Need Identification as Determinant of Success in Shell Petroleum Development Company (SPDC) Community Development Projects in Rivers State, Nigeria.

By

Adekola, G. and Oyebamiji, M.A
Department of Adult & Non-Formal Education
University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt

Abstract

The study examined need identification as determinant of success in Shell Petroleum Development Company (SPDC) Community Development Projects in Rivers State, Nigeria. A total of 300 questionnaire tagged NISSPDCCDP containing 25 items was used to collect information from the respondents. Percentage and Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to analyze the data collected. Findings of the study revealed that: SPDC does not engage in need identification for community development projects in her host communities; people's participation is low in SPDC community development projects due to lack of involvement in need identification stage; that successful implementation of community development projects is based on people's involvement in its identification as what they need will address their problems and will be sustained.

Keywords: *Need identification ;utilization; involvement; and sustainability.*

1. Introduction

One of the fastest growing and most needed areas of development is helping communities to evolve the necessary capacity to meet their basic needs. Such needs may include infrastructural facilities, skill acquisition, job creation, education, health, environmental sanitation and water supply. As observed by Energy API (2007) many multinational corporations are beginning to form partnership with host communities and national government to address these needs.

In Nigeria, majority of the multinational companies are involved in oil and gas exploration and production. Prominent ones among them are Shell Petroleum Developing Company (SPDC), Nigeria Agip Oil Company, Exxon Mobil and Chevron Texaco. In the process of oil exploration and production, these companies have contact with various communities especially the rural communities that are far less developed than their contemporaries in other parts of the world. Also, the activities of these oil industries have a lot of negative impact on the environment of the host communities thus, the need to intervene in the development of the host communities and the people by the oil companies.

To evolve a habitable and bring about development in the host communities the oil and gas industries, especially in the Niger Delta Area of Nigeria, often intervene in the process of development. Such intervention programmes often come with the aim of developing the host communities and according to Energy API (2007) to develop in the inhabitants of the host communities the capability and skills to achieve sustainable development.

The various oil and gas industries in Nigeria are involved in different community development projects. Such projects as listed by Energy API (2007) include: Remote Communities Electrification by Chevron Texaco, aimed at addressing energy poverty in the remotest areas of Niger Delta where many

619

communities lack electricity. Western Niger Delta Development programme by Chevron Nigeria limited aimed at improving the quality of life in the host communities. Technical Skill Acquisition in Warri, Delta State, and assistance for the Conocophilips Nigeria Business Unit aimed at a sustainable provision of essential basic infrastructure and support to less privileged children in the society. Support and Training Entrepreneurship Programme by Exxon Mobil aimed at improving micro enterprise development and provide small business skills training.

The Shell Petroleum Development Company (SPDC) being the largest investor in the Nigeria Oil and Gas has its community Development Programmes in almost every part of the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria. The Community Development activities cut across physical and human development in the host communities. The SPDC through her Community Relation Department has been involved in the construction of roads, bridges, hospitals, schools and school furniture, training of the youths on skill acquisition, and provision of employment through the Local Content Initiative introduced by the Nigeria government. However, despite all these efforts of the multinational oil industries, many oil producing communities in Nigeria are still backward and lack essential basic elements of life. This in most instances has led to conflict between the oil companies and inhabitants of the host communities who believed that the oil companies are not showing enough interest in their development.

All over the world, community development has been accepted as a major strategy for rapid development especially at the grassroots level. As observed by Adekola (2007) Community Development processes and programmes have become important to economic and social growth and development. This is because of the qualitative shift in the policies of nations, especially the third world countries, towards indigenous entrepreneurship and innovations. This is with the view to providing a more conducive participatory environment for mobilizing local resources as well as maximizes external support. Community development as a development strategy is predicated on laid down structure that guides its operations. Such structure according to Adekola (2009) includes:

i.   Identification of needs
ii.   Setting priority
iii.   Planning the project/programme
iv.   Mobilization of resources
v.   Implementing the plan/monitoring
vi.   Evaluation
vii.   Utilization and maintenance.

Ability of communities and organizations to, in practice, adhere to the structure of Community Development determines to a large extent the success of such community development programme. Success here is measured in terms of total implementation of the project's plan, acceptance and utilization by the community and ability of the project/programme to positively impact on the problems it is designed to solve in the community.

