in 1984 (an increase of about 437%). Also in Kano state, there were self help project activities including (a) dispensaries and clinics (b) wells, boreholes, earth dams and pipe borne water (c) feeder roads, bridges and culverts (d) schools and adult education centres (e) market stalls and cemeteries.

According to Amos (1978) between 1968 and 1978, it was discovered that self help groups gave priority to economic and social welfare projects. These they financed through donations, levies, community labour and matching grants from local government. Projects executed included primary and post primary schools, clinics, maternity homes, roads, bridges, postal agencies, market stall, and town halls.

Informal organization have also played commendable roles in the provision of schools, hospitals, markets, pipe borne water, electricity as well as construction and maintenance of roads in the rural areas. It has been shown that in the former eastern state of Nigeria, as much as 64% of the primary and post primary educational facilities were provided by informal organizations

The various projects executed by the Amuro communities in the Mopamuro LGA include the following:

- (i) Efo-Amuro – Health clinics, schools, market, borehole and town hall
- (ii) Takete-Ide – Repairs of community roads, culverts, construction of health clinics, schools, markets and town hall.
- (iii) Orokere – Culverts, schools, road rehabilitation.
- (iv) Ayede – Repairs of roads, school and school buildings.
- (v) Aiyedayo- Repairs of roads, construction of culverts
- (vi) Aiyeteju- Repair of roads, borehole, school building
- (vii) Otafun- Repair of roads, construction of borehole.

These communities also jointly have a secondary school called Amuro community secondary school where students or candidates from the districts are given preferential consideration before any other students from any other part of the state. Through this, they were able to give admission to their children who were rejected in other schools without compromising the requisite standard.

V. WHY COMMUNITIES MUST BE INVOLVED IN PROJECTS THAT AFFECTS THEM

Having enjoyed so much working and living together, having enjoyed each others confidence and relationships, having collaborated for so long to achieve common objectives, having sat together to jointly take decisions for their common goals and benefits, it is logical and reasonable to think that any attempt at breaking this bond would be minimally resisted or maximally broken and destroyed. No wonder then the failure of many government projects that has no element of consultation.

Government officials in their wisdom and for whatever reason they deemed fit, established projects in communities without consultation (idea generation and mode of implementation) with the rural communities. Many of them failed while many were also abandoned. The Directorate for Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI) no doubt did many great jobs around the country. It opened up roads, dug boreholes, provided rural electrification and even ventured into shelter. Many of them however failed eventually. To put it in the words of Ihimodu (1997), "A Presidential Inspection Team to some of

the projects reported back that many DFFRI roads were overgrown with grasses and boreholes (even when they worked) were unkept and that when they asked the communities where these facilities were cited, why the unholy situation of things, they reported that they had not been involved in the process and therefore could not organise for their maintenance.”

What they said was that they just woke up one morning and saw heavy machines making roads which they appreciated, but that was the end of it. Many of the projects have lost their functional utility. The lesson of this therefore is that the people must be involved as participants if there's to be any sustainability.

Since the people are the beneficiaries of development plans and projects, they have a stake in it. If they have a stake, they must be partners in that process. They must be the key participants whose views, choices, needs and feelings must be taken into account if we are to have sustainable development.

According to Igboeli (1992), no matter the level of technical and financial assistance offered to self-help groups, the members should share actively in the decision to undertake certain projects. That is, rather than imposing development projects on a community, its members should be allowed to participate meaningfully in the planning and execution.

Development is meaningless if it does not harness the potentials of the beneficiaries who are the primary stakeholders. It is therefore important to find out what ways the people think they can participate in the process of achieving their vision. We should move from bringing government close to the people to bringing people closer to government. In other words, it is high time we imbibe the culture of bottom-up approach to development planning, otherwise, development may be a mirage.

The fact of the failure of many government projects and even the plethora of abandoned projects that dot the landscape of many communities in Nigeria is a tragedy, with scarce resources and the ever increasing needs of the rural populace; we cannot continue to plan for the people from the top or from the cities without their inputs any more.

