DETERMINANTS OF INFORMATION SOURCES UTILIZATION IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AMONG MALE RESIDENCE IN OVIA SOUTHWEST LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA, EDO STATE, NIGERIA

[1]Osabuohien, J.I. and [2]Alakpa, S.O.E.

[1]Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension Services, 08058814256
University Benin, Benin City, Nigeria Email: julius.osabuohien@uniben.edu
[2]Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension Services, Faculty of Agriculture and Agricultural Technology, Benson Idahosa University, P.M.B. 1100, Benin City, Nigeria.
Email: salakpa@biu.edu.ng Phone: 08032283864

Abstract
Information sources are known to influence persuasive efficiency and eventual utilization of innovation. This study assessed determinants of information sources utilization in community development (CD) in Ovia Southwest local government area of Edo state, Nigeria. Primary data were obtained from 72 males involved in community development with the aid of validated questionnaire and analyzed using descriptive and logistic regression. Higher proportion (34.7%) of respondents were in the age range of 30 to 39 years, 65.3% had household size of 5 to 10 persons, 44.4% of them had contact with extension agents once monthly while 90.3% of the respondents participated in farming. However they preferred borehole pipe borne, water ($\bar{x}$=4.16). Inadequate/lack of access to information sources was most serious constraint of respondents in sourcing community development information. Age (wald = 2.89; p< 0.05) and community development experience (wald = 3.40; p<0.05) of respondents were significant determinants of information sources utilization in community development. The study recommends regular use of seminars and conferences that community development information is not sourced from; also regular use of radio, farm and home visit, fortnight training (FNT) that respondent are presently sourcing community development information should be encouraged, improved upon and sustained for further community development.

Keywords: Information source, utilization, community development, constraints

Introduction
Community development (CD) can be understood as a planned effort to build assets that increase the capacity of residents to improve the quality of life (Green and Haines 2008). These assets may include several forms of community capital: physical, human, social, financial, environmental political and cultural. Community development according to Ozor and Nwankwo (2008) is a social process by which human beings can become more competent to live with and gain some control over local conditions and the changing world. Community development is a kind of development that emphasizes self-help by citizens and also initiates a people-directed process that is based upon their own perception of their needs (Ekong, 2010).

Information source has been known to influence persuasive efficiency and eventual utilization of an innovation and information is known to be the back bone of decisions that affect change in all areas. Though information dissemination is a major constraint to research efficiency and innovation transfer, a source which the audience holds in high esteem appears to facilitate persuasive efficiency and vice versa. People, especially the rural dwellers have been shown to respond particularly to specific sources they hold and consider such sources in high esteem, highly credible, expert, trustworthy and close to the people (Itari, Beshel, and Ukeme, 2015). The use of information from a particular source may be determined by the source credibility as indicated in some of the findings above. It may also be determined by the amount of confidence a particular source enjoys from the users of the information or how reliable that source is. Anyanwu, Agwu, and Umeweni (2008) is of the opinion that no matter how relevant information might be, if it is wrongly packaged or transferred, it will never reach the target audience successfully.

Ever since Nigeria gained independence in 1960, rural Community development has been declared a priority by the successive governments, be it civilian or military. In this regard, several organizations, institutions and agencies have been set up to undertake and monitor the complicated process of nation-building, development and integration. This post-colonial orientation is a deviation from the erstwhile colonial arrangement whereby development efforts in all spheres were concentrated in the urban areas to the neglect of rural areas.

It is universally accepted that the improvement in the living conditions of a population largely depends on the appropriate channel used in disseminating information to that population (Momodu, 2012). Recently, studies (Gashaw, 2016; Osabuohien and Koyenikan, 2019; Osabuohien and Okoedo-Okojie, 2022) have addressed women and youth involvement in community development and the occupational diversification for sustained rural livelihood by youths in Ovia North East Local Government Area in Edo State, Nigeria. Hence it has become expedient that male involvement be studied as a matter of justification to conduct basic research for policy

implementation in this direction. Hence the broad objective of this study is to investigate information source in community development among male rural dwellers in Ovia South West LGA of Edo State, Nigeria. The specific objectives were to examine:

    i.socio economic characteristics of respondents
    ii.identify current community development projects and preference by respondents;
    iii.ascertain respondents sources of information for community development;
    iv.identify constraints faced in sourcing information on community development

Methodology

This study was conducted in Ovia South West Local Government Area (LGA) Edo State, Nigeria State. Ovia South West LGA is located in the southern agricultural extension service zone of Edo State with an area of $2803km^2$, population of 135,356 (2006 Census). Agricultural information is widely spread in the LGA probably due to some key non-governmental agricultural institutions such Okomu O.P.C., and Michelle Rubber Plantation Plcs and government owned agricultural institutions.

