

# Attitudinal and Financial Commitments of Community Stakeholders towards Project Development in selected Communities in Ibadan, Nigeria

**Obembe Jide Joseph**

Department of Project Management Technology

The Federal University of Technology, Akure

**Email:** obembejide@yahoo.com

## **ABSTRACT**

This study examines the stakeholders' attitudes, financial commitments and execution of community projects from 2013 to 2016 in three selected areas in Ibadan Metropolis, the capital of Oyo State, Nigeria. The three communities are: Alabidun, Akingbade, and Alafia Oluwa which were purposively selected. Primary data on payment of annual dues, expenditure of the collected funds on projects, and attendance at meetings were collected through the use of secondary data which were documents kept by the communities. These include data collected from meeting attendance registers, duplicate of donors' dues, payment receipts and minutes of the meetings of the three communities.

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used for data analysis. Imposition of penalties on annual development levy defaulters was found to have enhanced collection of dues in Alabidun (95%) and Ogungbade (75.1%) while Alafia Oluwa which did not use penalties realized only 62.3% of the amount expected for the period considered for this study. A significant and moderately positive relationship was found between attendance at community meetings and the payment of community project development dues. So also, a significant relationship was found between payment of levies imposed on community stakeholders and execution of projects.

**Keywords:** Assessment; Attitudinal; Financial commitment; Project Development; Communities

## **INTRODUCTION**

The rate of development of any community is facilitated by the people's recognition of the need for self-help and their readiness to take necessary actions towards achieving their community's development. Communities

embarking on self-help projects use their initiatives to ensure successful implementation. According to *Webster's Universal Dictionary and Thesaurus* (2010) a community is a group of people living in a particular place bounded together by a common social religious, occupational or other group, sharing common characteristics of interest and perceiving itself as distinct in some respect from the larger society within which it exists. *The Concise Oxford English Dictionary* (2006) also defines community as a group of people living together in one place having cultural, religious, ethnic or other characteristics in common, while Hornby (2015) defines community as a group of people who share the same religion, race, job and live in a particular area, village, town and country. Other authors similarly define community as a social group of any size whose members reside in a specific locality, share government and often have a common cultural and historical heritage.

In Nigeria, the provision of social amenities and infrastructures by governments to cities, towns and villages is often inadequate. Every city, town and village suffers infrastructural deficits that prevent the stakeholders from attaining a desired standard of living. This is contrary to what happens in the developed countries where governments are positively disposed to provision of social amenities.

The communities selected for this study are devoid of government presence at all levels: no evidence of the provision of infrastructures by the Federal, State or Local governments. In response to this challenge, the communities decided to provide these infrastructures using communal efforts, financial levy contribution donation and aids from philanthropists and members. They embarked upon the following infrastructural projects street electrification, including the, purchase of electric cables, poles and transformers, provision of water (boreholes and wells), construction of bridges, markets community health centres, school, community hall, grading and construction of roads among others.

As part of the project management sanctions and penalties were imposed on individuals who were absent from meetings and individuals who failed to pay their dues. The penalties included seizure of household equipment such as mortars and pestles, millstones and valuable domestic animals such as goats, other offenders were to purchase kegs of palm wine for the community or pay some money as fine. Many community members found it difficult to pay these dues and this had slowed down community project implementations. The

above challenges to community projects development in Nigeria have brought about this research study.

### **Hypothesis of the Study**

- Ho<sub>1</sub> Meeting attendance in communities will not have significant influence on the stakeholders' commitment to the payment of community project development funds.
- Ho<sub>2</sub> There is no significant relationship between community meeting attendance among stakeholders and payment of community project development dues.

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

The transformation of communities to improve their lives has become the main challenge to the economic and social development efforts of developing nations like Nigeria. This challenge arises from the need to promote the welfare of the people of the rural communities so that they could acquire a better standard of living in their homes (Onabanjo, 2004).

Community project development has been a way by which community members are mobilized and integrated into contributing meaningfully to the growth of their areas (Onabanjo 2004, Abiona, 2009). This awareness has made some communities to embark on various community projects that transformed their rural areas to a better developed setting. Osuji (1992) and Oino *et al.*, (2015) submit that communities in Nigeria and other parts of Africa have used communal efforts as the mechanism for mobilizing community resources to provide physical improvement and functional facilities in their localities in the social, political and economic aspects of their lives. Some of the community development programmes are rehabilitation of roads, community security programmes, purchase of electricity poles, transformer, cable among others (Anyanwu, 1992, Abiona, 2009, Oino *et al.*, 2015).

Chifamba:s, (2013) work on the challenges and barriers to community projects development initiatives pointed out challenges that impeded community development as inadequate resources that negatively impact the community's ability to effectively influence the direction of the rural development process. These challenges are: lack of access to financial resources, poor co-ordination, poor management, a diminishing team spirit and a decline in commitment to community projects and activities. For example, Amungwa's

(2015) findings on rural community development practice in Africa suggest that members of many rural communities became reluctant over time to make timely contribution towards community projects, while Oino *et al.*, (2015) noted that inadequate funding of community projects by stakeholders was a very serious problem.

