

## **ANALYSIS OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN WEALTH CREATION OF MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS (MDGs) AND ITS EFFECTS ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN ANAMBRA STATE**

**Taiwo Abdulahi Olabisi<sup>1\*</sup>, Emejulu Gerard A<sup>1</sup>, Nwachukwu Oforbuike Francis<sup>2</sup> and Okafor Ifeoma Petronilla<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Cooperative Economics and Management, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State of Nigeria.

<sup>2</sup>National Open University of Nigeria, Enugu state study center

<sup>3</sup>Federal Polytechnic Oko, Anambra State of Nigeria

---

**ABSTRACT:** *Community participation is commonly understood as the collective involvement of people in accessing the programmes and projects that are designed to cater for their needs. The importance of community participation in millennium development goals wealth creation programmes and project is not negotiable. The study examined the effects of community participation on rural development with reference to Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) wealth creation programmes in Anambra State. The sample size of 318 respondents was determined through multistage sampling technique. Evidence from the result revealed that, Anambra State MDGs has initiated and implemented various rural wealth creation programmes at different communities in the state findings also revealed that beneficiaries (community) are significantly involved (grand mean  $\bar{x} = 3.228$ ) in the initiation and implementation of rural wealth creation programmes and projects in Anambra State. Also the finding revealed that community participation has positive effects on rural community development. Therefore, in a bid to strengthen community participation in developmental project and programmes the researcher recommends the following Since the wealth creation programmes are targeted at the beneficiaries (community) the MDGs should endeavour to adopt Community Driven Development (CDD) strategy, where they will give the community (beneficiaries) more platform to actively participate, from initiation stage to the implementation stage that is before, during and after the execution of the projects and programmes.. Finally, the MDGs should set up management committees of various communities of intervention and also establish independent monitoring team that will evaluate the level of project implementation.*

**KEYWORDS:** Community Participation; Wealth Creation; Millennium Development Goals; Rural Development

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

The concept of wealth creation applies to individuals, households, businesses, communities, regions, states and nations. Pender, Marre and Reeder (2012) suggested that wealth creation concept is applicable in all contexts, although rural wealth creation involves opportunities and constraints that are distinct from wealth creation in urban areas. In a bid to create wealth for rural inhabitants especially in Anambra State, the state government adopted several strategies (e.g ANIDS) of wealth creation programmes so as to promote the livelihood of the

Anambarians, most especially those living in the rural areas. Meanwhile, Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) have been in existence since September 2000 when 189 member countries of the United Nations (UN) adopted the eight Millennium Development Goals that will eradicate extreme poverty, hunger and achieving other human developments (Abdulgafar; Ibrahim and Alasinrin 2013). These goals are to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger; to promote universal basic education; promote gender equality and empower women; reduce child mortality; improve maternal health care; combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases as well as to ensure environmental sustainability as well as maintain global partnership.

In the words of Igbuzor (2013) MDGs focuses on wealth creation in rural areas, particularly the means which it is created, this is because promoting sustainable rural development is one of the main missions of MDGs. Natural resources and amenities are generally more important as a form of wealth creation and as a contributor to economic development in rural areas than urban areas (Pender et al 2012). On the other hand many rural areas in Anambra State lack access to infrastructure and facilities that are common in urban areas such as good hospitals; highways; water treatment system; quality education internet etc, all these are attributed to low population density, distance; rural wealth creation strategies often lack other kinds of assets, particularly human capital, for similar reasons and rural economic development strategies must take active participation of the communities involved into consideration.

Chambers (2007) opined that participatory ideas need to be applied to small scale development in ways that would allow the communities to be informed participants in development with external agents acting mainly as facilitators and sources of fund. Voices of other researchers such as Amos (2003) and Stanly (2003) have led to the inclusion of community participation as a crucial means of allowing the poor to have control over decisions. The inclusion of participatory element in development has been accepted and implemented by development agencies and the World Bank.

In Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) programmes, community involvement is also recognized and sought for in the design and implementation of development programmes since elected representatives most often not always take care of the interest of the poor and local councils. Lack the capacities to articulate people's development agenda; community's active participation is very necessary for sustainability. Programmes that fail to factor in these participatory ideals are ephemeral and unsustainable because communities do not see them as their own or have inputs in their designs and implementation.

Community participation according to Olukotun (2008) refers to a sort of partnership which is built upon the basis of dialogue among the various actors during which the agenda is jointly set and local vies/indigenous knowledge are deliberately sought and respected. The general principles of community participation include.