Sampling: A multi stage sampling procedure was used in selecting respondents. The first stage is the selection of six (6) communities in the LGA. The second stage was a random selection: twelve (12) respondents from each community actively involved in community development, giving total of seventy two (72) respondents for the study.

Primary data for the study were obtained from 72 males involved in community development by means of questionnaire administered through interview schedule. Validation of the data collection instrument was accomplished through expert consultation with experts in the science of agricultural extension while reliability was ascertained through test-retest method. The instrument solicited responses on respondents' socio-economic characteristics such as age, education level, household size, contacts with extension (development) agents, annual income, community development experience. Community development information considered were: current community development project and preference, source of information on community development activities information.

Measurement of variables

Respondents' preference for community development projects was measured in a 5 point rating scale of highly preferred scored 5, preferred scored 4, undecided scored 3, low preference scored 2 and no preference scored 1. A mean score of 3 or greater than (3 ≥) was taken to mean that a particular community development project was preferred (5+4+3+2+1=15/5=3.0).

Respondents source of information for community development was measured in a 4 point rating scale of frequently used (used at least every 2 weeks)

scored 4, used (use at least every 2 months) scored 3, low use (use every 4-6months) scored 2, do not use at all scored 1. A mean score of 2.50 and above (4+3+2+1=10/4=2.50) was taken to mean that a particular information was frequently used by respondents.

Constraints to information sourcing was measured in a 5 point rating scale of very serious scored5, serious scored 4, undecided scored 3, not serious scored 2, and not a problem scored 1. A mean scored of 3.0> (5+4+3+2+1= 15/5=3.0) was taken to mean that a particular constraint was serious. A null hypothesis formulated for the study is that the socioeconomic characteristics of respondents do not significantly contribute to information sources utilization in community development.

Socioeconomic characteristics

Result in Table 1 showed that a higher proportion (34.7%) of the respondents were between 30 and 39years. This means that the respondents were relatively young and energetic and are likely to try out new ideas in community development in the use of different information sources for accessing community development information. This implies that they will be fit and willing to engage in more rigorous activities geared towards community development that aged people cannot and may not be ready to embark on. A higher proportion of the respondents (44.4%) had primary school education. The implication is that the respondents would likely take advantage of different information sources in accessing community development update for active involvement majority (65.3%) had household size of between 5 and 10 persons. The low level of education and large household size are characteristics of farming communities particularly in subsistence agriculture were the large family size is used as family labour on farmers (Siphesihle and Lelethu, 2020). A higher proportion (43.1%) had less than 10 years experience in community development activities, this is an indication that respondents are likely to appreciate information sources in an attempt desire to improve their own condition through self help. A higher proportion (44.4%) had contact with extension agents forth nightly meeting. This extension contact is regular enough to arouse interest for sourcing respondents as it can provide knowledge and information that will enable rural dwellers to understand and make decision about a particular community that development activity and then communicating knowledge to other rural dwellers.

A higher proportion (44.4%) of the respondents had contact with extension agents on a fortnightly basis. This level of contact will make the respondents acquitted with community development activities, this result degree with Table 3 as most frequently and highly used community development information sources.

Table 1: Socio-economic characteristics of respondents

Variables	Frequency	%
Age		
< 30 years	8	11.1
30 -39 years	25	34.7
40 -49 years	17	23.6
50 – 59 years	19	26.4
60 years and above	3	4.2
Household size		
< 5 persons	12	16.7
5-10 persons	47	65.3
11-15 persons	12	16.7
16-20 persons	1	1.4
21 and above		
Educational level		
No formal education	12	16.7
Primary school	32	44.4
Secondary school	20	27.8
Tertiary Institution	8	11.1
Estimate your monthly income		
<NGN30,000	9	12.5
NGN30,000 – NGN60,000	41	56.9
NGN60,000 -NGN90,000	19	26.4
NGN90,000 and above	3	4.2
How often do you have contact with development agents?		
Once weekly	3	4.2
Weekly	12	16.7
Monthly	25	34.7
Fortnightly	32	44.4

Source: Computed from Field survey data, 2022
**Multiple Responses given

Current community development projects and preference in the study area

Table 2 showed that seven (7) community development projects are currently ongoing in the study area. Most (90.3%) of the respondents participate in farming. However the most preferred was borehole pipe borne, water ($\bar{x}$=4.16), implying the water availability was likely an issue in the area.