Ngoma and Namilonga, (2015) found in Zambia that community stakeholders did not attend community meetings regularly and that committee members lacked proper accountability on project assets and financial resources. In addition, many of the stakeholders were illiterates which made them not committed to community projects development. Similarly, Alabi *et al.*, (2014) found that inadequate funding posed challenges to community project development; poor payment of development dues negatively affected Fadama projects in Abuja, Nigeria.

These research studies reported that success of community projects can only be achieved if the stakeholders pay their development dues promptly, were truly committed to the community works, attended community meetings regularly, cooperated with community members, and imposed penalties to stakeholders who did not carry out their obligations to the community among others (Osuji, 1992, Abiona, 2009, Onabanjo, 2004, Amugwa, 2015, Oino, 2015, Chifamba, 2013).

Other problems which have impeded community projects development programmes are lukewarm attitude of stakeholders to maintenance, wrong belief that government was capable and should meet all their needs inadequate funding on the part of community individuals/ members, illiteracy of many members, communication clashes, and lack of commitment on the part of the people (Amungwa, 2015, Oino *et al.*, 2015) Chifamba, 2013).

The Centre for Disease Control and Prevention, Home Office Crime Reduction Centre (2005) lists the difficulties confronting successful community projects development as follows late or irregular payment of security dues and yearly developmental levies by community stakeholders irregular attendance at community meetings, non-commitment of members to community decisions, nonchalant attitudes of members to community project activities, mistrust among stakeholders, and lack of time, resources, skills or confidence to contribute.

These challenges could be overcome through a greater understanding and awareness of the value and advantages that come from working together

more collaboratively and through experience with effective community projects (Home Office Crime Reduction Centre, 2005). Overcoming these challenges would make stakeholders have full sense of belonging to the community; build civic capacity at the level of the organization, provide security for lives and property, make some needed infrastructures available and monitor them well. It will also bring unity and cooperation among community stakeholders and enhance the social welfare of members in terms of adequate participation in social functions in the community.

## **METHODOLOGY**

This research was carried out in Ibadan metropolis.. The selected communities were; Alafia Oluwa, Alabidun and Ogungbade. The first two communities are located in Egbeda Local Government Council and the third in Ono-Ara Local Government Council all on the outskirts of the city. Secondary data was used to gather information on annual dues for security, development, social activities, projects and execution of projects for four years (2013 – 2016) in the concerned communities. Financial books, meeting attendance registers, and project documents of the communities were used to collect needed data. A questionnaire was also designed for primary data collection. The questionnaire was administered to 248 landlords in the study areas. This questionnaire treated the social economic characteristics of the respondents. All the landlords of the three communities were considered as respondents. The data collected were sorted, edited and coded as appropriate. Descriptive and inferential statistical techniques were used for data analysis.

## **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

Table 1 presents the educational qualifications of the respondents. 68% of landlords in Alabidun and 74% of those in Ogungbade have HND or Bachelor's degrees and the remaining 32% and 26% have primary and/or secondary education. 25% of the landlords in Alafia Oluwa have HND or Bachelor's degrees, and the remaining 75% of the landlords have primary and/or secondary education. This indicates that Alafia Oluwa residents are not as educated as those of the other two communities. This difference in educational levels of the three selected communities could have an effect on their attitudinal and financial commitments towards community project development. The

more educated a community, the more likely it is that the community stakeholders will be committed to self-help project development.

**Table 1: Educational Qualification of the respondents**

	Alafia Oluwa		Alabidun		Ogungbade	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
Primary six	30	41	12	14	10	12
WAEC/	15	20.5	10	11.8	8	
OND	10		5		5	
BSC/B.Tech/HND	18	25	53	68	67	74
Total	73	100	85	100	90	100

**Source: Field Survey, 2016**

### Financial Commitments of Alabidun Landlords (2013-2016)

Alabidun community is occupied by highly educated people who are mostly government workers (Table 1). The people are aware of the benefits derivable from executing community projects. Table 2 presents the amount expected to be paid, amount actually paid and amount not paid by the landlords in Alabidun community.

As the table shows, majority (56.6%) of the landlords completed the payment of their dues, while 43.4% of the landlords have amounts ranging from N200 to N11, 300 to pay so as to balance up their expected community project development dues. The various projects they expended funds on were: security of the environment, road repairs, police patrol and extension and repairs of facilities such as replacement of electricity pole, cable, purchase of transformer among others. These findings corroborate the findings of (Anyanwu, 1992, Abiona, 2009, Oino, *et al.*, 2015) that communities expend their development dues on projects.

