*Ondo University Journal of Agriculture and Social Sciences 2024, 2(1): 1–7*

GLINTPLUS

***Original Article***

# Rural-urban interactions and rural dwellers' participation in community-based projects in Edo and Ondo States, Nigeria

Oluwafolakemi A. Olaniyan[a,*] and James O. Okunlola[2]

[a] Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, P.M. B. 001, Nigeria; [b] Department of Agricultural Extension and Communication Technology, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Nigeria

## ABSTRACT

The Nigerian government has intervened in improving the conditions of the rural areas in Nigeria in various ways, but the desired improvement in the infrastructural condition of most of these areas seems to be a mirage. This study examines the effects of rural-urban interactions on rural dwellers' participation in community-based projects in Edo and Ondo States, Nigeria. The quantitative method of data collection through a structured, validated and reliable interview schedule was used to elicit information from 300 respondents across the two states. Focus Group Discussion was also conducted. Findings from the study revealed that the community-based projects mostly provided in the study area based on rural-urban interactions were the donation of books to schools (96%) and the building of classrooms in community schools (84%). More than half (61.7%) of the respondents indicated a high level of participation in the projects based on rural-urban interactions. Moreover, a positive and significant relationship exists between each type of project; educational projects ($r = 0.500$, $p = 0.000$) and respondents' level of participation in community-based projects. The study concludes that the respondents' rural-urban interactions are favourable to their participation in community-based projects. Therefore, the study recommended that the favourable perception of rural-urban interactions should be leveraged to promote the provision of community-based projects in other communities of Nigeria.

## HIGHLIGHTS

- Studied rural-urban interactions in Edo and Ondo States, Nigeria.
- Rural-urban interactions involve flows of goods, people, info.
- Community participation uses voluntary efforts for amenities.
- Participation helps rural people solve local development issues.

***Article History:***
Received: 19th July, 2024
Accepted: 5th August, 2024
Available online: 27th September, 2024

***Keywords:***
*Rural-urban interactions, rural dwellers, participation, community-based projects*

## 1. Introduction

Rural development and agricultural development are prerequisites for stimulating economic growth and poverty alleviation in developing countries of Africa such as Nigeria in which the rural economy is almost solely dependent on agriculture (IFAD, 2022). This arises from the fact that a large proportion (70%) of her populace is domiciled in rural areas and primarily engaged in agriculture as their source of livelihood (Egwemi & Odo, 2013; Matthew, Abraham & Adefemi, 2015). In the same vein, the World Bank (2022) reported that Nigeria is still tagged developing country with about 70% of its populace domiciled in rural areas and primarily engaged in agriculture. Moreover, previous estimates showed that the rural population which constitutes about 70% of the entire population of over 170 million people is neglected in terms of infrastructural development and this has in turn made most of the rural areas in the country qualitatively and quantitatively depopulated and progressively less attractive for socio-economic advancement (Laah, Abba, Ishaya and Gana, 2013). This according to Samuel, Mshelia and Njamba (2018) points to the relevance of self-help projects in providing basic supportive infrastructure such as electricity supply, markets, good access roads and affordable transport systems as well as improved agro-allied industry in Nigeria. This indicates that a risky gap exists between the urban and the rural areas in terms of their level of development. This gap is further exacerbated by the failure of policymakers and development planners to harness the potential of the interdependence of urban and rural areas in that urban problems cannot be solved unless those of the rural areas are contained (Tacoli & Satterthwaite, 2014 & Agergaard, Tacoli, Steel & Sinne, 2019). Gebre (2019) submitted that rural and urban areas co-exist along a continuum with multiple types of interactions which include the flow of people, agricultural commodities and other commodities from the rural-based producers to the urban markets (out-flow rural-urban interaction) and the flow of manufactured and imported goods from urban centres to rural settlements, flow of people, flow of information,

* CONTACT: O. A. Olaniyan; feludayo@gmail.com; Dept. of Agric. Ext. and Rural Dev., Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Nigeria
https://doi.org/10.52493/j.oujas.2024.1.103

financial and credit flow from urban-based institutions to the rural areas( in-flow rural-urban interaction). Corroborating this, IFAD (2015) avowed that while it is estimated that nearly 70 percent of the world's population will be living in urban areas by 2050, it is important to recognize that urban and rural areas cannot succeed without each other. This implies continuous interactions between the two centres especially in terms of supply and dependence on raw materials and other services from the rural areas (Fombe & Balgah, 2012). Consequently. Ogwumike (2013) posited that community participation connotes the utilization of the voluntary and concerted efforts of the members of a community to provide some basic amenities within the community. It involves sensitization, mobilization and organization of like-minded people with initiatives, self-direction, integrity and fore- sightedness for effective project conception, selection and implementation. Community participation in community development initiatives enables the rural people to identify problems and prioritize them to devise and design locally acceptable solutions to the problem. Community participation makes it easier for rural dwellers to identify priority among contending needs such as improvement in income, employment opportunities, and access to credit, portable water and other basic infrastructural facilities. This gives the rural dwellers a sense of belonging in ensuring the success of the projects.

