#### ASSESSMENT OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS' PARTICIPATION IN EMPOWERMENT PROGRAMMES OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (NGOs) IN NIGER STATE, NIGERIA.

Usman, U.N., Salihu, I. T., Abdullahi, A. and Umar, S. Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development Federal University of Technology, Minna, P.M.B. 65, Niger State, Nigeria \*Corresponding Author's E-mail: usmanummuqulthum@outlook.com. Phone No: +2347062056613, +2349153651969

#### ABSTRACT

NGOs have become tremendously active in a wide range of discipline and other more specialized roles such as poverty alleviation, emergency response, human rights work; hence the need to know rural households' participation in these programmes. Therefore, this study assessed rural households' participation on empowerment programmes of nongovernmental organizations in Niger state Nigeria. Data was obtained from randomly selected 112 households using structured questionnaires and analyzed with descriptive and inferential statistics. The result revealed that majority of the respondents (66.1%) were females, single (63.4%), had no formal education (66.1%) and are mostly farmers (63.4%). to The result on the extent of household participation in empowerment programmes showed that skill acquisitions and vocational training (X=3.85) ranked first while Community sanitation services (X=2.18) ranked the least. Probit regression model was used to analyzed the factors affecting the participation in empowerment programmes of NGOS, the result revealed that marital institution (0.66), formal education (0.71), distance to nearest market (-0.47), household size (-0.20), age (0.44) and complexity of the programme (-0.87) are significant determinants. The constraints of households' participation in empowerment programmes of NGOs were inaccessibility to the programmes, lack of awareness and language barriers. Thus, it was recommended that Non-Governmental Organizations should broaden their links so as to expose the rural people to a variety of empowerment/ training programmes.

Key words: NGOS, Empowerment, Household participation, Programmes

#### INTRODUCTION

During the pasts decades, Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) working in development sectors have soar their profiles at local, national and international levels (Lewis, 2001; Oyema, 2015). NGOs have become tremendously active in a wide range of discipline and other more specialized roles such as poverty alleviation, emergency response, human rights work, democracy building, conflict resolution, cultural preservation, environmental activism, policy analysis, and research and information provision. Non-governmental organizations are free associations with central goal of empowering the powerless and helping economic growth and development in rural areas (Oyema, 2015).



NGOs have gained increasing unceasing recognition because they target the needs and aspirations of rural communities, minorities and women. As a result, NGOs tend to do right in the eyes of the poor than majority of governmental organizations (Ofosu-Appiah, 2010).

According to World Bank (2013), the word "empowerment" is the process of increasing the capacity of individuals or groups to make choices and to transform those choices into desired actions and outcomes. The Bank noted in this process, the centrality of the action which both build individual and collective assets and improve the efficiency and fairness of the organizational and institutional context, which govern the use of these assets.

In Nigeria, the rural sector harbors the substantial amount of the poor, likely accounting for greater than 70% of the total population (World Bank, 2013). Conditions have continued to worsen and poverty has become a key issue in the rural areas in spite of their potentials. Reducing rural poverty for this reason has been a long-standing concern, propelling an array of initiatives by the Non-governmental organizations (NGOs), government and international development agencies. The constraints to developing the rural areas as well as the problems of this critical sector (rural sector) in Nigeria have come to loom very enormous. Therefore, a salient concern to policy makers, governments, multilateral institutions as well as the NGOs in different countries is to identify suitable strategy for poverty alleviation especially in the rural areas. Therefore, this study seeks to fill the research gap on the level of rural households' participation in empowerment programmes of Non-governmental organizations in Niger State. Thus, the specific objectives of the study were to; assess rural households' level and benefit of participation in empowerment programmes and to determine the factors influencing households' level of participation in NGO's empowerment programmes in the study area.

# METHODOLOGY

The study was carried out in Niger state which is in the North-central part of Nigeria and lies in between longitude 30 301 and 70 201 East of the Greenwich Meridian and latitude 80 201 and 110 301 North of the equator with an inhabitant of over 3,954,772 people in 2006 population census (National Bureau of Statistic (NBS), 2016).

A multistage sampling technique was used for the study. The first stage involved a random selection of two local government areas in the study area. Second stage was a purposive selection of one (1) Non-governmental organization from each of the LGAs selected in the study area. This was based on the intensity of their activities in the study area. In the third stage, Yamane formula was use to select sample size from sample frame of the 1120 respondents that involved in the activities (beneficiaries and participants) of the NGOs.



