International Journal of Geography and Regional Planning Research
Vol.7, No.2, pp.40-51, 2022
Print ISSN: 2059-2418 (Print),
Online ISSN: 2059-2426 (Online)

Residents' Perception on Community Participation in Infrastructure Development in Ido Local Government Area, Oyo state, Nigeria

[1]ODUNOLA, Olutayo Olaitan [2]MORENIKEJI, Timothy Oluseye [3]SALAWU, Ilyas Olawale [4]AYANKANMI, John Ayanyinka [5]OLORUNTOLA, Victor Adeniyi

[1,3,4,5]Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Nigeria.
[2]Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

Citation: Odunola, O.O., Morenikeji, T.O., Salawu, I.O., Ayankanmi, J.A., Oloruntola, V. A. (2022) Residents' Perception on Community Participation in Infrastructure Development in Ido Local Government Area, Oyo state, Nigeria, International Journal of Geography and Regional Planning Research, Vol.7, No.2, pp.34-45

ABSTRACT: *Community participation is a key factor in infrastructure development; it allows people to be part of developmental processes. This research assesses the perception of the residents' on community participation in infrastructure development in Ido Local Government, Oyo state, Nigeria.The study area was first clustered by using the ten (10) recognized political wards in the local government for delineation; a purposive sampling method was used to select two-fifth of the political wards, which amounted to four (4) wards that are more rural, using factors like proximity to the city center. A random sampling technique was used for the administration. A sample size of 0.132% of the 2020 projected population of the study area was used, which amounts to 196 respondents. The Likert Scale was used to analyse the perception of the residents using indices like the Participation Stage Index (PSI), Role Performance Index (RPI), Participation Impediment Index (PII), and Strategic Approach Index (SAI). Most of the respondents are aware of different forms of community participation. 'Informing' has the highest PSI of 4.05. The major role performed by community-based organizations is' 'serving as the public voice' with the highest RPI of 4.08. 'Lack of social responsibility" has the highest PII of 4.08. 'Process-based decentralisation strategies' have the highest SAI of 3.96. This research posits that citizens should be more civic by improving their social responsibility and that gender equality should be encouraged. The government, for its part, should establish a modern feedback platform and address the factor that is impeding people from participating in the development process through a suitable approach that promotes fairness.*

KEYWORDS: community participation, citizen participation, social inclusion, infrastructures, infrastructures development

INTRODUCTION

Infrastructure development is fundamental because it creates the basic conditions for a decent life (Suarez, 2018). Despite its importance, its deficit is more evident in the rural regions and remote areas of Nigeria, which calls for concern. According to Akinola (2007), 90% of the rural dwellers'

journeys are on unpaved roads, while 84% use bad roads, which increases travel time. The effect of this is a drastic reduction in the quality of life, dwindling economic activity, and the mass migration of rural dwellers into urban areas (Abumere et.al, 2002).

Lack of these infrastructures often affects the development of areas involved because they don't enjoy the same service as those living in urban areas or they pay more to access them. Provision of these facilities is also a yardstick in measuring the achievements of democratically elected leaders, as people see them as the foundation of good democratic governance.

Oyedele (2012) posited that the situation of available infrastructure, both quantitatively and qualitatively, is decaying, which either needs rehabilitation or replacement. The development of these infrastructures is more challenging because people find it difficult to access government. Other issues are finance, technology for development, maintenance, design, and quality requirements of projects to meet international standards and be sustainably developed.

The need to develop the basic amenities for rural areas should be considered as a part of an overall development which needs to include economic growth, the increase in health services, access to education and the community development itself (Abumere et.al, 2002). However, if the infrastructure is not aligned with the population's needs, its development can trigger social tension and conflict by inciting or exacerbating structural violence in the affected territories.

The term "citizen" has an inherently political meaning that implies a certain type of relationship between the people and their government. Citizens have a set of rights and responsibilities, including the right to participate in decisions that affect the public welfare. In addition to the intrinsic democratic value, participation is an instrumental driver of democratic and socio-economic change and a fundamental way to empower citizens (Aaron, 2020).