The cornerstone of community based development initiatives is the active involvement of members of a defined community in at least some aspects of project design and implementation. When potential beneficiaries also make

key project decisions, participation becomes self-initiated action-what has come to be known as the exercise of voice and choice or empowerment.

The benefits among others according to Mansuri and Rao (2004) are;

- i) It will lead to better designed projects
- ii) Better targeted benefits
- iii) It is more cost effective
- iv) It will lead to more equitable distribution of project benefits
- v) It will lead to less corruption
- vi) It strengthens the capabilities of the citizenry to undertake self-initiated development activities
- vii) It improves the match between what a community needs and what it obtains. This is because the project will be more consistent with the preference of the target group

In conclusion, Okafor (2005) said the current emphasis on communities participating in the project that affect them include the following factors:

- Decades of spending billions of dollars to eradicate poverty in Africa have given minimal results with over 300 million people in Africa living below less than \$1 a day. These people are completely alienated, disempowered and vulnerable.

- World Bank evaluation of projects indicated that those projects that have community participation have succeeded and were rated satisfactory.

- Evidence from donors and NGOs has shown that when the poor people are empowered with resources, voices etc, it really leads to sustainable development.

- When the poor were asked to indicate what make the greatest difference to their lives and what can make their projects sustainable, they responded:

- 1 Organization of their own so that they can negotiate with government, traders NGOs.
- 2 Direct assistance through community driven programmes so that they can shape their own destinies.
- 3 Local ownership of funds so that they can end corruption. They want government and NGOs to be accountable to them.

V1. PARTICIPATION AND SUSTAINABILITY

When communities are involved in project initiation and implementation, there is the

assurance of sustainability subject to some conditions unlike when they have no idea about the project or when it is imposed on them. There ought to be genuine demand by a community or groups within it for all projects whether aided or non-aided by the government or any international agency. This eliminates the tendency to abandon the projects when they are half-way completed and sustains the interest of communities or groups within them in maintenance and protection of those projects. The project is not seen on a stranger.

Development assistance is not eternal or indefinite. In most cases, they are for a period between five and ten years after which the beneficiaries are expected to continue the funding, maintenance and eventually sustaining the projects. Necessary machineries must therefore be put in place before the funding is over. They either put in place a community management organization to manage the project or contribute for the funding of the sustainability. Their sources of fund include:-

- Development levy on flat rate basis for all male and female adults
- Development levy in accordance with level of income
- voluntary contribution according to individuals wish and capacity
- Launching of a community appeal fund
- Contribution of materials and equipment by community, sons and daughters living outside
- Staging of a cultural play to which prominent people are invited and then cash or material appeal is made etc.

Most communities (once they are involved in project initiation, design and implementation) will see to the actualization, maintenance and sustenance of the project. If however they are not consulted, the success of such a project is doubtful. According to the New Nigeria (1987), if a community or group has a genuine need for a health centre and work towards its establishment, such a facility would be well protected and maintained by its members because it is their sweat. Local institutions are the key to sustainability. When local groups are actively involved in project design and implementation they take on ownership and are more likely to continue the project when donor funding ends, compared with externally imposed projects (Ford, 1993).

Supporting this view Ohiani and Oni (1987) said a community centre which is built exactly on the European Pattern is likely not to be patronised in an African village where the community is already closely knit. Rather a village centre to be used for communal purpose such as funeral ceremonies, dances and social gathering will be acceptable to the village.

According to the World Bank (2004),

"In 1968, a community of 2000 people in Malawi started work on a novel water supply system. Community members began the panning, construction and operation of their own water supply and distribution. Field staff for the project was recruited locally, traditional community groups formed the basis for water communities, and government support was limited. Virtually, all of the more than 6000 standpipes installed nationwide are still in working order. More than 1million Malawians have high quality, reliable and convenient water through systems that they themselves built, own and maintain. An analysis of rural and urban development over thirty years found high correlation between project performance and level of participation. The bank concluded by saying that a survey of 25 World Bank agricultural projects evaluated five to ten years after completion found that participation was an important determinant in project performance and sustainability".

