NIGERIAN JOURNAL OF PUBLIC SECTOR MANAGEMENT (NJPSM)

Effect of Foreign Agricultural Grant on Agricultural Productivity of Rural Communities in South East, Nigeria.

[1]Otuka, Ezinne., [2]Agbo, O.G, Ph.D., [3]Amobi, M.U, Ph.D & [4]Ikoro. E.I, Ph.D
[1, 2, 3&4]Department of Business Administration and Department of Entrepreneurial Studies, Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike, Abia State

Corresponding Author: Zinne2004@yahoo.com and ikoroike@gmail.com

Abstract

This study focused on effect of foreign agricultural Grant on agricultural productivity of rural communities in south east, Nigeria. The specific objectives of the study were: to ascertain the effects of foreign clean water and sanitation Grants on living condition of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria and determine the effects of foreign agricultural grants on agricultural productivity of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria. The study made use of survey research design. The target population of the study consisted of 12,575,100 people, comprising of the total population of rural dwellers of 50 LGAs in Southeast States of Nigeria. Using Godden (2004) formula, the sample size was calculated to be 423 respondents. Purposive sampling technique and random sampling techniques was used to sample the study respondents. Face validity was used, to check the reliability of the research instrument, a test-re-test method was adopted, and Cronbach Alpha reliability technique was used to measures the coefficient reliability of the instrument. Descriptive statistics, inferential statistics and content analysis was used to analyze the study objectives and test the 5 hypotheses posited. The content analysis revealed that there is lack of active involvement of community members in the initial stages of project development and planning and decisions regarding project implementation were made without sufficient consultation with local stakeholders. However, from the inferential statistics, findings revealed that, at 5% level (Sig < .05) of significance, World Bank IDA and IFAD foreign clean and sanitation grants had a positive and significant effect on living conditions of rural communities, and at 5% level (Sig < .05) of significance, World Bank IDA and IFAD grants had a positive and significant effect on agricultural productivity of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria. Based on the findings the researcher concluded that foreign agricultural grants, with reference to World Bank IDA Credit and IFAD agricultural grants had a positive and significant effects on the development of rural communities in Southeast, Nigeria. Therefore, the study recommended that World Bank IDA and IFAD need to sustain their foreign clean and sanitation grants as it positively and significantly affects agricultural productivity of rural communities. Also, they need to increase the scale of their financial support for foreign clean water in rural communities and use the grants to improve agricultural productivity, such as building and renovating borne holes,, providing essential sanitation materials, and ensuring a stable water for rural communities, which will address barriers to access and quality clean water and ensure that the benefits are more widely distributed.

Keywords: Effect, Foreign Agricultural Grant, Agricultural Productivity, Rural Communities, South East, Nigeria

Introduction

In the 19th century, efforts in development of rural areas were often spearheaded by religious missions. Missionaries from Europe and North America provided basic education, healthcare, and agricultural training as part of their evangelisation efforts. These initiatives laid the groundwork for later secular development programmes by introducing new skills and ideas to rural populations (Ahmed, Gbadebo, Iselobhor & Tokede, 2021). Philanthropic foundations, such as the Rockefeller Foundation (established in 1913) and the Carnegie Corporation, began to play significant roles in international development. They funded programmes aimed at improving agricultural practices, public health, and education in rural areas, primarily in

developing countries (Michael, 2021). The aftermath of World War II saw the establishment of international institutions aimed at rebuilding war-torn countries and addressing global poverty (Michael, 2021).

Foreign financial grants, typically provided by governments, international organisations encompassing World Bank International Development Association (IDA Credit), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), and other international organisations, aim to support projects that address specific needs in rural communities. These international donors channeled resources either directly through local Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) or in most cases, through government specialized agencies by way of programmes and projects (Amofah & Agyare, 2022). These grants can be directed toward various initiatives, including agricultural development, health care improvement, education, and infrastructure enhancement. By offering financial assistance without the burden of repayment, these grants empower communities to implement projects that might otherwise be unattainable due to financial constraints (Larry, Martin & lbenwo, 2021). However, the significance of foreign financial grants extends beyond mere economic support. They often promote capacity building, enabling local stakeholders to enhance their skills and knowledge. This empowerment can lead to greater community involvement in decision-making processes and foster a sense of ownership over development projects in rural communities (Ahmed, Gbadebo, Iselobhor & Tokede, 2021).

Foreign financial grants, typically provided by governments, international organisations encompassing World Bank International Development Association (IDA Credit), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), and other international organisations, aim to support projects that address specific needs in rural communities. These international donors channeled resources either directly through local Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) or in most cases, through government specialized agencies by way of programmes and projects (Amofah & Agyare, 2022). These grants can be directed toward various initiatives, including agricultural development, health care improvement, education, and infrastructure enhancement. By offering financial assistance without the burden of repayment, these grants empower communities to implement projects that might otherwise be unattainable due to financial constraints (Larry, Martin & lbenwo, 2021). However, the significance of foreign financial grants extends beyond mere economic support. They often promote capacity building, enabling local stakeholders to enhance their skills and knowledge. This empowerment can lead to greater community involvement in decision-making processes and foster a sense of ownership over development projects in rural communities (Ahmed, Gbadebo, Iselobhor & Tokede, 2021).

Statement of the Problem

A cursory look at the rural development programmes and policies in Nigeria revealed that several attempts have been made to develop the rural areas since colonial times. The

undeveloped nature of rural communities and its transformation had been of major concerns to successive Nigerian governments at all levels. Though, efforts aimed at modernizing the rural areas or at least improve the economic wellbeing of the rural population by the federal, state and local government have not yielded any appreciable results. Government had at various times introduced policies and programmes aimed at opening rural areas, providing educational facilities, provisions of agricultural inputs and literacy programmes, health facilities etc. (Attah & Angioha, 2019). However, most of these policies and programmes have had minimal or no significant effect in changing the lives of the rural people. Statistics shows that Nigeria is ranked among the Low Human Development Countries globally. With a Human Development Index (HDI) of 0.539, Nigeria takes 161st position among 189 countries ranked in the Report (United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 2020). Being a low human development country implies a high level of poverty. Nigeria National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) (2020) stated that about 83 million Nigerians (40.1 per cent) of the population live in extreme poverty.