Thus, a total of 165 participants and 115 beneficiaries were randomly selected, making a total of 280 respondents. Thus, 40% of the total which is 112 was used as respondents for this study. The distribution of the respondents in the study area is presented in Table 3.1 and Yamanne's formula is mathematically expressed as:  $n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$ 

Where; n =samples size

N = finite population

e = limit of tolerable error (level of precision at 0.07 probability)

l = constant

Finally, 10% of the respondents were randomly selected from the total of 1120 respondents to give the sample size of 112 households for the study.

| Zone  | LGA       | Selected NGOs                     | Sampling<br>frame<br>(participants) | Sampling<br>Frame<br>(beneficiaries) | Sample<br>Size (P) | Sample<br>size (B) |
|-------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| A     | Lapai     | Global promoters<br>for community | 105                                 | 25                                   | 20                 | 11                 |
|       | Bida      | Hakima<br>Empowerment<br>Center   | 100                                 | 50                                   | 19                 | 22                 |
| B     | Bosso     | Better life for<br>African Women  | 220                                 | 80                                   | 43                 | 35                 |
|       | Chanchaga | Star Foundation                   | 140                                 | 10                                   | 27                 | 4                  |
| С     | Kontagora | Raise Foundation                  | 100                                 | 40                                   | 19                 | 17                 |
|       | Wushishi  | Pearls Care<br>Initiative         | 190                                 | 60                                   | 37                 | 26                 |
| Total | 6         | 6                                 | 855                                 | 265                                  | 165                | 115                |

| Table 3.1 | nrocedure | for selection | of sample | size from | study area |
|-----------|-----------|---------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Table 3.1 | procedure | for selection | of sample | size from | study area |

Source: (Oladimeji, 2017; Daily trust, 2017; Daily trust, 2019; Star Foundation, 2018; News Agency of Nigeria, 2017; PCI, 2018).

### Method of data collection.

Primary data was used for the study. The primary data for the study was generated through an interview schedule/use of questionnaires to provide information on the socioeconomics characteristics of the household various empowerment programs of the NGOs, level of participation of the rural households', factors influencing the rural households' level of participation in NGO empowerment programmes, benefits as well as the constraints associated with the participation of rural households' level of participation in NGOS'



empowerment programmes. In addition, the relevant literature from textbook, journals, internet and official document will be consulted to supplement the study.

## Model specification

### **Probit regression model**

Objective iii will be achieved by using Probit regression model. The Probit regression model is specified in the equation 1.

In  $(Y_i) = \alpha i + \beta X$ The implicit form:  $Y = f(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6, X_7 X_8, X_9 X_{10})$ The functional form is expressed in the explicit form as;

$$\begin{split} Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \, X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 \, X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + \beta_7 X_7 + \beta_8 X_8 + \beta_9 X_9 + \beta_{10} X_{10} + \beta_{11} X_{11} \\ + \beta_{12} X_{12} \ \beta_{13} X_{13} + ei \end{split}$$

Where:

 $Y_1$  (dependent variable) = NGOs empowerment (participants = 1, beneficiaries = 0)

 $\beta_1 - \beta_{11}$  = Parameters to be estimated (regression coefficient)

 $X_1 - X_{13}$ =independent variables. Where;

 $X_1 = Age of household head (years); X_2 = Gender (male = 1, female = 0); X_3 = Marital institution (married=1, otherwise=0); X_4 = Household size (numbers); X_5 = formal education level (numbers); X_6 = major occupation (farming=1, otherwise=0); X_7 = membership of a cooperative (member=1, not a member=0); X_8 = access to extension services (easily accessed=1, otherwise=0); X_9 = access to credit services (easily accessed=1, otherwise=0); X_9 = access to credit services (easily accessed=1, otherwise=0); X_9 = access to credit services (easily accessed=1, otherwise=0); X_{10} = relative advantage of the programmes (yes=1, no=0); X_{11} = compatibility of the programmes (compatible=1, not compatible=0); X_{12} = complexity of the NGO programmes (complex= 1, otherwise=0); X_{11} = distance of the programmes (kilometers); <math>\beta_0$  = constant; ei = error term

# **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### Socio-economic characteristics of the respondents

The results in table 1 revealed that majority of the respondents are between the ages of (21-31) years. This could be attributed to the fact that most youths are part of the NGO programmes rather than the older ones, predominantly because of their greater ability to be agile, active and physically disposed to pursue economic activity. This is in agreement with earlier studies by Bzugu (2005) that the younger generation participate more in community development activities. Similarly, majority of the respondents were female explains more involvement of due to the fact that many households are catered for by women. Women will therefore require a wider range of technical knowhow on which to draw their livelihood pursuits in order to enhance their wide range of production, domestic and community duties (Danjuma et al., 2013).



