

Administrative Roles Performance of Community Development Workers and Public Infrastructure Development Outcomes in Rural Communities in Ogun state, Nigeria

Adekunle A. ADENIYI^{1*}

Abstract

This study is on administrative roles performance of community development workers and public infrastructure development outcomes in rural communities, Ogun state, Nigeria. Descriptive survey design of the ex-post facto type was used. Using total enumeration sampling technique, 813 respondents participated in the study. An adapted instrument "Administrative Roles Performance of Community Development Workers in Public Infrastructure Development Project Questionnaire (ARPCDWPIDPQ)" designed for the study was subjected to Cronbach Alpha test of internal consistency, which yielded 0.75. Data generated were analyzed using descriptive and correlation matrix at 0.05 level of significance. Correlation analysis showed positive significant relationship between administrative roles of community development workers and infrastructure development outcomes i.e ownership and control of public infrastructure ($r=.693$), citizen participation in management of public infrastructure ($r=.592$), access and utilization of public infrastructure ($r=.682$), productive activities/income ($r=.540$) and capacity building/enhancement of technical expertise ($r=.409$) respectively. This indicates that the independent variable had significant positive relationship with all the dependent variables at 0.05 level of significant. Hence, the null hypothesis was rejected at 0.05 level of significance. It is recommended that professional community development workers should be properly trained to improve their efficiency and effectiveness in the administration of public infrastructure development.

Keywords: Administrative roles, Community Development, Outcomes, Performance, Workers, Public Infrastructure

¹ Department of Adult and Development Education, Tai Solarin University of Education, Ijagun, P.M.B 2118, Ijebu Ode, Ogun State, Nigeria.
E-mail: akunleniyi@gmail.com

Introduction

Public infrastructure is an important component of development strategy at the international, national and community level. Its development is one of the benchmarks of assessing the achievements of various countries in the world and wherever it is inadequate, it has been identified to constitute one of the key constraints to short- and medium-term poverty reduction. In Nigeria, like most developing countries, the public infrastructural report is nothing to write home about. Most rural communities lack public physical, and socio-economic infrastructure, and where available, they are decayed and need repair, rehabilitation or replacement. Therefore, the rural population do not have the benefits which ought to have accrued to them for socio-economic emancipation, better livelihoods and wellbeing (Ezeah 2005:3; Abah, 2010; Ajadi, 2010; Abonyi and Nnamani, 2011).

Statement of the Problem

Authors have stated that government especially in developing nations strive hard to fund public infrastructure development programmes and projects in order to attain development objectives, the problem is that the administration of public infrastructure development projects at the community level have failed to ensure that the citizens feel and enjoy the outcomes. In Nigeria, past governments have adopted the global view and implemented policies to improve citizens socio-economic status, improve productivity and livelihoods with public infrastructure through implementation of Operation Feed the Nation (OFN); the National Accelerated Food Production Programme (NAFPP) and the Directorate for Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI) etc. Furthermore, provision of 1999 constitution that affirms the local as the third tier of government and several agencies empowered to carry out development of public infrastructure in the rural and urban communities are yet to provide the desired positive outcomes. However, it is pathetic that this high deficit of public infrastructure still exist in rural areas and citizens are still wallowing in poverty, poor livelihoods and wellbeing (Nwande and Olorunfemi, 2021).

Several authors have carried out research on administrative roles and performance of community development workers. For instance, Adisa (2013) studied the effect of motivation on job performance by community development workers in Osun State, Nigeria and Ositadinma (2020) research was on roles of public administrators in local community development. However, not much has been done on administrative roles community development workers perform and their impacts on public infra-

structure project outcomes. Therefore, there is the need for this study on administrative roles performance of community development workers and public infrastructure development outcomes in rural communities in Ogun state, Nigeria.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study are to identify the personal characteristics of community development workers in the study area., and identify community development workers roles in public infrastructure development in the study area. It is also to determine whether there is any significant relationship between community development workers' role performance and public infrastructure development outcomes in the study area.

Research Questions

Consequently, this study will provide answers to the following research questions: What are the personal characteristics of community development workers in the study area? What are the community development workers roles in public infrastructure development project in the study area? Is there any significant relationship between community development workers' role performance and public infrastructure development outcomes in the study area?

Hypothesis

The hypothesis of this study is: there is no significant relationship between community development workers' role performance and public infrastructure development outcomes in the study area?

