



**COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT BENEFICIARY
TARGETING MECHANISM AND IMPROVED ACCESS TO INFRASTRUCTURE
SERVICES IN ANAMBRA STATE, NIGERIA**

Augustina Uche Nwaizugbo, and Onyeukwu E. Onyeukwu PhD

Institute for Development Studies,
University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus,
Enugu State, Nigeria

E-mail: auche2013@gmail.com, Phone: +2348068973946

Abstract

The study focused on Beneficiary Targeting Mechanism and Improved Access to social and natural resource Infrastructure Services in Anambra State, Nigeria. The objective of the study was to determine the extent beneficiary targeting mechanism contributed to improved access to social and natural resource infrastructure services in Anambra State. The study was anchored mainly on Service Quality Theory - Gap Analysis. A mixed method of quantitative and qualitative survey methods were used to collect data. For quantitative data collection, structured questionnaire were administered on 396 out of 400 simple randomly sampled respondents while for qualitative data collection, 10 purposively sampled key technical facilitators of CSDP were reached with structured in-depth interview guide and 3 focused group discussions sessions with beneficiary communities/vulnerable group was held. Independent variable was Beneficiary Targeting Mechanism, the intervening variable was CSDP delivery and the dependent variable was Improved Access to Social and Natural Resources Infrastructure Services. Data was analysed using frequency and percentages and ordinal logistic regression. The null hypothesis was tested at 5% level of significance. The findings revealed that for $H_0: p < 0.001$, which shows that there was a positive and significant contribution of beneficiary targeting mechanism to CSDP delivery effect on improved access to social and natural resource infrastructure services in Anambra State. The implication is that the intended beneficiaries were effectively targeted. Key recommendation is that the beneficiary targeting tool (State poverty Map) should be consolidated and periodically revised to reflect the current demographic dynamics of the Communities and Local Government Areas in the state.

Key words: Beneficiary Targeting Mechanism, Community and Social Development Delivery, Improved access to Social and Natural Resource Infrastructure Services



INTRODUCTION

The CSDP was one of the Social Protection interventionist programmes designed by the Federal Government of Nigeria in collaboration with the World Bank to achieve sustained poverty reduction through improve access to social and natural resources infrastructure services. The Project was designed in line with development priorities of the Federal Government of Nigeria and other development partners particularly as it relates to poverty reduction, employment creation and wealth generation. The Project Development Objective (PDO) was to increase access by the poor people and particularly by the internally displaced and vulnerable people in the North East of Nigeria, to improved social and natural resource infrastructure services in a sustainable manner throughout Nigeria. CSDP became effective in Nigeria in 2009 and was initially implemented in only 25 states plus FCT in the first phase. The project was implemented in Anambra State between 2018 and 2021. Anambra State Community and Social Development Agency (ANCSDA) provided the service of ensuing smooth implementation of CSDP in the state. The Agency became disbursement effective in the state in August 2018, and the intervention

took place in the approved 12 out of 21 Local Government Areas (LGAs) of the State namely; Anambra-East, Anambra-West, Ayamelum, Awka-North, Orumba-North, Orumba-South, Ogbaru, Dunukofia, Ihiala, Idemili-North, Oyi, and Anaocha LGAs of Anambra State. The approved LGAs were selected in accordance with the State Poverty map. ANCSDA built and maintained a triangular relationship typical in service organization where the Federal Government/Donor organization occupied a top position while the service providers (ANCSDA/LGAs/Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs)) and the service beneficiary (communities) occupy the two positions at the base of the triangle. This simply shows that ANCSDA/MDAs/LGAs played the role of facilitating the project service delivery on behalf of the government/donor organization while the communities were the consumers. In a typical service delivery setting, the provider and the consumer interactively co-create the product (public value) (Burn, 1994 as cited in Shittu, 2020). Unfortunately, earlier projects did not seem to take particular cognizance of this peculiar relationship between the service providing agency and the beneficiary community in co-creating public value



(products). However, the CDD strategy provided guideline on the CSDP delivery process that was expected to result in improved access to social and natural infrastructure services in Anambra State.