However, worthy of note is that rural areas in Nigeria still battle the problem of lack or shortage of basic amenities despite several interventions by successive regimes in the country. This is an indication of the failure of these laudable interventions to accelerate the development of the rural sector. World Bank Report (2022) showed that Nigeria contributed 3 million (12.9%) people to the global extreme poor with about 44.7 million men and 43.7 women living on less than 1.90 U.S. dollars a day respectively. Correspondingly, the Human Development Report (2022) revealed that Nigeria is one of the poorest among the poor countries of the world with a Human Development Index (HDI) value of 0.534 and the global highest number of kids (at least 10.5 million) out of formal schools. This, therefore, calls for the need to explore the effects of rural-urban interactions on rural dwellers' participation in community-based projects. The study specifically:

1. characterized the types of community-based projects participated in by the respondents based on rural-urban interactions;
2. indicated the rural dwellers' level of participation in the community-based projects;
3. assessed the level of satisfaction derived by the respondents from their types of rural-urban interactions (out-flow and in-flow); and
4. determined respondents' perception of the effects of their types of rural-urban interactions (out-flow and in-flow) on their participation in CBPs;

The study hypothesized that: $H_{o1}$) there is no significant relationship between each type of community-based project executed in the study area and rural dwellers' level of participation in the projects, ii. $H_{o2}$) there is no significant difference in the respondents' types of rural-urban interactions (out-flow and in-flow) and satisfaction derived.

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1. Study Area

The study was conducted in Edo and Ondo States, Nigeria. Edo State which is one of the six States that made up the South-South geopolitical zone was excised from the former Bendel State. It lies approximately between longitude 6˚04'E and 6˚43'E of the Greenwich Meridian and latitude 5˚44'N and 7˚34'N of the equator. It is bounded in the South by Delta State, in the North by Kogi State, in the East by River Niger and Anambra and in the West by Ondo State. The national population estimate put the population of Edo State at 4,777,000 people with about 39.2% of the population being urban (Ojeifo, Joseph and Eseigbe, 2013). Secondary and tertiary activities such as commerce, industry and social services are highly engaged in the area but the dominant occupation of the people is agriculture. This has been favoured over time by the rich and well-drained sandy loam soil which retains the advantage of good food and cash crop production. The vegetation comprises forest in the south, savannah in the north and mixed or derived savannah in the central part of the state. Edo state is made up of several settlements most of which are rural. The distinct relief regions in Edo State include the Swamps/Greeks, the Esan Plateau and the dissected uplands of Akoko-Edo Local Government Area. The climate of Edo State is typically tropical with two major seasons: wet and dry. Ondo State is also one of the six States that make up the South West geopolitical zone of Nigeria and covers an area of approximately 15,049 square kilometres. It lies at latitude 7° 10' North and longitude 5° 05' East and has a population of 5, 316,600 (National Population estimate, 2022) and a population density of 353.3 people per square kilometre. It accounts for 2.5% of Nigeria's total population. Ondo State falls within the tropical humid climate that is characterized by wet and dry seasons. The average annual rainfall is about 1,220mm with a yearly relative humidity of 76.05, while the monthly minimum and maximum temperature ranges between $22.49^0$ and $26.6^0$C respectively. Furthermore, the dry season is short lasting from December to February. Agriculture is the traditional occupation of the people with a significant percentage of the State's labour force engaging in farming. Cocoa is the dominant cash crop grown in Ondo and other crops cultivated for domestic consumption include yam, cassava and oil palm. The main minerals found in Ondo State include iron ore, granite, quartz, coal, tin, marble and petroleum. Some agro-allied industries are located in the state. The people are also known for their bronze works and iron carvings. The tourist attractions include Idanre Hills and the caves of ashes at Isharun.

### 2.2. Sampling procedure and sample size

Multi-stage sampling procedure was used to select respondents for this study. At stage 1, three local government areas were purposively selected from each of the two States based on their classification as rural and the presence of community-based projects in the area. This gave a total of six local government areas in all. In stage 2, five villages were randomly selected from each of the local government areas using the list of the available community-based projects and their location in the selected villages as the sampling frame. Therefore, a total of 30 villages were selected across the two states. In stage 3, ten rural dwellers were randomly selected and interviewed from each of the villages based on their rural-urban interactions and participation in community-based projects within their villages. A total of 300 rural dwellers respondents were selected across the 30 sampled villages in the two States. Primary data were collected from the respondents through the use of a structured, validated and pre-tested interview schedule. Additional information was gathered from the respondents through Focus Group Discussion (FGD). The secondary source of information was gathered from existing literature, publications in journals and conference proceedings, the internet and reports relevant to the study.