The matter of infrastructure development, specifically those that pertain to the provision and improvement of basic amenities in rural areas, has long been considered by the government. Several policies have been advocated and implemented to ensure that the much-needed development takes place. Many of these policies, however, have not seen the light of day. The significance of citizen participation in public policy processes has been acknowledged not only at the national but also at the international level (Golubovic, 2010).

Community participation is a process that provides individuals with an opportunity to influence public decisions and to be a component of the democratic decision-making process. It is against this backdrop that this study assesses the impact of citizen participation in community infrastructural development in Ido Local Government, Oyo state, Nigeria.

METHODS

Ido Local Government is experiencing the resultant effect of the outward expansion of Ibadan's main local governments, as it is currently transforming from rural to urban.

As published in the 2015 Directory of Polling Units (PUs) by the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC), it consists of ten (10) political wards, in which four (4) of the political wards were purposefully selected as the sampling frame.

Based on the 2006 national population figure, the population of Ido Local Government, as published by the Federal Government of Nigeria (2010), was estimated to be 103,261 people. The projected population of the study area in 2020 is 148,185 using Dotson's (2018) population projection formula of $Nt = Pe^{(r*t)}$. The growth rate of 2.58 according to the World Population Review (2020) was adopted. This implies that there is an increase of 44,924 people from the 2006 population as defined by the National Population Commission (NPC).

Daniel (1999) proposed the Sample Size Formula $n = N*X/(X + N - 1)$, which was used. In this case, $X = Z_{\alpha/2}^2 *p*(1-p) / MOE^2$. Based on this formula, the sample size for this study is 196 respondents, which represents 0.132% of the projected population of the study area.

A multi-stage sampling method was used. Firstly, the study area was first clustered by using the ten (10) recognized political wards in the local government for delineation. A purposive sampling method was used to select two-fifths of the ten (10) political wards in the local government, which amounts to four (4) wards that are more rural, using factors like proximity to the city center.

The questionnaire distribution ratio was based on the number of polling units (PUs) per the selected ward as presented in Table 1. All the catchment areas in each ward were covered. At this micro level, a systematic random sampling technique was used by first selecting the first building in proximity to the polling units (PUs), after which subsequent respondents were at the interval of the fifth building till the questionnaires allocated for each ward were exhausted. The questionnaires were administered to the household head, who could be male or female. One representative per building was selected in a building with more than one household.

Table 1. List of Polling Units Per Wards in Ido Local Government Area and Questionnaire Distribution.

Name	Catchment Areas	Polling Units Capacity of Selected Wards	Number of Questionnaires administered
Ward I	Aba Emo/Ilaju/Alako	5	27
Ward II	Akufo /Idigba/Araromi	6	33
Ward IX	Omi-Adio/Omi Onigbagbo Bakatari	12	65
Ward X	Ogundele/Alaho/Siba/Idi-Ahun	13	71
TOTAL			196

Source: Independent National Electoral Commission (2015) and Authors' Field Survey (2020).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-economic Characteristics of Respondents

The rural status of the study area is reflected in the gender distribution of the respondents as more than three-fourths (76.0%) are female while 24.0% are male, which means these people are the husband or wife of the family selected. In rural areas, male genders are expected to be the breadwinners in rural areas. This reflects on those available at the time of administering the questionnaires.

Eighteen years was set as a benchmark because that is the consent age in Nigeria (Premium Times, 2015); administering the questionnaires to the household heads is an influencing factor for this. Those between 26-35years account for the majority of the respondents (35.2%), while those between 35-45years, above 45years, and between 18-25years represents 25.5%, 20.9%, and 18.4%, respectively.

Community members who are well educated are expected to have a sense of equality on developmental matters. Those with secondary education made up the majority of respondents, accounting for 39.8% of the total, followed by those with primary education (31.1%), those with no formal education, and those with tertiary education (20.4% and 8.7%, respectively).

