

Examination of the level of community development in Gombe local government, Nigeria.

¹Usman Bappi, ²Mulegi Tom and ³Eleanor Kirahora Barongo

¹Department of Public Administration, Gombe State University, Nigeria

²Department of Political Administrative Studies, Kampala International University, Uganda.

³Department of Development, Peace and Conflict Studies, Kampala International University, Uganda.

ABSTRACT

This study examined the level of community development in Gombe local government, Nigeria. The study was guided by the following research objectives: to identify the level of community development in Gombe local government and also to establish if there was a significant relationship between governance and community development in Gombe local Government in Nigeria. This study adopted mixed approaches, combining qualitative and quantitative approaches and using descriptive survey for data collection. Data was collected using researcher's devised questionnaires. Pearson Linear Coefficient of Correlation (r) was used to establish the type of relationship existing between the level of governance and community development in Gombe local government in Nigeria. For Community development, the findings revealed a general average mean of 2.77, which was interpreted as satisfactory. There was a significant relationship between Governance and Community development ($r=0.395$, $Sig=0.000$), the null hypothesis is rejected. The researcher concluded that the role of government in community development is simply to work closely with other players in the community development system; working closely can improve speed and smoothness in administrative and regulatory tasks, probably at limited cost.

Keywords: Examination, level, community development, Gombe local government and Nigeria.

INTRODUCTION

Governance is the act of governing. It relates to decisions that define expectations, grant power, or verify performance [1]. It consists of either a separate process or part of management or leadership processes [2]. These processes and systems are typically administered by a government, World Bank in 2005 [3]. The word governance derives from the Greek verb κυβερνάω [kubernáo] which means to steer and was

used for the first time in a metaphorical sense by Plato [4]. It then passed on to Latin and then on to many languages. Governance versus Government, as governance is still equated with government for many people, the difference between these terms is further explored below [5]. David Osborne's and Ted Gaebler's *Reinventing Government* (1992), has had a major influence on public policy makers over the last two

decades [6]. They established that governance was at the heart of what government was about. They argue that services can be contracted out or turned over to the private sector but that governance cannot: Governance is the process by which we collectively solve our problems and meet our society's needs [7]. Government is the instrument we use (*ibid*). Government refers to the formal institutions of the state. Government makes decisions within specific administrative and legal frameworks and

uses public resources in a financially accountable way [8]. Most important, government decisions are backed up by the legitimate hierarchical power of the state [9]. Governance, on the other hand, involves government plus the looser processes of influencing and negotiating with a range of public and private sector agencies to achieve desired outcomes. A governance perspective encourages collaboration between the public, private and non-profit sectors to achieve mutual goals [10].

Purpose of the Study

This study examined the level of community development in Gombe local

government, Nigeria.

Specific objective

- I. To examine the level of community development in Gombe local government, Nigeria.
- II. To establish if there was a significance relationship between

governance and community development in Gombe local government, Nigeria.

Research questions

- a) What is the level of community development in Gombe local government, Nigeria?
- b) Is there a significant

relationship between governance and community development in Gombe local government, Nigeria?

Hypothesis

There is no significant relationship between governance and community

development in Gombe local government, Nigeria.

Scope of the study

Geographical scope

The research location of this study was limited to Gombe local government, which is the capital of Gombe state of Nigeria and the largest and populace area of the

state with growing number of communities living in the stretch of the capital.

Content and time scope

This purely focuses empirical investigation on the effect of governance on community

development. The data was collected from August 2012 to April 2013.

Theoretical scope

The traditional classical development theories (i.e. modernization and dependency) are deemed appropriate and have, consequently, been selected to serve as a base for this study.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study was conducted using a correlation design. In this study the independent variable (Governance) was manipulated to examine its relationship with the dependent variable (community development).

Research population

Gombe local Government has a total of 52 senior staff as of 2012 and a total of nine communities with 98 districts heads and clan leaders making the total to 150. (<http://gombestate.gov.ng/Gombe-Local-Government.html>). Out of 150 only 109 make up the accessible population. The target population consisted of an accessible population of 150 respondents, which included the staff and administrator of Gombe local government, Nigeria as well as local leaders and districts heads. These respondents are categorized into two as follows:

- (1) The local government which comprised of the staff and management of Gombe local government and
- (2) The community which is made up of the districts heads and clan leaders.