- Encouraging communities to take responsibilities
- Promote participation for all
- Reconcile different interests
- Examine the problem/situation from different points of views
- Adapting the programme/activity to local situations.

Most programmes of the Millennium Development Goals are meant to accommodate community participation. These programmes ranging from elimination of extreme poverty, malnutrition, infant mortality, maternal mortality, illiteracy and elimination of gender inequalities are believed to make more impact if community voices are heard both in the design and implementation of the projects. In line with the elements of good governance and participatory concept of Anambra State, for which the state is now known, and in order to maximize the benefits from very scarce resources, Anambra has enthroned participatory concept to give citizens a voice in how public funds are allocated and spent by the government (Anambra State MDGs Manual 2010). The widespread community participation and inclusiveness have become the hallmark of Anambra State Government (ANSG) as the state government meets regularly with opinion leaders such as traditional rulers, presidents general of town unions, church leaders etc. The Government (ANSG) interacts frequently with youths and regular visits to the 21 local government areas with 177 communities are remarkable examples of community participation and inclusiveness.

MDGs and Anambra State Integrated Development Strategies (ANIDS) share similar vision and both programmes have significant relationship. The beauty of ANIDS lies in its simultaneous development approach of all sectors. Indeed, the strategy is ensuring that with meticulous planning, community participation/demand driven, the government is able to identify budgetary gaps, some of which the state needs to fill with the support of its development partners (ANSG 2013). The outcomes of community participation and development partnership activities are contributing factors to the achievement of the MDGs in Anambra State of Nigeria.

A number of MDGs programmes have been designed and implemented in Anambra State since 2007. These programmes include construction projects such as schools, hospitals, skill acquisition centers, ventilated improved toilets, drilling water borehole/small town regional scheme. These programmes aimed at reducing extreme poverty, infant mortality, gender inequality, illiteracy and creating wealth. Regrettably, majority of these programmes that have been implemented did not achieve the desired result, as the facilities constructed under the programme are not patronized by the people they were meant to serve. There are a number of complaints that some of the programmes executed did not factor in the peculiarities of the indigenous community and that communities were not involved in the design and implementation of the MDGs programmes (Olukotun 2008). Government and development agencies on the other hand felt that some communities were being difficult to access and that the level of participation was not significant enough and this situation has created an imbalance between the donor agencies and government on one side, and benefitting communities on the other side (Oyasanya 2013). Similarly, according to information gotten from desk officer in the MDGs office, Anambra state government house, there are difficulties in getting communities involved in the programmes of MDGs in the state. As such, this study became very necessary and is therefore meant to “know the extent of community participation on these MDGs programmes in Anambra State and also to assess the effects of such participation level on the sustainability of the MDGs projects.

### **Research Question**

The aim of this study is to appraise the community's level of participation in millennium Development Goals (MDGs) programmes and the effects on rural wealth creation in Anambra state. in order to achieve that the following research questions are raised;

- i. What are the types of MDGs rural wealth creation programmes initiated and implemented in rural areas of Anambra State?
- ii. To what extent does community participate in the implementation of the MDGs rural wealth programmes?
- iii. Are there any effects of MDGs rural wealth programme/project on rural community development of Anambra State?
- iv. What are the constraints that limit community participation in rural wealth creation programs?

### **Study Hypotheses**

H<sub>01</sub>: Communities in Anambra State have not significantly participated in the initiation and implementation of MDGs rural wealth creation programmes.

H<sub>02</sub>: Community participation in the MDGs wealth creation programmes has no significant effects on rural community development in Anambra State

### **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

The collective action theory was adopted for this study. The theory was propounded by Mancur Olson in 1965 when he argued that any group of people attempting to provide a public good has troubles to do so efficiently and individuals have incentives to free-ride on the effort of others in particular groups.

#### **Tenets of Olson Theory of Collective Action**

The theory was built on the following tenets:

- (i) Collective action theory is the furtherance of common interest among group of individuals in a given place and this is contrary to traditional economic development models that often foster sense of competition within a region and group people;
- (ii) Since there is common interest, the theory emphasized on collective participation as the group will go down if it does not foster the common interest of its members through their joint efforts;
- (iii) The theory supports the facts that public goods bear common and collective benefits.

#### **Premise for the Application of Collective Action Theory to Community Participation in Rural Wealth Creation**

The relevance of Olson's theory to community participation in rural wealth creation of MDGs is based on the following premises:

- (i) Common interest is an idea behind community participation in rural wealth creation programmes of MDGs and collectively people in a given community worked together with common interest to achieve a common goals as against working alone and competing with each to achieve individual goals.

