

Original Research Article

Government and Non-Governmental Organisation Led Agricultural Development Projects and the Accumulation of Social and Economic Capitals in Mezam, Cameroon

ABSTRACT

Government (GO) and Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) undertake agricultural development projects especially in Sub-Saharan Africa where agriculture-dependent livelihoods are predominant. Agricultural development has been accompanied by a theoretical debate vis-à-vis who is best placed to steer the process. Unfortunately, empirical evidence to refute or ramify the theoretical contestations are extremely limited. **We** contribute to this literature by comparatively analyzing the effects of GO and NGO-led agricultural development projects on social and economic capitals in Cameroon. Mixed methods **was** applied on stakeholders of four selected GO-led and four NGO-led development projects in Mezam division in the North West region of Cameroon, chosen due to its long history of both GO and NGO-led agricultural development projects. A structured questionnaire was used to collect quantitative data from randomly selected 180 beneficiaries, including 90 from GO and 90 from NGO projects, and 120 project staff that is 15 (2 top, 5 middle and 8 lower management) per retained organization. Recall was applied to construct before-after comparisons with interviewees, in the absence of baseline information. In-depth interviews and observations were done with selected project staff and beneficiaries, **and beneficiaries**, respectively. Quantitative data was analysed using SPSS version 25.0, while qualitative data was analyzed using content analysis. Results show significant increase in the growth of social and economic benefits for respondents from both GO and NGO-led projects ($p < 0.05$), though higher for NGO-led projects. Based on these results, **we** conclude that agricultural development by both organizational types can enhance social and economic development. Further studies are needed to ramify these results. Comparative analyses between project staff and beneficiaries can highlight any differences them, in terms of perceptive and actual impacts of GO and NGO-led agricultural projects on social and economic capitals. Comprehensive assessments based on all livelihood capitals are recommended to ground **our** contentions.

Keywords: *Government, NGOs, agricultural development projects, Social capital, economic capital*

1. INTRODUCTION

The role of Governmental (GO) and Non-Governmental (NGO) development projects in enhancing sustainable livelihoods for communities across the globe cannot be overemphasized. Between 2014 and 2017 for instance, development projects worldwide mobilized approximately US\$ 1,664 billion, of which over 8% (approximately \$ 138.7 billion) benefited African countries, improving the livelihoods of approximately 28% of those below the poverty line [1]. GO and NGO development projects are a form of organized social activity with specific focus (objectives), limited in space and sometimes limited in time aimed at bringing about long-term change [2]. Agricultural development contributes to the broader concept of sustainable development, and rural and urban livelihoods. Sustainable agricultural development¹ projects and practices have evolved in congruence with the concept of development **time** [3]. In fact, in the 1950s and 1960s, development projects were based on engineering, scientific rationality and top-down approaches, in accordance with the economic thinking of the time, in which science, technology and planning were central instruments for the rational control of nature and society [4]. This vision of development was based on the unlimited availability of natural resources, low wages and ease with which businesses and agriculture in rural areas in particular were set up. Development interventions did not sufficiently take into account the opinions and values of the project beneficiaries and therefore did not adequately address the needs of beneficiaries [5]. Consequently, development projects did not sufficiently include the social expectations of communities [6]. From 1980 onwards, a progressive change in the paradigm of development was noted. With the

consolidation of the Goal-Oriented Project Planning (GOPP) approach in the 1980s particularly by the German Agency for Technical Development-GTZ [7], and due to the large failure to sustainable development projects hitherto, beneficiaries such as households, families and whole communities began to play central roles in identifying planning implementing, monitoring and evaluating development projects directed towards them[8]. This new paradigm attracted new actors, particularly NGOs, who joined national governments in promoting participatory (agricultural) development [9, 10, 11]. Since then, NGOs have remained very active in fostering global (agricultural) development. Governments and NGOs play vital roles in promoting livelihoods and sustainability. They have both recognized the challenges to social and economic sustainability, and are beginning to address these issues in public policy discussions. It is imperative to work across organisations in order to address (agricultural) development issues in a global context. According to a Globe Scan poll of experts, the leading role in achieving sustainability will be played by business (35%), followed by NGOs (30%), and 24% governments [12].