The major goal of community development is to bring about positive change through self-induced development of the people and their community. It emphasizes better living for the whole community with the active participation and on the initiative of the people. It is the emphasis on initiative of and participation of the people that makes community development democratic in nature. In its democratic nature, community development believes that development of the people must originate from the people and handled by the people. It is this emphasis on development originating from the people that bring about the idea of needs and how to identify such needs. What people say they want or need is known as felt need in community development terminologies. The principle of felt need stresses that people must be able to identify what they want to do in other to achieve desired development. According to Onyeozu (2007) felt-need is something sincerely desired, something craved for, wanted, longed for or aspired to. It is an object of inner wish or heart-felt prayer. Ogili (2004) described felt needs as "those tangible and

intangible things a group requires as essential to its survival as an organic whole". Without those tangible and intangible things the group or community would remain stagnant. Such tangible things, as posited by Ogili (2004), include good roads, water supply, electricity, educational institutions, etc, while the intangible things include: ability to work together, methods and tools to carry out their occupation, ability to read, write and understand their physical, social and cultural environment.

The principle of felt needs maintains that there is a lack, problem or inhibitions that retard the growth of the people or their community. Thus, Anyanwu (1992) asserted that a need represents the difference between "what is, and what ought to be" in the living conditions of a community. McMahon (1970) described felt need as a technical term which stands for a non-observable or inferred bio-psychological state similar to a 'drive'. Felt need is a major force that could propel the individual member of a community to accept joining hands with others of like mind to seek and provide solution to problems identified as obstacles to community improvement. The essence of felt need is to start with the people where they are, proceeding with them at their own pace to achieve the goals they set for themselves.

The issue of moving with the people to satisfy the objectives they set for themselves means that the people cannot satisfy or meet all their felt needs at the same time. This brings to consciousness the question of which need to satisfy at a particular point in time. Thus, the concept of priority sets in. In community development terminologies, the most pressing need or the need that is to be satisfied at a particular point in time is known as priority need. The main question here is, "how do we determine the priority need and who determines it. This question is easy to answer going by the view of Mao Tse Tsung (1972) as cited in Onyeozu (2002:27) that

All work done for the masses must start from their need and not the desire of any individual or organization, however well intentioned. However, Onyeozu (1997) was quick to note that we might be assuming too much if we believe wholeheartedly that people always know their needs in all cases. This is so because, as change agents, we cannot rule out the possibility that the consequence of ignorance might include not knowing where their problem lay and what is needed to solve it.

The assumption that the people may not be ready all the time or be in a good position to effectively identify their needs does not impose on the change agent or collaborating organizations the authority to determine for the people, what their needs are. This is because it is the person who wears the shoe that knows where it hurts most. Though the change agents may believe that their skills, experiences and professional competence put them in the right position for need identification, imposing need or interest on the people is against the democratic nature of community development.

The answer to the question "Who identifies the Needs" is contained in the concluding part of the Cambridge Summer Conference's (1948) definition of community development. The concluding part of the definition states that "… if possible on the initiative of the community but if this initiative is not forthcoming spontaneously, by the use of techniques for arousing and stimulating it, in order to ensure its active and enthusiastic response to the movement." The implication of this statement is that the change agent cannot rely on the weaknesses and inabilities of the community for effective identification of needs to impose his own idea on them. The best a change agent can do is to use his professional competence and techniques to ginger and guide the people towards correctly identifying their needs. McMahan (1970) concluded that it is always the client who makes the judgment about his own need and what will satisfy that need.

Although an entire process of need identification may be subject to modification, depending on the prevailing circumstances, the following steps as revealed by Egenti (2005) are essential:

- An informal survey/fact finding on identification of community concern.

- Identification of interest groups who can serve as programme initiator in the community.
- Involvement of community and opinion leaders for proper identification of felt needs of the community
- Mobilization and sensitization of community people through empowerment process
- Identification of immediate community problem(s).
- Sharing of problems identified with community leaders for legitimation.
- Diffusion and definition of priority need.
- Matching available resources with identified need.
- Formulation of detailed plan of action and
- Evaluation of the entire process and results.

In the process of need identification, various instruments are at the disposal of the change agent for use. Such instrument include interview schedule for the community members, structured questionnaire, observation, focus group discussion, etc. Usage of any of these instruments depends largely on the skills of the change agent, the type of community (urban or rural), status of the community in terms of education, structure of the community, time and other relevant resources available.