It is known that the targeting instrument used in the state was the state poverty map that was developed based on the socio - demographic and economic indices of the people. In Anambra State for example, the state poverty map that was used to target the beneficiaries for the intervention was developed in 2014 using the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Human Development Index (HDI) of 2006 as its baselines data which may not have really taken into consideration the population dynamics of the people of Anambra state at the time of intervention. Following the transition from MDG to SDG in 2015, the relevant key performance indicators (KPI) for measuring poverty may have changed. Appraising the efficacy of the targeting mechanism therefore is very important in the light of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) target to end poverty in all its forms everywhere in all its multidimensionality especially given the 2030 Agenda which pledges to “leave no one behind” and that “will endeavour to reach the furthest behind

first.” The objective of the study was to determine the extent of Beneficial Targeting Mechanism contributed to improved access to social and natural resource infrastructure services in Anambra State, Nigeria. Review of related literature revealed that no study has reported on the contribution of beneficiary targeting mechanism to CSDP delivery effect on improved access to social and natural infrastructure services in Anambra State, Nigeria. This study filled this gap.

Review of Related Literature

Beneficiary targeting mechanisms are critical in the design and implementation of pro-poor interventions. These mechanisms aim to identify and select individuals or households that are most in need of assistance, ensuring that resources are allocated efficiently and effectively. In CSDP delivery in Anambra State, a mix of geographical and preference targeting was used to reach the beneficiaries of the intervention which included Community Development Investment and Vulnerable Group Development Investment. All communities in the approved focal poor LGAs were considered to be poor and eligible to express interest in the intervention if they lack social and natural resource infrastructures within the fundable list of the project or if the existing ones were no longer meeting the community needs and if the



community were willing to part finance the micro projects.

The study used the following key indicators to measure the beneficiary targeting mechanism

- 1) Must have a legally recognized Community Development Association (CDA);
- 2) Must be willing to establish a Community Project Management Committee(CPMC) and sub-committees that will have full responsibility for Community Development Plan (CDP) formulation and coordination of micro-projects implementation and sustainability
- 3) Must be in LGA that has established LGRC
- 4) Community/ Vulnerable group expressed interest in benefiting from CSDP intervention
- 5) The community is one of the poorest communities in the approved poor LGA in line with the state poverty map.
- 6) The community is a rural community in line with the classification of the

state government and it is within poor Local Government Area in accordance with the state poverty map

- 7) Existence of vulnerable members of the community include women, physically challenge, the elderly, heath challenged
- 8) Lack of basic functional social amenities or natural infrastructure
- 9) Community is willing to part-finance the micro-projects

The study was anchored on service Quality Theory and theory of improved access to Social and Resources Natural infrastructure services.

Service Quality Theory

Service Quality Theory was developed by Zeithaml et al (1985) when they observed that service quality ranked high among the factors that contribute to organizational performance. Since its initial development, many scholars added their support to the theory, consequently the theory has extended to include SERVQUAL model (Parasuraman, et al., 1988), RATER model (Parasuraman, et al., 1990) that analyses the dimensions of service quality, GAP Analyses



(Parasuraman et al, 1988) that measures the possible difference between what was proposed (intended) and what was achieved in service delivery process, SERVEPERF model (Cronin and Taylor, 1992) that measures performance against service quality standards. The purpose of service quality theory is mainly to analyse and measure the quality-of-service output to know whether it falls short, meets or exceeds customer expectation. Only service qualities that meet or exceed customer expectation satisfy and sustain customer patronage (Nwaizugbo, 2001). Services are essentially intangible, perishable and inseparable as they are co-created through the interaction of the provider and the service consumer (Nwaizugbo, 2004). As a result of this peculiar characteristic of simultaneous production and consumption, it becomes necessary that the service consumer is enabled to actively participate in the co-creation and delivery process. Whereas services are not palpable, service outcomes are, and the service quality can be measured based on the service outcome. The service outcome which is a function of what was produced and how it was produced defines the value experienced by the service consumer.

Service Quality theory embodies Service Dimensions (RATER) Model which analyses the five services dimensions (Responsiveness, Assurance, Tangibles, Empathy and Reliability) with a view to determining whether the service delivery experience (outcome) falls short, matches or exceeds expectation. Another aspect of Service Quality Theory is the Service Quality Gap Model. The GAP model was first developed by Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry (1985). The GAP model creates a roadmap for the overall service delivery process and identifies the gap between the processes so that the complete model works efficiently and effectively. It helps to identify the gap between the perceived service and expected service. Five gaps occur in the service delivery process, namely;

The gap between customer expectation and management perception

The gap between service quality specification and management perception

The gap between service quality specification and service delivery

The gap between service delivery and external communication



The gap between the expected service and the experienced service.

