

Benefits Derived by Participants from Justice Development and Peace Commission (JDPC) Programme in Ibarapa North Local Government Area of Oyo State, Nigeria

¹M.G. Olujide and ²O.O. Folaranmi

¹Department of Agricultural Ext. and Rural Development

²Department of Social Work, University of Ibadan, Ibadan

Abstract: This study investigated the benefits derived from Rural Community Development Programme of Justice, Development and Peace Commission in Ibarapa North Local Government Area of Oyo-State. This was carried out by assessing participants involvement in various activities of the programme, benefits derived, attitude towards the programme and constraint faced by participants. Ninety eight respondents were randomly selected from the participating communities in the study area. Findings show that respondents are young adults, male, married and had functional education. Majority always participate fully in JDPC activities, which include soil and water conservation, livestock production and training alternative income generating activity among others. Benefits derived from the programme include ability to use animal traction for cultivation, leadership training, extension services and land management practices. Most of the respondents had a favourable attitude towards the programme, but their most serious constraints in participation is inadequate infrastructural facilities and fund to support their present activities. It is therefore recommended that Justice Development and Peace Commission should form a link with the Agricultural and Rural Development Cooperative Bank so that soft loan will be available. And likewise encourage self-help projects to provide and maintain basic infrastructural facilities.

Key words: Benefits derived, participants, justice, development and peace commission

INTRODUCTION

The development programme is a complex phenomenon that needs adequate attention for successful implementation and execution. Development is design to improve the living condition of people and to allow their full participation in the process that will enhance change at home, community and at national level. Olawoye and Ogunfiditimi^[1]. Availability of social welfare services affords individuals, groups and communities the opportunity to realize their potentials as individually fulfilled and socially contributive individuals. This is one of the primary values in social work practice and it is also one of the indices of development.

Mabogunje^[2] defined rural development as the improvement of the living standard in the rural area on a self-sustaining basis through transforming of social-spatial features of their productive activities. Agricultural development is an aspect of rural development, which is to bring about change through innovations particularly for farmers. Agricultural development is an effort to develop rural communities in terms of agricultural produce so as to generate income^[3].

The responsibility for the provision of social welfare services in both developed and developing countries is split between government and the private sector, perhaps

that is why Krocke^[4] observed that the importance of Non-Governmental Organisation (NGOs) in the developmental programmes cannot be over emphasized, this is because population is increasing and the government cannot meet or satisfy the needs of the people. However, NGO's now play a visible and laudable role in the development of various sector of the economy. This view was corroborated by Adedoyin^[5] Idoko Ahmed^[6] and Olujide^[7] who emphasized the inability of government extension system to ensure adequate contact with farmers for innovation dissemination towards agricultural development, this situation led to the decision of government to encourage various organizations, agencies, groups or even individuals having the capacity to supplement its effort to be involved in linking farmers with capacity to supplement its effort to be involved in linking farmers with innovation. Some other matters personal or social problems which are not directly related to information and assistance on agricultural production but which impedes directly innovations in the agricultural sector are also of great concern to the private sector or NGOs in the provision of welfare services.

The Justice, Development and Peace commission (JDPC) of the Catholic diocese in Nigeria is a Non-governmental Organisation with a mission to

promote sustainable and integrated human development through holistic approach without any form of dissemination against any human being. The mission of the JDPC agrees totally with the most basic philosophy of social work which is to “respect the worth and dignity of every individual”. It represents the ministry services of the Catholic Church in the ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Its concept laid emphasis on the participation of the target group (resource-poor farmers, women, non Catholics, Muslims and Non-Indigenes^[8].