On the other hand, the World Bank (2020) acknowledges that 79 million Nigerians are extremely poor accounting for 20 percent of the extremely poor population in Sub-Saharan Africa. Based on the World Bank statistics, Nigeria has the largest poor population in the sub region and the majority (52.1 per cent) of this poor population resides in the rural areas (NBS, 2020). This is because the rural areas although blessed with abundant material and human resources still suffer from neglect and underdevelopment. Basic infrastructure that would engender development are lacking, hence productivity is low, resulting in low incomes. This poor economic profile of Nigeria is not due to the absence of human and material resources but rather due to the absence of a conscientious effort to transform these material and human resources into productive forces that will engender economic growth and development. The African Development Bank (AfDB) (2016) rightly observes that the failure to tap the enormous resources in Africa such as the agricultural potential has contributed to persistent poverty and deteriorating food security in the continent. Thus, although abundant human and material resources abound in the rural areas of Southeast Nigeria, such as arable land and other natural resources (Odusanya, 2020), they have remained largely untapped.

The development of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria has been a persistent challenge, characterized by high levels of poverty, inadequate infrastructure, limited access to resources, education and healthcare, low agricultural productivity, poor income generation, environmental constraints, reduced economic opportunities., technological and institutional constraints (Okafor, *et al.,* 2023). These factors can hinder their development and perpetuate cycles of poverty. In response, foreign financial grants made available by donor agencies have emerged as a vital tool for fostering sustainable growth and improving living conditions in these areas. World Bank IDA Credit and IFAD have provided primary education grants, basic health service grants, clean water and sanitation grants, agricultural and infrastructural grants and technical assistance aimed at fostering development by improving educational attainment, access

to healthcare, agricultural productivity, income generation and the overall living condition of these rural communities.

However, the utilization of foreign financial grants in the development of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria faces several challenges which include but not limited to issues of corruption and misappropriation of funds. This often plague the distribution and implementation of grants, leading to inefficiencies and failure to achieve intended outcomes. (Sennuga, Adedayo & Sennuga, 2021). Therefore, this study aimed to empirically assess whether the primary education grants, basic health service grants, clean water and sanitation grants, agricultural and infrastructural grants provided by IDA Credit and IFAD has translated into tangible development in terms of improving educational attainment, access to healthcare, agricultural productivity, income generation and the overall living condition of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria. Understanding the efficacy of donor interventions is crucial for informing policy decisions and optimizing the allocation of resources to achieve sustainable development in these rural communities. In the quest to proffer empirical solution to these problems, this study: Foreign financial grants and development of rural communities in Southeast, Nigeria with reference to World Bank IDA Credit and IFAD financial grants was initiated.

Objectives of the Study

The broad objective of the study is to determine the effect of foreign financial grants on the development of rural communities in Southeast, Nigeria with reference to World Bank IDA Credit and IFAD financial grants. The specific objectives of the study are to:

i. Analyze the effects of foreign clean water and sanitation grants on living condition of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.
ii. Determine the effects of foreign agricultural grants on agricultural productivity of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

Research Questions

The following research questions were answered by the study:

1. What are the effects of foreign clean water and sanitation grants on living condition of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria?
2. How does foreign agricultural grants affect agricultural productivity of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria?

Review of Related Literature

Conceptual Review

Clean Water and Sanitation

The significance of water to the existence of man cannot be overemphasized. This is because access to improved water and sanitation is a vital component for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) including good health, education, poverty and gender equality (Hutton & Varughese, 2016). Since the declaration of International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade in the 1980s and the Human Development Report (HDR) in 2006, access to water and sanitation has been recognized as the basic needs for human life and progress; therefore, the need for the eradication of inequality in access to water and decent sanitation across the globe has become a vital goal of the SDGs (Calow & Mason, 2014). Despite these giant strides, the future looks very bleak and daunting due to the disparities in access to water and sanitation services especially amongst the poor in developing countries, the rural dwellers, the ethnic and religious minorities and the women respectively (WHO/UNICEF, 2014; Aleixo *et al.,* 2016). The disparities in access to improved water and sanitation can be attributed to several factors such as geographical areas (region, urban/rural), social class (rich and poor), race, ethnicity and gender (Ribeiro 2015). Poor access to water, sanitation and hygiene facilities is one of the major contributors to the global burden of diarrhea disease. This health challenge impacts significantly on the social, economic and environmental well-being of the vulnerable groups, especially children from poor families (Roche *et al.,* 2017).

The SDG 6 emphasized the need for reducing the inequalities that exist among countries regarding access to safe drinking water, basic sanitation and hygiene as a basic human right (Aleixo *et al.,* 2016). In Nigeria, the formulation of a National Water Supply Policy (NWSP) has been instrumental to the progress recorded so far in the decline in the proportion of the population without access to improved sanitation from 38% to 29% between 1990 and 2015 (WHO and UNICEF, 2017). Globally, about 1.2 billion people still lack access to safe water while 2.6 billion people do not have access to basic sanitation (WHO & UNICEF, 2014). In sub-Saharan Africa, the situation is more worrisome due to the high inequalities observed among the low-income groups, the rural and peri-urban dwellers (WHO and UNICEF, 2014). Access to improved water and sanitation has a strong relationship with a healthy and productive life as well as environmental sustainability (UNICEF, 2014). Worldwide, approximately 6.3% of the deaths recorded result from poor drinking water, sanitation facilities, and hygiene practices (Emenike *et al.,* 2017). In Nigeria, lack of access to clean water has gross implications on the socio-economic development, personal hygiene and consequently, places the health of about 40 million Nigerians at risk (UNICEF & WHO, 2012). It is estimated that about 122,000 Nigerians including 87,000 children less than 5 years die annually due to diarrhoea. Most of these deaths have been linked to poor water, sanitation, and hygiene (Nwankwoala, 2011). Poor sanitation in

Nigeria has resulted in huge losses running to almost US$ 3 billion annually (FMWR, 2014). Therefore, for Nigeria to achieve the sustainable development goal 6 by 2030 in the rural areas, about 8 million people would be required to be reached annually (Hutton & Varughese, 2016).

Clean Water and Sanitation Grants

Clean water and sanitation grants are financial aids provided to support projects aimed at improving access to clean water and sanitation facilities. These grants are essential for promoting public health, reducing poverty, and enhancing the quality of life in underserved communities. Purpose of the grants includes ensuring that communities have reliable access to safe and potable water. Developing and improving sanitation infrastructure, such as toilets, sewage systems, and waste disposal mechanisms (Ibrahima, Ansoumana, Mamadou, Lamine, Dapa, Sokhna & Joseph, 2022). Educating communities about hygiene practices to prevent diseases. Safeguarding water sources from contamination and ensuring sustainable water management. The grants may be provided by national or local governments, often as part of public health or environmental initiatives. Grants offered by NGOs focused on health, development, and environmental protection. International grants funded by international bodies like the United Nations, World Bank, or other global entities dedicated to development. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) grants offered by private companies as part of their CSR initiatives (Ibrahima, *et al.*, 2022).