In the evaluation of another World Bank project, it was also found out that during a ten-year period in the Philippines, the National Irrigation Administration shifted from a top down government approach to heavy reliance on the local farmers in the design, operation and maintenance of local irrigation systems. It was discovered that the canals and structures worked better, rice yields were 20% higher and the irrigated area 35% greater than in control groups without participation (World Bank, 1991). In another report by the Research Observer (1991) on the evaluation of community development projects funded by the Agha Khan Rural Support Programme in Northern Pakistan, it was found out that community managed projects are better maintained than projects managed by the local government.

For projects to be sustainable there must be community participation. This is because, according to Musa (2000), through participation, the community develop skills for collective action, maintenance and sustainability. This is

evident in the community Development Works done by the Takete-Ide Community in the Mopamuro Local Government Area of Kogi State, Nigeria. They built schools, health centres, community centres and constructed roads. These activities have strengthened the potentials of the people. The development association formed have been upgraded into local societies with their own initiatives to address the people's needs to strengthen their position and to put forward their case to the decision making body particularly the local and state governments.

VII. CONDITIONS FOR ACHIEVING SUSTAINABILITY THROUGH COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Having seen the need for communities to participate in the conception, design and implementation of projects that affects them in order to achieve sustainability, there are certain conditions that must be fulfilled for the sustainability to be achieved.

The first condition for achieving sustainability through community participation is that there must be government support (state or local). This is because, according to Adamolekun (1983), local government arouse local citizens to contribute financially to the management of local affairs, get involved in local management as elected or appointed officials or participate on a voluntary basis within community development committees engaged in self-help projects. The assistance from the government can be in cash or in kind. For instance, after the completion of a project like a school or health centre, a community would normally need teaching and non-teaching staff and also health workers. The community may not be in a position to provide them except with government support.

Lending her own voice on the need for external agents to be involved for sustainability, Kleemeier (2000) found out from an examination of a Malawian rural piped water project that half the schemes are performing poorly, with the newest ones performing best. The weak sustainability, it was discovered stems largely from the weak institutional support from external agencies. According to Mansuri and Rao (2004), even if communities are initially successful in creating the project, they may lack the material resources and connections to sustain their efforts. Therefore, the need for a well functioning state

apparatus does not disappear with active community involvement. The communities must therefore lobby for continuing support for inputs and training so that they can sustain such projects. Put differently, Igboeli (1992) said that beneficiary communities, often too poor to find their own teachers, doctors, desks and medicine remain in need of government support for inputs, maintenance investment and trained staff to sustain project benefits. Thus, the need for a responsive state apparatus may increase when community participation projects are implemented.

In his own contribution, Mosse (1992) in an in depth study of tank management in India found out that the maintenance of community infrastructure is crucially dependent on external agents. The need to making participation work therefore is to create forms of downward accountability and simultaneously to maintain close links between the higher levels of government and the community.

Secondly, the community leaders must also accept the challenge for project sustainability and carry the whole community along. The leaders must be out rightly accountable and answerable to beneficiaries rather than to political and bureaucratic superiors (Mansuri and Rao 2004). Their records should be well kept in simple language and accessible to every members of the community. The leaders should be transparent in their dealings with members of the community and call for regular meetings where the people are briefed on the sustainability efforts of the community and the challenges ahead.

Therefore, the sustainability of community-based initiatives depends crucially on an enabling institutional environment, which requires government commitment, and on the accountability of leaders to their communities.

VIII. CONCLUSION

People in our communities have lived together over a long period of time - participating in various community activities together and sharing things in common. They are therefore used to doing things together after due consultation on issues that affects them - road construction and maintenance, marriage, farming activities etc. In this way, projects on which they are consulted are more accepted and seen as their own. They are therefore maintained.

We can therefore draw some conclusions agreed to by all the cited authors that participatory approach creates prosperity and sustainability by empowering communities. Participatory approach is the process of ensuring project sustainability. It also empowers the communities to shape their future by giving them resources and authority to use their resources.