It was also discovered that the majority of the respondents were married. This implies high level of responsibility and willingness to carter for the family by involving in NGO programmes. This agreed with the findings of ILO (2002) that majority of the married participants may have a bigger household sizes which may motivate them in order to raise their income and standard of living.

Furthermore, majority of the respondents had between (6-16 persons) as their household sizes. As such the larger the household, the more likely their participation interest. The large number of household members in the study area may be as a result to the polygamous nature of the rural people who tends to recognize household population as a symbol of authority among farmers.

This result agrees with the report of Marenya and Barrett (2007) who found that as the household size increases, the likelihood of expanding cultivated farm land is expected to be high among rural respondents. It was equally found that high number of the respondents had no formal education but may possess many forms of informal education such as skills/ vocational acquisition or Quranic education. According to Suleiman (2009), he describes education as the only panacea to empowerment considering the fact that without education, it will be burdensome to become genuinely relevant in the society. Likewise, it was found that majority of the respondents were farmers which indicates a predominantly agrarian society. Farming was described by Bello et al. (2016) as the only activity that everyone can easily and conveniently undertake as necessitate by high level of illiteracy in the study area.

### Extent of households' participation in empowerment programmes of NGOs

The respondents indicated their participation in different economic empowerment programmes of various NGOs. Table 3 revealed that the major programme participated in are skill acquisitions and vocational training (X=3.85), religious services (X=3.35) and health delivery services (X=3.23) while Peace and conflict resolution (X=2.24) and Community sanitation services (X=2.18) ranked the least respectively. Generally, the extent of household participation was low which was suspected to be as a result of some constraints facing rural household participation such as illiteracy level, inaccessibility of the programmes, complexity of the programmes, and lack of adequate formal source of information at the right time. The finding is in agreement with that of Abdulsalam (2015) who found that the extent of Nigerian household participation in empowerment programme is persistently low.



| Variables          | Frequency | Percentage | Mean |  |
|--------------------|-----------|------------|------|--|
|                    |           | (%)        |      |  |
| Age(years)         |           |            |      |  |
| 21 years and below | 28        | 25.0       | 27   |  |
| 22-26years         | 29        | 25.9       |      |  |
| 27-31 years        | 28        | 25.0       |      |  |
| 32 and above       | 27        | 24.1       |      |  |
| Gender             |           |            |      |  |
| Female             | 74        | 66.1       |      |  |
| Male               | 38        | 33.9       |      |  |
| Marital status     |           |            |      |  |
| Married            | 71        | 36.6       |      |  |
| Single             | 41        | 63.4       |      |  |
| Household size     |           |            |      |  |
| 5 and below        | 38        | 33.9       | 8    |  |
| 6-10people         | 48        | 42.0       |      |  |
| 11-15people        | 24        | 21.4       |      |  |
| 16 and above       | 2         | 1.8        |      |  |
| Formal education   |           |            |      |  |
| Non formal         | 74        | 66.1       |      |  |
| Primary            | 29        | 25.9       |      |  |
| Secondary          | 6         | 5.4        |      |  |
| Tertiary           | 3         | 2.7        |      |  |
| Major occupation   |           |            |      |  |
| Farming            | 71        | 63.4       |      |  |
| Other occupations  | 41        | 36.6       |      |  |

Assessment of rural households' participation in empowerment programmes of ...... Usman *et al.* 

Source: Field survey, 2019.