Agricultural development has been prioritized in many developing countries in Asia and Africa, due to its contribution to livelihoods. Up to 70 percent of Africans depend on agriculture, which contributes about 35 percent to the continent's gross domestic product[13]. Developing the agricultural sector therefore has a direct impact on poverty reduction in Africa. Some changes targeted by agricultural development projects in Africa and in other parts of the world include production and productivity increases [14], adaptation and resilience to climate change [15], and sustainability in diverse contexts such as livelihoods as an independent sector [16, 17], or in terms of GHG reductions [18]. The growth in agricultural development projects, and their promotion by GO and NGO actors has raised questions as to who is best placed to enhance highest impacts of agricultural development projects. This article provides an empirical response by comparatively analysing the impacts of agricultural development projects on social and economic capitals accumulation by beneficiaries in Mezam division of the North West region of Cameroon.

1.1 Background

1.1.1 Statement of the Problem

The impacts and sustainability of (agricultural) development projects is increasingly gaining importance in development discourses. Unfortunately, project outcomes generally tend to be less visible long after implementation ends [19]. The efforts devoted by agricultural development agencies to enhance the wellbeing of targeted beneficiaries and their livelihoods can become meaningless if projects are not beneficial and if the benefits are not sustained beyond the implementation period. Group approaches have been used by various development agencies as a means of delivering projects, extension services and assisting rural people to improve their living standards in terms of grants or loans through groups [20]. Agricultural Sustainability strategies such as capacity building, market integration and cooperatives management have produced suboptimal results [19-21].

An interesting debate with regards to the implementation and sustainability of (agricultural) development projects resolves from the theoretical discourses around implementing organizational form, particularly if state or non-state organizations should drive the development process [22]. A theoretical issue of concern in project-related development efforts has therefore been if the state should continue to be at the epicenter of (agricultural) development or not. Proponents of state-centrism do not see any other option for development, without the strong participation of the state. In other words, the state should be at the epicenter of the development process, defining piloting and shaping development outcomes [16, 23]. An opposing narrative has consistently accompanied the discourse for a state-centric development. According to this alternative narrative, development will be sustainable if the role of the state is limited to creating favourable policy environment and correcting market failures. In this case, development actors such as the Market and Non-profit organizations (e.g. NGOs) will promote durable and meaningful development [16]. Based on this school of thought, states remain predatory², as long as they concentrate on rent-seeking, and protecting the interest of a privileged few [23]. While this theoretical debate is on-going, development efforts continue to be undertaken by both state and non-state actors sometimes in parallel, but also in complementary manner.

² A predatory state often is limited to a state that does not protect private property rights and hinders economic development. Predatory state "would specify a set of property rights that maximize the revenue of the group in power, regardless of its impact on the wealth of society as a whole". It would promote the private interests of dominant groups in the state (such as politicians, army bureaucrats) or influential private groups with effective lobbying powers [23].

In Cameroon, the shift from a strong state (government) participation before the structural adjustment programs (SAPs) in the 1990s to a weaker one in favour of a stronger NGO intervention thereafter, re-stimulated this interesting debate [24]. In the current context, one observes the Cameroonian government bouncing back into the development process, by increasingly initiating and leading many development projects³ in a context characterized by diminishing NGO intervention [20]. In essence, state (GO) and NGO-led development projects operate in parallel. This deviates from the non-profit economic demand theory, which holds that Non-profit Organizations emerge to account for deficits created by failing states and markets [25]. At the same time, and even with activities on the ground propelled by both institutional forms, very little is known as to which of these two major actors possesses the (better) capacity to enhance sustainability or impacts. An *allodoxia*⁴ therefore exists between theoretical orientations and empirical reality with respect to the relationship between institutional form and the outcomes of (agricultural) development projects [23].