Table 2: Current community development projects and preference

Current Programmes	Freq**	%	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	Std. Dev
Road	24	33.3	3.67*	0.07
Farming	65	90.3	3.51*	0.15
Market	6	8.3	3.92*	0.21
Electricity	2	2.8	3.46*	0.13
School rehabilitation	3	4.2	3.33*	0.32
Borehole, Pipe borne water	14	19.4	4.16*	0.24
Healthcare	3	4.2	3.65*	0.22

Source: Computed from Field survey data, 2022
*$\bar{x} \geq 3.0$ = high preference   **Multiple response

Respondents source of information on community development

Table 3 showed that the most frequent source of information on community development is forth nightly training ($\bar{x}$=2.63) followed by farm and home visit, and radio ($\bar{x}$=2.52). respondents are likely to take advantage of forth night training meetings as an

information source as it can offer opportunity for individual knowledge about the full spectrum of community work and help to value the community more by learning new skills it becomes easier to help the community and teach those skills to under privilege community members.

Table 3: Sources of information

Information sources	Mean($\bar{x}$)	Std. Dev
Radio	2.52*	0.74
Television	1.09	0.21
Computer	1.22	0.30
Farm and Home visit	2.52*	0.63
Newspaper	1.67	0.49
Magazine	2.16	0.55
Journals	1.21	0.02
Farm visit	1.03	0.31
Seminars	1.09	0.20
Agricultural programs	1.91	0.94
Workshop	1.06	0.06
Conference	2.43	0.77
Group discussion	2.04	0.48
Monthly review meeting	2.27	0.74
Forth night training	2.63*	0.59
Interview	1.54	0.15
Printed media	1.90	0.08
Circular letter	0.79	0.05
Posters	1.74	0.51
Extension films	2.10	0.09
Recorded video	2.44	0.41
Audio cassette	0.79	0.05

Source: Computed from Field survey data, 2022, *$\bar{x} \geq 2.5$ = Frequently used.

Constraints faced in sourcing information for community development

Table 4 showed that the most serious constraint faced by respondents in sourcing information for community development activities was lack of incentives (motivation and encouragement) ($\bar{x}$=3.83), followed by lack of access to information sources ($\bar{x}$=3.70), poor power supply (M=3.66) Inadequate access to funds ($\bar{x}$=3.57), High level of illiteracy ($\bar{x}$=3.07) through incentives might increase zeal to work, community development emphasis self help approach however incentives that are seen as unfair

can lead to resentment in teamwork and undermine cooperation, over time it may create a sense of entitlement, decreasing motivation and lowering performance, hence the development agent should enforce advisory service along this line. The respondent hence do not properly comprehend the principle of community development. These results are in consonance with the finding of Ikoro (2016) and Arokoyo (2003) that fund raising problems and high level of illiteracy among on formation uses respectively were major constraints that severely restrict information sources use in agriculture.

Table 4: Constraints in sourcing information

Constraints	Mean($\bar{x}$)	Std. Dev
Lack/inadequate interest to use ICT tools	2.16	0.61
Lack of awareness about information source	2.26	0.65
Lack of access to information sources	3.70*	0.72
High level of illiteracy	2.07	0.68
Lack of communication	1.06	1.31
Policy by government	3.57*	1.33
Inadequate provision of ICT tools	2.15	1.3
Poor power supply	3.66*	1.2
High cost of alternative power supply	1.98	1.44
Lack of incentives	3.83*	0.87

Source: Computed from Field survey data, 2022
*$\bar{x} \geq 3.0$ = Very serious

Determinants of Information Sources Utilization in Community Development

From Table 5, it was observed that age (wald =2.89) community development experience (wald = 3.40), years of formal education attainment (wald = 5.59) for community development. and all other socio-economic characteristics were all positive determinant of respondents information sources utilization in community development, that is, as each of the socio-economic variable increase, there is also increase in utilization of information sources for CD. However, only age (wald = 2.89; p<0.05) and CD experience (wald = 3.40; p<0.05) were statistically and significant determinants of information sources utilization at 0.05 level of significance, while years of formal education attainment (wald =5.59; p<0.o1) and all other variables were statistically significance at 0.01 level. The odd ratio of 8.25 for example for age the relationship is positive showing that older respondents are more likely to source community development information through choice sources than younger respondents by about 882%.