Review of Related Literature

In an attempt to review literature on the concepts of this study, it is pertinent to state that the concepts and variables of this study are linked together. First, development as a globally accepted concept and process set the agenda for the emergence of community development as a process among industrialized countries after the World War II for public infrastructure provision for the wellbeing of citizens. Second, the crucial nature of these two processes may have compelled the innovation of development administration at the global, national and community levels. Arising from the above, the concept of development emerged

from Charles Darwin's theory of evolution propounded in 1859. Also, former President Harry Truman of the United States, on January 20th, 1949 in his "Point Four" agenda. According to The United Nations Organization's Act 55 of the Charter, development is about promotion of standard of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress. Todaro (2000) in Adeniyi (2015) stated that although several authorities see development concept as encompassing interests in economic, social and political change which are all amalgamated to achieve political progress, traditional and modern economic views have different perspective. The former group defines it as the process that leads to the capacity of a national economy whose initial economic conditions have been more or less static for a long time to generate and sustain an annual increase of its gross national product (GNP) at rates of about 5 percent to 7 percent or more. It is also defined as a multidimensional process which brings about more changes in social structures, population attitudes and national institutions, including facilitation of economic growth, reduction of inequality and eradication of poverty.

Development involves the ability to learn how to use the environment to better meet the needs of others by achieving needs satisfaction of the people. It is a process directed towards the attainment of better livelihoods by the poor people through increase in productivity and income and basic transformation in social, economic and political structure forming the core of development (Adeniyi, 2015).

Anyanwu (1999) identified that development is about people and forms the basis for the reason why it has been a major function of government. In his words "development is thus an emphasis on the people by the government to stimulate, motivate, help or encourage them to adopt new methods and learn new skills for their well-being". These actions of government are facilitated to achieve social change in conjunction with stakeholders for the attainment of felt needs, which include public physical and social infrastructure and services in their various communities. In the developing countries, development is a part of the essential activities of government which brings about quantitative and qualitative changes in an economy. Gant (2006) also agreed that development is about people by stating that development is an interaction of people that facilitates motivation and engagement for the utilization of the community resources for the major purpose of achieving better wellbeing. He further stated that in this regard, development administration encourages bringing innovation and change to the people, where desirable or necessary to accomplish development purposes and discourages adherence to traditional norms and forms for their own sake. It therefore means development requires resources for

provision of meaningful public infrastructure projects. However, the paucity of resources, human and material in developing countries like Nigeria, has prompted the need for making optimum utilization of available means and augmenting new means through development administration. Thus, development administration is simply termed as an action or functioning part of the government administration. It is action-oriented and places the administration at the centre in order to facilitate the attainment of development objectives at the national, state and community levels in nations (Brown, 1964).

The process of development administration entails several levels. In as much that development is essential at community level, it involves external administration for its attainment. In the words of Gant (2006), these are needed to activate relationships with agencies and groups at the community level for development projects or programmes objectives to be attained.

According to Brocklesby and Fisher (2003) community development means working at the grass-roots level, not for instance focusing on the policy level (unlike sustainable livelihoods approaches). Sail and Abu-Samah (2010) stated that community development is a process of providing a concerted effort to develop a community with the goal of improving the quality of life of its members. Therefore, community development is integral to the aims and activities of the government that receives attention, irrespective of paucity of resources, human and material in developing countries, government plan and implement projects and programmes that fit its priorities to bring out the best outcomes for the beneficiaries. Because community development is a process which dedicated to provide solutions to wide range of problems in the community, it must have wide public view to achieve its goals. The process of providing solutions should ensure public participation, capability building, decision making, efficient use of resources to create socio-economic structure and infrastructure for public use (Brocklesby and Fisher, 2003; Sail and Abu-Samah, 2010; Gilchrist and Taylor, 2011).

Public infrastructure is an essential provision that facilitates better wellbeing. It is defined as complex system of facilities, programs, and social networks that aims to improve people's quality of life in a community. These may include services, networks and physical assets will integrate physical and social planning and development and improve wellbeing of community members (Rothman, 2005). This has lent credence to the emergence of professional training and employment of community development workers by government and

development agencies for the purpose of administering public infrastructure development services in the urban and rural public. These designated workers administer the social, economic and cultural contents of development by performing specific roles as community development workers (Adisa, 2013). To attain the public infrastructure development objectives of government, there is need to carry out activities through engagement of communities, setting of goals for improvement and taking action through empowerment and participatory processes. Some authors have stated that a large part of the job of community development workers is administration of development projects, which means that they usually have a specific geographical community or social group they focus on.