Alabidun landlords were cooperative and understood the canons of ability and certainty of paying taxes. This knowledge made the levies on community stakeholders affordable. Annually, each house pays N6, 000 for security and N500 for development. From the Table 2, 95% of the expected community projects dues were paid. The community had in place penalties/sanctions on defaulters and this contributed to the huge amount realized from the community (N2,100,350). This finding shows that in this community, the stakeholders were committed. This is similar to the report of Chifamba (2013)

and Amugwa (2015) that community stakeholders must be committed and provide adequate funding for community project development.

**Table 2: Financial Commitments of Alabidun Landlords Community in Ibadan between 2013 and 2016**

	Expected Payment	Actual Payment	Debt	Percentage of Payment
X1	26,000	26,000	-	100
X2	26,000	24,500	1,500	94.2
X3	26,000	26,000	-	100
X4	26,000	22,500	3,500	86.5
X5	26,000	26,000	-	100
X6	26,000	26,000	-	100
X7	26,000	26,000	-	100
X8	26,000	26,000	-	100
X9	26,000	26000	-	100
X10	26,000	23,000	3,000	88.7
X11	26,000	22,900	3,100	88.7
X12	26,000	22,900	3,100	88.7
X13	26,000	26,000	-	100
X14	26,000	26,000	-	100
X15	26,000	26,000	-	100
X16	26,000	26,000	-	100
X17	26,000	21,000	5,000	80.8
X18	26,000	26,000	-	100
X19	26,000	18,900	7,100	72.7
X20	26,000	23,500	2,500	90.4
X21	26,000	14,700	11,300	56.5
X22	26,000	18,200	7,800	70
X23	26,000	26,000	-	100
X24	26,000	26,000	-	100
X25	26,000	26,000	-	100
X26	26,000	26,000	-	100
X27	26,000	23,900	2,100	91.9
X28	26,000	26,000	-	100
X29	26,000	24,800	1,200	95.4
X30	26,000	25,800	200	99.2
X31	26,000	26,000	-	100
X32	26,000	24,700	1,300	95
X33	26,000	20,700	5,300	79.6
X34	26,000	26,000	-	100

**Attitudinal and Financial Commitments of Community Stakeholders towards Project Development in selected Communities in Ibadan, Nigeria**

X35	26,000	25,500	500	98.1
X36	26,000	25,900	100	99.6
X37	26,000	26,000	-	100
X38	26,000	22,700	3,300	87.3
X39	26,000	24,900	1,100	95.8
X40	26,000	22,900	3,100	88.1
X41	26,000	26,000	-	100
X42	26,000	22,250	3,750	85.6
X43	26,000	26,000	-	100
X44	26,000	26,00	-	100
X45	26,000	25,400	600	97.7
X46	26,000	24,000	2,000	92.3
X47	26,000	25,500	500	98.1
X48	26,000	21,700	4,300	83.5
X49	26,000	26,000	-	100
X50	26,000	25,500	500	98.1
X51	26,000	26,000	-	100
X52	26,000	26,,000	-	100
X53	26,000	22,000	4,000	84.6
X54	26,000	21700	4,300	83.5
X55	26,000	25200	800	96.9
X56	26,000	26,000	-	100
X57	26,000	23500	2,500	90.4
X58	26,000	26,000	-	100
X59	26,000	26,000	-	100
X60	26,000	26,000	-	100
X61	26,000	24,500	1,500	94.2
X62	26,000	24,500	1,500	94.2
X63	26,000	26,000	-	100
X64	26,000	26,000	-	100
X65	26,000	26,000	-	100
X66	26,000	26,000	-	100
X67	26,000	25,600	400	98.5
X68	26,000	26,000	-	100
X69	26,000	26,000	-	100
X70	26,000	26,000	-	100
X71	26,000	24900	1,100	95.8
X72	26,000	26,000	-	100
X73	26,000	26,,000	-	100
X74	26,000	26,000	-	100
X75	26,000	25,000	1,000	96.2
X76	26,000	26,000	-	100



X77	26,000	23,100	2,900	88.8
X78	26,000	24,000	2,000	92.3
X79	26,000	26,00	-	100
X80	26,000	26,000	-	100
X81	26,000	26,000	-	100
X82	26,000	26,000	-	100
X83	26,000	26,000	-	100
X84	26,000	26,000	-	100
X85	26,000	26,000	-	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,210000</b>	<b>2,100,250</b>	<b>109,750</b>	<b>95%</b>

**Source:** Due Payment Register X<sub>1</sub>- X<sub>85</sub>= Landlords in Alabidun Community

### Financial Commitments of Ogungbade Landlords (2013-2016)

Table 3 presents the amount expected to be paid, the amount actually paid and the amount unpaid. Only 27.7% landlords had completed their payments, 66.8% had paid part of their dues while 5.5% did not pay any money. Ogungbade is a new residential layout and needs many infrastructures that government may not be able to provide. The community members need to cooperate with one another to have facilities like good roads, purchase of transformer, electricity pole, establishment of community market, health centre among others. Educated elites are many in this community and this probably influence payment (75.1%) of their annual dues. Penalties for failure to pay development dues were in place and were enforced. Strategies used included disconnection of electricity supply and enforcement of payment by police force. Ogungbade performed fairly well in paying the annual dues probably because the amount of money levied, N6000 per year per house for security and N500 for development per house per year were not too high. Like in the Alabidun community, the penalties on defaulters were adequately implemented, and this helped the community to realize 75.1% of the expected funds (N1,757,000).