Empirical research is needed to stem this knowledge paucity and inform policy decisions in order to better direct increasingly limited resources to the more competent institutional form, capable of enhancing sustainability in development projects, thereby optimizing limited resources. In addition, empirical research can unravel the mystery embedded in the theoretical debate on the role of state and non-state actors in the development process. Unfortunately, empirical efforts to refute or ramify the role of state and non-state actors in development and the sustainability and/or impacts of their efforts until now have not attracted sufficient research attention. The study draws on case studies from Mezam division in the Northwest Region of Cameroon to empirically compare the differential impacts of state (GO-led) and non-state (NGO)-led agricultural development projects⁵. The study sheds light on the empirical relationship between these two organizational forms⁶, and the impacts of agricultural development projects executed by both organizational forms in the Northwest Region of Cameroon. In this study, State/Government and Non-State/NGO will be used interchangeably⁷ [26].

1.2 Literature Survey

1.2.1 Role of the State in Development revisited

Max Weber defined a state as a human community that successfully claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory. The Weberian approach conceptualises the state as an institution or set of institutions exercising supreme political authority within a geographically defined territory [27]. This supreme political authority implies a monopoly of "legitimate" pressure, administration over a given territory, and the capacity to capture revenues for the support of state activities [28]. From a slightly different perspective, Greenberg also envisages the state as constituted by the civil and military bureaucracy, the government, or those having formal control over the state apparatus; and the formal and informal rules of the game that structure the form and operation of both apparatus and government [29].

The traditional role of the state as outlined by Anderson [33] consists of seven basic functions of government, namely (i) Providing economic infrastructure; (ii) Provision of various collective goods and services; (iii) The resolution and adjustment of group conflicts; (iv) The maintenance of competition; (v) Protection of natural resources; (vi) Minimum access by individuals to the goods and services of the economy; and (vii) Stabilisation of the economy [33]. Five fundamental tasks are at the core of every government's mission and are concerned with: (i) Establishing a foundation of law; (ii) Maintaining a non-distortionary policy environment, including macroeconomic stability; (iii) Investing in basic social services and infrastructure; (iv) protecting the vulnerable; and (v) Protecting the environment. It is almost impossible for any state to function as an island in the current era of

3 Some of the state-led projects in Cameroon North West region include ACEFA (Programme d'Amelioration de la Compétitivité des Exploitations Familiales Agropastorales), GP-DERUDEP (Grassfield Participatory and Decentralized Rural Development project), PACA (Projet d'Amelioration de la Compétitivité Agricole), LIFIDEP (Livestock Development Project), PROFALCAM (Platform for the Promotion of Local Flour in Cameroon).

4 Allodoxia is a concept that is used to describe false beliefs arising from misrecognition [30].

5 Development projects are endeavours aimed at reducing rural poverty by improving and increasing production activities through a community-based approach in designing and implementing major components which directly impacts the lives of the poor in the participating regions and districts. These components improve rural infrastructure, investment for the poor, improved agricultural services, better policies, environmental management, support for the implementation and coordination units [26].

6-Government organisation is a permanent or semi-permanent organization in the machinery of government responsible for the oversight and administration of specific functions, such as an administration. It may be established by either a national or a state government within a system, created by powers of government and established by legislation. Non-state is a superordinate concept that encompasses all actors in international relations that are not affiliated to or directed by government. It comprises individuals as well as entities across large range of organizations and institutions on the globe Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are non-profit entities independent of governmental influence. Sometimes called civil societies, are organized on community, national and international levels to serve a social or political goal [30, 31].

7The sustainability differences is viewed from various perspectives: on the basis of policy development, the State involves in development of new policies to steer and enable sustainability innovation via identifying major sustainability challenges at global, national, regional levels and setting up priority goals with long-term strategies meanwhile the Non-State is involved in the development of partnership approaches in which they fund and attempt to work with other organisations, direct funding through bilateral or multilateral donors, responding to relief work on international emergencies on contractual basis. Based on regulations, all State initiatives are in legislation, administration and enforcement with boundaries set by the international law while all Non-State initiatives are in legislation, administration and enforcement by the rules governing the NGO sector It should be noted that both organisations have the goal of working towards a common interest especially for the benefit of human welfare and a better society. Hence, will frequently been used interchangeably [32].

globalisation [34]. There are guidelines, policies, conventions and agreements provided at the global level, which guide the actions of states in both the developed and developing worlds [29]. Hence, the role of the state has changed tremendously especially in the 21st century, with a remarkable shift of attention from government to a governance perspective. For instance, the governance perspective highlights not just the institutional interactions usually associated with public policy making but it emphasises the relationship of society to governing. As a result, governments currently use organisations in society to implement programmes in order to share responsibility with the aim of promoting a development that is sustainable [34].