To be eligible for the grant, applicants must be non-profit organizations, local governments, or community groups with clear objectives aligned with the grant's purpose. It usually involves submitting a detailed proposal outlining the project's goals, methods, budget, and expected outcomes. There must be a clear demonstration of the need for clean water and sanitation in the target community (Ibrahima, *et al.*, 2022). Detailing the activities, timeline, and methodologies to achieve the project goals. A comprehensive financial plan showing how the grant funds will be used. Methods for measuring and evaluating the project's effectiveness and sustainability. By understanding these concepts, organizations can better navigate the process of securing and effectively utilizing clean water and sanitation grants to make a significant impact on public health and community well-being (Samuel, Boateng, Nana & Ebenezer, 2023).

Agricultural Grants

Agricultural grants are financial aids provided by governments, organizations, or institutions to support farmers, researchers, and agribusinesses. These grants aim to foster innovation, sustainability, and growth within the agricultural sector. These are grants to support the development of new agricultural technologies and practices (Mercy, Daniel & Nason, 2023). The funding is often directed towards projects that promote environmentally friendly farming methods. The grants help to increase the profitability and productivity of farms, contributing to rural economic development. Some agricultural grants are designated for agricultural research to

improve crop yields, pest resistance, and soil health. Agricultural grants can come in the form of funding for academic or institutional research projects, support for developing new farming techniques, machinery, or business models. Some agricultural grants focused on promoting sustainable farming practices, such as organic farming or water conservation, some are for educating farmers and agricultural workers in new methods or technologies, while some are financial aid for building or improving farm infrastructure, like irrigation systems or storage facilities (Mercy, *et al.,* 2023).

Agricultural grants can come from government agencies: National, state, and local governments often provide grants through departments of agriculture or similar bodies. Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) offer grants to support agricultural development and sustainability projects. Some private foundations focus on agricultural issues and provide grants for specific initiatives (Uzomba, Peter & Otokutu, 2020). International institutions like the FAO, World Bank, and others offer grants for agricultural projects, especially in developing countries. These grants can be accessed by individual farmers, research institutions, agribusinesses and communities. Applicants usually need to submit a detailed proposal outlining their project, objectives, and how they plan to use the funds. Proposals are typically reviewed by a panel of experts who assess the project's potential impact and feasibility. Successful applicants receive funds, which may be disbursed in stages based on project milestones. These grants often come with specific conditions, such as requirements to match funding or to use funds for designated purposes only. Recipients may be required to provide regular progress reports and a final report detailing the outcomes and impacts of the funded project (Uzomba, *et al.,* 2020).

Agricultural Productivity

Agricultural productivity refers to the efficiency of agricultural production, usually measured by the ratio of agricultural outputs to inputs (Zuberu, Ari & Iliya, 2019). Concept of agricultural productivity espoused the following:

a. Yield: The amount of agricultural produce (e.g., crops, livestock) harvested per unit of land (crop yield) or per animal (livestock yield). Increasing yield is a primary goal of improving agricultural productivity.
b. Inputs: Inputs in agriculture include resources like land, labour, seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, water, and machinery. Efficient use and management of these inputs contribute to higher productivity (Adewale, Lawal, Aberu & Toriola, 2022).
c. Technology: Technological advancements such as improved seeds, mechanization, irrigation systems, and biotechnology play a crucial role in boosting agricultural productivity by enhancing yields and reducing losses.
d. Crop rotation and diversity: Crop rotation and diversification help maintain soil fertility, reduce pests and diseases, and improve overall productivity over the long term.

e. Sustainability: Sustainable agricultural practices aim to maintain or enhance productivity while minimizing negative environmental impacts, such as soil degradation, water depletion, and biodiversity loss (Adewale, *et al.,* 2022).

The concept of agriculture productivity is bigger with the global impact, but it begins with well-organised farm management. The future and well-being of people is highly dependent on the global food production system. In the agricultural system, the high level of productivity ensures affordable and abundant food and fosters economic development, food security and prevention of scarce resources such as water and land. It is critically due to the expansion of population and climatic change extremes projected to tax on the existing food production system. Meanwhile, as the agriculture productivity growth has planetary repercussions, far-reaching and increasing agriculture efficiency always has and further will pursue to be accomplished at the farm level by exploring technology innovation to increase efficient farm management. In simple words, agricultural productivity can be understood as the ratio of agricultural exports to imports (Chen, Fu & Wang, 2022). Productivity can be calculated at different level such as the production system of a single farm, a region, a multi-farm cooperative or even the planet can all be calculated based on the agricultural productivity.

On a national level, agricultural productivity growth calculates exports of agriculture versus imports. A government that can sustain a greater level of agricultural exports helps a more robust economic growth rate, maintains more sustainable food prices for its population and becomes more competitive worldwide. Agricultural productivity plays a significant role in the growth of an economy. In the UK, in 2021, agriculture supported the economy by 0.5%. Agriculture facilitates half of the food that people consume, employs around half a million of the population and is a major part of the food and drink industry. In 2021, the land managers and farmers tackled 71% of the land in the UK and through them the population can protect the natural environment and ensure the greatest standards of plant health and animal health (UK Evidence Pack, 2022). In the UK, the agricultural evidence pack brings together present figures on agriculture to briefly summarise the current state of the agriculture sector.

Getting a true sense of agriculture growth and productivity in food production is more complex at the business level than measuring yield increases or selecting the best crops appropriate for the particular region. Most of the farm companies produce several products with several inputs. Perhaps those crop production systems help each other in the whole farm ecosystem, for instance corn planting following soybean to lessen nutrient demands on soil health or to break up disease cycles or grazing animals through harvested crops and to mitigate harvest residue. Such kind of operational complexities are difficult in most farming organisations whether smallholder farms or bigger firms making calculating farm productivity even more complex. Apart from that, different regional places and individual farms have different degrees of attainable agricultural productivity that relies on soil types, climate and other variables along

with farmers and cooperative farm companies must be conscious about the market economy of their productivity levels (Rambe & Khaola, 2022). A crop that evolves significantly without putting many inputs but sales for a low price due to the low demand or increased competition may not attain profitability but if the farm can enhance its efficiency metrics with the adoption of new technology, then it may provide positive economic benefits

Theoretical Review

The following theories underpinning studies on donor agencies and socioeconomic development of rural communities were reviewed: Integrated Rural Development Model and Modernization Theory

Integrated Rural Development Model (Abasi Ekong, 1981)

The Integrated Rural Development Model was associated with Abasi Ekong (1981) and Hallet (1996). The model assumes that for the socio-economic and cultural base of the rural societies to be broadened through integrated efforts of mobilizing and utilizing human and natural resources. This could be achievable through the provision of services, creation of motivational and purchasing power through better supply of income and employment opportunities, and by creating a clear association between agriculture (which is the major occupation of rural people), and service sectors in the rural areas rather than mere improvement of living conditions in terms of housing, food supply, water supply, education, feeder roads etc. Thus, the element of this model includes the following: income for rural communities, reduced poverty and unemployment in rural areas, equal distribution of wealth and income for rural people, the provision of essentials into the country's political practice (Hallet, 1996).