**Table 3: Financial Commitments of Ogungbade Community stakeholders in Ibadan, Oyo State between 2013 and 2016**

	Expected payment	Actual payment	Debt	Percentage of payment
Z1	26,000	26,000	-	100
Z2	26,000	26000	-	100
Z3	26,000	26000	-	100
Z4	26,000	26000	-	100
Z5	26,000	26000	-	100

**Attitudinal and Financial Commitments of Community Stakeholders towards Project Development in selected Communities in Ibadan, Nigeria**

Z6	26,000	26000	-	100
Z7	26,000	19500	6500	75
Z8	26,000	20000	6000	76.9
Z9	26,000	9000	17000	34.6
Z10	26,000	26000	-	100
Z11	26,000	26000	-	100
Z12	26,000	16000	10,000	61.5
Z13	26,000	20000	6000	76.9
Z14	26,000	24000	2000	92.3
Z15	26,000	26000	-	100
Z16	26,000	20500	4500	78.8
Z17	26,000	14000	12000	53.8
Z18	26,000	17500	8500	67.3
Z19	26,000	26000	-	100
Z20	26,000	21000	5000	80.8
Z21	26,000	26000	-	100
Z22	26,000	26000	-	100
Z23	26,000	23400-	2600	90
Z24	26,000	19000	7000	73.1
Z25	26,000	25000	1000	96.2
Z26	26,000	17,000	9,000	65.4
Z27	26,000	14,500	11,500	55.8
Z28	26,000	24000	2000	92.3
Z29	26,000	23000	3000	88.5
Z30	26,000	12,000	14000	46.2
Z31	26,000	24000	2000	92.3
Z32	26,000	23000	3000	88.5
Z33	26,000	18000	8,000	69.2
Z34	26,000	26000	-	100
Z35	26,000	15500	11500	59.6
Z36	26,000	21500	4500	82.7
Z37	26,000	26000	-	100
Z38	26,000	26000	-	100
Z39	26,000	23500	2500	90.4
Z40	26,000	24000	2000	92.3
Z41	26,000	14500	11500	55.8
Z42	26,000	24000	2000	92.3
Z43	26,000	11000	15000	42.3
Z44	26,000	26000	-	100
Z45	26,000	26000	-	100
Z46	26,000	26000	-	100
Z47	26,000	-	26000	00

Z48	26,000	3500	22500	13.5
Z49	26,000	24000	2000	92.3
Z50	26,000	23000	3000	88.5
Z51	26,000	15000	11000	57.7
Z52	26,000	24000	2000	92.3
Z53	26,000	-	26000	00
Z54	26,000	26000	-	100
Z55	26,000	26000	-	100
Z56	26,000	22000	4000	84.6
Z57	26,000	26000	-	100
Z58	26,000	20500	5500	78.8
Z59	26,000	23000	3000	88.5
Z60	26,000	24500	1500	94.2
Z61	26,000	21500	4500	82.7
Z62	26,000	26000		100
Z63	26,000	23000	3000	88.5
Z64	26,000	26000	-	100
Z65	26,000	26000	-	100
Z66	26,000	23000	3000	88.5
Z67	26,000	11000	15000	42.3
Z68	26,000	22500	3500	86.5
Z69	26,000	6500	19500	25
Z70	26,000	12500	13500	48.1
Z71	26,000	9000	17000	34.6
Z72	26,000	21500	4500	82.7
Z73	26,000	8000	18,000	30.8
Z74	26,000	12500	13500	48.1
Z75	26,000	18000	8000	69.2
Z76	26,000	13000	13000	50
Z77	26,000	24500	1500	94.2
Z78	26,000	26000	-	100
Z79	26,000	13000	13000	50
Z80	26,000	-	26000	00
Z81	26,000	25500	500	98.1
Z82	26,000	23500	2500	90.4
Z83	26,000	13500	12500	51.9
Z84	26,000	22000	4000	84.6
Z85	26,000	20000	6000	76.9
Z86	26,000	4000	22000	15.4
Z87	26,000	19000	7000	73.1
Z88	26,000	24000	2000	92.3
Z89	26,000	-	26000	00

**Attitudinal and Financial Commitments of Community Stakeholders towards Project Development in selected Communities in Ibadan, Nigeria**

Z90	26,000	21500	4500	82.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,340,000</b>	<b>1,757,000</b>	<b>583,000</b>	<b>75.1%</b>