An overwhelming proportion of the respondents are married (81.6%), while 12.8% and 5.6% are divorced and widow/widower respectively. Nearly all the respondents are Yoruba (98.5%), while 1.5% are Igbo. This homogeneity shows the possibility of not having contradictory views about developments.

Traders account for the majority of respondents (44.9%); there is no disparity among those who are farmers and artisans, as they account for 26.5% and 26.0%, respectively. Those who are civil servants represent a small fraction of the respondents (2.6%). Ido Local Government, where this study was carried out, has inter-state boundaries with Ogun state. The rural nature of the selected wards is evident in the types of occupations their people are in. Occupation can also influence people's perceptions about the development process, which is a function of infrastructure development that will be of benefit to their occupation. For instance, an artisan needs electricity more for their work, they will prefer to support electricity network to hospital.

Half of the respondents earn between #30,000-#50,000 monthly. Those whose monthly income is less than #30,000 account for 34.2%, while those earning above #50,000 represent 15.8%.

The demand for infrastructure is a function of the population, as there is an increase in the number of users. Respondents with a household size of 1-5persons account for the bulk of the respondents as they represent 80.6%. Those with a household size of persons between 6-10 and above 10 represent 18.4% and 1.0%, respectively.

Since the focus of the study is community-based, asking about the period of stay is necessary to determine how knowledgeable the respondents are about the study area. Those living in the study area for a period of 6–10 years account for the majority of the respondents (36.2%). Forty-eighth (24.5%) of them have been living there for 11-15years, 19.4% have been living there for 1–5 years. Those who have lived there for more than 15 years and those who have lived there for less than one year account for 14.8% and 5.1%, respectively.We can use this to measure how knowledgeable they are about the area under the subject of discussion.

Table 2. Socioeconomic Characteristics of Respondents

		Ward							
		1		2		9		10	
Socioeconomic Characteristics		**F**	**%**	**F**	**%**	**F**	**%**	**F**	**%**
	Male	8	29.6	9	27.3	16	24.6	14	19.7
Gender	Female	19	70.4	24	72.4	49	75.4	57	80.3
	Total	**27**	**13.8**	**33**	**16.8**	**65**	**33.2**	**71**	**36.2**
	18-25years	0	0.0	4	12.2	14	21.5	18	25.4
	26-35years	6	22.3	7	21.2	29	44.6	27	38.0
Age Distribution	36-45years	8	29.6	11	33.3	15	23.1	16	22.5
	above 45years	13	48.1	11	33.3	7	10.8	10	14.1
	Total	**27**	**13.8**	**33**	**16.8**	**65**	**33.2**	**71**	**36.2**
	None	3	11.1	7	21.2	11	16.9	19	26.8
	Primary	6	22.2	14	42.4	18	27.7	23	32.4
Educational Level	Secondary	16	59.3	12	36.4	32	49.2	18	25.4
	Tertiary	2	7.4	0	0.0	4	6.2	11	15.4
	Total	**27**	**13.8**	**33**	**16.8**	**65**	**33.2**	**71**	**36.2**
	Married	13	48.1	28	84.8	60	92.3	59	83.1
Marital Status	Divorced	8	29.6	3	9.1	5	7.7	9	12.7
	Widow/Widower	6	22.3	2	6.0	0	0.0	3	4.2
	Total	**27**	**13.8**	**33**	**16.8**	**65**	**33.2**	**71**	**36.2**
	Yoruba	25	92.6	33	100.0	64	98.5	71	100.0
Ethnicity	Hausa	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Igbo	2	7.4	0	0.0	1	1.5	0	0.0
	Total	**27**	**13.8**	**33**	**16.8**	**65**	**33.2**	**71**	**36.2**
	Farming	3	11.1	7	21.2	19	29.2	23	32.4
Occupation	Trading	19	70.3	16	48.5	30	46.2	23	32.4
	Civil Servant	2	7.5	0	0.0	3	4.6	0	0.0
	Artisan	3	11.1	10	30.3	13	20.0	25	35.2
	Total	**27**	**13.8**	**33**	**16.8**	**65**	**33.2**	**71**	**36.2**
	Less than 30,000	5	18.5	3	9.3	17	26.2	42	59.2
Monthly Income (₦)	30,000-50,000	16	59.3	21	63.4	37	56.9	24	33.8
	above 50,000	6	22.2	9	27.3	11	16.9	5	7.0
	Total	**27**	**13.8**	**33**	**16.8**	**65**	**33.2**	**71**	**36.2**
	1-5	23	85.2	25	75.8	58	89.2	52	73.2
Household Size	6-10	4	14.8	8	24.2	5	7.7	19	26.8
	Above 10	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.1	0	0.0
	Total	**27**	**13.8**	**33**	**16.8**	**65**	**33.2**	**71**	**36.2**
	Less than 1year	0	0.0	3	9.1	1	1.6	6	8.4
	1-5years	5	18.5	9	27.3	6	9.2	18	25.4
Period of stay	6-10years	5	18.5	17	51.5	27	41.5	22	31.0
	10-15years	10	37.0	4	12.1	18	27.7	16	22.5
	above 10years	7	26.0	0	0.0	13	20.0	9	12.7
	Total	**27**	**13.8**	**33**	**16.8**	**65**	**33.2**	**71**	**36.2**