- (ii) If the community failed to actively participate collectively in the wealth creation programmes of MDGs, it will be difficult to achieve the MDGs goals. Therefore the theory emphasizes on joint efforts to achieve common goals.
- (iii) Common interest encourages collective action therefore collective action facilitates the attainment of common goals which also leads to common benefits. That is, communities will all benefit collectively from MDGs rural wealth creation (e.g.; physical capital, intellectual/human capital, financial capital; social capital and political capital etc) through their joint actions in Anambra MDGs programmes.

## METHODOLOGY

The study area is Anambra State. The state is located in South East of Nigeria with Igbo ethnic majority. The state was created on 27<sup>th</sup> of August 1991. Anambra State is known for its commercial activities and manufacturing of various products is the state play host to the largest market in West Africa (Onitsha main market) and while manufacturing company in Nnewi. Also, Anambra is endowed with a lot of mineral resources especially oil and gas and other Agro-based resources and activities like fishery, farming as well as land cultivated for pasturing and animal husbandry with 100percent arable soil as most of state inhabitant are living in rural areas of the state. Meanwhile Anambra State has total population of 4,055,048 (NPC 2006) with 21 local government areas and 177 communities. Also the state shared boundary with Delta state at west, Kogi state at the north, Enugu state in the east while Imo state in the south.

Since the population of study is 4,055,048 with 177 communities in 21 local government areas (LGAs) the state. The study population was drawn from adult population that are inhabitants of rural communities which are equally a member of any community based developmental organizations (with reference to town unions, youth group, and women groups) where MDGs wealth creation programmes have been implemented and executed. The study population is infinite which consists of adults that are inhabitants of rural communities and at the same time be a bonafide member of any CBOs (Town Unions, youth groups and women group) in which their organizations must have collaborated with MDGs in the execution of any projects. The researchers used multistage sampling technique to obtain manageable sample size of 10 members each from the 36 CBOs. Thus, 360 members was the sample size for this study. The data was analyzed to test for community level of participation in MDGs wealth creation programmes ( $H_{01}$ ) and level of MDGs rural wealth creation projects executed in rural communities ( $H_{02}$ ) while ANOVA was used to test for the effects of community participation on the successful execution of MDGs wealth creation projects.

**Data Analysis and Presentation**

Types of the MDGs Wealth Creation Programme/Project initiated and implemented

**Table 1: Distribution of responses on the types of MDGs wealth creation programmes/project initiated and implemented in Anambra State**

S/N	Indicators for MDGs Programmes/Projects	Mean	Std. Deviation	Decision
<b>Physical Capital Projects:</b>				
i.	Construction of access roads	3.4818	1.01034	Agree
ii.	Renovation and construction of school building	4.364	0.7492	Agree
iii.	Construction and renovations of hospitals	4.524	1.06042	Agree
iv.	Drilling of bore hole and pipe borne water projects	3.899	.99179	Agree
v.	Rural electrification	3.042	.80858	Agree
vi.	Establishment of agro allied industries	2.7491	1.06399	Agree
vii.	Provision of waste management and environmental sanitization equipments	3.3151	.87686	Agree
<b>Financial Capital Programmes:</b>				
viii.	Provision of financial grants to cooperatives	3.018	.95103	Agree
ix.	Purchase of micro enterprises equipment e.g.	3.234	1.0267	Agree
x.	Provision of startup capital to artisan and petty traders	3.569	.86953	Agree
xi.	Giving welfare fund and up keep fund to widow, elderly people and vulnerable groups	4.388	1.10605	Agree
xii.	Conditional cash transfer (CCT)	4.596	.9956	Agree
<b>Individual and Intellectual Capital:</b>				
xiii.	Youth and women empowerment programmes	4.069	1.02483	Agree
xiv.	Affordable universal Basic Education (UBE)	3.668	.83381	Agree
xv.	Capacity building and skills acquisition programmes	3.425	1.46925	Agree
xvi.	Combating HIV/AIDs, malarial and other diseases	4.174	.9936	Agree
xvii.	Reducing child mortality & improving maternal health	3.518	.6397	Agree
xviii.	Gender equality campaign	3.703	1.020041	Agree
<b>Grand Mean (<math>\bar{X}</math>)</b>		<b>3.703</b>		<b>Agree</b>

**Source:** Field Survey October, 2014

Table 1, shows the descriptive analysis that was deduced from 5 point likert measure with conventional standard mean of 3.0 where any variable equal or less than 3.0 was considered weak which indicated that the respondent agreed that MDGs wealth creation programmes/projects was initiated and implemented in their communities. Therefore, there was enough evidence (grand mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) = 3.703) that MDGs has initiated and implemented various wealth creation programmes and projects in the communities of Anambra State. Some of these wealth creation programmes and projects include; construction of access roads (3.4818); renovation and construction of schools (4.364); construction and renovations of hospitals



(4.524); provision of micro credit facilities (3.018) empowerment programmes (4.069); capacity building (3.425).