**Source:** Due payment register: Z<sub>1</sub>- Z<sub>90</sub> = Landlords in Ogungbade Community

**Financial Commitment of Alafia Oluwa Landlords (2013-2016)**

Table 4 presents the dues paid by landlords in Alafia Oluwa. The table shows that only 3.4% of landlords completed their dues 96.6% paid only a part. Alafia Oluwa has little or no infrastructural facilities. The very few facilities such as electricity, culvert, road, and transformer and electricity poles were funded by the community members. The community does not belong to any political ward; therefore, there is no political leader to promote infrastructure development in the community. The community is mostly occupied by people of average means that are not as educated as people in other two communities and majority of them are not government workers. The annual dues per house are as follows: N6,000 security levy, N3000development levy and N1500 for social welfare amounting to N10,500 per house per year. This levy was considered too much for the payers and this makes them to avoid payment. In this community there is no penalty imposed on defaulter of dues payment and this makes community stakeholders to have nonchalant attitude towards payment of dues, which affect community project development negatively.

**Table 4: Financial Commitment of Alafia Oluwa Community Stakeholders in Ibadan, Oyo State between 2013 and 2016.**

	<b>Expected payment</b>	<b>Actual payment</b>	<b>Debt</b>	<b>Percentage of payment</b>
Y1	42,000	4400	37600	10.5
Y2	42,000	24,000	18,000	57.1
Y3	42,000	41700	300	99.3
Y4	42,000	33100	8900	78.8
Y5	42,000	37800	4200	90
Y6	42,000	12550	29450	29.9
Y7	42,000	40100	1900	95.5
Y8	42,000	39900	2100	95
Y9	42,000	38650	3350	92
Y10	42,000	26900	25,100	64
Y11	42,000	29400	12600	70
Y12	42,000	25700	16,300	61.2
Y13	42,000	28500	13500	67.9
Y14	42,000	29000	13000	69

Y15	42,000	15,300	26,700	36.4
Y16	42,000	37,700	4300	89.8
Y17	42,000	38,000	4000	90.5
Y18	42,000	30600	11,400	72.9
Y19	42,000	37,400	4600	89
Y20	42,000	29,400	12600	70
Y21	42,000	22600	19400	53.8
Y22	42,000	31000	11,000	73.8
Y23	42,000	31,300	10,700	74.5
Y24	42,000	41500	500	98.8
Y25	42,000	17500	24500	41.7
Y26	42,000	15,300	26700	36.4
Y27	42,000	39,000	3000	92.9
Y28	42,000	32400	9,600	77.1
Y29	42,000	500	37,000	11.9
Y30	42,000	39,400	2600	93.8
Y31	42,000	16,200	25,800	38.6
Y32	42,000	24000	18,000	57.1
Y33	42,000	42,000	-	100
Y34	42,000	42,000	-	100
Y35	42,000	19,400	22600	46.2
Y36	42,000	41,400	600	98.6
Y37	42,000	27,900	14100	66.4
Y38	42,000	25,500	15,500	60.7
Y39	42,000	39,500	2,500	94.0
Y40	42,000	26,200	15,800	62.4
Y41	42,000	14,400	27600	34.3
Y42	42,000	41.000	1000	97.6
Y43	42,000	5200	36800	12.4
Y44	42,000	6700	35300	16
Y45	42,000	8400	33600	20
Y46	42,000	36100	5900	86
Y47	42,000	29400	12600	70
Y48	42,000	21700	20,300	51.7
Y49	42,000	21450	20550	51.1
Y50	42,000	42000	-	100
Y51	42,000	10700	31300	25.5
Y52	42,000	23900	18100	56.9
Y53	42,000	15900	26100	14
Y54	42,000	33500	8500	79.8
Y55	42,000	30500	11,500	72.6
Y56	42,000	26900	15100	64

**Attitudinal and Financial Commitments of Community Stakeholders towards Project Development in selected Communities in Ibadan, Nigeria**

Y57	42,000	12400	29600	29.5
Y58	42,000	18400	23600	43.8
Y59	42,000	21400	20600	50.9
Y60	42,000	32400	9600	77.1
Y61	42,000	39,000	3000	92.9
Y62	42,000	32700	9300	77.9
Y63	42,000	41,000	1000	97.6
Y64	42,000	29500	12500	70.3
Y65	42,000	23250	18750	55.4
Y66	42,000	20000	22000	47.6
Y67	42,000	21100	20900	50.2
Y68	42,000	19000	23000	45.2
Y69	42,000	29200	12800	69.5
Y70	42,000	24400	17600	58.1
Y71	42,000	41,000	1000	97.6
Y72	42,000	31700	10,300	75.5
Y73	42,000	34,700	7300	82.6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,066,000</b>	<b>1,908,740</b>	<b>1,157,260</b>	<b>62.3%</b>

**Source:** Due Payment Register:

Table 5 shows the expected and actual meeting attendance of the three concerned communities for four years running. It was observed that Alabidun community stakeholders attended meetings more than other communities. Her attendance rates were 80.5%, 70.5%, 77.9% and 82.4% for years 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016 respectively. This meeting attendance enhanced their payment of project development dues. Ogungbade also had 78.8%, 65.2%, 76.7% and 80.7% attendance rate for the same period. The attendance also probably influenced 75.1% payment of the expected development dues. Alafia Oluwa had the poorest attendance of meetings. Her rates of attendance were 56%, 59%, 56% and 57% for the same period. This poor performance in meeting attendance of Alafia Oluwa may be due to low education of landlords and non-application of punishment to defaulters. The poor meeting attendance may also be responsible for low (62.3%) amount collected for the development of projects in the community.