Table 1: Categories of Sample

Categories of expect respondent	Population
Local Government	33
Community	76
Total	109

Sample Size

The sample size of the study consisted of 109 respondents selected from staff and administrators of Gombe local government, Nigeria as well as clan leaders and districts heads. Of which 76 were chosen from local government employees and 33 were selected from community. This number of 109 has been chosen according to the Slovene's formula for sample size, which is as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e^2)}$$

Where:

n = sample size

N = target population

$$e = \text{level of significance} = e = 0.05 = e^2 = (0.05)^2 = \underline{\underline{0.0025}}$$

$$n = \frac{150}{1 + 150(0.05)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{150}{1 + 150(0.0025)}$$

$$n = \frac{150}{1 + 0.375}$$

$$n = \frac{150}{1.375}$$

$$n = 109$$

Sampling Procedure

Stratified random sampling will be utilized to select respondents based on criteria

- i. The respondents sector (management and staff of local government)

ii. The respondents village, district or division (Community)

From the list of qualified respondents chosen based on the inclusion criteria, the systematic sampling was used and we finally select the respondents in each stratum with consideration to the computed minimum sample size.

Research Instrument

The study employed three (3) different research instruments as the main tool for collecting data in the field such as Questionnaire. The first Questionnaire used was face sheet, which was used to collect data on profile of the respondent. The second Questionnaire was on governance, which involved the six indicators of good governance (i) Voice and Accountability, (ii) Political Stability and Absence of Violence, (iii) Government Effectiveness, (iv) Regulatory Quality, v) Rule of Law, and (vi) Control of Corruption. The third Questionnaire used was on community development which involved the following terms; poverty, illiteracy,

bribery and corruption, bad governance, and insufficient fund among others. The questionnaires consist of close ended questions however, choosing such method was to save time during the information gathering period. The self-administered questionnaires were given to the respondents those who are able to read and write and those who can't read and write were helped by the researcher on filling the questionnaires. The close ended questionnaires allowed respondents to express their views, attitude, and feeling. Besides the questionnaire, the researcher conducted discussions with the respondents who are unable to read and write, to simplify

and make understandable to them the questionnaires, so they can easily answer. Furthermore, the researcher observed and notes the respondent's information

including their reaction, and physical appearances through discussion.

Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

Validity and reliability of the research instruments was concerned with the extent to which the research instrument yields the same results (Amin, 2005). The validity of the

research was ensured using the Content Validity Index (CVI). As follows:

$$CVI = \frac{\text{No of items declared valid}}{\text{Total no of items}}$$

The results of the content validity index are shown in table 2.

Table 2: Content Validity Index results

Variable	Total No of items	Number of valid items	CVI
Governance	10	8	0.800
Community development	12	10	0.833

Source: Expert Judgments

Table 2 shows that governance yielded CVI of 0.800 while community development yielded a CVI of 0.833. Since all variables yielded a CVI above 0.70 then according to [11] it is accepted for social sciences, it was concluded that the instrument was relevant in measuring governance and community development and therefore had a good validity. On the other hand, reliability is trustworthiness

and in the context of a measuring instrument, it is a degree to which the instrument consistently whatever it's measuring [12]. In this study, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient values of 0.70 were accepted as the minimum accepted for social sciences (Amin, 2005) and the results are shown below as generated from SPSS.

Table 3: Reliability results

Variable	Total No of items	Cronbach' alpha
Governance	10	0.812
Community development	12	0.837

Source: Primary data

Table 3 shows that Governance yielded Cronbach's alpha value of 0.812 while

community development yielded Cronbach's alpha value of 0.837. Since all

variable yielded alpha values above 0.70 as accepted for social sciences, it was

concluded that the instrument had a good reliability.

Data Gathering Procedures

After the researcher proposal was approved, the researcher applied for introduction letter from CHDR-KIU, which was given to him and which allows him to collect data from the field. Afterwards, the researcher collected the data; and it was entered into Statistical Package of

Social Science (SPSS version 16) to help generate the required statistics. The data was then analyzed to draw conclusion from research. At end the researcher submitted the final report to the concerned authorities.

Data Analysis

After the researcher sorting out the valid questionnaires and coding accomplished, to derive useful meaning from the data, and examine the propositions of this study, data from the survey were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) version 16. The following descriptive and inferential statistical approaches were applied:-

community development in Gombe local government, Nigeria.

- b) To establish if there was a significance relationship between governance and community development in Gombe local government, Nigeria.