1.2.2 The Sustainable Livelihood Framework Revisited

For the past few decades, research on rural people's sustainable livelihoods in developing nations has been based on the notion of Livelihood Concept⁸[35]. Beginning in 1992, this concept deliberated on a number of issues including; the sustainable livelihood framework which helps in gaining a thorough understanding of how rural households combine different resources in different environments and ways to achieve certain levels of living and doings[35].By definition, a livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (stores⁹, resources, claims and access) and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stress and shocks, maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets provide sustainable livelihood opportunities for the next generation; and which contributes net benefits to other livelihoods at the local and global levels and in the short and long-term[36].

1.2.3 Understanding livelihood capitals and their applications in impact assessments

In spite of criticisms [36, 39]the elements of the sustainable livelihoods framework (SLF) have not fundamentally changed from the original conceptualization developed by Scoones in 1998 and UK's Development for International Development in 1999. The livelihoods framework is divided into five components, namely (1) Vulnerability context, (2) different forms of livelihood assets, (3) policies and institutions, (4) livelihood strategies, and (5) livelihood outcomes [37, 38]. The goal of SLF was to better understand the application of rural development policy planning and its resulting effects on the sustainability of livelihoods[38]. It provides a map of existing issues and to understand how and why they (influence and shape livelihoods). Thus, while Scoones [37], provides what comprises each component of the framework, DFID, UK [47], claims to offer an understanding of how and why the sustainable livelihood components interact¹⁰[37]. The livelihoods paradigm developed by DFID emphasized the functions of markets, institutions, and technology in relation to efforts to combat poverty [47]. According to the framework, it differed slightly from DFID since it was intended to be used by practitioners of rural development as opposed to serving as a framework for directing research [36].

The five key elements that make up the framework for sustainable livelihoods are reviewed in the following sections below.

a) Vulnerability Context: The framework for sustainable livelihoods is used to evaluate people's mitigation methods to deal with a situation. For instance, dealing with the effects of climate change. It is suggested that there are various benefits of knowing vulnerability context in rural development activities. Researchers have suggested that comprehending the context of vulnerability may be useful in assessing people's resilience to external shocks. For instance, Chiwaula contend that people's levels of vulnerability affect how well they are able to handle stresses and shocks from the outside world. Additionally, community's level of vulnerability and its level of poverty are related, and that the more vulnerable a group of people are, the poorer they are. The most vulnerable and impoverished households are those with the weakest asset portfolios [40].

Researchers have suggested that a number of external factors in places where people reside put them at risk. Yanuartati reiterates that rural residents are vulnerable because of their periodic and irregular income which is frequently influenced by seasonality, markets, and employment prospects. Thus, environmental factors like trends, shocks, and seasonality frequently have an impact on rural populations [47]. Trends can change people's livelihoods and influence how they adopt strategies to deal with them. For instance, development interventions can encourage poor farmers to increase farm output, technological innovations, strategies to cope with increased population, and policy tendencies. Farmers must adapt to these changes due to the rising demand for agricultural products

⁸ The concept of livelihood refers to the way people make a living, which is based on capacity, assets and activities". Scoones looks at the concept as the skills, assets (both material and social) and the approaches which will be used by individuals and communities in order to survive". [36, 37].

⁹ In this concept, the term "stores" refers to physically storable assets like food, stocks, and savings.

