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Abstract
This study determined the relationship between economic status of members of Community Based Associations (CBAs) and their level of participation in development projects in Kwara state, Nigeria. Three objectives were raised, one research question answered and two hypotheses tested. The study used survey as well as correlation research designs. The population of the study was 15,000 members of 496 CBAs in Kwara State but only 1170 were selected as sample for the purpose of the study while 1008, respondents who completed the instrument adequately were used for the analysis. The sample was selected using multi-stage sampling technique. An instrument ‘tagged’ economic status and participation questionnaire (ESPQ) was used to collect the data analysed. The instrument was validated and tested for reliability using odd-even reliability technique. A reliability coefficient of 0.761 obtained was found to be statistically significant at P<0.05. Descriptive statistics of frequency counts, percentages and weighted scores were used in answering the research question. Multiple correlation analysis and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to test the hypotheses. All decisions were taken at probability level of 0.05. First, the study found that the level of participation was 2.62 (52.4%) on a scale of 5 which was considered to be high. Second, the relationship between economic status and level of participation was statistically significant at F (5,1002) = 23.422. Third, the variables of the economic status explained 10.5 percent of the variation in the level of participation with employment, access to water and transportation making statistically significant contributions. Based on the findings recommendations were made. Among others, it was recommended that enabling environment should be created for members to be employed.
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Introduction
Community based organizations are set up by collective efforts of indigenous people of homogenous or heterogeneous attributes but living or working within the same environment. Their coming together creates conditions which broaden the base for self governance and diffusion of power through a wider circle of the population (Adeyemo 2002, Adejumobi, 1991). It is seen as voluntary, non-profit, non-governmental and highly localized or neighbourhood institutions whose membership is placed on equal level and whose main goal is the improvement of the social and economic well being of every member (Abegunde, 2004).

CBOs are localized institutions in that their spheres of influence hardly extend beyond their immediate communities or neighbourhood. They are non-profit and non-government because all members contribute economically towards the fulfilment of their responsibilities to the immediate environment and not depend on government before fulfilling these (Claudia, 2003). Benefits accrued from members’ contributions to the associations are shared accordingly with fairness. They are concerned with the development problems of and development programme projects in their various areas (Esman and Upholt, 1984; Bralton 1990). They respond to community felt needs rather than market demand or pressure.

Distinction has been made between community based organisations (CBOs) and non-governmental organisation (NGOs) (CASSAD, 1992: Agboola, 1998). However, both scholars agreed that CBO and NGO have common attributes and their difference is a matter of “scale and location”. According to them, CBO suggests a simple institution that covers a relatively small area with local identity while NGO has a sophisticated and complex structure and covers a wider area and project. From the example made by one of them, the Rotary International qualifies as NGO but the Rotary Club of a community qualifies as CBO. In essence, community development is the essence of CBO. Through community development, efforts of the people are united with those of government authorities to improve the economic, social and cultural conditions of communities, so as to
integrate them into the life of the nations and to enable their people to contribute fully to national progress (United Nations, 1963).

Along this line, Fakoya (1984) argued that community development provides an avenue for people to organize themselves for planning action, defined their common and individual needs and problems, make group and individual plans to meet their needs and solve their problems, execute these plans with a maximum reliance upon community resources and supplement these resources when necessary with services and materials from government and non-governmental agencies outside their community. In the same vein, Bamidele (1994) saw it as a process whereby both urban and rural communities are assisted to provide for themselves, with deliberate and conscious speed, those services and amenities they need but which neither the state government nor local government can provide.

Realising the importance of CBOs in development, members of various communities form and are encouraged to form associations, otherwise referred to as community based associations (CBAs). These associations are driven by the desire to embark on two principal goals of executing self-help projects for the benefit of the community and or improvement of the living standard of members (Adejo, 2006). In Kwara state such associations are being formed and they are growing in lips and bounds. Presently, there are 469 CBAs in Kwara state (Kwara State Ministry of Youths and Social Development, 2013). Like every other CBAs those in the state embark on activities that empower their members economically, politically and socially, as well as carryout projects such as campaigns against HIV/AIDS; campaigns against early marriage and associated problems; and buildings of feeder roads, culverts and market stalls.

In addition, it is on record that in 2008/2009 the communities completed 356 self help projects at a cost N7,696,256:00 with N947,000:00 as the state Government grant (Ministry of Youth and Social Development, Community Development Division). Also, there are instances that associations organise training programmes for their members on the best practices related to their trades. Besides many of the associations in the state establish adult literacy centres for their illiterate members while the literate ones serve as volunteered facilitators.