### 2.3. Measurement of variables

***Types of community-based projects undertaken due to rural-urban interactions***

Types of CBPs were measured by giving a list of community-based projects provided based on rural-urban interactions in their communities and asking the respondents to indicate the ones they have participated in due to their interactions on a two-point scale of yes (1) and no (0).

***Respondents' level of participation in the community-based projects***

Respondents' level of participation in the community-based projects was assessed on a three-point scale of high, moderate

***Table 1.*** *Distribution of the respondents based on Community-based projects participated in due to rural-urban interactions*

| Community Based projects | Participated CBPs | Level of participation in CBPs | | | $\bar{x}$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes * | High | Moderate | Low | |
| Educational projects | | | | | |
| Donation of books to community schools | 288(96.0) | | | 33(11.5) | 2.166* |
| Building of classroom | 252(84.0) | 74(29.6) | 127(50.4) | 51(20.2) | 1.770* |
| Establishment/ equipping of school library | 21(7.0) | 0 | 20(95.2) | 1(4.8) | 0.186 |
| Donation of computer sets to schools | 127(42.3) | 24(18.9) | 86(67.7) | 17(13.4) | 0.643* |
| Giving scholarships and bursaries to indigents | 11(3.7) | 0 | 4(36.4) | 7(63.6) | 0.096 |
| Organising seminars/talks/ workshops for students | 29(9.7) | 4(13.8) | 15(51.7) | 10(34.5) | 0.170 |
| Paying community Teachers | 71(23.7) | 8(11.3) | 37(52.1) | 26(36.6) | 0.413* |
| Health projects | | | | | |
| Provision of drugs and vaccines to basic health centres | 113(37.7) | 41(13.7) | 52(46.0) | 20(17.7) | 0.641* |
| Construction of basic health centres | 168(56.0) | 49(29.2) | 103(61.3) | 16(9.5) | 1.196* |
| Supply of health equipment to health centres | 76(25.3) | 15(19.7) | 40(52.6) | 21(27.6) | 0.416* |
| Paying patients' medical bills | 8(2.7) | 3(37.5) | 3(37.5) | 2(25.0) | 0.056 |
| Organising health talks and campaigns | 77(25.7) | 5(6.5) | 48(62.3) | 24(31.2) | 0.456* |
| Water projects | | | | | |
| Sinking of boreholes in the community | 142(47.3) | 107(75.4) | 22(15.5) | 13(9.2) | 1.260* |
| Digging of wells in the community | 85(28.3) | 64(75.3) | 21(24.7) | 0 | 0.780* |
| Dredging of community streams or rivers | 83(27.7) | 44(53.0) | 39(47.0) | 0 | 1.163* |
| Transportation projects | | | | | |
| Grading of community road | 78(26.0) | 0 | 43(55.1) | 35(44.9) | 0.166 |
| Clearing of road path and waterways | 95(31.7) | 36(37.9) | 42(44.2) | 17(17.9) | 0.076 |
| Construction of feeder roads | 7(2.3) | 0 | 5(71.4) | 2(28.6) | 0.046 |
| Construction of bridges/fly over/culvert | 10(3.3) | 0 | 8(80.0) | 2(20.0) | 0.066 |
| Erection of bus stop sheds | 23(7.7) | 1(4.4) | 15(65.2) | 7(30.4) | 0.133 |
| Drainage projects | | | | | |
| Construction of gutter | 92(30.7) | 29(31.5) | 45(48.9) | 18(19.6) | 0.830* |
| Construction of drainage culvert | 86(28.7) | 11(12.8) | 45(52.3) | 30(34.9) | 0.716* |
| Dredging of canals in the community | 101(33.7) | 28(27.7) | 34(33.7) | 39(38.6) | 0.713* |
| Market &Economics Projects | | | | | |
| Construction of lockups shops | 17(5.7) | 3(17.6) | 11(64.7) | 3(17.6) | 0.103 |
| Erection of kiosk | 56(18.7) | 13(23.2) | 32(57.1) | 11(19.6) | 0.030 |
| Provision of market sheds | 42(14.0) | 8(19.0) | 26(61.9) | 8(19.0) | 0.173 |
| Creation of rural industry/Skill acquisition | 63(21.0) | 7(11.1) | 43(68.3) | 13(20.6) | 0.366 |
| Establishment of community bank | 19(6.3) | 2(10.5) | 13(68.4) | 4(21.0) | 0.033 |
| Security projects | | | | | |
| Establishment of vigilante group | 42(14.0) | 19(45) | 20(47.6) | 3(7.1) | 0.406* |
| Donation of security equipment | 30(10.0) | 5(16.7) | 15(50.0) | 10(33.3) | 0.223 |
| Involve in intelligence gathering | 15(5.0) | 3(20.0) | 7(46.7) | 5(33.3) | 0.100 |
| Payment/subsidizing of monthly security fee | 10(10.0) | 2(20.0) | 5(50.0) | 3(30.0) | 0.093 |
| Social development projects | | | | | |
| Construction of civic centre | 44(14.7) | 16(36.4) | 21(47.8) | 7(15.9) | 0.200 |
| Establishment of museum | 17(5.7) | 2(11.8) | 3(17.6) | 12(70.6) | 0.046 |
| Building of tourist centre | 25(8.3) | 5(20.0) | 14(56.0) | 6(24.0) | 0.210 |
| Erection of town halls | 180(60.0) | 76(42.2) | 66(36.7) | 38(21.1) | 0.933* |
| Waste management | | | | | |
| Construction of public toilet | 70(23.3) | 19(27.1) | 38(54.3) | 13(18.6) | 0.110 |
| Erection of incinerator | 43(14.3) | 7(16.3) | 15(34.9) | 21(48.8) | 0.093 |
| Provision of waste disposing materials | 198(66.0) | 84(42.4) | 69(54.8) | 45(22.7) | 0.810* |
| Voluntary sanitation of the community | 193(64.3) | 95(49.2) | 52(26.9) | 43(22.3) | 0.876* |