- a) To examine the level of

B. For the level of community development in Gombe local government, Nigeria

Mean Range	Response Mode	Interpretation
3.50-4.00	Strongly agree	Very high
2.50-3.49	Agree	High
1.50-2.49	Disagree	Low
1.00-1.49	Strongly disagree	Very low

Ethical Considerations

The respondents whom data is collected from were kept confidential, and the data was used for academic purpose only. The respondents were informed of the main aim of the research and were presented

with a letter of introduction which was secured from the CHDR-KIU. On the other hand, the authors quoted in this study were acknowledged through citations and referencing.

Limitations of the Study

The researcher claimed an acceptable level of significance $p < 0.05$ or 5% error in the view of the following anticipated threats to validity with relevance to this study: 1) Extraneous variables which was beyond the researcher's control such as respondent's honesty, personal biases and uncontrolled setting of the study. 2) Instrumentation: the research instrument on Governance and community development in Gombe local government, Nigeria was not standardized. A validity and reliability test was done to produce credible research tool. 3) Testing: The use of research assistants can bring about inconsistency in the administration of the questionnaires in terms of time of administration, understanding of the items in the questionnaires and explanations given to the respondents. To minimize this threat, the research assistants was oriented and briefed on the procedures to be done in data collection. 4) Attrition/Mortality: Not all questionnaires maybe returned neither completely answered nor even retrieved back due to circumstances on the part of the respondents such as travels, sickness, hospitalization and refusal/withdrawal to participate. In anticipation to this, the researcher gave out more than enough questionnaires to the respondents by exceeding the minimum sample size. The respondents were also reminded not to leave any item in

the questionnaires unanswered and was closely followed up as to the date of retrieval, and the sample size was achieved.

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

What is level of Community development in Gombe, Nigeria?:

The third phase of Questionnaire was on community development which involve the following terms; such as poverty, participation,

education, corruption, and information used as sub headings to determine the level of community development in Gombe local government, Nigeria.

Table 4: Mean and standard deviation results for Community development

Poverty				
	Scale	Mean	Rank	Interpretation
1	Local government work (effectively) in variety of ways to reduce poverty	1.47	6	Very low
2	Significant number of families have increased their households income	1.44	3	Very low
3	There are job opportunities in terms of farming, livestock's and cash crop business	3.07	12	High
4	Commercial activities through weekly market days have improve economic development	1.46	5	Very low
5	Illiteracy in general lead to poverty	2.90	10	High

Source: Primary data

	Participation			
	Scale	Mean	Rank	Interpretation
6	Local people support and participate in project invariably	1.43	2	Very low
7	There is equal participation in provision of locally available materials (stones, poles, water etc.) in ongoing projects	2.85	11	High
8	Participation is by invitation and all are usually invited to participate	1.45	4	Very low
9	People are given the chance to contribute their own quota in participation	1.41	1	Very low
10	Participation is educative as People learn when they participate.	2.51	8	High
	Education			
44	Local government effort in education has minimized illiteracy	1.47	6	Very low
12	Individual persons have access to educational facilities	1.44	5	Very low
41	School enrolment is increasing as more families send their wards to schools	3.00	11	High
	Corruption			
14	Local councils are not held accountable for their actions and inactions	2.88	9	High
15	There is mismanagement of resources at the local government level	2.54	10	High
16	Community development projects are sometimes awarded based on favoritism and nepotism rather than merits (thereby enthroning mediocrity at the expense of meritocracy).	2.47	8	High
17	Low wages and welfare packages at the local level lead to shortage of trained personnel in the execution of projects and as such projects implemented are of poor quality	2.40	7	High

	Information			
	Scale	Mean	Rank	Interpretation
18	Individuals in communities have access to information	1.48	7	Very low
49	There is an adequate communication between local government officials and the communities	1.39	6	Very low
20	Communities are informed of a decision that concerns them by the Local government authority.	1.41	1	Very low

Source: Primary data

Mean Range	Response Mode	Interpretation
3.50-4.00	Strongly agree	Very high
2.50-3.49	Agree	High
1.50-2.49	Disagree	Low
1.00-1.49	Strongly disagree	Very low

Poverty: Table 4: shows that the respondents strongly dis agreed that Local government work (effectively) in variety of ways to reduce poverty (Mean 1.47) they also strongly dis agreed that Significant number of families have increased their households income (Mean 1.44) while they agreed that There are job opportunities in terms of farming, livestock's and cash crop business (Mean 3.07) but they strongly dis agreed that Commercial activities through weekly market days have improve economic development (Mean 1.46) and they agreed that illiteracy in general lead to poverty (Mean 2.90). These findings show that poverty is still a major issue as most of the locals are poor and they constitute the majority.