The contribution of CBA in Kwara state is recognised by the local and state governments. In some instances, government authorities consult with these associations in the effort to identify the felt needs of their immediate communities. Also, they often canvass for their support in carrying out such projects. Therefore, the CBAs including the ones in Kwara state execute self help projects directly or indirectly through their members who are driven and mobilised to participate in the activities of the associations. In other words, the success of the CBAs require effective and adequate participation of its members. That is, by extension, membership participation in CBAs projects and programmes is central to the development of the communities (Adeniyi, 1991, Adewale, 1997 and Walter, 2003).

Furthermore, discussion underscores the importance of membership participation in community development interventions. However, it is recognised that it is difficult securing members’ effective participation in community development projects and programmes (Lane, 1995; Nelson & Wright 1995 and Patel & Mitlin, 2002). Precisely, interview conducted on leadership of some CBAs as well as personal experience of the researchers showed that some members of the association in the state often excuse themselves from meetings with genuine reasons. Besides some other members hardly paid their dues as at when due. The observation according to Akinyemi (1990) and Ebireri (2012) is not unconnected with the fact that effective participation depends on some fundamental factors including membership empowerment, power sharing leadership quality, funding and social status.

The influence of members’ economic status on their level and quality of contributions to community development projects and programmes is also being challenged. For instance, individual who is interested in participating in a programme may be constrained by his or her level of income or employment status. In other words, individual economic status, psychological disposition and social characteristics often play significant role in the level and quality of participation in CBA activities.

For emphasis, it might not be faulted that the characteristics of members of the CBAs in Kwara state would differ and vary. Also, the contributions of these CBAs to the development of their communities would also vary in nature and intensity depending on the goals of the CBA and the locality. For emphasis, the attitude of the CBAs shows that their goals slightly vary. However, the goals cut across the following:

(i) To foster unity among members;
(ii) To bring the association into the mainstream of the state and nation’s political, social and economic systems;
(iii) To ensure growth and development of members, association and their immediate communities;
(iv) To provide greater equality of opportunity;
(v) To pool together productive power of latent talents and skills and to facilitate greater and more efficient production in line with the goals of the association and the state;
The objectives of the study are to determine; suggest the direction on how to enhance members participation in community development activities. Association and their level of participation in projects? It is conceived that addressing these questions would project in Kwara state and what is the degree of relationship between economic status of members of association and their level of participation in projects? It is conceived that addressing these questions would suggest the direction on how to enhance members participation in community development activities.

Objectives of the study
The objectives of the study are to determine;

(i) The level of participation of members of CBAs in development projects in Kwara state
(ii) The relationship between economic factor and the level of participation
(iii) Which variables of economic status explain variation in the level of participation

Research Question
The research question is;

(i) What is the level of participation of members of CBAs in development projects in Kwara state?

Hypotheses
The following hypotheses are tested:

Ho₁ There is no significant relationship between economic status and level of participation
Ho₂ Variables of economic status will not significantly explain variation in the level of participation.

Methodology
The study adopted a survey design to examine the relationships between economic status and participation of members of CBAs in development projects in Kwara state, Nigeria. The survey design is considered appropriate as it affords the opportunity of studying large and small populations by selecting and studying samples chosen from the populations to discover the relative incidence, distribution, and interrelations of sociological and psychological variables (Osuala, 2001:96).

The population of this study comprised 15,477 members spread 469 Community Based Associations (CBAs) registered with Kwara State Ministry of Social Development. The sample of 1170 members were randomly selected using multi stage random selection techniques. In the first instance, the names of the associations were arranged in alphabetical order. From the list, random start equi-distant random sampling technique was used to select 234 (50%) associations. Then the first five members of each association that volunteered to participate in the research were eventually considered. The sample consisted of 607 males and 463 females. They were all members of the selected CBAs.

A questionnaire designed by the researchers tagged economic status and participation questionnaire (ESPAQ). The questionnaire divided into three sections: Section A, B and C. Section A covers economic data; section B contains items measuring the respondents relationship with other members of the CBA; Section C consists of items on self-rating of participation. Section A contains eleven items such as age, marital status, family size, level of education, means of transportation, sources of water and monthly income as examples. The Section B contains five (5) items such as “members rally round members need” “members talk to one another with respect just to mention these two. Response to these items are taken on five point Likert type scale. Section C is on self rating on participation. This section contains eleven items. The items include “I do not hesitate to give my financial contribution when needed” Whenever there is discussion, I make my knowledge available”, “I always look forward to attend our meetings”, just to mention these three. For details of SESAPQ see appendix I.