*Values in parentheses represents percentage; *Multiple responses; Grand mean = 0.405*

and low participation. A high level of participation was coded as 3, moderate as 2 and low as 1. Categorisation as high participation was determined at a value of >2.00.

***Respondents' level of satisfaction derived from out-flow and in-flow rural-urban interactions***

Respondents were asked to indicate the level of satisfaction derived on a three-point scale of very satisfied (3), just satisfied (2) and not satisfied (1). High at satisfaction value >2.00.

***Rural dwellers' perception of the effects of their out-flow and in-flow rural-urban interactions on their participation in CBPs***

This variable was measured by asking the respondents to respond to 20 perception statements on the effects of their forms of rural-urban interactions on a 5-point Likert scale of Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree and Strongly Disagree. This was coded for positive statements as SA = 5, A = 4, U = 3, D = 2, SD = 1 and was reversed for negative statements.

### 2.4. Data analysis

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used in this study. Descriptive statistics used include frequency distribution, percentages, mean and standard deviation while the inferential statistics utilized include Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) and t-test. Hypothesis one was tested using Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) while two were tested using t-test.

## 3. Results and Discussion

### 3.1. Types of Community-based projects participated in due to rural-urban interactions

Results in Table 1 indicate that the community-based projects participated in based on the respondents' rural-urban interactions were donation of books to community schools (96%), building of classrooms (84%), voluntary sanitation of the community (64.3%), erection of town halls (60%), construction of health centres (56%), sinking of borehole(47.3%), donation of computer sets to community schools (42.3%), provision of drugs and vaccines (37.7%), dredging of canals (33.7%) and construction of gutters (30.7%). Moreover, the result in Table 1 also shows that the level of participation was high for donation of books to community schools ($\bar{x}$ = 2.166), building of classroom ($\bar{x}$ = 1.770) and Construction of basic health centres ($\bar{x}$ = 1.196). This observation was buttressed by the community male and female groups at Egbetta village in Edo State during the Focus Group Discussion that:

***Table 2.*** *Distribution of the respondents based on the level of participation in the community-based projects due to rural-urban interactions*

| *Level of participation* | *Frequency* | *Percentage (%)* |
|---|---|---|
| *High* | *181* | *61.7* |
| *Low* | *115* | *38.3* |

** High at >2.00*

***Table 3.*** *Distribution of the respondents based on the level of satisfaction derived from their types of rural-urban interactions (out-flow and in-flow)*