Modernization Theory (Anthon Smith, 1973)

Modernization is the view that sees the development of societies as a change from a state of traditionality to a state of modernity. The theory is credited to the work of Anthony Smith (1973). Anthony (1973) was of the view that the content of modernity should be taken as an idealization of the spirit which should animate development policies, successful in the west. Modernization Theory posits that development is a linear process that involves transitioning from traditional to modern societies. According to this theory, the key characteristics of modernization include industrialization, urbanization, increased literacy, and adoption of modern technologies. These transformations are believed to lead to improved economic productivity, higher standards of living, and enhanced social and political structures. Anthony Smith's (1973) interpretation of Modernization Theory further incorporates the role of cultural and national identity in the modernization process, arguing that cultural cohesion and national identity play crucial roles in how societies adapt to modernity. Smith (1973) emphasizes the importance of integrating traditional values and institutions with modern practices to achieve sustainable development. Thus, modernization is a process of change in locating those qualities of western societies, which are absent in the traditional societies and making the later adopt

them. This approach is evident in David McClelland theory, where need for achievement is the missing factor which should be injected into traditional societies (McClelland, 1971).

According to Agbakoba (2003), modernization theorists generally adopt Structural Functionalist approach to the study of society. They take society as whole with parts that contribute towards the maintenance of the whole. This is the basis of the teleological determinism of the modernization theory. Despite its shortfalls, the benefits derived from modernization such as the creation of more jobs to reduce unemployment through industrialization, improving on people's health and adoption of various community-bassed organisations to improve the condition of the rural people cannot be overlooked. Modernization is very important because it brings about development and changes which are to the benefit of mankind, when it is not manipulated negatively by some people for tier own selfish interest.

Application of Modernization Theory to the Study

This study examines the effect of donor agencies on the socioeconomic development of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria through the lens of Anthony Smith's Modernization Theory. The theory stated that the content of modernity should be taken as an idealization of the spirit which should animate development policies, successful in the west. The theory posits that development is a linear process that involves transitioning from traditional to modern societies. It stated that the key characteristics of modernization include industrialization, urbanization, increased literacy, and adoption of modern technologies which will lead to improved economic productivity, higher standards of living, and enhanced social and political structures. The theory adopted Structural Functionalist approach to the study of society, which inferred taking society as whole as parts that contribute towards the maintenance of the whole. The theory advocated for the creation of more jobs to reduce unemployment through industrialization, improving on people's health and adoption of various community-based organisations to improve the condition of the rural people.

Methodology

The study made use of survey research design. Kerlinger (1973) considered survey research as social scientific research and focused on people, the vital facts of people, and their beliefs, opinions, attitudes, motivations and behaviour. The study made use of both primary and secondary sources of data, Primary data were elicited with the help of a well-structured questionnaire entitled: "Foreign Financial Grants and Development of Rural Communities in Southeast Nigeria" and a well-structured interview schedule. The questionnaire was closed ended type designed in five points Likert Scale (Strongly Agree = SA, Agreed = A, Disagreed = D, Strongly Disagreed = SD and Undecided = U). The interview schedule capture the specific objectives of the study. Secondary data was sourced from journals, textbooks, newspapers, magazines,

National Population Commission of Nigeria website, National Bureau of Statistics website, World Bank IDA Credit and IFAD State Coordinators documents and other relevant internet materials. The population of the study consisted of the population of ten rural Local Government Areas (LGAs) of each of the five Southeast States of Nigeria (Abia State, Anambra State, Ebonyi State, Enugu States and Imo State) that benefited from World Bank IDA Credit and IFAD grants. Thus, the target population of study that was extracted from National Population Commission of Nigeria website and National Bureau of Statistics website as of March 2024 was Twelve million, five hundred seventy-five thousand and one hundred (12,575,100) people, comprising of the total population of rural dwellers of fifty (50) rural LGAs in Southeast States of Nigeria that benefited from World Bank IDA Credit and IFAD grants. The table below showed the target population of the study extracted from the fifty (50) rural LGAs in the Southeast Nigeria.

The computed sample size for the fifty (50) rural LGAs in Southeast States of Nigeria that benefited from World Bank IDA Credit and IFAD grants was four hundred and twenty-three (423) respondents. The study used purposive sampling technique and random sampling techniques. Purposively, ten (10) LGAs that benefited form World Bank IDA Credit and IFAD grants was selected from the five (5) Southeast States of Nigeria (Abia State, Anambra State, Ebonyi State, Enugu States and Imo State). The study made use of face validity techniques. To check the reliability of the research instrument, a test-re-test method was used in which a pilot survey was conducted on a smaller segment other than the main group.

Data Presentation

The computed sample size for the fifty (50) LGAs in the five (5) Southeast States of Nigeria was four hundred and twenty-three (423) respondents. Equal number of questionnaire were distributed in fifty (50) LGAs in the five (5) Southeast States of Nigeria. The table below showed the total number of questionnaire sampled and the number of questionnaire that was returned.

Table 1: The Number of Questionnaire Sampled in the fifty (50) LGAs in the five (5) Southeast States of Nigeria and the Number of Questionnaire Returned

States	Number Distributed	Number Returned	Number Not Returned	Number Not Properly Filled	Percentage (%)
Abia	78	72	06	04	17.0
Anambra	105	96	09	07	22.7
Ebonyi	86	81	05	07	19.1
Enugu	84	76	08	06	17.9
Imo	70	63	07	04	14.9
Total	**423**	**388**	**35**	**28**	**91.6**

Source: Field Survey, 2024.

Table 1 showed that a total of seventy-eight (78) questionnaire was sampled in Abia State, while seventy-two (72) questionnaire was returned which represent 17.0% of the total questionnaire returned. Out of seventy-two (72) questionnaire returned, four (4) was not properly filled. One hundred and five (105) questionnaire were sampled in Anambra State, while ninety-six (96) questionnaire was returned which represent 22.7% of the total questionnaire returned. Out of ninety-six (96) questionnaire returned, seven (7) was not properly filled. Eighty-six (86) questionnaire was sampled in Ebonyi State, while eighty-one (81) questionnaire was returned which represent 19.1% of the total questionnaire returned. Out of the eighty-one (81) questionnaire returned, seven (7) was not properly filled. Eighty-four (84) questionnaire was sampled in Enugu state, while seventy-six (76) questionnaire was returned which represent 17.9% of the total questionnaire returned. Out of seventy-six (76) questionnaire returned, six (6) was not properly filled. Seventy (70) questionnaire was sampled in Imo State, while sixty-three (63) questionnaire was returned which represent 14.9% of the total questionnaire returned. Out of the sixty-three (63) questionnaire returned, four (4) was not properly filled. Totally, three hundred and eighty-eight (388) questionnaire were returned, which represent 91.6% questionnaire return rate. However, only three hundred and sixty (360) valid questionnaire returned was used for the data analysis.