In Rivers State Nigeria, oil companies especially SPDC have embarked on various Community Development projects aimed at improving the quality of life in the host communities. However, her efforts are less acknowledged and appreciated by the people. This is to the extent that residents of the host communities, especially the youths at times, disrupt the activities of those involved in the implementation of the Community Development programmes and at the extreme attack, vandalize and the refusal to utilize completed projects occur in host communities. To professionals in community development, these types of problems often occur; only when the people are not involved in the process of decision making to arrive at such project or such project does not meet the priority need of the people. To this end, this study examines the extent to which SPDC engage in need identification for community development and determines the impact it has on the success of SPDC Community Development programmes in her host communities in Rivers State, Nigeria. This is with the aim of ascertaining if SPDC is involved in the process of need identification for community development projects in her host communities, determine the relationship between need identification and people's participation in SPDC community development projects, determine the relationship between need identification and success of SPDC community development projects and ascertain the relationship between need identification and sustainability of community development programmes in SPDC host communities.

Scope of the Study
The scope of this study covers SPDC community development activities in her host communities in Emohua Local Government Area of Rivers State, Nigeria. Specifically, the study focused on community development efforts of SPDC in Elele Alimini, Rumuekpe and Omudioga.

Research Question
The following research question was formulated to guide the study.
RQ1: To what extent is SPDC involved in the process of need identification for community development programmes in her host communities.

Hypotheses
Ho$_1$: There is no significant relationship between need identification and peoples' participation in SPDC community development projects in her communities.
Ho$_2$: There is no significant relationship between need identification and success of SPDC community development programmes in her host communities.
Ho$_3$: There is no significant relationship between need identification and sustainability of Community Development programmes in SPDC host communities.

Need Identification as Determinant of Success in Shell Petroleum Development Company (SPDC) Community Development Projects in Rivers State, Nigeria.

2. Methodology

This study adopts the survey research design. The population for the study comprised community leaders, youths, members of Community Development Committee (CDC) and women groups in the three communities used for the study. For sample selection, three communities i.e Rumuekpe, Elele Alimini and Omudioga were purposively selected for the study. This was due to high rate of SPDC activities these communities. Random sampling technique was used to select one hundred respondents from each of the communities used for the study. Thus, a total of three hundred people participated in the study. Efforts were made to ensure that all the groups mentioned above were adequately represented in the sample. The instrument for the study was a self-designed questionnaire titled Need Identification and Success of SPDC Community Development Projects. The instrument contains twenty-five items structured on Likert Rating Scale. The instrument was exposed to validity and reliability test. A reliability index of 0.87 was recorded before the instrument was administered on the respondents with the help of three post graduate students in the Department of Adult and Non-Formal Education, University of Port Harcourt. Data collected were analyzed with percentage and Pearson Product Moment Correlation.

3. Result

RQ1: Does SPDC engage in need identification for community development.

Table 1 Frequency/percentage analysis on SPDC engagement in need identification for Community Development.

n = 300

S	ITEMS	RESPONSE					
		SA	A	D	SD	Total	Remark
1.	SPDC always carryout need identification before embarking on CD projects in my community	51 17%	89 29.67%	92 30.67%	68 22.67%	300 100%	 Rejected
2.	SPDC always involved only to community leaders in need identification for community development	102 34%	91 30.33%	80 26.67%	27 93%	300 100%	 Accepted
3.	SPDC always involve every sector of the community in need identification for her community development programmes.	28 9.33%	72 24%	90 30%	110 36.67%	300 100	 Rejected
4.	SPDC always do all preliminary works on Community Development project for my community in their office.	88 29. 33%	92 30.67%	60 20%	60 20%	300 100	 Accepted
5.	SPDC always carryout community development programmes projects the meet the immediate needs of people of my community.	69 33%	79 26.33	96 32%	56 18.67	300 100	Rejected

The analysis of data on research question one as contained in table 1 reveals that 46.67% of the respondents gave positive response to the assertion that SPDC always carryout need identification before embarking on community development in the study area while 53.33% of the respondents gave negative response. This implies that respondents rejected the assertion that SPDC always engage in need

identification before embarking on community development in her host communities. However, 64.33% of the respondents agree that SPDC always involved community leaders in need identification while 35.67% disagree. With the high percentage of positive response, it is accepted that SPDC always involved community leaders in need identification for Community Development in her host community whenever she engage in need identification process. Probing further, 60% of the respondents gave positive response to the assertion that SPDC always do all preliminary works on Community Development in her office while 40% of the respondents gave negative response. With high positive response, it is accepted that SPDC always do all preliminary work on her community development project in the office. Notwithstanding, 49.33% of the respondents agree that SPDC always carryout community development project that meet the priority needs of the people while 50.67 disagree. With the very slim gap between the positive and negative response, it is difficult to state categorically that the assertion is rejected. However, considering the negative response the respondents gave to other items used in answering research question one, it is clear that the answer to research question one is negative. Therefore, the result here is that SPDC do not always engage in need identification for community development in her host communities.