**Table 5: Yearly meeting attendance by community stakeholders (2013 – 2016)  
Expected and actual meeting attendance per year per community**

<b>2016</b>	<b>Alafia Oluwa</b>	<b>Alabidun</b>	<b>Ogungbade</b>
Available landlord	73	83	90
Expected attendance	816	996	1080
Actual attendance	457	779	822
Percentage of actual	56%	80.5%	78.8%
<b>2015</b>			
Available landlords	73	88	105
Expected attendance	876	1058	1260
Actual	523	746	822
Percentage of actual	59.7%	70.5%	65.2%
<b>2014</b>			
Available landlord	65	80	85
Expected attendance	780	960	1020
Actual	441	748	782
Percentage of actual	56.5%	77.9%	76.7%
<b>2013</b>			
Available landlord	58	70	75
Expected attendance	696	840	900
Actual	391	692	726
Percentage of actual	57%	82.4%	80.7%

Table 6 presents reasons why some community stakeholders were reluctant to pay the community development levies fully in their areas. From the table, 40.3% of the landlords reported that some community members were not committed to the development of their areas therefore did not pay the funds promptly. This finding corroborates the earlier report that in London late payment of community levies; non commitment of members to community decisions; irregular attendance of community meetings among others adversely affected community project development (Home Office Crime Reduction Centre (2005). In addition, 50% of the respondents claimed that the economic situation in the country was responsible for their nonpayment of development levies. Forty landlords also claimed that arbitrary imposition of levy on stakeholders leads to refusal to pay their dues. Furthermore, thirty five respondents claimed that mismanagement of funds by community executives discouraged them from paying the community development levies while another twenty three respondents based their reason on embezzlement of the community funds by community executives.

**Table 6: Reasons why some Community Stakeholders Reluctant to Pay Full Expected Development Dues**

		Frequency	%
1.	Nigeria economy is bad that government workers did not receive salaries for months.	50	20.2
2.	Community executives embezzle the contributed dues	23	9.3
3.	Arbitrary imposition of development levy by some communities	40	16.1
4.	Unwillingness of some landlords to be committed to community development therefore do not pay their dues promptly	100	40.3
5.	Mismanagement of funds by community executives	35	14.1
	TOTALs	248	100%

Table 7 presents different dues payable by landlords in the study areas. These dues are, security levy which was N6, 000 in all the communities per year, development levy was N500 per landlord per year in Alabidun and Ogungbade imposed and N3000 per landlord per year in Alafia Oluwa. Social welfare levy, was paid alone by Alafia Oluwa, amount imposed was N1500 per landlord per year, while others made it free for the period. Alafia Oluwa imposed a levy of N42, 000 on each landlord, while other communities imposed N26,000 on each landlord. This may be one of the reasons why Alabidun and Ogunba landlords responded positively to community project payments than Alafia Oluwa.



**Table 7: Yearly dues imposed in each community per house per year for 2013 - 2016**

Community	Security due per year per house	Due/Development Per year Per house	Social welfare Per year Per house	Total dues payable per year	Total dues payable per house for 4 years
Alafia Oluwa	N6,000	N3000	N1500	N10,500	42,000
Alabidun	N6,000	N500	-	N6,500	26,000
Ogungbade	N6,000	N500	-	N6,500	26,000

Table 8 reveals the yearly project development dues collected by each community considered in this study between 2013 and 2016. Alabidun collected N2,100,250 which was the highest. This was followed by Alafia Oluwa (N1,908,740), while Ogungbade collected N1,757,000. The percentage of funds realized to expect revenue by the three communities are 95%, 62.3% and 75.1% respectively.

**Table 8: Funds Realised Annually for Project Development in the communities**

Year	Alabidun	Alafia Oluwa	Ogungbade
2013	504060	458098	421680
2014	493558	448554	412895
2015	546065	496272	456820
2016	556567	505816	465605
Total	2,100,250	1,908,740	1,757,000
2013-2016 Projected revenue	2,210000	3,066,000	2,340,000
Percentage collected	95%	62.3%	75.1%

Table 9 shows the yearly records of meetings attended by the community stakeholders in the three communities between 2013 and 2016. Ogungbade Community had the highest attendance (3182), followed by Alabidun (2965), while Alafia Oluwa had the least (1818). The meeting attendance reflected funds contributed by the communities. When the total amount of dues paid is considered, Alabidun ranked the best with 95%, followed by Ogungbade (75.1%), while the least was Alafia Oluwa 62.3%. The yearly meeting

attendance follows the same pattern with community project development dues payment. The meeting attendance at Ogungbade was 82.6% while that of Alabidun and Alafia Estate were 78.6 and 58.3% respectively between 2013 and 2016.