Data Analysis

Respondents Opinion on Foreign Clean Water and Sanitation Grants

Table 1: Descriptive statistics analysis result on the respondents' opinion on foreign clean water and sanitation grants.

ITEMS	SA 5	A 4	U 3	D 2	SD 1	T	M	Std. Dev.
World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid in the construction and rehabilitation of water supply systems	107 (535)	168 (672)	47 (141)	25 (50)	13 (13)	1411	3.92	1.013
World Bank IDA and IFAD grants assist in the building and improving of sanitation facilities	112 (560)	173 (692)	35 (105)	29 (58)	11 (11)	1426	3.96	1.003
World Bank IDA and IFAD grants support the development of water resource management plans.	61 (305)	127 (508)	89 (267)	52 (104)	31 (31)	1215	3.37	1.176
World Bank IDA and IFAD grants promote environmental conservation and sustainable water use practices	76 (380)	149 (596)	73 (219)	38 (76)	24 (24)	1294	3.60	1.130
World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid the implementation of policies that promote access to clean water and sanitation.	59 (295)	111 (444)	93 (279)	60 (120)	37 (37)	1175	3.26	1.215
N							**360**	
Total Mean							**18.1**	
Grand Mean							**3.6**	
Benchmark Mean							**3.0**	

Source: Field Survey 2024.

Table 4.2.5 revealed that out of the 360 respondents, 107 respondents strongly agreed that World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid in the construction and rehabilitation of water supply systems in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria. 168 respondents agreed, 47 respondents were undecided, 25 respondents strongly disagreed, and 13 respondents strongly disagreed. There was no missing value. The responses gave a Mean value of 3.92 which is above the Benchmark Mean point of 3.0 and a Standard Deviation value of 1.013, which showed that more than the average number of the respondents agreed that World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid in the construction and rehabilitation of water supply systems in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

In the second item, out of the 360 respondents, 112 respondents strongly agreed that World Bank IDA and IFAD grants assist in the building and improving of sanitation facilities in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria. 173 respondents agreed, 35 respondents were undecided, 29 respondents strongly disagreed, and 11 respondents strongly disagreed. There was no missing value. The responses gave a Mean value of 3.96 which is above the Benchmark Mean point of 3.0 and a Standard Deviation value of 1.1003, which showed that more than the average number of the study respondents agreed that World Bank IDA and IFAD grants assist in the building and improving of sanitation facilities in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

In the third item, out of the 360 respondents, 61 respondents strongly agreed that World Bank IDA and IFAD grants support the development of water resource management plans in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria. 127 respondents agreed, 89 respondents were undecided, 52 respondents disagreed, 31 respondents strongly disagreed. There was no missing value. The responses gave a Mean value of 3.37 which is above the Benchmark Mean point of 3.0 and a Standard Deviation value of 1.176, which showed that more than the average number of the respondents agreed that World Bank IDA and IFAD grants support the development of water resource management plans in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

In the fourth item, out of the 360 respondents, 76 respondents strongly agreed that World Bank IDA and IFAD grants promote environmental conservation and sustainable water use practices in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria. 149 respondents agreed, 73 respondents were undecided, 38 respondents disagreed, and 24 respondents strongly disagreed. There was no missing value. The responses gave a Mean value of 3.60 which is above the Benchmark Mean point of 3.0 and a Standard Deviation value of 1.130, which showed that more than the average number of the respondents agreed that World Bank IDA and IFAD grants promote environmental conservation and sustainable water use practices in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

In the fifth item, out of the 360 respondents, 59 respondents strongly agreed that World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid the implementation of policies that promote access to clean water and sanitation in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria. 111 respondents agreed, 93 respondents were undecided, 60 respondents disagreed, and 37 respondents strongly disagreed. There was no missing value. The responses gave a Mean value of 3.60 which is above the Benchmark Mean point of 3.0 and a Standard Deviation value of 1.130, which showed that more than the average number of the respondents agreed that World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid the implementation of policies that promote access to clean water and sanitation in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

Generally, Table 4.2.5 revealed that foreign clean water and sanitation grants efficiently boost the living condition of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria, as revealed in the Grand Mean of 3.6 which is above the Benchmark Mean of 3.0 and signified that the model is positive.

Respondents Opinion on Foreign Agricultural Grants

Table 2: Descriptive statistics analysis result on the respondents' opinion on foreign agricultural grants.

ITEMS	SA 5	A 4	U 3	D 2	SD 1	T	M	Std. Dev.
World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid in the agricultural equipment purchase	92 (460)	186 (744)	45 (135)	23 (46)	14 (14)	1399	3.89	0.988
World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid in the agricultural infrastructure development	119 (595)	179 (716)	37 (111)	17 (34)	08 (08)	1464	4.06	0.904
World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid in the agricultural training.	148 (740)	151 (604)	41 (123)	16 (32)	04 (04)	1503	4.17	0.880
World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid to increased crop yields through the adoption of new technologies	156 (780)	147 (588)	25 (75)	21 (42)	11 (11)	1496	4.16	0.995
World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid to provide mechanisms that support agricultural conservation practices	127 (635)	142 (568)	43 (129)	29 (58)	19 (19)	1409	3.91	1.125
N							**360**	
Total Mean							**20.2**	
Grand Mean							**4.1**	
Benchmark Mean							**3.0**	

Source: Field Survey 2024.