Source: Authors' Field Survey, 2021.

Appraisal of Infrastructures

The availability of infrastructure induces development. As revealed by 93.9%, there is an availability of schools in the study area as education provides stability. A hospital is available as posited by 90.3%. The Nigeria Health Facility Registry by the Federal Ministry of Health (2020) attests to this as there is a presence of primary and secondary healthcare facilities that are public and privately owned.

One hundred and seventy-six (89.8%) of the respondents said there is the availability of roads that support the mobility of goods and people. An electricity network is a gadget that connects the power supply from the producer to the consumers; this is available as revealed by 65.8%. People depend on water for domestic uses; 57.7% revealed that there is no availability of borehole or pipe-borne water in their vicinity. The totality of the respondents agreed that there is no presence of a library that should serve as an archive of knowledge in the study area. One hundred and seventy-five (89.3%) revealed that there was no presence of a public security service.

The bulk of the respondents (84.7%) said there was no presence of public space in their area. There is a presence of bridges, as revealed by 60.7% of the respondents, and also communication networks (73.0%). The totality of the respondents revealed that there is no public toilet.

Table 3. Availability of Infrastructures

Infrastructures	Availability					
	Yes		No		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
School	184	93.9	12	6.1	196	100.0
Hospital	177	90.3	19	9.7	196	100.0
Road	176	89.8	20	10.2	196	100.0
Electricity network	129	65.8	67	34.2	196	100.0
Borehole/Pipe borne water	83	42.3	113	57.7	196	100.0
Library	196	100.0	0	0.0	196	100.0
Public security service	21	10.7	175	89.3	196	100.0
Public space	30	15.3	166	84.7	196	100.0
Bridge	119	60.7	77	39.3	196	100.0
Communication network	143	73.0	53	27	196	100.0
Public toilet	0	0.0	196	100.0	196	100.0

Source: Authors' Field Survey (2021).

Appraisal of Community Participation

Community participation comes in different forms, like political, social, economic, and cultural. The totality of the respondents agreed that they are aware of political citizen participation, while 87.2%, 71.9%, and 65.7% revealed that they are aware of an economic, social, and cultural form of community participation.

From the perception of the respondents, the Participation Stage Index (PSI) was developed, which was adapted from the eight rungs of Arnstein's Ladder of Citizen Participation. The mean is 3.02.

'Informing' have the highest PSI of 4.05, which means people have the privilege to influence developmental projects for their social good. 'Placation' is the next stage of involvement as perceived by the respondents with a PSI of 3.98, which means the community might have been granted a limited degree of influence in a developmental process in the past.