In order to ensure that the contents of the instruments are valid, items were drawn taking cognisance of the objectives of the study. Furthermore, copies of the instruments were given to experts in community development and community education in the Department of Continuing Education and Extension Services, University of Maiduguri and in the Department of Adult Education and Community Services, Bayero University Kano. The validated instruments were tested for reliability using odd-even technique. A reliability coefficient of 0.789 was obtained found to be statistically significant at P<0.05. Hence the instrument was considered reliable.
The researchers obtained a letter of introduction from the Head of Department of Continuing Education and Extension Services, University of Maiduguri, addressing to the Chairpersons of the various community based associations in Kwara State seeking permission to carry out the study. The administration of the instrument was done by the researchers and three trained research assistants. The research assistants were trained by the researchers on how to administer the questionnaire. The researchers made sure the selected assistants were familiar with the interpretation of the content of the instrument in the language of the immediate environment of the respondents. This is necessary in case a respondent does not understand English. Of the 1170 copies of the questionnaire administered, 1008 were completed as expected.

The only research question was answered through descriptive statistics of frequency counts and weighted averages while the hypotheses were tested using multiple correlation analysis, regression analysis or analysis of variance as deemed fit the nominal data were transformed into interval data by awarding 1 to 5 to ‘strongly disagree’, ‘agreed somehow’, ‘agree’ and ‘strongly agree’ as the case may be.

Results

Research Question One: What is the level of participation of CBAs members in community projects?
The data and information used in answering the research question are contained in table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of participation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely high</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average = 2.62; Level of Participation tends to ‘High’

Table 1 shows the self rating of the respondents on participation scale. Of the 1008 respondents, 144 (14.3 %) rated their participation as ‘very low’, 360 (35.7%) as ‘low’, 240 (23.8%) as ‘high’, 240 (23.8%) as ‘very high’ and 24 (2.4%) as ‘extremely high’. On weighting the rating with ‘1’ assigned to ‘very low’ and ‘2’, ‘3’, ‘4’, and ‘5’ to ‘low’, ‘high’, ‘very high’ and ‘extremely high’, a total weight of 2664 and an average weighted score of 2.62 were obtained. That is, the participation level of members of CBAs in community activities is ‘high’ at 2.62 (52.4 %), on a scale of five.

Hypothesis 1 (Ho1): There is no significant relationship between economic status and the level of participation of CBAs members in community projects

In testing the hypothesis, the variables of employment, type and ownership of building, monthly income, transportation mode and health status considered as characteristics of economic status were related to level of participation. Multiple Correlational Analysis and one way Analysis of Variance were employed. The results of the analyses are presented in tables 2 and 3 respectively.
Table 2: Multiple Correlation Coefficients of Variables of Economic Status and Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Monthly income</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Access to water</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.101**</td>
<td>.071*</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.110**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building</strong></td>
<td>.101**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.611**</td>
<td>-.067**</td>
<td>-.150**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monthly income</strong></td>
<td>.071*</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.066**</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.611**</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.115**</td>
<td>.240**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to water</strong></td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.067*</td>
<td>.066*</td>
<td>.115**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.216**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation</strong></td>
<td>.110**</td>
<td>-.150**</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.240**</td>
<td>.216**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3: One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>967.106</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>193.421</td>
<td>23.422</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>8274.608</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>8.258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9241.714</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R Square= 0.105; Adjusted R= 0.100

a. Predictors: (Constant), Access to Water, Employment, Monthly income, Transportation, Building
b. Dependent Variable: Participation

Table 2 presents correlation coefficients of the relationships between variables of economic status and level of participation, while table 3 contains information on the test of significance of the relationships. The correlation coefficients for the relationship between each of the variables of economic status (access to water, 0.216; employment, 0.110; transportation, 0.240) and level of participation as in table 4.2 were positive and statistically significant at p< 0.01 and p<0.05 except that of ‘mode of building’ (-0.150) which was negative and significant at both probability levels and monthly income (0.022) which was positive but not significant. Table 4.3 of the result of ANOVA reveals that the relationship between economic status in aggregate and level of participation is significant at F(5, 1002)=23.422. That is, there is significant relationship between economic status and level of participation of members of CBAs in community projects.

Hypothesis 2 (H0): Variables of economic status will not significantly explain variation in the level of participation.

The result of the regression analysis showing the values of beta coefficient for each of the economic variables, indication of explanatory power, ranking and level of significance, is contained in table 4.
Table 4: Explanatory power of Variables of Economic status in Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic characteristics</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients (beta)</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Income</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building type</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to water</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at p <0.05

Table 4 presents beta coefficients for the five predictors or independent variables. By the values of the coefficients, only the variables of employment (.106), transportation (.231) and access to water (.184) significantly explained variation in the level of participation of members of CBAs in projects while other variables of monthly income (.002) and Building type (.014) did not at p< 0.05. The table also reveals that the all variables contributed 10.5 percent to the variation.