Table 4.2.7 revealed that out of the 360 respondents, 92 respondents strongly agreed that World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid in the agricultural equipment purchase in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria. 186 respondents agreed, 45 respondents were undecided, 23 respondents strongly disagreed, and 14 respondents strongly disagreed. There was no missing value. The responses gave a Mean value of 3.89 which is above the Benchmark Mean point of 3.0 and a Standard Deviation value of 0.988, which showed that more than the average number

of the respondents agreed that World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid in the agricultural equipment purchase in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

In the second item, out of the 360 respondents, 119 respondents strongly agreed that World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid in the agricultural infrastructure development in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria. 179 respondents agreed, 37 respondents were undecided, 17 respondents strongly disagreed, and 08 respondents strongly disagreed. There was no missing value. The responses gave a Mean value of 4.06 which is above the Benchmark Mean point of 3.0 and a Standard Deviation value of 0.904, which showed that more than the average number of the study respondents agreed that World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid in the agricultural infrastructure development in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

In the third item, out of the 360 respondents, 148 respondents strongly agreed that World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid in the agricultural training in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria. 151 respondents agreed, 41 respondents were undecided, 16 respondents disagreed, 04 respondents strongly disagreed. There was no missing value. The responses gave a Mean value of 4.17 which is above the Benchmark Mean point of 3.0 and a Standard Deviation value of 0.880, which showed that more than the average number of the respondents agreed that World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid in the agricultural training in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

In the fourth item, out of the 360 respondents, 156 respondents strongly agreed that World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid to increased crop yields through the adoption of new technologies in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria. 147 respondents agreed, 25 respondents were undecided, 21 respondents disagreed, and 11 respondents strongly disagreed. There was no missing value. The responses gave a Mean value of 4.16 which is above the Benchmark Mean point of 3.0 and a Standard Deviation value of 0.995, which showed that more than the average number of the respondents agreed that World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid to increased crop yields through the adoption of new technologies in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

In the fifth item, out of the 360 respondents, 127 respondents strongly agreed that World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid to provide mechanisms that support agricultural conservation practices in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria. 142 respondents agreed, 43 respondents were undecided, 29 respondents disagreed, and 19 respondents strongly disagreed. There was no missing value. The responses gave a Mean value of 3.91 which is above the Benchmark Mean point of 3.0 and a Standard Deviation value of 1.125, which showed that more than the average number of the respondents agreed that World Bank IDA and IFAD grants aid to provide mechanisms that support agricultural conservation practices in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

Generally, Table 2 revealed that foreign agricultural grants improve agricultural productivity of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria, as revealed in the Grand Mean of 4.1 which is above the Benchmark Mean of 3.0 and signified that the model is positive.

Respondents Opinion on Agricultural Productivity of Rural Communities in Southeast Nigeria

Table 3: Descriptive statistics analysis result on the respondents' opinion on agricultural productivity of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

ITEMS	SA 5	A 4	U 3	D 2	SD 1	T	M	Std. Dev.
The quantity of crops produced per unit of land over a specific period has increased	126 (630)	150 (600)	52 (106)	20 (40)	12 (12)	1388	3.99	1.010
The output per unit of labour input in agricultural production has increased	133 (665)	164 (656)	41 (123)	16 (32)	06 (06)	1482	4.11	0.893
The income generated by rural communities from agricultural activities has increased	144 (720)	161 (644)	33 (99)	18 (36)	04 (04)	1503	4.17	0.874
Rural communities' adoption of modern agricultural technologies and practices has increased	111 (555)	127 (508)	73 (219)	32 (64)	17 (17)	1363	3.79	1.120
Access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food within rural communities has increased.	107 (428)	139 (556)	67 (201)	39 (78)	11 (11)	1274	3.83	1.044
N							**360**	
Total Mean							**19.9**	
Grand Mean							**3.9**	
Benchmark Mean							**3.0**	

Source: Field Survey 2024.

Table 3. Revealed that out of the 360 respondents, 126 respondents strongly agreed that the quantity of crops produced per unit of land over a specific period has increased in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria. 150 respondents agreed, 52 respondents were undecided, 20 respondents strongly disagreed, and 12 respondents strongly disagreed. There was no missing value. The responses gave a Mean value of 3.99 which is above the Benchmark Mean point of 3.0 and a Standard Deviation value of 1.010, which showed that more than the average number of the respondents agreed that the quantity of crops produced per unit of land over a specific period has increased in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

In the second item, out of the 360 respondents, 133 respondents strongly agreed that the output per unit of labour input in agricultural production has increased in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria. 164 respondents agreed, 41 respondents were undecided, 16 respondents strongly disagreed, and 06 respondents strongly disagreed. There was no missing value. The responses gave a Mean value of 4.11 which is above the Benchmark Mean point of 3.0 and a Standard Deviation value of 0.893, which showed that more than the average number of the

study respondents agreed that the output per unit of labour input in agricultural production has increased in the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

In the third item, out of the 360 respondents, 144 respondents strongly agreed that the income generated by rural communities from agricultural activities has increased among the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria. 161 respondents agreed, 33 respondents were undecided, 18 respondents disagreed, 04 respondents strongly disagreed. There was no missing value. The responses gave a Mean value of 4.17 which is above the Benchmark Mean point of 3.0 and a Standard Deviation value of 0.874, which showed that more than the average number of the respondents agreed that the income generated by rural communities from agricultural activities has increased among the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

In the fourth item, out of the 360 respondents, 111 respondents strongly agreed that the rural communities' adoption of modern agricultural technologies and practices has increased in Southeast Nigeria. 127 respondents agreed, 73 respondents were undecided, 32 respondents disagreed, and 17 respondents strongly disagreed. There was no missing value. The responses gave a Mean value of 3.79 which is above the Benchmark Mean point of 3.0 and a Standard Deviation value of 1.120, which showed that more than the average number of the respondents agreed that the rural communities' adoption of modern agricultural technologies and practices has increased in Southeast Nigeria.

In the fifth item, out of the 360 respondents, 107 respondents strongly agreed that access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food within rural communities has increased in Southeast Nigeria. 138 respondents agreed, 67 respondents were undecided, 39 respondents disagreed, and 11 respondents strongly disagreed. There was no missing value. The responses gave a Mean value of 3.83 which is above the Benchmark Mean point of 3.0 and a Standard Deviation value of 1.044, which showed that more than the average number of the respondents agreed that access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food within rural communities has increased in Southeast Nigeria.

Generally, Table 3. Revealed the model of agricultural productivity of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria. The model is positive with the Grand Mean of 3.9 which is above the Benchmark Mean of 3.0. The responses elicited revealed that foreign agricultural grants enhanced agricultural productivity of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

Hypotheses

Decision Criteria

If the significance level (α) is greater than 5% level (Sig < .05), the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted

Hypothesis One

HO_1: Foreign clean water and sanitation grants does not have any significant effect on living condition of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

HA_1: Foreign clean water and sanitation grants had a significant effect on living condition of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

Table 4: Ordinary Least Regression analysis result on the effects of foreign clean water and sanitation grants on living condition of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

Variable	Unstandardized Coefficients B	Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	2.084	0.057		36.504	0.000
Foreign lean water and sanitation grants	0.704	0.020	0.883	35.567	0.000
R^2		**0.779**			
R^2		**0.772**			
F-Statistics		**1264.990**			

a. Dependent Variable: Living condition.
b. Predictor: Foreign clean water and sanitation grants.