'Manipulation' and 'therapy' have PSIs' of 3.77 and 3.17. 'Manipulation' is an illusory form of participation; 'therapy' means that the government in the past made the citizens see themselves as a problem, whereas it is the system that is not favourable.

As perceived, 'consultation', 'partnership', 'delegation' and 'citizen control" have values below the mean of 2.88, 2.39, 2.02, and 1.86, respectively. This means respondents don't see themselves at the stages of citizen participation. For instance, 'partnership', 'delegation' and 'citizen control' are the stages at the upper level of the rung in ascending order, which connotes that they don't have a good degree of control over developmental processes.

Table 4. Residents' Perception of the Current State of Infrastructures

Stages	Rating					*F*	SWV	PSI
	5	4	3	2	1			
Informing	415	200	159	20	0	196	794	4.05
Placation	400	196	162	18	4	196	780	3.98
Manipulation	375	164	150	40	10	196	739	3.77
Therapy	255	120	144	70	32	196	621	3.17
Consultation	225	100	126	60	54	196	565	2.88
Partnership	100	164	30	100	75	196	469	2.39
Delegation	25	40	150	100	81	196	396	2.02
Citizen control	0	36	144	92	93	196	365	1.86
Total								**24.12**

$\bar{x}$ = 3.02

Source: Authors' Field Survey (2021).

Community participation in decision making increases the level of acceptance of such a project. As revealed, 53.0% have participated in the decision-making on the provision of health facilities in their area, 50.7% in the electricity network, 49.2% in road construction, 46.1% in schools, 42.8% in bridges, and 29.2% in borehole/pipe-borne water provision. None of them has participated in the decision-making of a library, public security service, or public toilet.

Their opinions were further sampled to know which infrastructures they would like to be part of its decision-making in the future. The bulk of the respondents (75.6%) revealed that they would like to be part of the decision-making for the provision of borehole/pipe-borne water. 73.8% said

it was a road, 61.8% in the public security service, 60.2% in the electricity network, 51.0% in hospitals, 48.1% in the bridge, and 30.8% in schools. None of them want to be involved in the decision-making process for infrastructure such as a library, public space, or public toilet. These responses are a reflection of the desired infrastructure by the respondents in their respective communities.

In achieving their common goals, most communities do form Community-Based Organizations groups with a formal structure. An overwhelming proportion (76.8%) of the respondents affirmed the availability of at least one of these organizations in their community. The roles of these organizations were assessed from the perceptions of the respondents. To achieve this, the Role Performance Index (RPI) was developed. The mean is 3.61.

Serving as the public voice of the community is the major role played by the CBOs in the study with the highest RPI value of 4.08. The next roles performed are 'breaking barriers to development' and 'middleman for resources and actions' with RPI values of 4.02 and 3.84, respectively.

Respondents revealed that the CBOs do not 'provide technical and financial help to the community' and 'execution of socioeconomic development programs." These roles have the values of 3.09 and 3.01, which are below the mean. This connotes little performing or non-performing of the roles.

Table 5 Residents' Perception of the Roles of the Community Based Organizations (CBOs)

Roles	Rating					*F*	SWV	RPI
	5	4	3	2	1			
Public voice of the community	430	240	90	40	0	196	800	4.08
Breaking barrier to development	400	264	84	36	4	196	788	4.02
Middleman for resources and actions	375	216	114	38	10	196	753	3.84
Provide technical and financial help to the community	255	164	93	42	52	196	602	3.09
Execution of socioeconomic development programs	200	156	117	78	39	196	590	3.01
Total								**18.04**

$\bar{x}$ = 3.61
Source: Authors' Field Survey (2021).

Factors Affecting Community Participation in Infrastructures Development
In their study, Rajabi et al. (2015) developed some variables in the SWOT Analysis of citizen participation. Some of these factors were adopted in assessing factors serving as an impediment to full community participation in infrastructure development; based on this, a Participation Impediment Index (PII) was used with a mean of 3.29.