| Level of participation in empowernment | VH (%)   | H (%)    | M (%)    | L (%)    | N (%)    | WM    | Rank             |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|------------------|
| programmes                             |          |          |          |          |          |       |                  |
| Skill acquisition and                  | 48(42.9) | 26(23.2) | 23(20.5) | 3(2.7)   | 12(10.7) | 3.85* | 1 <sup>st</sup>  |
| vocational training                    |          |          |          |          |          |       |                  |
| Community mobilization                 | 4(3.6)   | 21(18.8) | 17(15.2) | 35(31.3) | 35(31.3) | 2.32  | $8^{th}$         |
| Health services delivery               | 18(16.1) | 29(25.9) | 38(33.9) | 15(13.4) | 12(10.7) | 3.23* | 3 <sup>rd</sup>  |
| Credit services                        | 17(15.2) | 29(25.9) | 24(21.4) | 19(17.0) | 23(20.5) | 2.98  | $5^{\text{th}}$  |
| Delivery of agricultural input         | 7(6.3)   | 18(16.1) | 25(22.3) | 13(11.6) | 46(43.8) | 2.29  | $9^{\text{th}}$  |
| Religious services                     | 27(24.1) | 19(17.0) | 41(36.6) | 16(14.3) | 9(8.0)   | 3.35* | $2^{nd}$         |
| Agricultural extension                 | 18(16.1) | 25(22.3) | 39(34.8) | 12(10.7) | 18(16.1) | 3.12* | $4^{th}$         |
| services                               |          |          |          |          |          |       |                  |
| Awareness creation on                  | 9(8.0)   | 14(12.5) | 25(22.3) | 23(20.5) | 41(36.6) | 2.35  | $7^{\text{th}}$  |
| innovations                            |          | × /      |          |          |          |       |                  |
| Community sanitation                   | 6(5.4)   | 16(14.5) | 22(19.6) | 16(14.3) | 52(46.4) | 2.18  | 11 <sup>th</sup> |
| services                               |          | × /      |          |          |          |       |                  |
| Political mobilization                 | 3(2.7)   | 15(13.4) | 33(29.5) | 38(33.9) | 22(20.5) | 2.44  | 6 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Peace and conflict resolution          | 0(0)     | 22(19.6) | 26(23.2) | 21(18.8) | 43(38.4) | 2.24  | $10^{\text{th}}$ |

Source: Field survey, 2019

Key: VH=very high, H=high, M= moderate, L=low, N=never. WM=Weighted Mean, \*= Significant, Decision rule:  $X \ge 3$  = High and X < 3 = Low.

# Benefits associated with households' participation in empowerment programmes of NGOs

NGOs carry out various roles in terms community development and empowerment, majority of the household agreed to have participated and benefitted. This result simply indicates that the provision of vocational skills by the NGOs will increase the potentials of the households in terms of skills acquisition opportunities for the benefits of the respondents, perhaps, it also results to a diversification and increase in income.

In the course of discussion conducted with the respondents the household said they received trainings on how to make detergent, beads, bed sheets, store grains, makeup, bake cake, make tie and dye and how to spray insecticides on farms. On the other hand, some of the Non-governmental organization agents believed that the level of skill acquisitions/vocational training is very high because most times they can train the women theoretically pending when they receive funds from donors. Wally (2008) has mentioned that non-governmental organizations through capacity building help to sustain community development.



#### Assessment of rural households' participation in empowerment programmes of ...... Usman *et al.*

The study also indicated that the respondents had access to credit by these Non-government organizations. This implies that the beneficiaries had access to loans and free donations from these non-governmental organizations a one point in time. It will therefore increase their income activities and also strengthen their potentials. In some cases of long-term loans were given with little or no collateral still the respondents find difficulty in paying back with the thought that it is a free government package for them to be used for other personal activities. This development becomes a major constraint to the micro credit project scheme organized by non-governmental organizations in the study area. Mayoux (2000) noted that micro credit brings far more benefits to people just below the poverty line than those far above it, and this is because credits given to poor households may go into solving some of the family problem (sickness, school fees, malnutrition and accumulated debts). According to the study, the respondents often have access to health care services which indicates that the NGOs comes to the community much often to deliver health care services; this perhaps will improve their health status. Discussion that was carried out, that most of the household said they had received free treatments like optical services, free mosquitoes' nets were given, peer education on STDs and HIV/AIDS, free medical tests and treatment against malaria and typhoid was made available to them and family planning sensitizations were delivered for the child bearing aged women.

Finally, a large percentage of the household clearly supported the view that NGOs created awareness in the community. In the course of the discussion, the majority of the households' that participated in the programmes said NGOs' had informed, sensitized them on the importance of empowerment and other issues like mother and child mortality, political issues, HIV/AIDS, water sanitation, agricultural and nutritional needs, and good governance in the area.