In February 2002, JDPC Ibadan was founded by Ibadan Archdiocese with participants in selected local government areas of Oyo and Osun states. The commission has its seat at St. Patrick’s Catholic Church Compound, Orita Basorun Ibadan and is a part of national network of JDPC in the Catholic diocese in Nigeria. Individual JDPCs has autonomy in initiating and implementing programme. The programmes of Ibadan JDPCs include the following:

- Rural Community Development Programme (RCDP)
- Human Rights and Legal Aids (HRLA)
- Women Development and Promotion (WEP)
- Reconciliation and Alternative Dispute Resolution (RADR)
- Democracy and Government (DG)
- Prisoners Welfare Services (PWS) and
- Microstat. (JDPC Ibadan Bulletin, 2004)

This study focused on the activities of the Rural Community Development Programme (RCDP) with a vision to help farmers working in a healthy and sustainable environment assured of food security and income generation at household level and have access to basic welfare amenities with a view to enhancing their social functioning skills/capacities. With its few years of establishment there is need to assess whether rural farmers are benefiting from programme. And if they are benefiting, what are these benefits and constraints they may likely be encountering in the course of participating in the programme. It is against this background that the study examined the following objectives.

The general objective of the study is to determine the benefit derived by the participants from the rural community development programme. The specific objectives are to:

- determine personal characteristics of the respondents
- determine the level of involvement in the programme

- examine the benefit derived by participant from the rural community development
- assess the attitude of participant towards the programme
- identify constraints that participants face during the programme.
- recommend some social work intervention

MATERIALS AND METHODS

For the purpose of the study, Ibarapa North LGA was purposively selected because of its apparent features of rurality. Ibarapa North LGA consists of three major towns namely Ayete, Tapa and Igangan. The research was conducted in Igangan and the seven communities under it namely: Aba-Ibadan, Aba Isale, Ominigbo, Elede, Idi-Ope, Asunnara and Osinago. Ninety eight farmers registered with the JDPC and out of this population farmers were selected using a random sampling techniques.

Benefit derived from JDPC: Respondents were presented with a list of possible benefits one could derive from JDPC using a 3 point scale of high (3), medium (2) and low (1). The individual scores were summed up and mean calculated. Respondents with a score above the mean were categorized as high benefits, while respondents with scores below the mean as low benefit and those with mean scores as medium benefit.

For the measurement of level of involvement, respondents were presented with list of activities involved in JDPC programme, which include animal integration, soil and water conservation, animal traction, community/group leadership training, field visit, community development, skill development on income generating activities and agricultural extension services. This was measured on 3 point scale never participate (0), rarely (1) and Always (2). Individual scores were summed up and mean calculated. This was then categorized into high level of involvement, medium and low level of involvement using the mean score.

Respondents attitude was measured by presenting 20 attitudinal positive and negative statements to respondents on a social five point scale of strongly agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree and Strongly Disagree. Individual scores were summed up and mean calculated respondents with scores mean and above were categorized to have favourable attitude and respondents with scores below the mean were categorized as unfavourable. Constraints were measured by asking respondents to list constraints being faced and to rate them on a 2 point scale of serious constraints (2) and Not

serious constraints (1). Need for social work intervention was determined based on the abilities/inabilities of the individual participant to cope with the constraints indentified.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Result of analysis on Table 1 shows that majority (74.5) of the participants were 50 years old and above. This is a time picture of present rural setting in southwestern point of Nigeria, where majority of the youth had gone for white-collar jobs in the cities. Both male and female are well represented in the programme, which is contrary to past intervention which neglect programme because it helps in one way or other in their agricultural activities. This involves water and soil conservations by planting crops that improve soil fertility and water conservation. Most of the respondents 82.7% participated in community/group/leadership programme. The programme had really helped them to solve many of their problems in the community, by developing leadership skills required in group and community management.

Also on the workshop of income generating activities and agricultural extension services majority of the respondents are involved because they both help in raising their standard of living of the farmers. The income generating activities workshop help in developing alternative or coping strategy to ensure household food security especially during dry season.

Table 2 shows that 51% did not participate in animal integration programme due to norms religious and cultural belief. Animal integration activities involves rearing of cattle, pigs, rabbit, etc. Majority of the respondents 99% were involved in soil and water conservation.