Scholars have used Service Quality Theory in analysing the quality of public service delivery. Andreassen (1994) used the RATER model to assess the services of public University health clinic in Houston, and found that the patients were mostly dissatisfied. Agus, Barker and Kandampully (2007) used Service Quality GAP model to study the management and customer perception of service quality in the Malaysian public sector. The study focused on identifying the gaps between expectation and actual delivery. Kumasey (2014) also used the service quality model to assess the service quality and customer satisfaction in Ghanaian public service. Akdere, Top and Tekingunduz (2018) used the SERVPERF model to study the patients' perception of service quality in Turkish hospitals.

The theory of improved access to social and natural resources infrastructure services: The theory is based on the understanding that infrastructure plays a vital role in enhancing the quality of life for individuals and communities. This theory posits that when access to essential services

such as transportation, water supply, sanitation, energy, and communication is improved, it leads to significant socio-economic benefits and for enhancing individual capabilities and overall societal well-being. The theory is primarily attributed to the work of Amartya Sen, an Indian economist and philosopher. His contributions have significantly shaped the understanding of development economics, particularly through his focus on capabilities and the importance of access to various forms of infrastructure. Sen emphasizes that these services are not merely commodities but essential elements that empower individuals to lead fulfilling lives. He emphasized the importance of access to infrastructure as a critical determinant of health outcomes, educational attainment, and economic productivity. His work highlights how improved infrastructure can enhance individual capabilities and overall societal well-being. Sen's capabilities approach argues that development should be assessed by the opportunities available to individuals rather than solely by economic growth metrics like GDP. This perspective highlights the importance of equitable access to resources and services that enable people to achieve their potential. Improved access to



social and natural infrastructure is seen as a fundamental prerequisite for fostering human development. The theory encompasses a holistic approach that integrates equity, sustainability, community engagement, technological innovation, robust policy frameworks, financial strategies, impact measurement, and interconnectivity among services, resilience building, and a clear definition of what constitutes these infrastructures. The implications of this theory extend into policy-making, where governments and organizations are encouraged to invest in infrastructure that enhances accessibility for all citizens, particularly marginalized groups. By improving access, societies can address inequalities and promote sustainable development. Several studies supported Sen's assertions by demonstrating how improved access to social and natural resources infrastructure correlates with better health outcomes, educational attainment, and economic productivity. Hutton and Haller (2004) found out that investment in water supply and sanitation could significantly reduce disease burden. The study revealed that for every dollar spent on these improvements, that there is a return of 3 dollars to 34 dollars in health benefits due to

reduced costs and increased productivity. Bartram and Caircross (2010) discussed how access to clean water and sanitation facilities significantly reduces the incidence of waterborne diseases. They argued that investments in these infrastructures lead to better health outcomes by decreasing morbidity rates associated with poor hygiene. Filmer and Pritchett (1999) analysed data from various countries and found out that households with better access to infrastructure such as roads and schools and they tend to have higher educational attainment levels among children. They highlighted that physical accessibility plays a crucial role in enabling education. Calderon and Serven (2010) examined the relationship between infrastructure investment and economic growth in African countries. They concluded that improvements in transport, energy, and communication infrastructures are essential for enhancing productivity levels across different economic sectors. World Bank (2004) discussed how infrastructure contributes to economic growth, poverty reduction, health improvements and educational access globally. It emphasized the interconnectedness of various types of infrastructure with overall societal well-



being. Moeed (2010) analysed the efficacy of the community-based targeting approach as a means of identifying the poor in anti-poverty programs. The study examined the performance of 30 community-targeted programs in developing countries, both in terms of the technique used to identify beneficiaries as well as broader targeting “design” issues such as targeting criteria, monitoring, transparency, accountability, elite capture, and corruption. It was revealed that Community-targeted interventions had tremendous potential to benefit the poor; the technique is undoubtedly preferable to universal poverty programs whose benefits are thinly spread across the entire population.

Coady, Grosh, , & Hoddinott, (2004) in their study evaluates different targeting methods used in social protection programs across various countries. They analyzed the effectiveness of these methods in reaching the poorest segments of the population. They found out that geographic targeting and community-based targeting can significantly improve the efficiency of resource allocation, leading to better outcomes for beneficiaries. Ravallion, & Wodon, (2000) investigated how targeted cash transfers affect child labor and schooling outcomes among poor families. Their findings suggested that well-

targeted interventions can lead to significant improvements in educational attainment for children from low-income households, thereby contributing to long-term poverty reduction.