| Table 4: Distribution of respondents according to the benefits of participation |          |          |          |          |          |       |                 |  |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|-----------------|--|
| Benefits of participation   | SA (%)   | A (%)    | UD (%)   | DA (%)   | SD (%)   | WM    | Rank            |  |
| Through the programmes, I acquired new skills and Vocations                     | 54(21.4) | 24(21.4) | 12(10.7) | 12(10.7) | 13(11.6) | 3.84* | 1 <sup>st</sup> |  |
| The programmes has help my farming activities through credit Services           | 26(23.2) | 38(33.9) | 18(16.1) | 18(16.1) | 8(7.1)   | 3.50* | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |  |
| NGOs has improved my religious lifestyle  | 26(23.2) | 41(36.6) | 12(10.7) | 12(10.7) | 6(5.4)   | 3.62* | $2^{nd}$        |  |
| Through the programmes, I am carried along politically                          | 0(0)     | 0(0)     | 30(26.8) | 76(67.9) | 6(5.4)   | 2.21  | 8 <sup>th</sup> |  |
| The programmes has helped in safe and free health services                      | 24(21.4) | 36(32.1) | 19(17.0) | 19(17.0) | 6(5.4)   | 3.47* | 4 <sup>th</sup> |  |
| NGOs has assisted me in community sanitation and cleaning                       | 0(0)     | 1(0.9)   | 35(31.3) | 72(64.3) | 4(3.6)   | 2.30  | 6 <sup>th</sup> |  |
| The programmes has help me in self-empowerment and sustenance                   | 0(0)     | 2(1.8)   | 27(24.1) | 73(65,2) | 10(8.9)  | 2.21  | 8 <sup>th</sup> |  |
| The programmes has helped create awareness on innovation                        | 18(16.1) | 34(30.4) | 16(14.3) | 16(14.3) | 12(10.7) | 3.27* | 5 <sup>th</sup> |  |
| NGOs has assisted in quick delivery in agricultural input and extension         | 0(0)     | 1(0.9)   | 26(23.2) | 75(67.0) | 10(8.9)  | 2.17  | 9 <sup>th</sup> |  |
| The programmes has helped in increasing my income through diversification       | 0(0)     | 0(0)     | 32(28.6) | 73(65.2) | 7(6.3)   | 2.22  | 7 <sup>th</sup> |  |

International Journal Of Agricultural Economics, Management And Development (IJAEMD) 10(1); 2022

#### Source: Field survey, 2019

Key: SA=strongly agree, AG=agree UD=undecided, DA=disagree SD=strongly disagree. WM=Weighted Mean, \*= Significant, Decision rule X > 3= High and X < 3 =Low.

# Factors affecting households' level of participation in empowerment programmes of NGOs

Probit regression analysis was used to determine the factors influencing participation of rural households' in empowerment programmes of NGOs in the study area. The results Table 5 shows that pseudo R2 was 0.2054 suggesting that the specification fits the model well and the variables included in the model explain 20.5 % of rural households' participation in empowerment programmes of NGOs indicating the goodness of fit of the model while the remaining 79.5% is error which is beyond explanation. The results indicated that marital institution and formal education positively and significantly influenced the rural households' participation.



However, distance to nearest market, household size, age and complexity of the programmes had negative and significant effect on participation. The marginal effects were used to interpret the change in probability of participation among the household.

The results indicated that 'age' had negative and significant effect on the households' decision level of participate in empowerment programmes NGOs (p = 0.051). The marginal effect of probit results showed that the increase in one year of their age would decrease the probability of respondents' orientation towards empowerment programmes by 8.81%. This is because younger people are more risk inclined, quick to adopt technology, more physically fit and pay less allegiance to societal norms. This finding is consistent with the findings of Alene et al. (2008) who found that besides being risk inclined; younger persons are quick in adopting technology which may increase their community development skills.

Similarly, the results in Table 5 showed that marital institution is positive and had a significant impact on the households' decision level of participates in empowerment programmes NGOs. (p=0.727). The marginal effect indicated that for every married person the participation level increases by 76.4%. Marital institution significantly is associated with programmes participation. Furthermore, the result of this study was not surprising, considering the findings from many of studies having the highest of married farmers. Married farmers are likely to be under pressure to acquire more skills, not only for family use but also for commercial purposes to be able to take care of size of the family. Therefore, marital status is a principal determinant of respondents' participation in empowerment programmes with the results showing that married persons have higher tendencies of participating than those who are single including divorcees, widowed, and never married.

Equally, the result also indicated that household size had a negative and significant impact on the households' decision level of participate in empowerment programmes NGOs. (p=0.039). The marginal effect indicated that for every increase the household size per year participation level decreases by 128.33%. As Teklewold *et al.* (2006) noted, household size is a proxy to labor availability. Therefore, larger households are likely to have a lower probability to participate in empowerment programmes, family members are likely to diversify their activities in an attempt to earn more income to ease the consumption pressure imposed by a large family size. In relation to the formal education level of the respondents, the study established that as the formal education level of the respondents increases the more likely they participate in empowerment programmes of nongovernmental organization.