Community development is critical to the provision of public infrastructure. Therefore, its success depends on the level of effectiveness of administrative roles performance by community development workers. Some scholars identified that community development workers are key to the success or failure of community development and provision of public infrastructure and programmes. In this regard, they perform certain roles which are geared towards the attainment of development objectives of government and the public satisfaction in the communities. The major role of community development workers is to function as external development administrator. This role involves creating activities and processes, activate relationships out of central administrative control, with stakeholders of public infrastructure development at the community and inter agency level. Working as external development administrator, community development workers must build collaboration and people's participation in order to successfully implement public infrastructure development project (Gant, 2006).

According to Adisa (2013), community development workers often act as a link between communities and local government, national, international and other statutory bodies. They are frequently involved in addressing inequalities in projects planning and execution by community development groups and associations.

In the words of Ositadinma (2020), the mandate of community development workers is also to function as administrators of development programmes and projects that will bring positive change and empowerment within the communities. There is no doubt that community development is critical to the provision of public infrastructure, therefore, its

success depends on the level of effectiveness of administrative roles performance by community development workers. Some scholars identified that community development workers are key to the success or failure of community development and provision of public infrastructure programmes and projects. In this regard, they perform certain roles which are geared towards the attainment of development objectives of government and the public satisfaction in the communities. Several authors identified that the administrative roles community development workers must perform to achieve public infrastructure development objectives include, but not limited to, mobilisation of human and financial resources, allocation, distribution and management of resources, conflict resolution, consensus and peace building, justice and equity, safety and crisis management. It also includes citizen participation, involvement in vision and planning, resource persons, capacity building, enhancement of local technical expertise and community empowerment. Other administrative roles performed by community development workers are local governance, ownership and control, strategic planning and economic development (Brocklesby and Fisher, 2003; Sail and Abu-Samah, 2010; Gilchrist and Taylor, 2011, Adisa, 2013; Ositadinma, 2020).

Methodology

This study adopts the descriptive survey design of the ex-post facto type. The population of the study was 813, made up of the total number of beneficiaries in the rural communities that participated in the public infrastructure development project. The study adopts purposive total enumeration sampling technique in the selection of the sample. Therefore, based on the small size of population the rural communities under study which only amounted to eight hundred and thirteen (813) members, all the members of the communities were selected as the sample. An adapted instrument "Administrative Roles Performance of Community Development Workers in Public Infrastructure Development Project Questionnaire (ARPCDWPDPQ)" was designed for the study. This instrument was subjected to Cronbach Alpha test of internal consistency to generate the validity index of the instrument. The reliability of this instrument was done using the test-retest method within an interval of sixty days. Subsequently, it was subjected to Cronbach Alpha test of internal consistency, which yielded 0.75. Data generated were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistical tools like frequency count, percentage and correlation matrix at 0.05 level of significance.

Data Analysis

Table 1: Demographic Data.

S/N	Demographic Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Gender			
1.	Male	553	68
2.	Female	260	32
	Total	813	100
Age			
1.	21-30	46	5.7
2.	31-40	202	24.8
3.	41-50	385	47.4
4.	51-above	180	22.1
	Total	813	100
Level of Education			
1.	No formal Education	153	18.8
2.	Primary School Education	453	55.7
3.	Secondary School Education	196	24.1
4.	Tertiary Education	11	1.4

Source: Field Data 2021

Table 1.0 above shows that the distribution of the respondents in the study area was constituted by male 553(68%) female 260(32%). It shows that 5.7% of the respondents were 21-30 years, 24.8% were 31-40, 47.4% were 41-50 years and 22.1% were 51 years above. It reveals that among the respondents 153 (18.8%) had no formal education, 453 (55.7%) had primary school education, 196(24.1%) had secondary education while 11(1.4%) had tertiary education respectively.

Table 2: Personal characteristics of community development workers

		Rating		Total
		High	Low	
1	Respect for the people	731 (90%)	82(10%)	100(100%)
2	Communicate effectively	781 (96%)	(4%)	100(100%)
3	Passion for community and community development	692 (85%)	121(15%)	100(100%)
4	Acknowledge and accepts local leaders	745(91.6%)	68(8.4%)	100(100%)
5	Open minded about tasks	810(99.6%)	3(.4%)	100(100%)
6	Understand people and their circumstances	712(87.6%)	101(12.4%)	100(100%)
7	Identify and respect the local structures to work with	729(90%)	84(10%)	100(100%)
8	Provide expertise and guidance	805(99%)	8(1%)	100(100%)
9	Promote partnerships with local structures	697(86%)	116(14%)	100(100%)
10	Exchange information	804(99%)	9(1%)	100(100%)
11	Good interpersonal skills	698(86%)	115(14%)	100(100%)
12	Sensitive to different cultures	794(97.7%)	19(2.3%)	100(100%)
13	Self-motivated and flexible	769(94.6%)	44(5.4%)	100(100%)
14	Advocate that bring about action	753(92.6%)	60(7.4%)	100(100%)
15	Enable people	789(97%)	24(3%)	100(100%)
16	Team player	783(96.3%)	30(3.7%)	100(100%)