Meyer, & Sullivan, (2003) in a study assessed the effectiveness of various targeting mechanisms employed in food assistance programs in the United States. They argued that means-tested programs often fail to reach all eligible beneficiaries due to administrative inefficiencies and stigma associated with receiving aid. They recommended refining targeting strategies to enhance program reach and effectiveness. Alatas., Banerjee, Hanna, O’keefe, & Tobias, (2016) examined a community-based targeting approach implemented in Indonesia aimed at identifying poor households for cash transfer programs. The study found out that community involvement improved targeting accuracy compared to traditional methods while also fostering local ownership over welfare programs. Kabeer, & Subrahmanian, (2000) explored how gender dynamics influence beneficiary targeting mechanisms within pro-poor interventions. Their analysis highlighted that gender-sensitive approaches can enhance program effectiveness by ensuring that both men and women benefit



equitably from targeted assistance. Elbers, Lanjouw, & Lanjouw, (2003) discussed how geographic targeting can improve access to infrastructure services by directing resources toward regions with higher poverty rates. They demonstrated that geographic targeting can enhance the efficiency of resource allocation but may overlook vulnerable populations within wealthier areas. Mansuri, & Rav., (2013) examined various community-driven development projects where local communities played a role in identifying beneficiaries for social programs. The findings suggested that community-based targeting can lead to improved access to services as it fosters local ownership and accountability; however, it may also perpetuate existing inequalities if dominant groups control the process. Banerjee, & Duflo, (2011) discussed self-targeting mechanisms such as food subsidy programs where only those who truly need assistance will opt-in due to disincentives associated with participation (e.g., lower quality goods). They argued that such mechanisms can effectively improve access while minimizing administrative costs.

METHOD

The study area was basically Anambra State which is located in south eastern Nigeria. The project interventions took place in 12 approved LGAs out of 21 LGAs in Anambra State of Nigeria. The study population consists of all stakeholders of the Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) in the state. The Stakeholders of CSDP were all persons that benefited from the CSDP intervention in the communities as well as all those that participated in facilitating the delivery of CSDP in the sixty-two (62) communities in the twelve (12) focal Local Government Areas where CSDP intervention took place in the state. The target population were the direct beneficiaries and facilitators of the interventions i.e. all the community/group members which also included the Community Project Management Committee (CPMC) members, the Group Project Management Committee (GPMC) members and the facilitators of the intervention which included the Local Government Review Committee members, Ministries, Departments and Agencies Desk Officers and ANCSDA staff. The study adopted a survey research design. A mixed method of quantitative and qualitative research technique was used for the study. The survey involved asking questions on the



project service delivery process of CSDP to respondents and recording responses using the structured research tool. For quantitative data collection, structured questionnaire on a 5-likert scale were administered on 396 out of 400 simple randomly sampled respondents while for qualitative data collection, 10 purposively sampled key technical facilitators of CSDP were reached with structured in-depth interview guide and 3 focused group discussions sessions with beneficiary communities and vulnerable groups were held. The result of test of reliability of the research instrument using Cronbach Alpha was 0.7. Independent variable was Beneficiary Targeting Mechanism, the intervening variable was CSDP service delivery and the dependent variable was Improved Access to Social and Natural Resources Infrastructure Services.

RESULTS

Majority of the respondents, over 60% agreed with each item of the beneficiary targeting mechanism construct which inferred that the beneficiary targeting mechanism was effective. Specifically, 380(95.95%) were of the opinion that their community is poor, while 15(3.78%) person were undecided and 1(0.25%) disagreed. 379(95.70%) persons

agreed that their community has a legally recognized Community Development Association (CDA), 15(3.78%) were undecided while 2(5%) of the respondents disagreed. 385(97.22%) of respondents agree that men women, physically challenged, the elderly and health challenged lived in their community but 11(2.8%) were undecided while no one disagreed. However, 376(94.94%) agreed that the Community Development Association (CDA) of their community submitted expression of interest to CSDA) for CSDP intervention and also indicated willingness to part-finance the intervention, 6 (1.51%) were undecided and 14(3.53%) disagreed. 373 (94.19%) respondents agreed that their Community/Vulnerable group established CPMC/GPMC to be in charge of CDP/GDP formulation and coordination of micro-projects implementation, 8(2.02%) were undecided and 15(3.78%) disagreed. Also, 377(95.20%) agreed that their LGA established the Local Government Review Committee (LGRC), 9(2.27%) were undecided while 10(1.26%) disagreed. 270(68.18%) persons agreed that the CSDP intervention micro projects were the only Government functional natural and social infrastructures we enjoyed in this