'Lack of social responsibility" has the highest PII of 4.08. This is a pointer that people are not satisfying their civic obligation, whose advantage is for the entire society. The next contributing factor is 'weaknesses of social cohesion' which reflects weak bonding among the community members. It has a PII value of 3.98.

'Lack of accountability' which is a clog in achieving goals, is the absence of trust in managing public funds and has a PII value of 3.95. 'Unclear role of people in the program" has a value of 3.74. Lack of clear communication results in this, which means people don't have a clear view of their terms of engagement in developmental processes.

'Discord in the society' and 'absence of regulatory mechanism' have PIIs' values of 3.72 and 3.69, respectively. The first shows a lack of oneness in achieving common ground on developmental issues, while the latter shows a vacuum of implementation tools.

As posited by the respondents, variables like 'creation of instability in constant change', 'fear of vandalism', and 'lack of modern citizenship status" are not factors responsible for passive community participation in infrastructure development in the study area, with PIIs' values of 2.48, 2.06, and 1.90, respectively.

Table 6 Perceived Participation Impediment Factors in Infrastructures Development

Factors	Rating					*F*	SWV	PII
	5	4	3	2	1			
Lack of social responsibility	420	248	93	38	0	196	799	4.08
Weaknesses of social cohesion	410	248	81	32	9	196	780	3.98
Lack of accountability	400	244	90	30	10	196	774	3.95
Unclear role of people in the program	360	208	96	60	10	196	734	3.74
Discord in the society	350	216	90	64	10	196	730	3.72
Absence of regulatory mechanism	330	220	132	22	20	196	724	3.69
Creation of instability in constant change	160	120	30	104	72	196	486	2.48
Fear of vandalism	80	36	81	124	82	196	403	2.06
Lack of modern citizenship status	0	68	99	120	86	196	373	1.90
Total								**29.60**

$\bar{x}$ = 3.29

Source: Authors' Field Survey (2021).

Strategic Approach Mechanism

Schiibeler (1996) identifies four (4) different approaches to implementing community participation. The Strategic Approach Index (SAI) was developed to measure this from the respondents' perception with a mean of 3.47.

'Process-based decentralisation strategies' have the highest SAI of 3.96. This approach aims to bring infrastructure management closer, which makes them a stakeholder in its decision-making process.

'Community-based support strategies' have a SAI value of 3.76; this approach allows community members to form the basic unit for organizing developmental activities. 'Area-based strategies' have a SAI of 3.48. The approach aims to have the appropriate inputs of people concerned in development activities, and it is more specific than community-based support strategies.

The respondents don't perceive 'functionally-based collaboration strategies' as a mechanism to be adopted in increasing community participation. Maybe because it entails self-management of infrastructure service provision, it has a value of 2.69, which is below the mean.

The bulk of the respondents (68.3%) opined that the government has to orchestrate the participation of the community in infrastructure development since they are the provider of these amenities. Meanwhile, 20.4% agreed that it is the community that should orchestrate the process. Those that revealed that individuals and private organizations should be the ones to initiate the process account for 9.2% and 2.1, respectively. There is no significant disparity between those who see themselves as stakeholders in the developmental process and those that do not, as they represent 51.2% and 48.8% of the respondents, respectively.

Table 7 Residents' Perception of Strategic Approach

Approaches	Rating					*F*	SWV	SAI
	5	4	3	2	1			
Process-based decentralisation strategies	355	248	159	10	5	196	777	3.96
Community-based support strategies	315	224	150	40	7	196	736	3.76
Area-based strategies	300	196	99	68	20	196	683	3.48
Functionally-based collaboration strategies	80	148	174	80	45	196	527	2.69
Total								**13.89**

$\bar{x}$ = 3.47

Source: Authors' Field Survey (2021).