Source: Field Survey (2022)

Table 2 above shows the perceived characteristics of community development workers and their ratings by the respondents in the study area. As captured above, among a total of 813 respondents, 731(90%) identified that the community development workers scored high in respect for the people, 781(96%) scored them high in passion for community and community development, 745(91.6%) rated them high in acknowledge and accept local leaders, 810(99.6%) rated them high in open minded about tasks while 712(87.6%) rated them high on understand people and their circumstances. Furthermore, 729(90%) rated them high in identify and respect of the local structures to work with, 805(99%) rated them high in provide expertise and guidance, 697(86%) rated them high in promote partnerships with local structures, 804(99%) rated them high in exchange information, 698(86%) rated them high in good interpersonal skills while in sensitive to different cultures 794(97.7%) rated them high, In self-motivated and flexible 769(94.6%) rated them high, 753(92.6%) rated them high as advocate that bring action, 789(97%) identified that they enable people while 783(96.3%) rated them high as team players.

Table 3: Correlation analysis between administrative roles of community development workers and public infrastructure development outcomes (i.e., ownership and control of public infrastructure, citizen participation in management of public infrastructure, access and utilization of public infrastructure, improvement of productive activities/income and capacity building/enhancement of technical expertise)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Administrative roles of community development workers	1					
2. Ownership and control of public infrastructure	.693**	1				
3. Citizen Participation in management of public infrastructure	.592**	.558**	1			
4. Access and utilization of public infrastructure	.682**	.661**	.759**	1		
5. Improvement of productive activities/Income	.540**	.624**	.793**	.853**	1	
6. Capacity building/Enhancement of Technical Expertise	.409**	.341**	.400**	.448**	.567**	1

0.05 Level of Significance

The above Table shows that there is a positive significant relationship between administrative roles of community development workers and public infrastructure development outcomes i.e., ownership and control of public infrastructure ($r=.693$), citizen participation in management of public infrastructure ($r=.592$), access and utilization of public infrastructure ($r=.682$), productive activities/income ($r=.540$) and capacity building/enhancement of technical expertise ($r=.409$) respectively. The result indicates that the independent variable had significant positive relationship with all the dependent variables at 0.05 level of significant.

This corroborates the finding of Nkonya, Philip, Mogues, Pender and Kato (2012), they reported that the administrative roles performance of community development workers in the course of public infrastructure project leads to beneficiaries' ownership, control and access for productive activities significantly. It further confirms the earlier finding of Oladunni and Aduba (2014) that administrative roles performance of community development workers significantly increased the mean household income progressively. Furthermore, this result is similar to the findings of Nkonya, Philip, Mogues, Pender and Kato (2012) that administrative roles performance of community development workers in the course of public infrastructure project lead participatory outcomes which increased beneficiaries' capability in engaging in modern productive activities which lead to increased production and ability to manage individual and public infrastructure. It is also similar to the finding of Ibeawuchi and Nwachukwu (2010) that administrative roles

of community development workers contributed to outcomes such as improved beneficiaries' capacity in the area of record keeping, participatory rural appraisal, group dynamics, business management, organizational principles, agricultural insurance policy, participatory monitoring and evaluation. This result also corroborates the earlier findings of Kimenyi, Deressa, Pugliese, Onwuebele and Mendie (2014) that administrative roles performance of community development workers in the course of public infrastructure project had positive significant impacts on the poor and vulnerable and with positive and significant outcomes that led to the satisfaction of beneficiaries.

Conclusion

This study examined the administrative roles performance of community development workers and public infrastructure development outcomes in rural communities in Ogun state, Nigeria, contributing to the existing literature on the relationship between administrative roles performance of community development workers and public infrastructure development outcomes (i.e., ownership and control of public infrastructure, citizen participation in management of public infrastructure, access and utilization of public infrastructure, productive activities/income and capacity building/enhancement of technical expertise). The result indicates that the independent variable had significant positive relationship with all the dependent variables at 0.05 level of significant.