Thus, these rural wealth creation programmes and project initiated and implemented are in correlates with the vision of MDGs.

#### The Level of Community Participation in MDGs Programmes Initiation and Implementation

**Table 2: Distribution of responses on the level of community participation in MDGs rural wealth creation programme**

S/N	Community Participation Indices	Mean	Std. Deviation	Decision
i.	participation in the (design) development of project/programme plan	2.682	1.0334	Not involved
ii.	Involved in the evaluation of the projects	2.4031	0.2661	Not involved
iii.	Procurement of project materials	2.396	.90041	Not involved
iv.	Participate in community project identification	3.407	.7286	Involved
v.	Participate in project execution	2.846	1.06481	Not involved
vi.	Involves in the capacity building programme/training	4.332	.6334	Involved
vii.	Provision of part of the project fund	3.625	1.02019	Involved
viii.	Involved in the decision making process on the selection of contractor	2.384	1.18699	Not involved
ix.	Involved in the selection of site location for MDG projects	4.563	.04756	Involved
x.	Provide labour for MDGs projects	3.774	.080942	Involved
xi.	Provision of land for MDGs projects	4.826	.81665	Involved
xii.	Involve in the monitoring and maintenance of projects	3.537	1.02495	Involved
xiii.	Offer advisory services to MDGs on the community programmes	3.702	.94881	Involved
xiv.	Provision of security services to protect projects	3.881	.72268	Involved
<b>Grand Mean (<math>\bar{x}</math>)</b>		<b>3.2238</b>		<b>Involved</b>

**Source:** Field Survey October, 2014

Table 2 shows the result of how communities responded to the level of their participation in MDGs rural wealth creation programmes and projects. Therefore, the result revealed that the communities are not involved in some aspect of MDGs programmes and projects, such as development (design) of programmes and projects plan (2.682); evaluation of the projects (2.403); procurement of project materials (2.396); project execution (2.846); selection of contractors (2.384). meanwhile, to a significant level, the communities are involved in other aspects MDGs programmes and projects which include, capacity building programmes (4.332); counter part funding (3.625); selection of project site location (4.563); provision of labour

(3.774); monitoring and maintenance (3.57). As such, with grand mean of  $(\bar{x}) = 3.228$ , it was deduced that the communities in Anambra State participated to a significant level in the initiation and implementation of MDGs rural wealth creation programmes and projects.

### Test of Hypothesis One ( $H_{01}$ )

$H_{01}$ : Communities in Anambra State have not significantly participated in the initiation and implementation of MDGs rural wealth creation programmes/project.

$H_{A1}$ : Communities in Anambra State have significantly participated in the initiation and implementation of MDGs rural wealth creation programmes and project.

In order to affirm or reject the study hypothesis, descriptive statistics result table 2 was subjected to test with T-test statistics model and the result was presented in the table 3 below:

**Table 3: Paired Sample Test**

	Paired Difference					T-value	df	Sig. (2tailed) P-value
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error mean	95% confidence interval of the difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Paired actual 1 standard	.4261	.3479	.6684	49.681	.88362	4.392	14	.000*

\* Significance at 5% level of significance

### Decision

The 95% lower bound of mean difference is 49.681 while the calculated T-value was 4.392. Therefore, P-value equal to 0.000. As such the P-value (0.000) was less than conventional 0.05 at 5% level of significance. Thus, there is strong reason to reject the null ( $H_0$ ) hypothesis while the alternate ( $H_A$ ) was accepted. This implied that, the communities in Anambra State have significantly participated in the initiation and implementation of MDGs rural wealth creation programmes and projects.

These further strengthen the result of the descriptive statistics table 2 on the level of community participation in the programmes and projects that are meant for their development.