Participation: Participation according to the respondents is

fair as they strongly disagreed that Local people support and participate in project invariably (Mean 1.43) while they agreed that There is equal participation in provision of locally available materials (stones, poles, water etc.) in ongoing projects (Mean 2.85) but they strongly disagreed that Participation is by invitation and all are usually invited to participate (Mean 1.45) also strongly disagreed that People are given the chance to contribute their own quota in participation (Mean 1.41) but agreed that Participation is educative as People learn when they participate (Mean 2.51).

Education: Education is the live wire of every meaningful development, education is power. Education in the communities according to the respondents has not been given serious attention it deserved as the respondents strongly disagreed that Local government effort in education has minimized illiteracy (Mean 1.47) and also strongly

disagreed that Individual persons have access to educational facilities (Mean 1.44) while they agreed that School enrolment is increasing as more families send their wards to schools (Mean 3.00). It is found out the wealthy families send their ward to school leaving the poor ones in the dilapidated public schools of the communities.

Corruption: Corruption in the local Governments is common as local civil servants and their superiors engaged in different kinds of corruption according to the respondents corruption is High, As they agreed that Local councils are not held accountable for their actions and inactions (Mean 2.88), also agreed that There is mismanagement of resources at the local government level (Mean 2.54), they also agreed that Community development projects are sometimes awarded based on favoritism and nepotism rather than merits (thereby enthrone mediocrity at the expense of meritocracy) (Mean 2.47) and they also agreed that Low wages and welfare packages at the local level lead to shortage of trained personnel in the execution of projects and as such projects implemented are of poor quality (Mean 2.40).

Information: Information is facts or knowledge, Information lead to development. According to the respondents' information has not been

given priority and its very poor in the communities, the respondents strongly disagreed that Individuals in communities have access to information (Mean 1.48) they also strongly disagreed that There is an adequate communication between local government officials and the communities (Mean 1.39) and likewise they strongly disagreed that Communities are inform of a decision that concerns them by the Local government authority (Mean 1.41). These study findings relate to a great extent to what [10-13], noted that the main goal of Community development is improving the economic wellbeing of a community through efforts that entail job creation, job retention, tax base enhancements and quality of life. [14], noted that Economic development although a complex process it is influenced by a number of factors such as natural resources, transport and communication, power, capital, human resources, technology, social attitude of the people, political condition in the country. On the other hand, if a country is overpopulated, labour force is unemployed, uneducated, unskilled, and unpatriotic, it can put serious hurdles on the path of economic development [15].

Is there a significant relationship between the level Governance and Community developments in Gombe, Nigeria?

The fourth research question asked if there was any significant relationship between the level Governance and Community developments in Gombe, Nigeria. To answer this question, a co-

relation and regression analyses were conducted using Pearson's correlation and ANOVA statistics and the findings are shown below.

Table 5: Relationship between the level Governance and Community developments in Gombe, Nigeria

Variables correlated	Computed r- value		P-value	Interpretation of Correlation	Adjusted R ²	Decision on Ho
Governance vs. Community development	0.395**		0.000	There is a significant Relationship	0.148	Not accepted

$P \leq 0.05$

Source: Primary data

Table 5 shows Pearson’s correlation coefficient $r = 0.395^{**}$ and $p = 0.000$ suggesting that Governance had a low positive significant relationship with the level of community development in Gombe, Nigeria. The regression analysis revealed an adjusted R2 value of 0.148 at significance $p=0.000$ suggesting Governance although a significant predictor of the variance in the level of community development, it had a low influence as it predicted only 14.8% while other variables predicted the majority of 85.2% of the variance in community development in Gombe, Nigeria. This implied that the low level of Governance resulted into low levels of community development in Gombe. The study therefore disqualified the Null hypotheses that:

H0; There is no significant relationship between Governance and community development in Gombe, Nigeria. And qualified the alternative hypothesis that:

There is a significant relationship between Governance and community development in Gombe, Nigeria.