The overall prediction of 62.35% showed that the model predicts 62% of the response correctly. The R square (0.902) indicate that the explanatory variables jointly account for 90% respondents likelihood of information sources usage in accessing community development activities.

Table 8: Determinants of information sources utilization in community development

Variables	B	Std. Error	Wald	Sig	Odd ratio
Age (number of years)	2.11	0.73	2.89*	0.03	8.25
Comm.devt. experiences (years)	3.16	0.93	3.40*	0.04	23.57
Formal edu.(years)	2.18	0.39	5.59**	0.01	8.85
Household Size	2.92	0.66	4.42**	0.01	18.54
Annual income	3.17	0.43	7.37**	0.01	23.81
Contact with extension agents	2.85	0.47	6.06**	0.01	17.29
U = Error Term	11.32	2.18	5.19**	0.01	82454.34

Source: Computed from Field survey data, 2022
-2loglikehooood ratio= 118.932, R Square = 0.902, Prediction = 62.35%
**Significant at 0.01 level
*Significant at 0.05 level

Conclusion and Recommendations
The study concludes that all selected socio-economic characteristics of respondents involved in CD positively and significantly determined their utilization of information sources in actualizing community development activities.

Recommendations

Based on the study findings, the followings were recommended:

1. Regular use/conduct of seminars and conferences through which for now agricultural programmes and workshops for which now community development information is not sourced in the study area should be encouraged by government and relevant stakeholders in community development.

2. Also, regular use of radio, farm and home visit, fortnight training (FNT) through which respondent presently source community development information should be encouraged, improved upon and sustained by relevant stakeholders.

References

Anyanwu, A. C., Agwu, A. E. And Umeweni, C. A. (2008). Sources Of Agricultural Information Used By Women Farmers In Orumba Anambra State, Nigeria. *Asset: An International Journal. (Asset Series A.).* 2(1):97-104.

Ekong E. E. (2010), Rural Sociology (3rd Edition) Dove Educational Publishers.

Gashaw T., (2016). Constraints Rural Women Farmers Face In Utilizing Agricultural Extension Services In Bure Woreda, North Western Ethiopia. *Journal Of Radix International Educational And Research Consortium* 5(2): 1-13.

Green,G.P. and Haines, A. (2008). Asset building and community development second edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Itari, P. E, Beshel, C. A. and Ukeme, I. (2015). Indigenous Communication Media And Utilisation Of Development Information In Rural Communities Of South-South, Nigeria. *International Journal Of English And Literature (Ijel)*, 5(7): 85-96.

Ikoro D. E, Igbokwe E. M and Iwuchukwu J. C (2016) Constraints to Gender Participation in Rural Community Development in Abia State, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension Abstracted by*: EBSCOhost, Electronic Journals Service (EJS), Vol. 20 (1) June, 2016

Momodu O. M. (2012) Rural Libraries And Community Development In Nigeria, International Journal Of Basic, Applied And Innovative Research, Ijbair, 1(3):91-97.

Ogunjemilua A.A And Familugba J.O. (2015). The Contributions Of Nigeria Women Towards National Development *International Journal For Innovation Education And Research* l(3):5.

Ozor, N And N. Nwankwo. (2008). The Role Of Local Leaders In Community Development Programmes In Ideato Local Government Area Of Imo State: Implication For Extension Policy Department Of Agricultural Extension University Of Nigeria, Nsukka *Journal Of Agricultural Extension* 12 (2).

Osabuohien, J.I and Koyenikan, M. J (2019). Peri-urban women participation in group community development activities in Ovia northeast local government area of Edo State, Nigeria *Agricultural Economics and Extension Research Studies* 7(1): 13-20

Osabuohien, J. I. and Okoedo-Okojie, D. U. (2022). Socioeconomic characteristics as correlate of male youth involvement in community development: implication for extension communication *Nigerian Journal of Agriculture, Food and Environment* 18(1): 1-7

Siphesihle Q. and Lelethu M. (2020). Factors affecting subsistence farming in ruralAreas of Nyandeni local municipality in the Eastern Cape Province S.Afr. Jnl.Agric.Ext.48(2): 2 Access on 13th September,2023 from http://dx.doi.org/10.17159/2413-3221/2020/v48n2a540