| *Rural-urban interactions (out-flow to urban) statements* | *Level of satisfaction* | | | $\bar{x}$ | *SD* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *VS* | *JS* | *NS* | | |
| *I interact with urban areas because of the possibility of securing better employment opportunities* | *121(56.0)* | *71(32.9)* | *24(11.1)* | *2.44* | *0.68* |
| *I believe that urban areas will offer me access to a great economic transaction* | *161(77.0)* | *41(19.6)* | *7(3.3)* | *2.78** | *0.51* |
| *There are better opportunities for training and skill acquisition in the urban centres than in rural areas* | *147(66.8)* | *68(30.9)* | *5(2.3)* | *2.64** | *0.52* |
| *I stand the chance of getting better contracts from affluent people in the cities* | *87(56.9)* | *59(38.6)* | *7(4.6)* | *2.52* | *0.58* |
| *Rural-urban interaction is an opportunity for me to visit my family and relations in the cities* | *158(65.6)* | *81(33.6)* | *2(0.8)* | *2.64** | *0.49* |
| *It serves as a forum for meeting people in clubs and societies.* | *95(53.1)* | *80(44.7)* | *4(2.2)* | *2.50* | *0.54* |
| *It could be a germane avenue for the exchange of environmental goods and amenities* | *67(46.2)* | *78(53.8)* | *0* | *2.46* | *0.50* |
| *I expect that the cities will be stocked with improved infrastructures and public utilities than rural areas* | *157(67.4)* | *72(30.9)* | *4(1.7)* | *2.65** | *0.51* |
| *The abundance of private utilities and services in the cities could also promote people's welfare* | *143(64.1)* | *72(32.3)* | *8(3.6)* | *2.60** | *0.55* |
| *In this era of technology, I am of the opinion that interaction with urban areas will expose me and my children to modern technologies and ideas for livelihood and community development* | *144(60.8)* | *81(34.2)* | *12(5.1)* | *2.55* | *0.59* |
| *Rural-urban interactions (in-flow to rural)* | | | | | |
| *As for me, rural areas are peaceful unlike the experience in the urban areas due to congestion* | *214(79.3)* | *54(20.0)* | *2(0.7)* | *2.78** | *0.42* |
| *As an entrepreneur, I see rural areas as an avenue to market my products as well as contribute my own quota to community development as there are fewer competitors* | *119(72.6)* | *41(25.0)* | *4(2.4)* | *2.70** | *0.50* |
| *Living with one's community members could foster love, security and a sense of belonging among the people* | *141(59.0)* | *84(35.1)* | *14(5.9)* | *2.53* | *0.60* |
| *Back at home, I could use the knowledge gained in the urban area to reinforce my people for community development* | *183(86.7)* | *25(11.8)* | *3(1.4)* | *2.85** | *0.39* |
| *I would enjoy better access to irreplaceable rural goods and services back at home* | *155(82.4)* | *25(13.3)* | *8(4.3)* | *2.73** | *0.50* |
| *It could serve as an avenue for me to teach my children our culture and their history* | *174(80.6)* | *42(14.0* | *0* | *2.80** | *0.39* |
| *As a philanthropist, my returning home could attract development to my village due to the donations of my friends and community members in the cities* | *75(62.5)* | *42(35.0)* | *3(2.5)* | *2.60** | *0.54* |
| *I earn respect from my people as they always consult me for advice, and this as reduce idleness* | *115(56.1)* | *79(38.5)* | *11(5.4)* | *2.50* | *0.59* |
| *My returning home is a means of keeping me close to nature* | *63(39.6)* | *86(54.1)* | *10(6.3)* | *2.33* | *0.59* |
| *There is a tendency to save more money for community development in rural area as the cost of living is low* | *166(64.6)* | *72(28.0)* | *19(7.4)* | *2.57* | *0.62* |

*VS (Very Satisfied JS (Just Satisfied) NS (Not Satisfied); Figure in parentheses represents percentage; Grand mean = 2.60*

***Table 4.*** *Categorization of the respondents based on the level of satisfaction derived from the motivational factors for rural-urban interactions.*

| Level of satisfaction | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| High | 161 | 53.7 |
| Low | 139 | 46.3 |

** High at satisfaction value >2.00*

*"the high level of participation recorded for these projects was based on the ability of these projects to improve the educational standard of their children" and reduce the rate of erosion in their community*

Correspondingly Ogunleye-Adetona (2010) in an earlier study discovered that rural dwellers participated more in building town halls, building schools and construction of health centres than others like processing facilities and transportation. The high availability of educational facilities could account for the high literacy level discovered in the study area.

### 3.2. Respondents' level of participation in the various community-based projects

Results in Table 2 show that more than half (61.7%) of the respondents indicated that their level of participation in these projects based on rural-urban interactions was high. This implies that rural dwellers often participate in community projects based on felt needs and mutual benefits that can be derived from such projects. This could be used to stimulate more holistic participation in the provision of other basic infrastructures in developing their communities.

### 3.3. Level of satisfaction derived by respondents from out-flow and in-flow rural-urban interactions

It can be inferred from Table 3 that the respondents derived a high level of satisfaction from their out-flow rural-urban

interaction through having access to great economic transactions ($\bar{x}$ = 2.78) and better opportunities for training and skill acquisition in the urban centres ($\bar{x}$ = 2.64). They also derived a high level of satisfaction from their inflow-rural urban interaction by using the knowledge gained in the urban area to encourage their people to participate in community development ($\bar{x}$ = 2.85) and teaching their children their culture and their history ($\bar{x}$ = 2.80). This finding corroborates that of John (2014) that rural-urban