Participation is a new vision that seeks to put the rural communities in the driver seat and give them a new set of powers, rights and obligations which enables them to ensure sustainability of their projects. These include:

- The right to be treated as people with capabilities not objects of poverty.
- The rights to hold politicians and officials accountable.
- The power to command local bureaucrats.
- The power to hire, pay and discipline service providers.
- The right to share of central government revenue
- The obligations to be accountable to local people.
- The obligations to enable women, other ethnic minorities and excluded groups to participate fully in economic development through empowerment.

If communities are involved in project formulation, design and implementation, the projects are likely to be sustained, more cost effective there's more equitable distribution of project benefit, it also leads to better designed projects etc. According to Starkey (2002), participatory user focused network can have all stakeholders work together and encouraged to collaborate and learn from each other.

However, for the sustainability to be achieved there must be government/institutional support and the community leaders must be accountable and transparent.

REFERENCES

- Adamolekun, L. 1983. *Public Administration: A Nigerian and Comparative Perspective*. New York: Longman Inc., pg. 75
- Amos, E. 1978. *Community Development: A Strategy in Mass Mobilization and Political Integration in Anka LGA 1968-1978: A Case Study of Imane District, Benue State*. A Dissertation submitted to the Dept of political Science Bayero University, Kano for the award of B.Sc. degree in June, 1978 pp 16-18.
- Chambers, R. 1997. *Whose Reality Counts? Putting the First Last*. Rugby: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Ford, D. 1993. *Community level progress in Sustainable Development: Population and Environment*. Proceedings of a workshop on sustainable development in sub-Saharan Africa held in Baltimore, Maryland, May 19-21, 1991.
- Green K.O. 1999 *Grass root Development*. Washington: Academy for Educational Development.
- Hillman, A. 1960. *Community Organization and Planning*. New York: Macmillan.
- Igboeli, M. O. 1992 "Self-help as a strategy for Rural Development: A critique", (Pp. 401-413) in M. S. O. Olisa and J. I. Obiukwu (eds.), *Rural Development in Nigeria: Dynamics and Strategy*. Awka: Mekslink Publishers.
- Ihimodu I. I. 1997. "States' vision plans of development." *A lecture delivered on March 20, 1997*, pp. 3 & 5
- Kleemeier E. 2000. "The impact of participation on sustainability: An analysis of the Malawi Rural Piped Scheme Programme." *World Development*, 28(5): 929-944
- New Nigeria. 1987 A publication of New Nigerian Newspaper Ltd, Kaduna Dec.16, pg. 10
- Mausuri, G. and V. Rao. 2004. "Community based and Driven Development: A critical Review." *The World Bank Research Observer*, 19(1): 6, 31
- Mosse, D. 1997. "Colonial and Contemporary ideologies of community management: The case of Tank irrigation development in South India." *Modern Asian Studies*, 33(2): 303-38
- Musa, S. M. E. 2002. *Feeder Roads and Food Security in Balancing the Load: Women, Gender and Transport*. UK: Zed Books Ltd., Pp. 79-94.
- Ohiani, B. and S. B. Oni. 1987 *Community Development for Promoting Socio-Economic Growth*. Zaria: Oluseyi Boladeji Company, Pp. 14, 85
- Okafor, C. 2005. "CDD: Concepts and Procedure." *Paper delivered at the LEEMP workshop in Kainji National Park, New Bussa*, Pp. 2-10.
- Olson, M. 1973: *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, p. 46
- Stanley, B. 2003. *Sustainability through Participation*. Minna: Dele Publishers, p. 211.
- Starkey, P. 2002. *Local Transport Solutions for Rural Development*. UK: Russell Press, p. 12
- Tade, P. 2001. *Community Participation*. Ibadan: Adams Publishers, p.14
- United Nations. 1956. *Twentieth Report of the administrative committee on coordination to the Economic and Social Council*. 24th Session. Annex III, Document E/2931, Oct. 18th pg. 14
- Woodard, M.D. 1987. "Voluntary Association Membership Among Black American and the Post Civil Right Era." *Sociological Quarterly*, 28: 285-300.
- World Bank 1991 *World Development Report*. New York: Oxford University Press.