| Variables                       | Coefficients | Ζ        | p>   z |
|---------------------------------|--------------|----------|--------|
| Age                             | 0.440426     | -1.95**  | 0.051  |
| Gender                          | 0.1155561    | 0.35     | 0.727  |
| Marital institution             | 0.6579432    | 2.06**   | 0.039  |
| Household size                  | -0.2033405   | -2.84*** | 0.005  |
| Formal education                | 0.7063702    | 2.23**   | 0.026  |
| Major occupation                | 0.0087938    | -0.23    | 0.820  |
| Cooperative                     | 0.082938     | 0.98     | 0.328  |
| Extension                       | -0.1853336   | -0.52    | 0.600  |
| Credit                          | -5.47e-08    | -0.05    | 0.960  |
| Relative advantages             | 0.0151074    | 0.39     | 0.697  |
| Compatibility of the programmes | 0.0915434    | 0.91     | 0.365  |
| Complexity of the programmes    | -0.8424903   | -2.78*** | 0.006  |
| Distance of the programmes      | -0.4379471   | -2.83*** | 0.005  |
| Constant                        | -0.8024893   | -2.25    | 0.021  |
| Log likehood = -61.177241       |              |          |        |
| No. of observation $= 112$      |              |          |        |
| LR $chi2(13) = 31.62$           |              |          |        |
| Prob > chi2 = 0.0027***         |              |          |        |
| Pseudo $R2 = 0.2054$            |              |          |        |

Table 5: factors affecting household level of participation in empowerment programmes of nongovernmental organizations.

Source: Survey data (2019).

Note. \*\*\* = 1% significance level, \*\* = 5%, and \* = 10% significance level.

The relationship is observed to be positive and significant. More educated respondents were also more likely to participate in NGO programmes than respondents with less educational qualification. This is as a result that higher education was likely to expose people to more information regarding their needs and interest. These findings agreed with those findings by Yengoh (2010) who all found higher levels of education to enhance information access by the farmers for improved technology up take and higher farm productivity.

They also observed education to enhance the respondents' ability to receive, decipher and comprehend information relevant to making innovative decisions in their farms.

However, the probit results revealed that complexity of the programmes was found to have negative and significant influence on the participation level of the respondents. The respondents are likely to participate in programmes that are less complex than the one than are more complex. It explains that the more complex this programmes are, beyond their comprehension and applicability the tendency of their participation in such programmes reduces.



Furthermore, the probit results revealed that distance to programmes center was found to have negative significant influence on level of participation in households' level of participation in empowerment programmes of NGOs. The negative sign means that as the distance to the programmes increases, the probability of household's orientation towards participating in empowerment programmes reduces in the study area. This is because as the distance to programme center increases, the transportation cost increases as well, this is a disincentive to empowerment programmes participation. The marginal effect revealed that as the distance to nearest programmes center increase by one kilometer, the probability of household to participate in the empowerment programmes decreases by 13.4%. This is in line with the findings of Eskola (2005) who reported that the distance to nearest town was the significant factor that affected the respondents' degree of participation.

#### Constraints to participation in empowerment programmes of NGOs

The respondents indicated varying perceived constraints to participation in empowerment programmes of Non-governmental organization in the study area. The Table 6 shows that inaccessibility of the programmes was ranked the first and thus the most disturbing constraint. This could be as a result of unavailability of the programmes, even when it is available it tends to be inaccessible. The unavailability of the programmes could be tied to fact that NGO's willingness to provide free services to comparably enormous number of rural households. Another constraint identified to limit the extent of participation of rural households' in NGO empowerment programmes is lack of awareness which was ranked the second constraint. This result is also tied to the fact that majority of the rural household had no formal source of information related NGOs empowerment programmes. Hence, rural households' only access news that may have been tested and satisfied through friends, family or change agents This finding is in agreement with Adesope et al. (2012) who stated that sources of information for new innovations or news among rural households is mostly through friends, relatives, neighbors and extension agents which eventually takes longer period of time to be disseminated.