The result of analysis on Table 3 shows that majority of the respondents benefit highly from the following activities of RCDP, animal integration (94.9%), soil and water conservation (75.5%), community/group leadership training (56.1%) and animal traction (51%). Respondents explained that they benefit from animal integration in that they were taught to keep different types of livestock especially goat, local chicken, cattle, rabbit and pig. They also benefit the method of using organic manure by these livestock to conserve the soil fertility and likewise animal traction, which increase the size of land being faced by various participants of the programme. The leadership training had increased the level of mutual understanding within the community and social interaction. The extension services provided makes them to be aware and use improved methods of crops production. They also gain the provision of improved seedlings at subside rate from the extensions service activity and the visitation the

participation of women. Ninety one point eight percent of the respondents were married, while majority had functional education (66.3%) as their highest educational attainment. This means they attended adult literacy classes. Result of analysis also shows that the programme is not religion in biased because both religions Christian (54.1%) and Muslim (40.8%) were well represented. The

Table 1: Distribution of personal characteristics of respondents

Personal characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
(a) Age (Years)		
26 – 27	6	6.1
38 – 49	19	19.4
50 – 61	33	33.7
62 and above	40	40.8
(b) Gender		
Male	63	64.3
Female	35	35.7
(c) Marital status		
Married	90	91.8
Single	4	4.1
No response	4	4.1
(d) Educational attainment		
Functional education	65	66.3
Primary education	24	24.5
Secondary education	5	5.1
Tertiary education	4	4.1
(e) Religion		
Christian	53	54.1
Muslim	40	40.8
Others (tradition)	5	5.1

Table 2: Level of involvement in JDPC programme

Programmes	NP		RP		AP		NR		Total	
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Animal integration	50	51.0	13	13.3	34	34.7	1	1.0	98	100
Soil and water conservation	-	-	-	-	97	99.0	1	1.0	98	100
Animal Traction	50	51	13	13.3	34	34.7	1	1.0	98	100
Community/group leadership	1	1.0	11	11.2	81	82.7	5	5.1	98	100
Field visit	-	-	12	12.2	85	86.8	1	1.0	98	100
Community development	1	-	13	13.3	84	85.7	1	1.0	98	100
Workshop on income generating activities	1	1.0	1.0	6.1	59	60.2	32	32.7	98	100
Agric. Ext. Services	-	-	6	2.0	95	97.0	1	1.0	98	100

N P = Never Participating; RP-Rarely Participating; AP = Always Participating, F = Frequency, P = Percentage.

Table 3: Benefits derived from JDPC programmes

Benefit derived from JDPC Programmes	High		Medium		Low		Total	
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
Animal integration	93	94.9	5	5.1	-	-	98	100
Soil and water conservation	74	75.5	24	24.5	-	-	98	100
Animal traction	50	51.0	48	49.0	-	-	98	100
Community/group /Leadership	55	56.1	39	39.8	4	4.1	98	100
Field visit/Agric. Ext. Services	98	100.0	-	-	-	-	98	100

Table 4: Participants attitude towards JDPC Programme

Attitudinal statement	SA	A	UD	D	SD	Mean score
The programme have improved my living standard	68 (69.4)	30 (30.6)	-	-	-	3.9
The programme require a lot of money and so should not be carried out	-	-	-	34 (34.7)	64 (65.3)	3.8
The programme have exposed me to new technology which increase my productivity	51 (52.0)	47 (48.0)	-	-	-	3.9
I am not always eager and happy to involved in the programme	-	-	-	41 (41.8)	57 (58.2)	3.6
The programme has had an adverse effect on my production level	-	-	-	29 (29.6)	69 (70.4)	3.6
The programme aims of improving the community	51 (52.0)	46 (47.0)	-	-	-	3.8
The resident of the community do not improve at all with the programme	1 (1.0)	-	1 (1.0)	25 (2.0)	70 (71.0)q	2.9
The programme is a waste of time that I should have used for other things	-	-	-	46 (46.9)	52 (53.1)	3.8
I don't know why I involved myself in the programme	-	-	-	46 (46.9)	52 (53.1)	3.8
The programme encourages individual participation in the community development project	47 (48.0)	50 (51.0)	-	-	1 (1.0)	3.4
The programme had foster a good relationship within people of the community	58 (59.2)	40 (40.8)	-	-	-	3.6
I feel proud to tell anyone of my involvement in the programme	75 (76.5)	23 (23.5)	-	-	-	3.6
The programme are good but the are capital intensive hence unaffordable	-	-	-	39 (39.8)	59 (60.2)	3.8
Only rich farmers who have influence usually take part in most of their programme	65 (66.3)	33 (33.7)	-	-	-	3.8
The programme has helped me in solving problem in my farm	65 (66.3)	32 (33.7)	-	-	-	3.9
The programme really affects my living standard in a negative way	-	-	-	26 (27.0)	71 (72.0)	3.8
The resident of the community have benefited from the programme	35 (36.0)	61 (62.0)	1 (1.0)	-	-	3.6
The programme do not expose me to modern technology which also affect my productivity	-	-	-	28 (28.6)	70 (71.4)	3.7
The programme is not cumbersome and is interesting	64 (65.3)	34 (34.7)	-	-	-	3.8