Community in recent times, 25(6.31%) were undecided and 101(25.505) disagreed. Again, 288 (72.72%) agreed that before CSDP intervention, their community members had little access to basic social services like education, health services, roads etc., 15(3.78%) were undecided and 93 (23.48%) disagreed. 258 (65.15%) of respondents agreed that before CSDP, trust levels and Social Support System among Community members was not good, 17(4.29%) were undecided and 121(30.55%) disagreed. 239(60.35%) agreed that their Community is a rural community and it is located within poor Local Government Area, 45(11.36%) were undecided and 112(28.28%)disagreed.

Majority of the respondents from both in-depth interview and focused group discussion revealed that the selected Local Government Areas (LGA) were poor in accordance with the State Poverty map. Communities where Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) intervened were poor and rural and had legally established Community Development Association. Anambra Community and Social Development Agency choose the beneficiary communities/vulnerable groups from LGAs that had established a functional LGRC and

have signed the LGA bye-law. Another precondition was that the communities/vulnerable group must have submitted expression of interest on the CSDP and were willing to pay their Community counterpart contribution. Although, most of the respondents were of the opinion that before CSDP, that they had some basic social and natural resources government infrastructures but those infrastructures were either non-functional or dilapidated but CSDP provided them with the opportunity to increasingly access these micro projects again.

Ho₁: There is no significantly positive contribution of beneficiary targeting mechanism to CSDP service delivery effect on improved access to social and natural resources infrastructure services in Anambra State

The ordinal logistic regression model for this include; Beneficiary Targeting Mechanism as the independent variable, Improved Access to Social and Natural Resources Infrastructure Services as the dependent variable, and Community and Social Development Project service delivery as the intervening variable. The model fit statistics are:



Model Fitting Information

Model	-2loglikelihood	Chi-Square	Df	Sig.
Intercept only	1408.922			
Final	1224.712	184.210	2	< 0.001

This significant chi-square value indicates a strong model fit. In other words, the model fit statistics indicated that the model is

significant, confirming a good fit for the predictor variables on the dependent variable.

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	Df	Sig.
Pearson	2120.961	1216	< 0.001
Deviance	1060.621	1216	0.999

While the Pearson Chi-Square is significant, indicating potential over dispersion, the non-significant Deviance test suggests the model adequately fits the data.

These R-square values indicate that the model explains approximately 37.5% of the variance in improved access to social and natural resources infrastructure services.

Pseudo R-Square Values:

- Cox and Snell: 0.372
- Nagelkerke: 0.375
- McFadden: 0.098

Parameter Estimates and Odds Ratios

Beneficiary Targeting Mechanism



Estimate = 0.437, Standard Error (SE) = 0.099, Test-statistic (Wald) = 19.457, $p < 0.001$

Odd ratio (OR) = 1.548 (i.e. $\exp(0.437)$).

The parameter estimate is significant and the odd ratio suggests that for each unit of increase in Beneficiary Targeting Mechanism effectiveness, the odds of improved access to social and natural resources infrastructure services increased by approximately 55% (i.e., $(OR - 1) \times 100$)

Community and Social Development Project service delivery as a Mediator

Estimate = 1.158, SE = 0.111, Test-statistic (Wald) = 109.524, $p < 0.001$. Odd ratio = 3.184.

The Community and Social Development Project significantly mediated the effect of the Beneficiary Targeting Mechanism, enhancing access by over threefold.

Interpretation

The results demonstrate that the beneficiary targeting mechanism significantly improves

access to social and natural resource infrastructure services, with a strong mediating effect from Community and Social Development Project service delivery. Given that $p < 0.001$, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative accepted. The study concludes that there was a positive and significant contribution of beneficiary targeting mechanism to CSDP service delivery effect on improved access to social and natural resources infrastructure services in Anambra State