**Table 9: Yearly meeting attendance by community stakeholders towards project development**

Year	Alabidun		Ogungbade		Alafia Oluwa	
	Actual	Expected	Actual	Expected	Actual	Expected
2013	692	840	726	900	397	696
2014	748	960	782	1020	441	780
2015	779	996	852	1080	457	816
2016	746	1058	822	1260	523	876
Total	2965	3840	3182	3854	1818	3120
Percentage	76.6%		82.6%		58.3%	

Table 10 presents fund raising as another source of income to the communities. Whenever the communities have projects to be executed they usually solicit for funds from individuals, agencies and even local government chairmen. This source contributed N350,000 to Alabidun, N520,000 to Ogungbade and N280,000 to Alafia Oluwa communities. This additional fund helped the communities to execute intended projects between 2013 and 2016.

**Table 10: Other Source of Funds.**

	Alabidun	Ogungbade	Alafia Oluwa
Fund raising	350,000	520,000	280,000

Table 11 presents the funds expended on different projects executed by the communities between 2013 and 2016. These projects include community security, street electrification, construction of community halls, community markets and schools as well as road maintenance. This table reveals that none of the communities raised enough funds needed to execute all projects. This is why the amount spent by each community on projects was below the estimated funds needed considering the listed projects and their estimates. For instance, Alabidun community estimated #2,550,000 for different projects needed to be executed but could raise #2,450,250. The community spent #2,240,000 which is 87.8% of the needed funds. Similarly, Ogungbade community estimated

#2,340,000 to be spent on essential projects but generated #2,277,000 (Table 3 and 10) and spent #2,470,000 indicating that #193000 excess money expended was borrowed from individuals in the community according to the landlords of the community.

Furthermore, Alafia Oluwa community estimated #3,548000 for different projects to be provided for the community between 2013 and 2016, realized #2,188,740 from collections while #2,390,000 expected on executed projects.. The amount expended was far above amount collected by #201260.

Attitudinal and Financial Commitments of Community Stakeholders towards Project  
Development in selected Communities in Ibadan, Nigeria

**Table 11:** Projects executed by the Communities between 2013 and 2016

S/N	Project	Alabidun		Ogungbade		Alafia Oluwa	
		Estimated cost	Amount Expended	Estimated cost	Amount Expended	Estimated cost	Amount Expended
1	Community Security;Day&Night guards and Policing	1,300,000	960,000	900,,000	1,000000	1,240,000	1,000,000
2	Street Electrifying and Maintenance	300,000	400,000	450,000	450,000	350,000	300,000
3	Community Hall Construction	250,000	350,000	400,000	350,,000	700,000	260,000
4	Community Market	350,000	230,000	350,000	300,000	450,000	230,000
5	Community School	Pending	Pending	Pending	Pending	308000	350,000
6	Road Maintenance: grading,, bridges, channels etc	350,000	300,000	240,000	370,000	500,000	350,000
		2,550,000	2,240,000	2,340,000	2,470,000	3548,000	2,390,000

According to the chairman of the community the additional funds were borrowed. This suggests that the community stakeholders are not committed to project development.

**Table 12: Summary of One-Way - ANOVA Showing the Influence of Meeting Attendance on Stakeholders' Commitment to the Payment of Community Project Development Dues**

Source	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIG (P-Value)
Between Grps	537.267	3	179.089	5.505	.004
Within Grps	7385.170	227	32.534		
Total	7922.437	230			

Table 12 answers hypothesis 1. This table shows a positively and significantly correlated meeting attendance to the commitment of stakeholders on community project development.

**Table 13: Summary of PPMC Showing Relationship between Meeting Attendance and Payment of community project Development Dues**

		MEETING	PAYMENT
MEETING attendance	Pearson Correlation	1	.500(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.005
	N	231	231
PAYMENT of community dev dues	Pearson Correlation	.500(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	
	N	231	231

## SUMMARY

The study assessed attitudinal and financial commitments of community stakeholders towards project development in three selected communities in Ibadan Metropolis. It also examined those factors that induced them to

response to payment of development dues and attendance of community meetings that come up monthly.