¹⁰ For further discussion, see [36, 38, 39, 47].

and the availability of development initiatives [36]. Another type of vulnerability is shock, which refers to unforeseen events like floods or droughts as well as socioeconomic shocks like those brought on by armed conflicts and economic decline. However, rural communities must deal with these vulnerability situations which continuously put them at risk. Their ability will influence how successfully they achieve the implementation of their development projects[41].

b) Livelihood Assets: Livelihood assets are essential for sustainable living. According to multiple studies, the development of assets is connected to wellbeing and a household's capacity to expand output from various businesses (livelihood outcomes) for rural residents. Livelihood assets divide resources that a household has access to into five categories: human, social, natural, physical, and financial assets [36, 39]. See figure 1.

i. Human Capital: Mensah classifies human capital as a manpower asset that comprises the age distribution, family size, gender composition, number of households, labor force. In a case study on cattle ranching in Indonesia, it was discovered that inadequate livelihood asset management was caused by low quality human capital including limited education and skills [42, 43]. It is measured using the indicator approach. This approach aims to propose an analytical pair-wise comparison approach to ranking indicators of human capital and it's a good source of innovation and strategic renewal. This was captured in the research through a number of variables including mastery of subject matter by project organization, capacity to deliver target-friendly packages, sound organizational and management skills, amount of skilled labour available at community level, capacity building workshops to beneficiaries[43].

ii. Social Capital: Social capital is defined as a networks of relationships among people who live and work in a particular society that enable society to exist and be successful through financial, emotional, physical, and other resources to meet their needs for survival and improvement. Building social capital requires trust and participation among individuals[44]. This study captured social capital through a number of variables including membership in groups and networks, level of trust among organisation and beneficiaries, solidarity among project beneficiaries and staff, knowledge of gender equality, prestige/respect from community members, good policies favouring the promotion of culture and racial inequalities, gender balance, solidarity framework among beneficiaries'/community members, appreciation of livelihood situation. Social capital can maximize the economic advantages for rural residents in non-financial ways. These ideas have to do with how members of a group or community connect or form networks with one another as well as the power dynamics that exist within the community [45]. It can be measured with Organisational Network Analysis (ONA), conducted through surveys. This is important as it establishes future structures that position community members where they can deliver the most impact and serves as a powerful tool to identify isolated individuals or groups and provides effective strategies for reconnecting members. Social capital is crucial for improving community members' livelihoods since it can open up new chances for employment and lead to better livelihood outcomes [46].

iii. Natural Capital: Natural resources have an impact on rural livelihoods, such as water, soil, biodiversity, and environmental services, are referred to as natural capital [36]. Measuring natural capital can be by thevaluation method. This estimate the economic value of the benefits that natural capital provides to humans. The variables used in this study include; participation in biodiversity conservation, participation in tree planting, number of trees owned by beneficiaries, activities related to water conservation, Land owned, waste and Soil management practices. These variables are important in this study since it fight against climate change, ensures food security, fight against diseases and yields economic benefits to the communities concerned. Natural resources should not be depleted because rural residents rely heavily on them for their economic activities, particularly those that are connected to the agricultural sector[47]. For instance, it has been noted that cattle farmers who work wetlands earn more money from their herds of cattle than those who work dry ground. This is due to the fact that farmers in wetlands have better access to water, allowing them to cultivate their crops and forages more effectively than farmers in dry land environments. Hence, compared to farmers in dryland areas, farmers can better raise their cattle and have surplus forage that they can sell in the feed market [36].

iv. Physical Capital. Physical capital is the rural livelihoods' supporting infrastructure. It is vital to serve the basic necessities of rural people such as school buildings, government offices, sanitation/healthcare [48]. It is measured by the sum of Total Fixed Asset Purchase Price + capital improvements) – (Accumulated Depreciation + Fixed Asset Liabilities). The variables used in this study are number of infrastructure owned, household equipment, farm equipment, number and/or quality of housing, other physical infrastructure (roads, bridges, etc). these variables were desired to

access the means available at the disposal of the communities that can help them participate in social and economic community while providing necessities such as food, shelter, water, transportation. According to Stoian, constructing bridges between farms or communities and market places can reduce the time and distance that farmers must go to markets, which lowers their transportation expenses for selling their produce [49].