The main analysis demonstrated that the independent variable has positive relationship with the dependent variables, wherein, an increment in the independent variable produces positive corresponding increment in each of the four dependent variables of the learning outcomes in this study. The findings are meaningful and will contribute to the growing literature because it shows that the veritable tool required for desired public infrastructure development outcomes is community development workers with effective and efficient administrative skills. Considering a policy perspective, the results suggest that emphasis should be on training of community development workers in modern development administration.

The limitation of this study is that it is constrained by scarce fund thereby restricting the samples of population studied to the sample used. It is pertinent to state that the variables of the study will continue to receive attention from researchers for a long time to come. Therefore, researchers should attempt to address further understanding of modern development administration for public project delivery. It is recommended that the Nigeria government should follow global trend in policy adoption of development administration and seek international donor agencies support in funding and training of relevant graduates in modern development administration for positive outcomes.

References

- Abah, N. (2010). *Development administration: a multi – dispensary approach*. Enugu: John Jacob Classic Publishers.
- Adeniyi, A. A. (2015). *Community–driven development variables and rural livelihood in Fadama II communities in Ogun state, Nigeria*. A Ph.D. thesis in the Department of Adult Education, University of Ibadan, Nigeria
- Abonyi, N., & Nnamani, O. (2011). Development and food crisis in emerging economy: a critical appraisal of Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Administrative Science*. 9, 1 and 2, 265 – 278.
- Adisa, B. O. (2013). Effect of motivation on job performance by community development workers in Osun State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Community Development*, 1, 2, 48-57.
- Ajadi, B. (2010). Poverty situation in Nigeria: an overview of rural development institutions. *Pakistan Journal of Sciences*, 7, 5, 351 – 356.
- Anyanwu, C.N. (1999). *Introduction to community development*. Ibadan: Gabesther.
- Brocklesby, M. A., & Fisher, E. (2003). Community development in sustainable livelihoods approaches – an introduction. *Community Development Journal*, 38, 3, 185–198. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Brown, S. D. (1964). Meaning of development administration. In I. Swerdlow (Eds), *Development administration: concepts and problems*. Syracuse: 1963. pp: 162. *American Political Science Review*, 58, 4, 1037-1038. New York: Syracuse University Press,
- Ezeah, P. (2005). *Rural sociology and rural development with focus on Nigeria*. Enugu: John Jacob Classic Publishers
- Gant, F.G. (2006). *The concept of development administration in E. E. Otenyo & N. S. Lind (Eds)*. Comparative public administration: the essential readings (257-285) Oxford: Elsevier Ltd.
- Gilchrist, A., & Taylor, M. (2011). *The short guide to community development*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Ibeawuchi, E., & Nwachukwu, C. (2010). An investigation on the impact of Fadama II project implementation in Imo state. *American Journal of Scientific and Industrial Research*, 3, 32-538.

Kimenyi, M., Deressa, T., Pugliese, J., Onwuemele, A., & Mendie, M. (2014). Analysis of community-driven development in Nigeria's Niger Delta Region: use of the institutional analysis and development (Iad) Framework. Global Economy and Development Program. Africa Growth Initiative. [Online] Retrieved from <http://ndpifoundation.org> (March 29, 2015)

Nkonya, E., Phillip, D., Mogue, T., Pender, J., & Kato, E. (2012). *Impacts of community-driven development programs on income and asset acquisition in Africa: the case of Nigeria*. World Development. Amsterdam: Elsevier. 40.9: 1824-1838.

Nwande, M. C., & Olorunfemi, G. C. (2021). The operation and maintenance of rural infrastructure for development in Nigeria- the policy options. *International Journal of Innovative Development and Policy Studies*, 9,4, 90-101. Seahi Publications.

Oladunni, O. A., & Aduba, J. (2014). Household income generation, progression and sustainability under Fadama III implementation. *Research Journal of Agriculture and Environmental Management*, 3,8, 406-416.

Ositadinma, E. A. (2020). Roles of public administrators in local community development. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 10, 9, 559-567.

Panahi, F., Ziaeeemehr, M., & Hoseini, A. (2014). Factor Analysis of Effective Components on Beneficiaries' Participation in the Management of Irrigation and Drainage Networks (Case study: Bushehr). *International Journal of Agriculture and Crop Sciences*, 66-70.

Sail, R.M., & Abu-Samah, A. (2010). Community development through community capacity building: a social science perspective. *Journal of American Science*; 6,2, 68-76. Marsland Press.

Todaro, M. (2000). *Economic Development*. Addison-Wesley Series in Economics. U.S.A.: Addison Wesley.