***Table 5.*** *Distribution of the rural dwellers based on their perception of the effects of their types of rural-urban interactions (out-flow and in-flow) on their participation in community-based projects in the study area.*

| Statements | SA | A | Un | D | SD | $\bar{x}$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Out-flow to urban* | | | | | | |
| *I appreciate the contribution of rural-urban interaction in supporting my children's education in the cities that have further applied innovations to participation in CBPs.* | *34.0* | *49.3* | *2.3* | *3.7* | *10.7* | *3.92** |
| *Through this medium, I send agricultural goods to my children and relatives in the cities to cushion the effect of the high cost of living in the cities and the money contributed for the provision of community-based projects.* | *23.7* | *46.7* | *3.0* | *16.7* | *10.0* | *3.37** |
| *I support rural-urban interaction because it helps them to know important areas in the countries and what is happening around them to further boost one's participation in community-based projects.* | *69.0* | *27.7* | *1.0* | *2.0* | *0.3* | *4.63** |
| *Rural-urban interaction is good, it gives one edge over the others in some technical issues relating to participation in community-based projects.* | *50.3* | *37.3* | *2.3* | *8.7* | *1.3* | *4.26** |
| *I save the returns I made from my sales in the banks in the cities which I used in paying my community developmental levies* | *47.0* | *25.0* | *3.3* | *13.0* | *11.7* | *3.82** |
| *Rural-urban interaction is dangerous because it exposes one to various risks like armed robbery, fraudsters, kidnapping and accidents among others.* | *(20.7)* | *(41.3)* | *(2.7)* | *(21.3)* | *(14.0)* | *2.66* |
| *I don't have to interact with cities for my children to have access to quality education as there are basic schools and apprentice centres to learn a trade in my village.* | *(17.7)* | *(21.3)* | *(11.3)* | *(35.7)* | *(14.0)* | *3.07* |
| *Of what benefit is the sending of products to those in the cities? Most of them do not appreciate it at all.* | *(15.0)* | *(26.7)* | *(12.0)* | *(31.0)* | *(15.3)* | *3.05* |
| *Commuting in the urban areas is stressful, one leaves early in the morning only to return late in the evening without any meaningful participation in CBPs.* | *(28.0)* | *(22.7)* | *(3.3)* | *(30.7)* | *(15.3)* | *2.82* |
| *I don't like saving my money in the banks in the cities because they deduct a lot of charges and create policies that make it difficult to get your money when you need it.* | *(1.3)* | *(48.7)* | *(4.0)* | *(25.7)* | *(20.3)* | *3.15* |
| *In-flow to Rural* | | | | | | |
| *As a business person, I have relocated to a rural area because I see it as an avenue to maximize profit before others start doing the same business.* | *(11.3)* | *(14.0)* | *(22.7)* | *(48.3)* | *(3.7)* | *2.81* |
| *I am a strong advocate of rural-urban interaction because of its positive impact in improving the standard of living of those in rural areas through community-driven development.* | *(69.3)* | *(19.0)* | *(1.3)* | *(9.3)* | *(1.0)* | *4.46** |
| *In my own opinion, rural-urban interactions provide better living conditions in rural areas by enhancing dwellers' participation in CBPs.* | *(25.7)* | *(50.3)* | *(9.0)* | *(13.7)* | *(1.3)* | *3.85** |
| *Philanthropists and donations from indigenes and non-indigenes in the cities come to the village as a result of rural-urban interactions.* | *(24.3)* | *(46.0)* | *(9.0)* | *(16.3)* | *(4.3)* | *3.69** |
| *As a retiree, I have relocated to my village and was able to invest my savings in the cities on some businesses which employ some youths in my village and empower them to participate in community-based projects.* | *(14.3)* | *(11.0)* | *(24.0)* | *(42.0)* | *(8.7)* | *2.80* |
| *I don't have to relocate to a rural area to succeed as an entrepreneur* | *(4.0)* | *(57.3)* | *(13.7)* | *(15.0)* | *(10.0)* | *2.69* |
| *Money made in the city is expended in the city for footing one bill or the other with little or nothing for community development activities.* | *(11.7)* | *(16.3)* | *(6.0)* | *(52.3)* | *(13.7)* | *3.24* |
| *In some cases, it is the resources that are taken away from the rural areas that are used to develop the cities.* | *(17.0)* | *(61.7)* | *(8.7)* | *(8.0)* | *(4.7)* | *2.21* |
| *My village was marginalized by its neighbouring peri-urban city which takes all the basic infrastructures that are supposed to be shared equally between the two communities.* | *(19.3)* | *(36.3)* | *(21.0)* | *(17.7)* | *(5.7)* | *2.54* |
| *Many people use such donations that are meant for community development projects to enrich themselves.* | *(5.7)* | *(62.0)* | *(10.3)* | *(17.3)* | *(4.7)* | *2.53* |

*Values in parentheses represent percentages; Grand mean = 3.27*

***Table 6.*** *Categorization of the respondents based on their perception of the effects of their types of rural-urban interactions on their participation in community-based projects*

| *Level of satisfaction* | *Frequency* | *Percentage* |
|---|---|---|
| *Favourable* | *197* | *65.7* |
| *Unfavourable* | *103* | *34.3* |

**Favourable perception at value >3.00*

interactions help people to develop knowledge and skills in the urban areas which are used to improve farming back in the rural areas. This was affirmed by an education group comprising men, women and youths at Ominitin village, Ondo State during the Focus Group Discussion that:

"*they maintain cordial relationship with their relatives in urban areas to pave way for their children who might be interested in searching for tertiary education, agricultural innovations and employment opportunities"*.