v. *Financial/Economic Capital*: Due to its greater versatility than the other four categories of capital, financial capital is one of the most significant resources for rural lives in general, and a key outcome of agricultural development projects in particular. It can be easily swapped for other types of capital, such as the acquisition of physical capital, and has the financial resources needed to expand agricultural investments, ordeal with extreme events [50]. Variables used in the study include engagement in income generating activities by beneficiaries, engagement in savings activities, engagement in credit activities, profits from project-related activities, rate of reliability of transactions with suppliers and retailers, innovative activities that created value, transforming subsistence activities into economic ones, employment opportunities for, overall financial sustainability of beneficiary. The key advantage is that liquid assets may be easily sold and turned into cash when need arises. Liquidity assets considers three dimensions: time, volume, and price. These dimensions capture the spread, depth, and the resiliency of the market. Intra-daily measures of liquidity are relevant for capturing the core features of a market and accounting. It is measured as $\text{Current Ratio} = \frac{\text{Current Assets}}{\text{Current Liability}}$, $\text{Quick Ratio} = \frac{\text{Cash} + \text{Marketable securities} + \text{Accounts receivable}}{\text{Current liabilities}}$ [50]. A summary of livelihood capitals is presented in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Livelihood assets and their relationships with other components of the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework

c) Policies and Institutions: Livelihood strategies and outcomes are not just dependent on access to capital assets or constrained by the vulnerability context; they are also transformed by the environment of structures and processes. Structures are the public and private sector organizations that set, implement policy and legislation affecting livelihoods. Policy determining structures cannot be effective in the absence of appropriate institutions and processes through which policies can be implemented [52]. Processes provide incentives that stimulate people to make better choices. One of the main problems the poor and vulnerable face is that the processes which frame their livelihoods, may systematically restrict them unless government adopts pro-poor policies that in turn, filter down to legislation and even less formal processes.

d) Livelihood Strategies: Livelihood strategies aim to achieve livelihood outcomes. Decisions on livelihood strategies may invoke natural/non-natural resource based activities, off-farm activities, migration and remittances, pensions and grants, intensification versus diversification, and short-term versus long-term outcomes, some of which may compete [39, 51]. One of the many problems of development is that projects and programs, while favoring some, can disadvantage others.

e) Livelihood Outcomes: livelihood outcomes are what individual households and communities can achieve by implementing their livelihood strategies [37]. Potential livelihood outcomes can include more income, increased well-being, reduced vulnerability, improved food security, more sustainable use of the natural resource base, and recovered human dignity from conflict situations [50].

The sustainable livelihoods approach encourages thinking out of the box. It frees development practitioners from conventional approaches that are often restricted to identifying problems and finding solutions but rather invites them to look at contexts and relationships so that development activities can become more process-oriented [50]. It compels them to look for multiple entry points and to move beyond a homogenous "community" view and a narrow sectoral perspective. It represents an important shift away from the focus on project inputs, outputs, and the assumed mechanical links between them. In particular, the sustainable livelihoods approach stresses the importance of understanding institutions by mapping the institutional framework and linking the micro to the macro and the formal to the informal. Therefore, it calls for a new style of policy appraisal that moves from universal prescriptions to context-specific approaches that allow alternative, local perspectives to reveal themselves in the policy framework.

1.2.4 The Contribution of Donor-Funded Agricultural Projects on social and Economic Capital

Agricultural development projects whether implemented by GO or NGOs can contribute to (rural) development in many Sub Saharan African (SSA) countries, where it plays a central role in economic growth, food security and livelihoods. There is growing evidence in SSA suggesting that agricultural development projects are boosting (rural) economies and also reducing household and community poverty [53, 54, 55]. Several studies have demonstrated that development project generate positive impacts on the livelihoods of their beneficiaries, through the accumulation of financial capital (income and savings), the accumulation of social, and economic capitals [16, 56, 57, 20]. In addition to economic capital, social capital through the improvement of health conditions, capacity building, counselling services, increase in meals per day has also improved through agricultural development projects. Though Balgah *and* others [16] found no significant difference in the number of meals per day for the beneficiaries of the Biogas project, they observed a 10% significant increase in the number of times luxury food (meat and or fish) was eaten a week (3 to 4 times per week on average, $p = 0.06$) [16, 61, 53].