Mean = 3.7

implication of this observation is that programme is designed for equal opportunity improvement in the livelihood activities of rural folks.

Table 4 presents the mean scores for each statement in measuring the attitude of respondents to RCDP programme. The overall mean score is 3.7. This implies that statements with score of 3.7 and above are those that really discriminate. Which means that only 11 statements were used in the final analysis to determine their attitude. Individual scores were calculated and mean found. The minimum score 19 highest score 52 and mean score of 38. Therefore respondents with a score of 38 and above were categorise to have favourable attitude towards JDPC programme, while those with scores below the mean as having unfavourable attitude.

Result of analysis on Table 5 shows that majority (83.7%) of the respondents had a favourable attitude towards RCDP programme, while only 16.3% had unfavourable attitude. The reason that can be accounted for this might be the activities of the programme, which ensures household food security and improvement in alternative income generating activity. The implication of this observation for development organizations is the

Table 5: Distribution of respondents attitude towards RCDP programme

Attitude	Frequency	Percentage
Favourable (38-52)	82	83.7
Unfavourable (<38)	16	16.3
Total	98	100.0

Table 6: Distribution of constraints faced by participants

Constraints	Yes		No		Rank
	Fq	%	Fq	%	
Inadequate information from extension officers	3	3.1	95	96.9	3 rd
Inadequate fund	41	41.8	57	58.2	2 nd
Inadequate facilities	66	67.3	32	32.7	1 st
No direct contract with extension officers	3	3.1	96.9	96.9	4 th
Are you allow to participate in the decision making	3	3.1	96.9	96.9	5 th

Table 7: Test of relationship between selected personal characteristics and the benefit derived from JDPC programme

Variables	X ²	Df	P	D
Gender	4.354	1	0.037	S
Religion	1.957	2	0.0376	NS
Educational Level	7.174	3	0.067	NS
Marital Status	0.437	1	0.508	NS
Age	7.829	4	0.098	NS

p = 0.05

provision or inclusion of activities in programme that will empower the rural folks by ensuring household food security poverty reduction and alternative income generation during off-season, especially for the rural folks.

The result of analysis on Table 6 shows that participants identified inadequate facilities, fund, information from extension officers, direct contact with extension agents and inability to participate in decision process as some of the constraints they face in participating fully in JDPC programme. They ranked inadequate facilities and fund, respectively as their most serious constraints. The implication of this is that infrastructural facilities like good road network, manlet stalls, school, clinic, electricity and fund just to mention few can impend the impact and sustainability of the effect JDPC programme on livelihoods of inhabitants in the study area.

The Table 7 shows that there is no significant relationship between the religion, educational level marital status and the age of the respondents at p level of 0.0376, 0.067, 0.508 and 0.098, respectively to the benefit derived from the JDPC programme. Also, the benefit derived from JDPC programme is significant between the gender and the benefit from JDPC programme (p. level of 0.037).