Moreover, results in Table 4 show that most (53.7%) of the respondents derived a high level of satisfaction from the motives for rural-urban interactions. The implication is that rural-urban interactions could create a foundation for future generations by improving the infrastructural and social services needed for notable development.

### 3.4. Respondent's perception of the effects of their out-flow and in-flow rural-urban interactions on their participation in CBPs

The results in Table 5 reveal that rural dwellers expressed favourable perceptions of statements such as I support rural-urban interactions because it helps them to know important areas in the countries and what is happening around them to further boost one's participation in community-based projects (($\bar{x}$ = 4.63), I am a strong advocate of rural-urban interaction because of its positive impact in improving the standard of living of those in rural areas through community-driven development ($\bar{x}$ = 4.46), Rural-urban interaction is good, it gives one edge over others in some technical issues relating to participation in community-based projects ($\bar{x}$ = 4.26), I appreciate the contribution of rural-urban interactions in supporting my children's education in the cities who have further applied innovations to participation in CBPs ($\bar{x}$ = 3.92) ) and I enjoy selling my farm produce to those in the cities because it gives me more profit and business contacts to further participate in community-based projects ($\bar{x}$ = 3.90). This shows that the respondents perceived rural-urban interactions as a good avenue for them to boost their participation in community-based projects. The implication is that all the stakeholders involved in community development activities should harness the potential of rural-urban interactions to improve community participation in the provision of essential projects.

This was affirmed by two female members of the agriculture group at Ebetta village during FDG that:

***Table 7.*** *Relationship between each type of community-based project and rural dwellers' level of participation in the projects*

| *Variables (Types of projects)* | *r-value* | *p-value* | *Decision* |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Educational projects* | *0.500* | *0.000* | *S* |
| *Health projects* | *0.635* | *0.000* | *S* |
| *Water projects* | *0.586* | *0.000* | *S* |
| *Transportation projects* | *0.636* | *0.000* | *S* |
| *Drainage projects* | *0.653* | *0.000* | *S* |
| *Market& Economic projects* | *0.707* | *0.000* | *S* |
| *Security projects* | *0.707* | *0.000* | *S* |
| *Social development projects* | *0.700* | *0.000* | *S* |
| *Waste management projects* | *0.673* | *0.000* | *S* |

*Significant at p< 0.05 (S = Significant)*

*"they made more profit from farm produce sold in the urban areas than what they realise if they sell locally and this has helped them in participating more in agricultural CBPs"*.

This implies that rural-urban interactions can stimulate rural dwellers' participation in community-based projects. Therefore, a continuous interaction between the two centres is needed especially in terms of supply and dependence on raw materials and other services from the rural areas as the urban population keeps increasing through housing construction and other infrastructural developments (Fombe and Balgah, 2012). Similarly, results in Table 6. show that more than half (65.7%) of the respondents indicated a favourable perception of the effect of their types of rural-urban interactions on their participation in community-based projects. This suggests that respondents are pleased with the contributions of rural-urban interactions in promoting their participation in community-based projects. The implication is that rural-urban interactions should be harnessed to stimulate the participation of community members in the provision of other basic infrastructures in developing their communities.

### 3.5. Relationship between each type of community-based project and rural dwellers' level of participation in community-based projects

The result of the correlation analysis in Table 7 reveals that a positive and significant relationship exists between each type of project: educational projects (r = 0.500, p = 0.000); health projects (r = 0.063, p = 0.000 ); water projects (r = 0.586, p = 0.000); transportation projects (r = 0.636, p = 0.000); drainage project (r = 0.653, p = 0.000); market and economic projects (r = 0.707, p = 0.000); security project (r = 0.707, p = 0.000); social development projects (r = 0.700, p = 0.000); waste management projects (r = 0.673, p = 0.000) and respondents' level of participation in community-based projects. It could therefore be inferred that the rural dwellers' level of participation depends on the types of community-based projects they were involved in. This implies that the more the type of project is related to the needs of the respondents, the more their level of participation in such projects. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected.

### 3.6. Differences in the rural dwellers' types of rural-urban interactions (out-flow to urban and in-flow to rural) and satisfaction derived.

A significant difference subsists in the rural dwellers' types of rural-urban interactions and satisfaction derived. (t = 5.946, p = 0.000). It suggests that the respondents' rural-urban interactions (out-flow and in-flow) have varying degrees of influence on their satisfaction. This was affirmed through the assertion of the females in the agricultural inputs and credit group at Oba village in Ondo State during the Focus Group Discussion that:

"*Participation in community-based projects is based on the level of benefits inherent in such projects in meeting their household roles"*.