| Constraints   | SC (%)   | NSC      | NAC      | WM    | Rank             |
|---|----------|----------|----------|-------|------------------|
|   |          | (%)      | (%)      |       |                  |
| Inaccessibility of the programmes                     | 64(57.1) | 32(28.6) | 16(14.3) | 2.43* | 1 <sup>st</sup>  |
| Lack of awareness                                     | 52(46.4) | 49(43.8) | 11(9.8)  | 2.37* | $2^{nd}$         |
| Cultural differences                                  | 27(24.1) | 32(28.6) | 53(47.3) | 1.77  | $7^{\text{th}}$  |
| Poor relative advantages to the households' needs     | 5(4.5)   | 50(44.6) | 57(50.9) | 1.54  | $9^{\text{th}}$  |
| Low or no compatibility to household's activities and | 10(8.9)  | 35(31.3) | 67(59.8) | 1.49  | 11 <sup>th</sup> |
| needs.  |          |          |          |       |                  |
| Proximity to the programmes venue                     | 10(8.9)  | 48(42.9) | 54(48.2) | 1.61  | $8^{th}$         |
| Illiteracy level                                      | 53(47.3) | 40(35.7) | 19(17.0) | 2.30* | $4^{th}$         |
| Language barrier                                      | 55(49.1) | 41(36.6) | 16(14.3) | 2.35* | 3 <sup>rd</sup>  |
| Limited funds   | 6(5.4)   | 88(78.6) | 18(16.1) | 1.89  | 6 <sup>th</sup>  |
| Lack of interest                                      | 8(7.1)   | 41(36.6) | 63(56.3) | 1.51  | $10^{\text{th}}$ |
| Complexity of the programmes                          | 50(44.6) | 30(26.8) | 32(28.6) | 2.16* | 5 <sup>th</sup>  |

International Journal Of Agricultural Economics, Management And Development (IJAEMD) 10(1); 2022

Source: Field survey, 2019

Key: SC= serious constraints, NSC=not a serious constraints, NAC= not a constraint. WM=Weighted Mean, \*= Significant, Decision rule X > 2.0= HIGH and X < 2.0 =LOW.

More so, another significant constraint is language barrier which is associated with the illiteracy level of the rural household as majority of the respondent do not understand or speak English language as the general language because of the little or no form of formal education which they possess. The respondents further disclosed during a discussion that there is a need of a translator which helps in the dissemination.

The fourth constraints associated with the participation of NGO programmes are illiteracy level and has an implication on the better understanding and participation on the empowerment programmes considering the fact that without education it will be difficult to become genuinely economically empowered and relevant in society. This is in conformity with the work of Sivaran (2006) which states that education is the best and most effective strategy for promoting rural empowerment and it subsequently plays a significant role in rural economic empowerment.

### **Conclusion and Recommendations**

From the result of the findings, the following conclusion were made;

Age, level of education, household size, occupation, skills/vocational training, delivery of health services, complexity of the programmes and distance of the programmes were significant to rural households' participation empowerment programmes of NGOs. Younger people, literates, larger household size, healthy and less complex programmes were participated in the most by the rural households.



Hence, empowering the rural household should consider this factors with immense relevance to enhance overall economic development in the study area. The major constraints to participation in empowerment programmes of NGO showed inaccessibility of the programmes, and this could be as a result of unavailability of the programmes, even when it is available it tends to be inaccessible. The unavailability of the programmes could be tied to fact that NGO's willingness to provide free services to comparably enormous number of rural households, thus having an impact on the extent of participation to be inarguably low.

Based on the research, the following recommendations are suggestions to motivate NGOs in promoting rural households' empowerment programmes in the study area.

1. Most of the respondents engaged in skills/vocational training programmes such as bead making, bed sheet making, tailoring, hair making etc. Non-governmental organizations should broaden their links so as to expose the rural people to a variety of vocational training programmes.

2. The credit services programmes as one of the programmes embarked on by the nongovernmental organizations had an encouraging and positive outcome on the respondents. It is recommended that the non-governmental organizations should ensure constant monitoring and evaluation of the utilization of the disbursed credit in order to ensure proper management of loans.

3. Majority of the participants in the Non-governmental empowerment programmes were younger people, Non-governmental organizations should therefore consider creating programmes for the older generations. This is because older people need to be self-sustained and empowered.

4. For a rural household empowerment, they need access to the human, social and material resources necessary to make rational choices in life. As such NGOs should ensure to provide incentives to the households to facilitate their needs and socio-economic status.

5. The rural household be given more access to education, especially encouraging them to go beyond secondary school level; this could be achieved by reaching out to parents and guardians in their places of gathering like churches, mosques, cooperatives centers to enlighten them on importance of education especially Girl child education.