Source: Field Survey 2024.

The result in Table 4. revealed that foreign clean water and sanitation grants with the regression coefficient of (0.883) is significant and positively affected living condition of the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria at 5% level (Sig < .05) of significance. The result portrays that an increase in foreign clean water and sanitation grants will lead to a positive increase in living condition of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria by 0.883. Therefore, at 5% level (Sig < .05) of significance, foreign clean water and sanitation grants had a positive and significant effect on living condition of the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

The **R- square** which shows the proportion of variation in the dependent variable that can be explained by the independent variables revealed that 77.9% of the total variation in the living condition of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria was explained by the variation in foreign clean water and sanitation grants. While the **Adjusted R** explains the effect of decrease in the degree of freedom arising from the independent variable. The **F-statistics** (1264.990) is significant at 5% level, which shows the overall significance of the entire model. Therefore, the independent variables in the model were significant in explaining the change in the dependent variable.

Decision

Based on the above results in Table 4., which revealed that at 5% level (Sig < .05) of significance, foreign clean water and sanitation grants had a positive and significant effect on the living condition of rural the communities in Southeast Nigeria, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis which states: "Foreign clean water and sanitation grants does not have any significant effect on living condition of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria" and accepted the alternate hypothesis which states: "foreign clean water and sanitation grants had a significant effect on living condition of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria."

Hypothesis Two

HO_2: Foreign agricultural grants have no significant effect on agricultural productivity of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

HA_2: Foreign agricultural grants had a significant effect on agricultural productivity of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

Table 5. : Ordinary Least Regression analysis result on the effects of foreign agricultural grants on agricultural productivity in Southeast Nigeria.

Variable	Unstandardized Coefficients B	Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	1.349	0.052		25.831	0.000
Foreign agricultural grants	0.917	0.018	0.938	51.186	0.000
R^2		**0.880**			
R^2		**0.879**			
F-Statistics		**2620.050**			

a. Dependent Variable: Agricultural productivity.
b. Predictor: Foreign agricultural grants.

Source: Field Survey 2024.

The result in Table 5. revealed that foreign agricultural grants with the regression coefficient of (0.938) is significant and positively affected agricultural productivity of the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria at 5% level (Sig < .05) of significance. The result portrays that an increase in foreign agricultural grants will lead to a positive increase in agricultural productivity of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria by 0.938. Therefore, at 5% level (Sig < .05) of significance, foreign agricultural grants had a positive and significant effect on agricultural productivity of the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria.

The **R- square** which shows the proportion of variation in the dependent variable that can be explained by the independent variables revealed that 88.0% of the total variation in the

agricultural productivity of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria was explained by the variation in foreign agricultural grants. While the **Adjusted R** explains the effect of decrease in the degree of freedom arising from the independent variable. The **F-statistics** (2620.050) is significant at 5% level, which shows the overall significance of the entire model. Therefore, the independent variables in the model were significant in explaining the change in the dependent variable.

Decision

Based on the above results in Table 4., which revealed that at 5% level (Sig < .05) of significance, foreign agricultural grants had a positive and significant effect on agricultural productivity of rural the communities in Southeast Nigeria, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis which states: "Foreign agricultural grants have no significant effect on agricultural productivity of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria" and accepted the alternate hypothesis which states: "Foreign agricultural grants had a significant effect on agricultural productivity of rural communities in Southeast Nigeria."

Summary of Findings

This study examined the effect of foreign Agricultural Grants on Agricultural Productivity in South East, Nigeria. The following are the findings:

i. At 5% level (Sig < .05) of significance, foreign clean water and sanitation grants had a positive and significant effect on living condition of the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria. This result implies that the financial support from these organisations has effectively addressed key factors that influence living conditions, such as access to safe drinking water, improved sanitation, and the reduction of waterborne diseases. These improvements in water and sanitation infrastructure lead to enhanced hygiene and improvements in the environment, which contribute to better living conditions in these communities.
ii. At 5% level (Sig < .05) of significance, foreign agricultural grants had a positive and significant effect on agricultural productivity of the rural communities in Southeast Nigeria. This result mean that the financial support from these organisations is addressing key challenges faced by rural farmers, such as limited access to modern farming techniques, inputs. The grants have facilitated the adoption of improved agricultural practices, technologies, and better access to markets, which have contributed to higher agricultural productivity in these rural communities.

Conclusion

Based on the study findings the researcher concluded that foreign financial grants, with reference to World Bank IDA Credit and IFAD financial grants had a positive and significant

effects on the development of rural communities in Southeast, Nigeria. The findings indicate that these financial grants have had a positive and significant effect on the development of these rural communities, particularly in improving primary education, access to healthcare, infrastructure, agricultural productivity, and overall community welfare. The analysis suggests that the inflow of foreign aid has contributed to the enhancement of livelihoods in rural areas, demonstrating the potential of international financial support in fostering sustainable development. Thus, foreign financial grants from the World Bank IDA and IFAD have proven to be valuable tools in advancing rural development in Southeast Nigeria. With careful management and targeted interventions, these financial resources hold significant potential to accelerate sustainable growth and improve the quality of life for rural populations. The conclusion drawn agrees with the basic tenets of Anthony Smith's Modernization Theory. The theory posits that the key characteristics of modernization include industrialization, urbanization, increased literacy, and adoption of modern technologies which will lead to improved economic productivity, higher standards of living, and enhanced social and political structures.

Thus, World Bank IDA and IFAD through their financial grants had significantly facilitated the modernization process in these rural communities in Southeast Nigeria, which have snowballed into enhanced education, healthcare, clean water and sanitation, infrastructure development and agricultural productivity in these rural communities.

i. World Bank IDA and IFAD need to regularly maintain their clean water and sanitation grants as it positively and significantly affects the living condition of the rural communities. However, they need to expand the scope of clean water and sanitation projects to reach more rural communities. Many rural areas still lack adequate access to clean water and sanitation facilities, so scaling up efforts will help improve the living conditions of a larger population. They need to focus on strengthening water supply systems, including the construction of new boreholes, water treatment plants, and piped water systems. They also need to ensure that these systems are sustainable and well-maintained for long-term access to clean water. Additionally, they need to increase investments in building sanitation infrastructure, such as latrines and sewage systems, in rural communities, which will help to reduces health risks, particularly the spread of waterborne diseases.
ii. World Bank IDA and IFAD need to continuously review their agricultural grants as it had a positive and significant effect on agricultural productivity of the rural communities. However, they need to enhance efforts in the distribution of high-quality seeds, fertilizers, tools, and pesticides through the agricultural grants, which will enable farmers to enhance yields and reduce crop losses, thereby boosting overall productivity. Also, they need to strengthen agricultural extension services to provide farmers with the knowledge and skills needed to adopt modern farming techniques. Training programmes on soil management, crop rotation, and pest control will help to improve productivity and sustainability in rural farming. Additionally, they need use the grant to subsidize technology adoption or provide

access to innovations that increase productivity, such as precision farming, climate-smart practices, and improved irrigation systems.