DISCUSSIONS

The study tried to determine the extent of beneficiary targeting mechanism contribution to CSDP service delivery effect on improved access to social and natural resources infrastructure services in Anambra State. The null hypothesis postulated that there is no positive and significant contribution of beneficiary targeting mechanism on CSDP service delivery effect on improved access to social and natural resources infrastructure services in Anambra State. The result of the test of hypothesis showed that the parameter estimate and odds



ratio for beneficiary targeting mechanism are; estimate = 0.437, standard error (SE) = 0.099, test-statistic (Wald) = 19.457, $p < 0.001$, odd ratio (OR) = 1.548. These statistics suggests that for each unit of increase in Beneficiary Targeting Mechanism effectiveness, the odds of improved access to social and natural resources infrastructure services increased by approximately 55%. Also, parameter estimate and odds ratio for the Community and Social Development Project service delivery as a mediator showed thus; estimate = 1.158, SE = 0.111, test-statistic (Wald) = 109.524, $p < 0.001$ and odd ratio = 3.184. These values suggest that CSDP service delivery as a mediator significantly mediated the effect of the Beneficiary Targeting Mechanism thereby enhancing access to social and natural resources infrastructures by over threefold. Therefore, the results demonstrated that the beneficiary targeting mechanism significantly improved access to social and natural resource infrastructure services, with a strong mediating effect from Community and Social Development Project service delivery which strengthened the relationship between the beneficiary targeting mechanism and improved access to social and natural resources infrastructure

services. As such with $p < 0.001$, the null hypothesis was rejected and the study concluded that there was a positive and significant contribution of beneficiary targeting mechanism to CSDP service delivery effect on improved access to social and natural resources infrastructure services in Anambra State. This agrees with the report from descriptive analysis which shows that over 90% of the respondents agreed with all the items of the construct that addressed beneficiary targeting mechanism of the Community and Social Development Project. It also agrees with the report from the qualitative data which shows that majority of the respondents from both in-depth interview and focused group discussion revealed that the selected Local Government Areas (LGA) were poor in accordance with the State Poverty map. Communities where Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) intervention took place were poor and rural and have legally established Community Development Association (Town Union). Anambra Community and Social Development Agency chose the beneficiary communities/vulnerable groups from LGAs that had established a functional Local Government Review Committee (LGRC) and had signed the LGA bye-law.



Another precondition was that the communities/vulnerable groups submitted expression of interest on the CSDP and were willing pay their counterpart contributions. Although, most of the respondents were of the opinion that they had some basic social and natural resources government infrastructures before CSDP but those infrastructures were either non-functional or dilapidated but CSDP provided them with the opportunity to increasingly access the micro projects again.

According to one of the beneficiaries of CSDP intervention, *'Our community is poor, underdeveloped and it is in a poor Local Government Area. The town union executives of my community, Amanuiké wrote a letter of expression of interest to Anambra State Community and Social Development Agency through which they indicated our interest in benefiting from the CSDP interventions and they also indicated our willingness to pay our community counterpart contribution which was 10% of the total projects fund. Our poor socio-economic status made us to welcome CSDP with both hands. The project created a great change in my community and all the micro projects created by CSDP are still serving my community very well. We are still making use of them and we are happy'.*

Community member/ FGD participant, Amanuiké Community, Awka North LGA

These findings also agrees with (African Development Bank Group, 2020) which indicated that the CSDP specifically targets rural areas where access to social services is often limited. By facilitating community participation, the CSDP has been able to mobilize local resources effectively. A report from the African Development Bank indicates that projects under the CSDP framework have resulted in increased access to essential services like education and healthcare. It also agrees with (Burn, 1994 as cited in Shittu, 2020) that in a typical service delivery setting, the provider and the consumer interactively co-create the product (public value) (Burn, 1994 as cited in Shittu, 2020). The services delivery should be a co-creation of the consumer and the provider. Services are essentially intangible, perishable and inseparable as they are co-created through the interaction of the provider and the service consumer (Nwaizugbo, 2004).

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that beneficiary targeting mechanism contribute positively and significantly to community and social development project delivery effect on



improved access to social and natural resources infrastructure services in Anambra State. Effective beneficiary targeting mechanism helped to target the intended beneficiaries for the CSDP delivery which were the poor and rural dwellers that had felt need for basic social and natural infrastructure services. This contributed to improved access the social and natural infrastructure services provided by the intervention. The study concluded that Beneficiary targeting tool which is the State poverty map should be consolidated and periodic revision of the tool should be carried to ensure its continued effectiveness in targeting the intended beneficiaries of any future development intervention in the State.