Hypothesis One
There is no significant relationship between need identification and people's participation in SPDC community development projects.

Table 2: Correlation on need identification and people's participation in SPDC community development projects.

Variables	N	r.cal	r.tab	X	Remark
Need identification Participation in Community Development project	300	0.661	0.781	0.05	Ho. Rejected

The analysis of data on hypothesis one reveals a correlation value of 0.661 and table value of 0.781. At α value of 0.05 the hypothesis is rejected. This means that a relationship exist between need identification and peoples participation in SPDC community development projects.

Hypothesis Two
There is no significant relationship between need identification and success of SPDC community development programmes in her host communities.

Table 3: Correlation on need identification and success of Community Development in SPDC host communities.

Variables	N	r.cal	r.tab	X	Remark
Need identification Success of SPDC Community Development programmes.	300	0.941	0.82	0.05	Ho. Rejected

Data analysis on hypothesis two as contained in table 3 reveals that r.calculated = 0.941 and r.tabulated = 0.82. At 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that there is a relationship between need identification and success of SPDC Community Development programmes in her host communities.

Hypothesis Three

There is no significant relationship between need identification and sustainability of community development programmes in SPDC host communities.

Table 4: Correlation on need identification and sustainability of Community Development in SPDC host communities.

Variables	N	r.cal	p.tab	X	Remark
Need identification Sustainability of community development programmes	300	0.763	0.691	0.05	Ho. Rejected

The analysis of data on hypothesis three as contained in table 4 reveals r.calculated of 0.763 and r. tabulated value of 0.691. At α value of 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that there is a significant relationship between need identification and sustainability of community development programmes in SPDC host communities.

4. Discussion of Findings

The analysis of data on research question one, which seeks to determine whether SPDC engage in need identification before embarking on community development, reveals a positive response of 46.67% and a negative response of 53.33%. This shows that SPDC does not embark on need identification for community development before embarking on community development in her host communities. This finding is contrary to the view of Mao Tse Tsung (1972) in Onyeozu (2007:27) who claimed that "all work done for the masses must start from their need and not the desire of any individual (or organization) however well intentioned". This finding is also contrary to the view of Anyanwu (1992) who noted that need identification is the starting point of all community development activities. According to Armstrong and Davies (1975) identification of felt need is the corner stone whereby community work derives its whole legitimacy. However the finding of the study is contrary to Uzoagu (2010) that community development of SPDC is based on community felt need. However still, it needs to be noted that Uzoagu did not established who identifies the need, she only revealed that SPDC community development programme is based on the need of the people. Therefore the finding of this study is still in order since according to Uwen (2005) Community Development activities of SPDC started with community Assistant Programme which places emphasis on corporate philanthropy. The finding of this study is further supported by the fact that it is also revealed in table one that 64.33% of the respondents in this study agree that SPDC always carry along only the community leaders in planning for community development in her host communities and that majority of the planning work is always done in her office. This could be the reason for the generality of the people not knowing when and how SPDC conduct need identification for community development in her host communities.

Finding from hypothesis one shows that there is a significant relationship between need identification and people's participation in SPDC community development projects. This finding support the view of Anyanwu (1992) that where the community development project being implemented does not originate from the people their participation is always minimal. According to Paul (1987), participation is an active process whereby beneficiaries influence the direction and execution of development projects rather than merely receiver of project benefits. This means that where the people do not dictate the tune and direction of community development project through involvement in need identification (dictating what project should be embarked upon) their participation is always minimal.

The finding of this study that a relationship exist between need identification and participation in SPDC community development projects in her host communities is also in line with the view of Bruce (1964) in Oyebamiji and Adekola (2008) that development without people's co-operation and approval is unethical,

since it assumes that the people themselves have no idea of their needs and how best the needs could be met. This finding is also in line with Williams (1980) who observed that communities do not only have the right to participate in decisions that affect their living and working conditions, genuine participation requires community involvement in all the phases of the programme/project. Where they are denied such involvement especially at the planning stage they are likely to withdraw their involvement in the other phases of the project.