This further buttresses the findings of Ogunleye-Adetona (2013) that rural dwellers tend to conceptualize their development

***Table 8.*** *Differences in the rural dwellers' types of rural-urban interactions (out-flow to urban and in-flow to rural) and satisfaction derived.*

| *Variables* | *F* | *T* | *Df* | *Mean difference* | *p-value* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Respondents' rural-urban interactions (outflow*inflow)* | *1.091* | *5.946* | *298* | *33261* | *0.000** |

**Significant at p< 0.05*

in those areas that will have an effect on individuals and develop their future economy. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected.

## Conclusion and Recommendation

The study concludes that the respondents participated more in the provision of educational projects based on the benefits accrued to them from these projects. Similarly, a positive relationship exists between each type of community-based project and participation in the community-based projects. Moreover, the high level of satisfaction derived from the types of rural-urban interactions and favourable perception of the effect of rural-urban interactions on rural dwellers' participation in community-based projects is a reflection of the need to further apply the bottom-up approach to all rural development policies and projects in Nigeria.

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made:

1. the favourable perception of rural-urban interactions should be leveraged by relevant stakeholders to promote the provision of community-based projects in other communities of Nigeria;
2. community-based projects should be related to the needs of the respondents to ensure a high level of participation in such projects; and
3. rural dwellers should be encouraged by community leaders, community development associations and trade groups to participate in all projects instead of concentrating on just a few.

## Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the contributions of Oba Benson Akinyemi, the Oloja of Ominitin, Mr. Charles Oliha, Mr. Elumaro, Mr. Osagie, Mr. Mayowa and Mr. Afolayan who served as resource person and research assistants for this study.

## CRediT authorship contribution statement

**OAO:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing - original draft, Data curation, Writing - review & editing; **JOO:** Data curation, Writing - review & editing, Resources

## Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

## References

Agergaard, J; Tacoli, C; Steel, G; & Sinne, B.O. (2019). Revisiting Rural-Urban Town development in Sub-saharan Africa. *The European Journal of Development* 31(1), 2-11

Egwemi,V. and Odo, L.(2013). Rural Development and Poverty Eradication in Nigeria. *Journal of Research in National Development,* 11(1), 101-110.

Fombe, L.F. and Balgah,S.N. (2010). The Urbanization process in Cameroon: Process, Patterns and Implications, New York: Nova Science Publishers Inc: 167.

Gebre, T. (2019). Mutual Benefits of promoting Rural-Urban Interdependence. Retrieved 9th August, 2021 from JSTOR https:// www.jstor.org>resrep01719

Human Development Report (2022). Uncertain Times, Unsettled Lives: Shaping our Future in a transforming world. Retrieved 12th November, 2022 from https://byjus.com> free-les-prep

International Fund for Agricultural Development (2020). IFAD Annual Report. Retrived from www.ifad.org

International Fund for Agricultural Development (2015). Rural Transformation: Key to Sustainable Development. *JLIFAD* Investing in Rural People: 1-7.

John O.O. (2014). Rural-Urban Migration Experiences of Migrants from Western Kenya to Kisumu and Nairobi. Migration out of Poverty Research Programme Consortium: 1-24

Laah, D.E, Abba,M. Ishaya, D.S. and Gana, J.N.( 2013). The Mirage of Rural Development in Nigeria. *Journal of Social Sciences and Public Policy***,** 5 (2), 13-25.

Matthew, O.A; Abraham, F. A. and Adefemi, O.O. (2015). Assessing incomeeffect of rural development programme: A case study of community –baded agriculture and rural development project in Kwara State (Nigeria. *Journal of Agribusiness and Rural Development*, 4(38), 607-616.

National Population Estimate (2022). Current Population of each State in Nigeria. Retrieved from city population.de; ondipa.org

Ogunleye-Adetona, C.I. (2010). Human Resources and Economic Resources in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa* 12 (3), 204 - 211.

Ogunleye-Adetona, C.I. (2013). The Role of Community Self Help Projects in Kwara State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability* 2, 28-45

Ogwumike, F.O. (2013). Poverty Alleviation Stategies in Nigeria. Proceedings of the 17th Annual Conference of the Zonal Research Unit of the CBN, Markudi,(June 8-12) pp. 279-293

Ojeifo, O. M. and Joseph, O.E. (2013). Categorisation of Urban centres in Edo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Business and Management* (IOSRJMB) 3(6), 19-25

Samuel, N.J; Mshelia, A.D. and Njamba, J.G.(2018). Community Participation in the Provision and Maintenance of Self-Help Projects in Michika Local Government Area of adamawa state, Nigeria. *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research* 6(7), 26-32

Tacoli, C., McGranahan G. and Satterthwaite D. (2014). World Migration Report 2015. Urbanization, Rural-urban Migration and Urban Poverty, Geneva, International Organisation for Migrations (IOM).

World Bank Report (2022). Prosperity Report. Retrieved from https://guardian>news>nigeria