The study covered Alabidun, Alafia Oluwa and Ogungbade located on the outskirts of Ibadan Metropolis. The population size for the study was the entire landlords of the three communities. The research instrument used was secondary data collection which includes meeting attendance register, payment receipts for development dues and minutes of meetings of the communities. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used for data analysis. The study showed that the three communities considered for this research were financially and attitudinally committed to community project development. Alabidun Community collected 95% of the expected community project development dues and similarly, Ogungbade collected 75.1% while Alafia Oluwa collected 62.3% of the expected dues. Attendance of meeting went the same trend as that of development dues. Ogungbade community had the highest percentage (82.6%) of meeting attendance, followed by Alabidun with 76.6% while Alafia Oluwa had 58.3%. From above finding, it can be inferred that meeting attendance has influence on payment of development dues.

The study also shows that imposition of penalties on dues defaulters helped in realizing more funds. This was clearly revealed by amount realized by Alabidun (95%) and Ogungbade (75.1%) communities when compared with Alafia Oluwa which did not apply penalties in collecting development funds (62.3%). The funds generated from security levy, development levy, and donations from agencies and individuals were used to execute community projects. These projects are community security, street electrification, school, market among others. The analysis of the hypotheses revealed that meeting attendance has significant influence on the stakeholders' payment of community project development dues at  $\{F(3,227) = 5.505, p < 0.05\}$ . The second hypothesis showed a significant and moderately positive relationship at  $\{r = 0.500; p < 0.01\}$  between community meeting attendance and financial commitments in the payment of community project development dues.

## RECOMMENDATION

Basis on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

- (i) Imposition of levy on landlords should take capability and ability of the payers into consideration.

- (ii) If a community wishes to realize adequate funds from the levies on stakeholders it should apply penalties on defaulters.
- (iii) Members of community executive should always encourage stakeholders to attend meetings regularly to be aware of what goes on in the community.
- (iv) Anybody that has a building in a community should count himself/herself bonafide member who should take part in all activities that will move the community forward.

### CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE

This research study has established how attitudinal and financial commitments of community stakeholders affect community development in Nigerian communities. It also provided information on how community committee imposes development levy on members for easy payment using the ability and capability of members.

### REFERENCES

- Abiona IA. Principles and practice of community development (pp 1) Ibadan University press., 2009.
- Alabi OO, Ogbonna IE, Lawal A F, and Awoyinka Y. K. Assessment of Fadama Project Phase II in Federal Capital Territory, Abuja, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development*, 2014; 6 (1), pp. 44-47 ISSN 2141-2170.<http://w.w.w.academicjournals.org>.
- Amungwa FA. New trends in rural community development practice in Africa: The case of Cameroon's grass field rural development project , *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural development* , 2015; 7 ,pp. 240-246, ISSN 2141- 2154.
- Anyawu, CN. Comm development.The Nigeria perspective, Ibadan, Gabesther Educational Publishers, 1992.
- Chamber's 21<sup>st</sup> Century Dictionary.An imprint of Chambers publihers Ltd, 7 Hopetoun Crescent Endinburgh EH74AY 2007.
- Chifamba, E. Confronting the challenges and barriers to community participation in rural development initiations in Duhera District, Ward, 12 Zimbabwe ,*International. Journal of Current Research and Academic Review* ISSN :2347- 3215, 2013; 1, Number 2, pp. 01-19. [w.w.w.ijcrar.com](http://w.w.w.ijcrar.com)

- Concise Oxford English Dictionary published in the United States by Oxford University press Inc. New York. ISBN 978-0-19-860864-6.2006.
- Hornby AS. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, Oxford University Press, Longman, ISSN: 978-0-19-4798792, 2016.
- Home Office Crime Reduction Centre. Passport to community engagement. London; homeoffice. Retrieved. 2005.
- Jean-Jacque, R .Bank Rules on Community Contracting Presentation made at Rural Water and Sanitation Clinic on Nov. 1998
- Ngoma, F. and Namilonga, B M. Literacy levels and people's Participation in community self -help projects in Luangwa District, Zambia. International Journal of Contemporary Applied Sciences, 2015; 2, ISSN 2308-1365 ,w.w.w,ijcas.net.
- Oino PG, Towett G, Kirul KK and Luvega C. The Delemma in sustainability of community based-projects in Kenya, Global Journal of Advanced Research, 2015 2, Issue -4 pp. 757-768.
- Onabanjo FA. Community development: Rural development and planning social change (pp 1-4) Lagos, Felix Enterprises. 2004.
- Osuji CE. Community participants: Proceeding of UNICEF sponsored Workshop, University of Ibadan Consultancy Services Unit. 1992.
- Thesaurus Dictionary [http:// Dictionary.Reference .com/ browse/ community](http://Dictionary.Reference.com/browse/community). Webster's Universal Dictionary and Thesaurus (2010) Geddes and Grossef ,144 port Dundas Road Glasgow G40HZ, ISBN 978184205188. 2011.

---

**Reference to this paper should be made as follows:** Obembe Jide Joseph (2017), Attitudinal and Financial Commitments of Community Stakeholders towards Project Development in selected Communities in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Intl J. of Social Sciences and Conflict Management*, Vol. 2, No. 4, 2017, Pp. 213-236

---