Findings

The summary of findings is as follows:

1. The average level of participation of members of CBAs in community projects was high at a weighted average of 2.62 (52.4%) on a 5 point scale;
2. Economic status significantly related to level of participation at F (5, 1002) =23.4. Of the variables of economic status (health, employment, transportation, mode of building, and monthly income), health, employment, and transport positively and significantly correlated with the level of participation; while monthly did not, building negatively and significantly correlated with the level of participation; monthly income did not and while mode of building negatively and significantly correlated the level of participation.
3. All the variables of economic status explained 10.5 percent of the variation in the level of participation with employment, transportation and health variables making significant contributions.

Discussion

The study investigated the relationship between economic status of members of CBAs in Kwara State and their level of participation in development projects. The finding of the research question revealed that members rated their participation in development project high with an average of 2.62 (52.4%) on a scale of five(5). Though, contrary to the finding of Mohammed (2010) who observed that participation in development project in Bangladesh was as low as 7-24 percent; the finding of this study is expected as it is an evidence of Nigeria governments efforts at national, state and local levels, Particularly in Kwara State, to encourage private participation in development activities. More so, it is realised now than before that government alone cannot meet the needs of the people or the government. Furthermore, that participation of members of a community or association in development project eventually lead to the development of the entire community or society could also explain governments action. This is so more especially, when participation according to Jakariya (2000) is seen as a means to define goals and not as an end itself and when it is recorded that development activities without cooperation and involvement of the community members can hardly be effective or successful (Cheetham, 2002).

However, the remarks of Narayan (1995) in Jakariya, (2000) that participation does not exist in a vacuum is suggestive. It suggests that participation in projects could be influenced by individual and community characteristics. Therefore, there is need to examine factors that influence participation as its done through the four hypotheses formulated and tested in this study.

The finding in respect of the first hypothesis revealed there was a significant correlation between economic status of the respondents and their level of participation in development projects organised by the different CBAs at F(5,1002)=23.422 with access to water, employment and transportation as predictors of the dependent or criterion variable of level of participation. The finding is in agreement with the findings of Mohammed (2010) and Nwahia, Omonona and Onyeabor (2012) but at variance to the findings of James, James, Jacob and Boniface (2010).

The result of the second hypothesis tested (that is, variables of economic status will not significantly explain variation in participation level) showed that of the five variables of access to water, employment/occupation, monthly income and mode of building, variables of employment, transportation and access to water significantly explained the variation while the other two variables of mode of building and monthly income did not. All of the five variables explained 10.2 percent of the variation. The fact that mode of building and monthly income were not significant predictors, even though the finding is in consonance with that of Settle, Alreck and Beckh (1979),
should be accepted with caution. More so, most of the interrelationships between the independent variables as shown by the multiple correlation coefficients were statistically significant. For instance, the relationship between the variable of employment and building, as well as employment and income were statistically significant at $r=0.101, p<0.05$ and $r=0.071, <0.05$ respectively. It, therefore, makes sense to say that it is only possible to earn income if someone is employed (in public or private service) and with the income earned one. This position possibly explains why the result of the study by Nwahia, Omonona & Onyeabor (2012) revealed that increase income of both active and non active members of the households examined came top as a factor of participation (Okwute,2014).That access to water and transportation variables significantly correlated with level of participation agreed with the findings of Ford foundation (1998) in Okwute (2014). Precisely, access to water is considered as a proxy of water is considered as a proxy of health status and human capital formation furthermore, on the relationship between employment and level of participation which was found to significant and positive appeared to be consistent with other findings such as Akinboye, Anyanmuyi, Kuponiyi & Aiyetoro (2007), Lernfchigkeit (1979) to mention these two.

However, on the collective contribution of all the economic variables examined the multiple r-square of 0.102 revealed that the variables contributed or explained 10.2 percent of the variation in the level of participation of members of CBAs in development project. That is 89.8 percent of the variation is the level of participation has been explained by the variables of economic status examined in this. As if this result is expected, the study went ahead to determine the relationship between other factor a specially social factor or status and level of participation as stated in hypothesis three (3).

**Conclusion**

Based on the findings of the study it could be concluded that the level of participation of members of CBAs in Kwara state was high. The study also concluded that the level of participation was related positively and significantly to the members’ economic status, especially to their employment status, accessibility to good water and transportation.

**Recommendations**

1. With the participation rate of level slightly above the midpoint (2.62) of a scale of five, the researchers are recommending that members of CBAs should be encouraged to increase their participation in the activities of the associations by attending association’s meeting regularly; generously making information that could lead to effective execution of project available; encouraging ownership of projects executed and seeing that such projects are maintained; among others.

2. The fact that economic status significant correlated with level of participation suggests that attention should be paid to economic status, especially the significant predictors of employment status, access to good water, and transportation. Accordingly, members should be encouraged to seek employment, particularly self employment so that they can earn income and be able to make financial contribution when necessary. Also since access to good water is a perquisite to good health and a means to building human capital, effort should be made to provide good water in the communities. This, on the other hand can be a project for the CBA(s) to embark on.
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