The finding on hypothesis two reveals that a significant relationship exists between need identification and success of SPDC community development projects in her host communities. This finding is in line with the view of Oyebamiji and Adekola (2008) that many community development projects fail or are poorly implemented or become unsustainable because of low level of people's participation resulting from implementation of project that does not meet the priority need of the people. They claimed that involvement of the people in all stages of the project would improve project performance. Osuji and Ogolo (1998) further stated that development projects in which people are involved articulating their needs themselves have better chances of being understood, accepted, supported and valued, and better sustained and maintained by the community.

The finding on hypothesis three reveals that there is a significant relationship between need identification and sustainability of community development programmes in SPDC host communities in Rivers State. This finding is in line with Oyebamiji (2000) who noted that the central objective of involving local people in development programmes is to enable them to assume full responsibility for the programme or project at all stages. He emphasized that through participation in action programmes, self reliance is encouraged. This finding is also in line with Osuji and Ogolo (1998) as cited above. This finding is also not far from the view of Jhinga (2004) who noted that the aim of sustainable development is the creation of sustainable improvement in the quality of life of the people. This is achievable only when the people participate in programmes designed to improve the quality of life now and later. Since according to Onokerhoraye (1995) sustainable development is to conserve, reserve, use and manage resources and undergo the process of development in such a way that what we do to improve live and living standard today does not compromise future use of such resources, and improvement in life and living standard. Lastly, this finding corroborates Jiko (2004) in Uzoagu (2010) that Community Development approach of SPDC, does not address some key issues of sustainability such as programme integration and beneficiary involvement due to adoption of partial rather than holistic approach to Community Development.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study examines the relationship between need identification and success of SPDC Community Development programmes in her host communities in Rivers State, Nigeria. The study discovers that need identification correlates with success of SPDC Community Development programmes in her host communities. The study therefore concludes that for SPDC to achieve full success in her community development projects, the company should reduce her policy of central guidance and control from SPDC Sustainable Community Development and promote more of people's involvement in her community development programmes. The study also concludes that to ensure sustainability and carry every community member along in her community development programmes, SPDC should involve more of the ordinary citizens through the Community-Based-Organizations (CBOs) rather than only the community leaders who the people see as agent of government.

Derived from this conclusion, this study recommends that:
1. SPDC should review her 2004 policy on sustainable community development to give more room for people's participation at all the stages of her community development programmes; since this policy emphasis strong internal control and accountability at the expense of people's participation in programmes aimed at improving their welfare.

2. SPDC should remove all hindrances to people's participation in community development programmes through adequate interaction with the people at their own levels.
3. Government in Nigeria should ensure enactment and implementation of policies promoting peoples involvement in activities of oil companies operating in their communities.
4. Government at the state and local government levels should provide capacity development programmes for the Community Development Committee (CDC) members and community leaders to enhance better understanding of their roles in community development programmes of oil companies operating in their communities as representative of the people.

References

Adekola, G. (2007) Synergising Community Development into National Development Plans. *African Journal of Educational Research and Development.* 1. (1) 120-128.

Adekola, G**.** (2009) Community Development in the African Indigenous Education: Implications for Contemporary Community Development Practices. African Journal for Contemporary Issues in Education. 4 (1).Ghana.

Amstrong, R. & Davies, C. (1975) The Educational Element in Community Development Work in Britain. *Community Development Journal.* 20

Anyanwu, C.N. (1992) *Community development: The Nigerian perspective.* Ibadan: Gabesther Educational Publishers Ltd.

Ogili, E. F. (2004) *Community Development for New Africa*. Enugu: Adels Foundation Publishers.

Onokerhoraye, A.G. (1995) *Urbanization and environment in Nigeria: Implication for sustainable development*. Benin: The Benin Social Science Series.

Onyeozu, A.M. (2007) *Understanding community development.* Port Harcourt: Davidstones Publishers Ltd.

Osuji E. E. & Ogolo, M. B. (1998) Constraints to peoples participation in community development in Rivers State of Nigeria. Nigeria 2 (1).

Oyebamiji, M. A. (2000) *Community participation for improved delivery of primary health care services in Osun State Nigeria 1990-1998.* University of Ibadan, Unpublished Ph.D Thesis.

Oyebamiji, M.A. & Adekola, G. (2008) Fundamentals of Community Development in Nigeria. Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt Press.

Paul, S. (1987) *Community participation in development projects.* Washington D.C: Ed. Publishers.

Williams, C. (1980) Twelve Lessons of Participatory Community Development. www.scn.org/modules/emp.12htm