### Effect of Community participation in the rural wealth creation programmes of MDGs in Anambra State

**Table 4: Distribution of responses on the effect of MDG wealth creation programmes on rural community development in Anambra State**

S/N	Rural Development Indicators	Mean	Std. Deviation	Decision
i.	Good road network for easy evacuation of farm produce and easy accessibility for people	3.742	1.06641	Agree
ii.	Conducive learning environment for students as a result of classroom renovation and construction	4.689	1.18238	Agree



iii.	Reduction in child mortality rate and improve health care services delivery through construction, renovation and supply of health care facilities by MDG	4.016	.08666	Agree
iv.	Access to drinkable water through community water project of MDGs	3.871	.57331	Agree
v.	Improving business activities through steady rural electrification programmes.	3.036	.09248	Agree
vi.	Employment opportunities through establishment of agroallied industries	2.862	1.02043	Disagree
vii.	Maintain clean environment	3.012	1.08226	Agree
viii.	Reduced community poverty level by producing micro credit facilities and productive materials to the beneficiaries (e.g. grinding machine computer, hair dryer, sewing machines etc)	4.603	.69481	Agree
ix.	Reduced crime rate and socio vices among youth through various youth development programmes	3.614	.88072	Agree
xi.	Improved literacy level among beneficiaries through MDGs affordable universal basic education programmes	4.249	.64817	Agree
xii.	Enhanced self reliance and entrepreneurial ability among beneficiaries through MDGs capacity building and skill acquisition programmes;	4.333	1.32758	Agree
xiii.	Control and precaution of disease outbreak (e.g. Ebola, HIV, malaria etc) through NDGs rigorous awareness campaign	3.628	1.00662	Agree
xiv.	Facilities sense of inclusion and belonging among women through MDG gender equality programmes	3.157	.063368	Agree
xv.	Caring for vulnerable people (e.g. widow, elderly people and orphan)	3.084	.88463	Agree
<b>Grand Mean (<math>\bar{x}</math>)</b>		<b>3.4596</b>		<b>Agree</b>

**Source:** Field Survey October, 2014

Based on the descriptive statistics result on the above table 4, the table shows that the majority of the respondents (grand mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) = 3.4596) agreed to all the rural development indicators. Therefore, they agreed that community participation in MDGs rural wealth creation programmes and projects in Anambra State has significant effects on the rural development. These effects include good road network (3.742); conducive learning environment (4.689); improved health care delivery services (4.016); access to drinkable water (3.871); improved business activities (3.036), employment opportunities (3.862); reduction in community poverty level (4.603) etc. But the MDG lack capacity to provide employment opportunities (2.862) for the rural populace.

This result corroborates with MDG reports of (2012) on the contributions of MDG rural wealth creation effects on development.

### **Test of Hypothesis two (H<sub>02</sub>)**

H<sub>02</sub>: MGDs rural wealth creation programmes/projects have no significant effects on rural community development in Anambra State.

H<sub>A2</sub>: MGDs rural wealth creation programmes/projects have significant effects on rural community development in Anambra State.

In order to ascertain whether MDGs rural wealth creation programmes/projects have effect or not, the descriptive statistics result table 4 was subjected to analysis of variance test with SPSS version 20. Therefore, the result was presented in the table 6 below:

**Table 5: Summary of One Way ANOVA result**

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F-value	Sig. P-value
Between groups	.636	88	.6481	.68142	.020*
Within groups	8.0641	230	.4886		
Total	644.0641	318			

\* Significance at 5% level of significance

### Decision

From the result of the ANOVA table 5 above, the F-value was .68142 while the P-value was 0.020 both at 5% level of significance. Since the P-value (0.020) was less than the conventional threshold of 0.05, as such the researcher rejected the null hypothesis (H<sub>02</sub>) and accepted the alternate (H<sub>A2</sub>). Therefore, concluded that MDGs rural wealth creation programmes and projects have significant effects on rural community development in Anambra State.

This evidence further affirmed the result of the descriptive statistics result table 4.

### Hindrances to Community Participation in MDGs programmes

**Table 6: Distribution of responses on the challenges that hindered community participation in MDG programmes and projects**

S/N	Indices for Hindrances	Mean	Std. deviation	Decision
i.	Corruption among community leaders and government officials	3.281	1.07759	Agree
ii.	Disagreement among communities on the location of MDGs projects	3.824	1.04979	Agree
iii.	Lack of awareness and communities orientation	3.666	.94221	Agree
iv.	Government indifference	4.152	.98202	Agree
v.	Communities attitude to the acceptance of MDGs	3.738	1.01799	Agree
vi.	Absence of platform for community meetings	3.328	1.08537	Agree
vii.	Conflicts among different interest groups in the community	4.560	.86476	Agree
viii.	Poor funding of MDGs projects	4.362	1.00154	Agree
ix.	Abandon programmes and projects	4.501	1.08881	Agree