REFERENCES

Adewale, A. T., Lawal, O. A., Aberu, F. & Toriola, A. K. (2022). Effect of credit to farmers and agricultural productivity in Nigeria. *East Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 1(3), 377-388.

African Development Bank (AfDB) (2016). Feed Africa – Strategy for agricultural transformation in Africa 2016-2025. *Retrieved 20th May 2024 from: https://www.afdb.org/en/documents/document/feed-africa-strategy-for-agricultural-transformation-in-africa-2016-2025-89888*.

Agbakoba, J. C. A. (2003). *Philosophical issues in Development*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd.

Ahmed, A. O., Gbadebo, O. V., Iselobhor, F., Tokede, A. M. (2021). An appraisal of Nigeria's rural development programmes and policies: Lessons learnt and the way forward. *FUTY Journal of the Environment*, 15(1), 83-92.

Aleixo, B., Rezende, S., Pena, J. L., Zapata, G. & Heller, L. (2016). Human right in perspective: Inequalities in access to water in a rural community of the Brazilian Northeast. *Ambiente & Sociedade*, 19(1), 63-84.

Amofah, S. & Agyare L. (2022). Poverty alleviation approaches of development NGOs in Ghana: application of the basic needs approach. Cogent Soc Sci.8(1), 206 -234.

Attah, F. M. & Angioha, P. U. (2019). Development Agencies and Community Development: Assessment of the World Bank's Commercial Agriculture Development Project (CADP) in Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(3), 34-52.

Calow, R. & Mason, N. (2014). *The real water crisis: inequality in a fast-changing world.* Overseas Development Institute Framing Paper, London.

Chen, Y., Fu, W. & Wang, J., (2022). Evaluation and influencing factors of China's agricultural productivity from the perspective of environmental constraints. *Sustainability*, 14(5), 2807-2819.

FMWR (2014). *Making Nigeria open-defecation-free by 2025: A national road map.* Federal Ministry of Water Resources, Nigeria.

Hutton, G. & Varughese, M. (2016). *The costs of meeting the 2030 sustainable development goal targets on drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene*. The World Bank Press.

Ibrahima, S., Ansoumana, B., Mamadou, A. K., Lamine, D., Papa, M. N., Sokhna, T. & Joseph, M. (2022). Impact of regional water supply, sanitation et hygiene (WASH) program in Senegal on rural livelihoods and sustainable development. *Journal of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development,* 12(1), 1-15.

Larry, E. U., Martin O. E N. & lbenwo, G. (2021). World Bank-Assisted Development Projects and socio-economic development of rural communities in Ebonyi State: A study of Ebonyi State community and social development Agency (EB-CSDA). *International Journal of Business and Management Invention,* 10(9), 46-56.

McClelland, D. (1971). *The Achievement Motive in Economic Growth: Development and Social Change*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Mercy, C., Daniel, M. N. & Nason, V. (2023). Impact of funding on performance of agricultural extension services in Bomet, Kenya: Case of community-based organizations. *African Journal of Empirical Research,* 4(2), 937-944.

Michael, E. (2024). The role of selected international donor agencies in the development of Nigeria. *Journal of Public Administration, Finance and Law,* 22(1), 181-206.

National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) (2020). *2019 poverty and inequality in Nigeria: Executive summary.* Abuja: NBS.

Nwankwoala, H.O. (2011). Localizing the strategy for achieving rural water supply and sanitation in Nigeria. *African Journal of Environmental Science and Technology, 5*(13), 1170–1176.

Odusanya, R. (2020). List of natural resources in Nigeria and their locations. *Retrieved 20th May 2024 from https://www.legit.ng/1161400-list-natural-resources-nigeria-locations.html*

Okafor, O. E., Michael, M. C., Okafo, O. & Nwafor, O. G. (2023). Influence of International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) on Value Chain Activities of Members of Cooperative Societies in Awka North Local Government Area of Anambra State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science,* 7(7), 1353-1371

Rambe, P. & Khaola, P. (2022). The impact of innovation on agribusiness competitiveness: The mediating role of technology transfer and productivity. *European Journal of Innovation Management,* 25(3), 741-773.

Ribeiro Sarmento Sarmento MPH, D. (2015). *An analysis of access to improved drinking water and sanitation and distance to the water source in a newly independent country, Timor-Leste.* Assessing Geographical and Socioeconomic Disparities.

Roche, R., Bain, R., & Cumming, O. (2017). A long way to go–Estimates of combined water, sanitation and hygiene coverage for 25 sub-Saharan African countries. *PLOS One,* 12(2), 1017-1783.

Samuel, K. A., Boateng, A., Nana, A. F. & Ebenezer, E. Y. A. (2023). Impact of improved water supply on livelihood and health: Emphasis on Doba and Nayagnia, Ghana. *Journal of Innovation and Development,* 2(100033), 1-9.

Sennuga, M. A., Adedayo, T. G. & Sennuga, S. O. (2021). The impact of foreign aid on socio–economic development in Nigeria. *International Journal of Management Science*, 4(01), 60 – 70.

UNICEF (2014). Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS). United Nations Children's Fund, New York. *Retrieved 20th May 2024 http://www.unicef. org/statistics/index_24302.html.*

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2020). *Human development report 2020: Rethinking human development in an era of planetary transformation.* New York: United Nations Development Programme.

Uzomba, P. C., Peter, C. U. T. N. & Otokutu, O. P. (2020). Agricultural funding-based contributions and performance of Nigerian Agricultural Sector. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences,* 10(1), 331–349.

WHO & UNICEF (2017). *Progress on Drinking Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene: 2017 Update and SDG Baselines.* Geneva: World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF).

WHO & UNICEF. (2014). *Wash Targets and Indicators Post-2015:* Recommendations from International Consultations Comprehensive Recommendations, 12.

World Bank (2020). *Poverty and shared prosperity: Reversals of fortune.* Washington DC: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / the World Bank.

Zuberu, E., Ari, M. A. & Iliya, B. (2019). Effect of agriculture financing on agriculture productivity in Nigeria. *International Journal for Innovative Research in Multidisciplinary Field,* 5(7), 104-115.