These study findings relate to a great extent to what Jim (2010) claimed that The role of government in community capacity building is Reorienting government to supporting communities, and it requires not just structural adjustments but fundamental changes in beliefs, assumptions and organizational culture. It makes demands on the leadership, skills, resources and organisation as well as the capacity of agencies of community development. They need to go through the same process of capacity-building as the communities they serve. After all, agencies are communities themselves. According to [11-16] the role of city government in community development is to simply work closely with other players in the community development system, cities can improve speed and smoothness in administrative and regulatory tasks, probably at limited cost.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was guided by two objectives which comprised of (I). To identify the level of community development in Gombe local government, Nigeria (II). To establish if there is significance relationship between governance and community development in Gombe local government in Nigeria. The first objective was the level of community development in Gombe local government, Nigeria. Poverty, participation, education, corruption, and information were used as subheadings in order to determine the level of community development in Gombe local government, Nigeria. The findings exposed that community development is fair to some extends. The second objective was to establish if there is

significance relationship between governance and community development in Gombe local government, Nigeria and the study found out Pearson's correlation coefficient $r = 0.395^{**}$ and $p = 0.000$ suggesting that Governance had a low positive but significant relationship with the level of community development in Gombe, Nigeria . The regression analysis revealed that Governance although a significant predictor of the variance in the level of community development, it had a low influence as it predicted only 14.8% while other variables predicted the majority of 85.2% of the variance in community development in Gombe, Nigeria.

CONCLUSION

On community development there are items such as the Poverty, participation, education, corruption, and information which were used to expose the level of community development which is also fair according to the respondents. On the relationship between governance and community development in Gombe local government, Nigeria the study found out that there was a significant relationship between governance and community

development in Gombe local Government, Nigeria. Basing on this finding, the null hypothesis is rejected and the researcher concludes that Governance is significantly related to the level of community development. This is because of the correlation of 0.148 and the level of significance at .000. The researcher also conclude that Governance directly influence the level of community development.

REFERENCES

1. Amin, M.E. (2005). Social sciences research: Conception, methodology, and analysis. Kampala: Makerere University.
2. Alvin, Y. 1953. Social change and development: modernization, dependency, and world system theories. London: SAGE Publications.
3. Agagu, A. A. (1997). Local Government in Kolawole, D. Reading in Political Science, Ibadan: University Press Limited.
4. Ajayi, K. (2002). Theory and Practice of Local Government. Ado Ekiti: UNAD.
5. Awotokun, K. (2005). Local government administration under 1999 constitution in Nigeria. *Journal of social science*, 10(2), 129-134.
6. Barkan, Joel, Alex Gboyega and Mike Stevens (2001), State and Local Governance in Nigeria, (Final Draft) World Bank Report
7. Burkey, S. 1993. People first. United Kingdom: Biddles LTD.
8. Chambers, R. 1998, Poverty in India: concepts, research and reality. Discussion paper 241, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex.
9. Chambers, R. 1983. Rural Development - Putting the Last First. London: Longman.
10. Coetzee, J. 1989. Development. Johannesburg: South Book publishers Ltd
11. Coetzee, K. et al. 2002. Development, theory, policy and practice. South Africa: Oxford university press.
12. Coetzee, J. 1986. Development is for people. Johannesburg: Macmillians. Ltd.
13. Cohen, J. 1987. Integrated rural development. Sweden: The Scandinavian Institute for African Studies.
14. Cyper, J. and Diethz, 1997. The process of economic development. Britain: Redwood Books.
15. Datta, C. 2003. Participation of the people. (Eds.) Cornwall, A. and Pratt, G. UK:ITDG. De Beer, F. & Swanepoel, H. 1998. Community development and beyond. South Africa: national books printers
16. Eade, D 1997 Capacity building. United Kingdom: Oxfam Publication limited.
17. Edwards, A. & Janes, D. 1997. Community and community development. Netherlands: Mution & Cop.
18. Encyclopedia Britannica Student and Home Edition, Version: 2010.01.00.000000000 software application for windows (<http://www.britannica.com>)
19. OECD (1996) Better Policies for Rural Development. Paris: OECD. (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development)

Usman Bappi, Mulegi Tom and Eleanor Kirahora Barongo (2023). Examination of the level of community development in Gombe local government, Nigeria. IDOSR JOURNAL OF ARTS AND MANAGEMENT 8(2): 48-62. <https://doi.org/10.59298/IDOSR/JAM/23/10.1.62>