CONCLUSION

This study evaluates the view of the respondents on community participation in infrastructure development in the Ido Local Government Area of Oyo State, Nigeria. In order to make meaningful efforts in engaging community participation in infrastructural development, the following suggestions were made, both for the government and the community:

The government, as the major provider of these amenities, should create an ICT platform where people can make their plight/desire known to those in authority. There should be a feedback response that the submitted inquiry was received for further action. This gives people hope that their request is under processing. Fairness should be used in achieving community engagement; it builds trust and gives people a sense of belonging. Also, the factor(s) that are preventing people from participating in the planning process should be addressed; the government should be closer to the people than ever before by implementing a friendly engagement approach(es).Awareness should be intensified about the importance of community participation in infrastructure development.

On the part of the community who are the beneficiaries of this infrastructure, they should be more civic by improving their social responsibility. Gender equality should be encouraged in this process; leveling ground should be provided for the female gender to be a partaker of the process.

References

Aaron, A. (2020). Citizen Participation Overview. *National Democratic Institute*, 5.

Abumere, S.; Okafor, S. & Oluwasola, O. (2002). Rural Infrastructure and the Develoment Process in Rural Nigeria. *African Journals Online*, 3-6.

Akinola, S. R. (2007). Coping with Infrastructural Deprivation through Collective Action Among Rural People in Nigeria. *Nordic Journal of African Studies 16(1):30-46*, 1-3.

Arnstein, S. (1969), A Ladder of Citizen Participation, AIP Journal, July, pp. 214– 216.

Daniel, W.W. (1999). Biostatistics: *A Foundation for Analysis in the Health Sciences. 7th edition, New York: John Wiley & Sons.* https://select-statistics.co.uk/calculators/sample-size-calculator-population-proportion/#:~:text=n%20%3D%20N*X%20%2F%20(,N%20is%20the%20population *accessed on 17/11/2020*

Dotson, J.D. (2018). *Formula to Calculate Population Projection.* https://sciencing.com/calculate-population-projections-8473012.html accessed on 17/11/2020

Federal Ministry of Health (2020). *Nigeria Health Facility Registry*. https://www.hfr.health.gov.ng/facilities/hospitals-search?_token=vflFxdV7eKBjugs5Col4B9yzfN883ikrArLSq3Zf&state_id=130&lga_id=1645&facility_level_id=0&ownership_id=0&operational_status_id=1&registration_status_id=0&license_status_id=0&geo_codes=0&service_type=0&service_category_id=0&entries_per_page=20&page=1 accessed on 19/04/2021

Federal Republic of Nigeria (2010). National Population Commission 2006 Population and Housing Census Priority Table Volume III

Federal Republic of Nigeria (2015). Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) Oyo state Directory of Polling Units https://www.inecnigeria.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/PU_Directory_Revised_January_2015_Oyo.pdf accessed 17/11/2020

Golubovic, D. (2010). An Enabling Framework for Citizen Participation in Public Policy: An Outline of Some of the Major Issues Involved. *The International Journal of Not-for-Profit Law*, 3.

Oyedele, O. A. (2012). The Challenges of Infrastructural Development in Democratic Governance. *TS01C - Construction Economics and Management I, 6119*, 3.

Premium Time (2015). FACT CHECK: Nigeria's Sexual Offences Bill stipulates 18 years, not 11 years, as age of consent. https://www.premiumtimesng.com/news/headlines/185851-fact-check-nigerias-sexual-offences-bill-stipulates-18-years-not-11-years-as-age-of-consent.html accessed on 19/04/2021

Rajabi, A.; Molaee, A.L. ; Farahzad, M. & Motaghi, S. (2015). Survey of the Strengths and Weaknesses Points of Citizen Participation in Urban Planning with Emphasis on Sustainable Development (Case Study of Tehran District 22). *Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Sciences*. 5(5S) pp. 375-384.

Schiibeler, P, (1996). Participation and partnership in Urban Infrastructure Management, World Bank, Washington.

Suarez, R. E. (2018). Development and Conflicts linked to Infrastructure Construction - Cepal. *Natural Resources and Infrastructure Division*, 2.

World Population Review (2020). Growth Rate of Nigeria. https://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/nigeria-population accessed on 17/11/2020