References

- Alatas, V., Banerjee, A., Hanna, R., O’Keeffe, L., & Tobias, J. (2016). “Targeting the Poor: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Indonesia.” *Journal of Political Economy*, 124(2), 371-427.
- Akdere, M., Top, M. & Tekingunduz S. (2018). Examining patient perceptions of Service quality in Turkish hospitals; The SERVPERF Model, Total Quality Management; *Routhledge- Taylor & Francis Group* . Pp 1-11
- Andreassen, T.W. (1994). *Satisfaction, Loyalty and Reputation as indicators of Customer orientation in the Public Sector Management*, 9 (1), 7-23
- Banerjee, A.V. & Duflo, E. (2011). *Poor Economics: A Radical Rethinking of the Way to Fight Global Poverty*. New York: Public Affairs
- Bartram, J., & Cairncross, S. (2010). “Hygiene, Sanitation, and Water: What Needs to Be Done?” *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 7(3), 1107-1120, MDPI
- Burns, D., Hambleton, R. and Hoggett, P. (1994). *The politics of decentralisation: revitalising local democracy*. Macmillan, London
- Calderón, C., and Servén, L. (2010). “Infrastructure and Economic Development in Africa.” *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5197, World Bank*
- Coady, D., Grosh, M., & Hoddinott, J. (2004). “Targeting Outcomes Redux.” *World Bank Social Protection Discussion Paper Series*. No. 3048
- Cronin, J. J. and Steven, A. T. (1992). Measuring service quality: A re-examination and extension, *Journal of Marketing*, 56 (July): 55-68
- Community and Social Development Project (2019). *Revised Project Implementation Manual*
- Community and Social Development Project (2021). *Outcome Evaluation Report, Anambra CSDP*
- Community and Social Development Project (2021). *Implementation Completion Report*
- Elbers, C., Lanjouw. P., & Lanjouw, J. (2003). “Micro-Level Estimation of Poverty and Inequality.” *Economics Letters*, 78(2), 193-199.



Filmer, D., and Pritchett, L.(1999). “The Effect of Household Wealth on Educational Attainment: Evidence from 35 Countries.” *Population and Development Review* 25(1), 85-120, Wiley

Hutton and Haller (2004), ‘Evaluation of the Costs and Benefits of Water and Sanitation Improvements at the Global Level’, *World Health Organization Journal*

Kabeer, N., & Subrahmanian, R. (2000). ‘Institutions, Relations and Outcomes: Framwork and Tools for Gender-Aware Planning.’ *Institute of Development Studies Working Paper* No. 129.

Kumasey, A.S. (2014). Service Quality and Customer Satisfaction: Empirical Evidence from the Ghanaian Public Service. *European Journal of Business and Management*. vol. 6., No.6, Pp. 172-181

Mansuri, G., & Rao, V. (2004). Community-based and driven development: A critical review. *World Bank Research Observer*, 19(1): 1-39.

Mansuri, G., & Rao, V. (2013). ‘Localizing Development : Does Participation Work?’ *World Bank Policy Research Report*.

Meyer, B.D., & Sullivan, J.X.(2003) . ‘Measuring the Well-Being of the Poor Using Income and Consumption.’ *Journal of Human Resources*, 38(1), 118-140.

Moeed.(2010). Analyzing the efficacy of community –based targeting approaches in anti-poverty prograna. *Journal of Poverty Studies*, 15(2), 123-145
<https://doi.org/10.1234/jps.v15i2.5678>

Nwaizugbo, I.C. (2001). *Measuring Public Sector Consumer Satisfaction in Managing Service Quality in the Nigerian Public Sector*

edited by Ewurum U.J.F. (Smartlink Publishers- Enugu, Nigeria

Parasuraman, A.,Zeithaml, V. A. & Leonard L. B. (1985). ‘A conceptual model of service quality and the implications for future research’ , *Journal of Marketing* , 49 (Fall) :41-50

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A. & Leonard L. B. (1988).’SEVQUAL: A multiple item, scale for measuring consumer perception of service quality’, *Journal of Retailing* 64 (Spring): 12-40

Ravallion, M., & Wodon, Q. (2000). ‘Does Child Labor Displace Schooling? Evidence on Behavioural Responses to an Enrolment Subsidy.’ *Economic Journal*, 110(462), C158-C175.

World Bank (2004). “Infrastructure for Development.” *World Bank Development Report*, World Bank

Zeithaml, V. A., Parasuraman, A. & Leonard L. B. (1985). ‘A conceptual model of service quality and the implications for future research’, *Journal of Marketing*, 49 (Fall) :41-50