#### REFERENCES

- Abdulsalam, O. I. (2015), "Impact of youth empowerment scheme on poverty alleviation in Nigeria", International Journal of Business, Economics, and Law, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 35-39.
- Adesope, O. M., Oguzor, N. S. and Ugwuja, V. C. (2012). Effect of socio-economic characteristics of farmers on their adoption of organic farming practices.crop production technologies, Peeyush Sharma (Ed.), ISBN: 978-953-307-787-1, InTech, Retrieved from: http://www.intechopen.com/books/crop-productiontechnologies/effect-of-socio-economic-characteristics-offarmers-on-their-adoptionof-organic-farming-practices.
- Alene, D. A., Manyong, V. M., Omanya, G., Mignouna, H. D., Bokanga, M. and Odhiambo,
  G.D. (2008). Smallholder marketed surplus and input use under transactions costs: Maize supply and fertilizer demand in Kenya. Food Policy 32(4):318–328.
- Bello, O. G., Orifah, M. O., Oladipo, F. O. and Ijeoma, M. C. (2016). use of improved groundnut processing technologies among women processors in Jigawa state, *Nigeria, Nigerian Journal of Agriculture, Food and Environment*. 12(4):62-67
- Bzugu, P.M,Gwary M.M and Idrisa Y.L (2005). Impact of Extension services on rural poetry Alleviation among farmers in Asikirauba local government are in Borno state. Sahel Analtst, Faculty of management sciences, University of Maiduguri. 26(4) Pp 96-10
- Danjuma, Muhammad, and alkali (2013) factors militating against women economic empowerment and poverty reduction in African countries. IOSR journal of business management, 13 (6): 47-51
- Eskola, E. (2005), 'Agricultural Marketing and Supply Chain Management in Tanzania: A Case Study', Working Paper Series No. 16, Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF), Dar-es-Salaam.
- Fahm, A. O. (2017), 'Muslim Women and Social Responsibility in Nigeria: Contributions of the Federation of Muslim Women's Associations in Nigeria (FOMWAN)', Altercation Special Edition, 19, pp. 175- 191; <u>https://doi.org/10.29086/2519-5476/2017/sp19a8</u>
- ILO International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (2002): Every child counts. New global estimates on child labour, Geneva, April 2002, section 3.1, pp. 37-41.
- Kolawole, B. O., & Omobitan, O. A. (2014). Raging Poverty and Agricultural Output in Nigeria: An Empirical Investigation. Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development, 5(6), 63–72.

- Marenya, P. P. and Barrett, C. B. (2007). Household-level determinants of adoption of improved natural resources management practices among smallholder farmers in Western Kenya. *Journal of Food Policy*, 32(4), 515-536.
- Mayoux, L. (2000). Microfinance and the Empowerment of Women. A Review of the Key Issuesfrom, https://www.llo.org/wcm.sp/groups/pblic/ed.emp/documents/publication/wcms.no 7993.pdf.
- National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), (2016). Available online: Retrieved from <u>http://nigeria.opendataforafrica.org/xspplpb/nigeria-census</u>:Last updated: Tuesday, 31 May 2016.
- Nigeria Population Commission (NPC) (2006). Year Book on Nigeria Population data. Nigeria Population Commission, Nigeria Report Retrieved on February 2<sup>nd</sup> 2015 from http://www.jstor.org.
- Ofosu-Appiah, B. (2003). Making Non-governmental Organizations More Effective and Responsive in a Globalized World.http://www. ghanaweb.com/ Ghana homepage / features/ artikel.php? ID = 48854. As cited Oyema A.O (2015). Factors influencing women perception of non-governmental organizations empowerment programmes in Makurdi local government area of Benue State, Nigeria.
- Ojo, M, A., Nmadu, J, N., Tanko, L., and Olaleye, R, S. (2013). Multinomial Logit Analysis of Factors Affecting the Choiceof Enterprise Among Small-holder Yam and Cassava Farmersin Niger State, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural science*, 4(1): 7-12 (2013)
- Oyema, A.O. (2013)" Factors Influencing Women Perception of Non-Governmental Organizations Empowerment programmes in Makurdi Local Government Area of Benue State, Nigeria"
- Rex, C. Paul, F. and Catherine, M (2014). Role of radio in agricultural extension and advisory services. Farm Radio Trust Malawi, Lilonnge University of Agriculture and natural resources, Ministry of Agriculture.
- Solomon, O. (2008). Small scale oil palm farmers' perception of organic agriculture in Imo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Environmental Extension*, 7(1), 67-71.
- Suleiman, S.H. (2009)"Education, Panacea to Women Empowerment in Nigeria" all Africa.com publication.2 (2):11
- Teklewold, H., Kassie, M. & Shiferaw, B. (2013). Adoption of multiple sustainable agricultural practices in rural Ethiopia. *Journal of agricultural economics*, 64(3), 597-623.
- World Bank.(2013). World Development Report 2013:Jobs. Washington,DC: the world bank
- Yengoh, G. T., Armah, F. A., & Svensson, M. G. (2010). Technology adoption in smallscale agriculture. Science, technology & innovation studies, 5(2), 111–131.