Strengths and limitations of participants: There is no gainsaying the fact that people have problems in life, as a matter of fact, it is believed that problems are like building blocks which is carefully resolved or set in order becomes growth points for individuals. Perhaps that is why Schwartz, explains social work to be a mediating process through which individuals and society reach out for each other in mutual need for self fulfillment. It is in the light of the above that this researcher thinks that it is possible for people to turn problems into prospects which is part of the purpose of social work practice. On the constraints faced by the participants at the JDPC programme, some questions are pertinent here: Were the participants able to benefit from the programme in spite of the constraints? Were they able to turn the constraints into advantage? It could be observed from the attitudes of participants as well as the benefits accrued to them that they displayed positive attitudes in spite of the constraints. This is an area of strength which is an area of concern for social work practice under the principle of client empowerment.

Limitations included inadequate facilities, inadequate funds, inadequate information and lack of information from extension officers, lack of direct contact from extension officers and others have implication for social work practice. This is because direct practitioners in social

work sometimes have opportunities to improve or expend agency services based on assesment of unmet client needs. Such unmet clients' needs manifest inform of all forms of inadequacies stated above, gaps in service, need for preventive services and etc. This limitation has implication for community organization as a method of practice in social work through macro work. Macro work concerns itself with the need for improved provision of social services in Ibarapa North Local Government Area.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The findings reveal that most of the respondents are above 49 years of age, male, married and had functional education as the highest educational attainment. This is a good discovery for rural development in Nigeria because it will remove the erroneous belief that most people in the rural areas are older adults and had no formal or informal education.

Most of the respondents always participate in RCDP programme of activities, which include soil and water conservation, agricultural extension services, field visit, community development, group leadership training and workshop on alternative income generating activity.

The benefits they derived from RCDP programme include integration of animal production with their farming activity, soil and water conservation, animal traction, leadership training and field visits.

Majority had a favourable attitude towards RCDP programme of activities, while their most serious constraints include inadequate infrastructural facilities and fund.

Based on the findings of the study the following recommendations are made specific for Justice Development and Peace Commission RCDP programme in Ibarapa North LGA of Oyo-State.

Justice, Development and Peace Commission should establish a link between the community and Agricultural and Rural Development Cooperative Bank. So, that a soft revolving loan with low interest be provided for the participants.

Encourage communities to embark on self-help projects in the areas of priority infrastructural needs, so as to support and improve their livelihood activities.

Government should provide infrastructures like market stalls, clinic, etc to encourage the youth and young adults to stay on farm.

Provision of radio messages on current market prices and days.

It is recommended that one or two social workers be invited to attend monthly meetings of the JDPC or other related CBO's in Ibarapa North LGA to allow social

workers have in input in the planning and execution of community-based programmes. This will enable social workers identify the areas of strengths in order to help participants build and reinforce and at the same time identify the weaknesses so as to mobilize appropriate community resources to strength such weak areas.

REFERENCES

1. Olawoye, J.E. and T.O. Ogunfiditimi, 1979. Multi-dimentional approach to conceptualization and measurement of development. (A paper presented at Workshop organized by society for International Development, Confrence Centre, University of Ibadan, pp: 1-7.
2. Mabogunje, A.L., 1980. The development process: A spatial perspective London". Hutchinson University Press, pp: 101.
3. Ekong, E.E., 2000. Rural Sociology; Introduction and analysis of Rural Nigeria Published by Dove publishers Calabar. pp: 200-220.
4. Krocke, J.E., 1973. Rural Development, Income Distribution and Fertility, New York; The Population Council, pp: 65.
5. Adedoyin, S.F., 1995. "The role of NGOs in the development of Agriculture in Nigeria". A paper presented at a seminar organized by Justice Development and Peace Commission programme (JDPC) in 1995.
6. Idoko, J.O. and B. Ahmed, 1997. The role of NGOs in Agricultural Development: The case of Okpokwu Local Government Area of Benue State. J. Agric. Extension, 5: 24-30.
7. Olujide, M.G., 1999. "Analysis of Selected Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) in rural Development in South-West Nigeria" Ph.D thesis Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, pp: 104.
8. JDPC, 2002. Annual Report of Activities. Published by Ijebu Diocese of Catholic Church, Ijebu Ode, pp: 1-56.