<b>x.</b>	Substandard projects and incompetency among contractors	3.753	.06894	Agree
<b>xi.</b>	Absence of stringent measures and sanctions for MDGs projects defaulters	3.064	.04474	Agree
<b>xii.</b>	Poor leadership and management in the community	2.584	1.01038 1	Disagree
<b>xiii.</b>	Lack/poor maintenance culture among community inhabitant	3.621	.06492	Agree
<b>Grand Mean (<math>\bar{x}</math>)</b>		<b>3.726</b>		<b>Agree</b>

**Source: Field Survey October, 2014**

With all indications the grand mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) = 3.726) from the above table 6 result, the table shows that community participation in MDGs programmes and projects was being hindered by various challenges. These challenges range from corruption (3.281); disagreement among communities (3.824); lack of awareness and orientation (3.66); communities' attitude (3.738); poor funding (4.362); abandon of programmes and projects (4.501). Meanwhile, the majority of the respondents only disagree that poor leadership and management in the community is not really a problem for their participation in MDGs programmes and projects.

This also corroborated the result of Ogunmola and Badmus (2010) as they revealed the challenges facing MDGs' programmes.

## CONCLUSION

The MGDs vision has a social dimension and was anchored on the basis of reducing poverty level, peaceful, equitable and developed society. Therefore, the realization of the MDGs vision (20:2020) was hinged on creating platform for the beneficiaries (community) to actively participate in the development programmes and projects that are designed for the purpose of promoting their livelihood. Because community participation in developmental projects and programmes is the assurance of the achievement (success) and sustainability of such developmental projects and programmes.

Based on the aforementioned findings, there is need to strengthen community participation in developmental projects and programmes. Therefore the researchers recommend the following policy implications:

- 1) The MDGs should trim down their rural wealth creation programmes and projects to a manageable size. This will enable the developmental agency (MDGs) to do more proactive, focused and give adequate attention to the pressing needs and aspirations of the beneficiaries;
- 2) Since the wealth creation programmes are targeted at the beneficiaries (community) the MDGs should endeavour to adopt Community Driven Development (CDD) strategy, where they will give the community (beneficiaries) more platform to actively participate, from initiation stage to the implementation stage that is before, during and after the execution of the projects and programmes. This will facilitates the attainment 9success) and sustenance of such developmental programmes and projects;

- 3) In order to strengthen positive effects of rural wealth creation programmes of MDGs. The agency (MDGs) needs to create employment opportunities among the rural inhabitants (participating communities). This will eventually reduce rural to urban migration and give them (beneficiaries) especially the youth means of livelihood that will totally eradicate poverty;
- 4) The issue of poor funding, abandonment, conflict of interest and corruption should be properly handled by the agency (MDGs). This will reduce waste of scarce resources, and create efficient utilization of both human and non-human resources, peaceful community and will also strengthen and encourage the community to participate actively in the developmental programmes and projects; and
- 5) Finally, the MDGs should set up management committees of various communities of intervention and also establish independent monitoring team that will evaluate the level of project implementation.

This will also boost community participation and strengthen the sustenance of the projects.

## REFERENCES

- Abani, C., Igbuzor, O. and Moru, J. ( 2005). Attaining the Millennium Development Goals in Nigeria: Indicative Progress and a Call for Action. In Moru. J. (Ed), *Another Nigeria is Possible: Proceedings of the First Nigeria Social Forum*. Abuja, Nigeria Social Forum.
- Chambers, R., and G.R. Conway (1992). "Sustainable rural livelihoods: Practical concepts for the 21st century." IDS Discussion Paper 296. Institute of Development Studies. Brighton, United Kingdom.
- Igbuzor, O (2005). Perspectives on Democracy and Development. Lagos, Joe-Tolalu & Associates.
- Igbuzor, O (2005). Review of 2005 MDG Report, Lagos, Robitos Alliance Publishers.
- Igbuzor, O (2011), Review of How Africans underdeveloped Africa by Joshua Agbo. Lagos, Robitos Alliance Publishers.
- Igbuzor, O (2012). Review of Sure and Steady Transformation. . Lagos, Robitos Alliance Publishers.
- Nigeria Millennium Development Goal Report (2010)
- Nigeria Millennium Development Goal Report (2011)
- Nigeria Millennium Development Goals 2005 Report.