Researchers working on the drivers of financial inclusion among cocoa producers in the Southwest Region of Cameroon, proved that there is a positive relationship between benefiting from agricultural projects and income. They furthered that there has been an increase in access to finances and the adoption technologies, up-scaled farm output and farm income, leading to a corresponding increase in net farm profits [58]. The findings of Mudavanhu & Mandizvidza [59], revealed that 18% of the population attained high food security as a result of the donor funded input supply scheme. Findings revealed that before the implementation this scheme in 2008, 75% of the population lived on US\$100 per year and after the implementation of the project, 35% of the population were able to live on US\$300 in 2009. Further, an increase in revenue reflects an increase in savings which promoted household investment. Farmers in Kenya who had adopted the biogas technology, witness an increase in financial savings of about 3000 Kenyan Shillings US\$18.81.8 [60].

In Cameroon, it is believed that, one of the key aspects of beneficiary livelihoods improved through the implementation of development projects is individual and household incomes of both men and women [16, 20, 53, 55]. Muluh revealed that the mean agricultural and livestock incomes following the implementation of the Investment Fund for Communal and Agricultural Micro-projects (FIMAC 1) loan scheme for beneficiaries in the North West Region of Cameroon increased from US\$213.1 to US\$401 (a difference of US\$187.9, an 88.1% increase) and from US\$96.4 to US\$249.1 (a difference of US\$152.7, a 158% increase), respectively. Balgah in 2018 demonstrate that beneficiaries of the Biogas project implemented by Heifer International in Cameroon (HPI) witnessed an annual increase in household incomes of FCFA54,680 (US\$91.13), and over 40% increase in monthly savings [16]. The above findings lead us to conclude that the adoption and implementation of development projects can be seen as an important means of securing on the economic situation and livelihoods of farmers

in rural areas especially in developing countries. Based on these results, it is therefore expected that the agricultural projects implemented by both the GO and NGOs in Mezam Division would have positive impacts on the livelihoods of the beneficiaries.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1 Research Methodology

This section presents the methodological procedures applied in the research process. These include description of the study area, research design, sampling methods and procedures, research instruments, methods of data collection and how results were generated, analyzed and discussed.

2.2 The Scope and Area of Study

This study was carried out in Mezam one of the seven divisions in the Northwest Region of Cameroon. It covers a land surface of 1.841km² with Bamenda as its capital city (Figure 2). Mezam is located between latitudes 5°20' and 6°15'N and longitudes 09°7' and 10°21'E. It consists of 27 autonomous villages; and it is bounded to the North West by Menchum, Boyo Division to the North East, Momo Division to the West, Ngoketunjia to the East and to the South by the Western Region. It has an estimated 700,000 inhabitants giving a population density of 380.2 inhabitants per km²[62]. Administratively, Mezam is composed of seven subdivisions: Bafut, Bali, Bamenda 1, Bamenda 2, Bamenda 3, Santa and Tubah Sub Divisions [63]. The study area is characterized by a cool temperate-like climate, influenced mainly by mountainous terrain and rugged topography. It is situated at an altitude of between 1300m to above 2500m above sea level with an average annual rainfall of about 2400mm, temperature, ranging between 15°-32°C with an average of about 23.5°C. There are two main seasons; wet/rainy season, which starts in March and ends in October, and dry season from November to February. The harmattan dry air characterizes the dry season [64, 65]. The climatic conditions of the area are favorable for agricultural practices and three types of soils exist in the area namely: volcanic, hydromorphic and feralitic soils. The economy of the region and that of Mezam division in particular is predominantly agricultural.

Over 80% of the rural population depends solely on agriculture, including a strong livestock sub-sector. Food crops include Maize, rice potatoes and beans, Plantains, cocoyams, cassava, yams are also produced, and many of these are food staples in the region [66, 67, 68]. Besides, there are vast flowing rivers and water bodies (such as river Mezam, lake Awing) that encourage irrigation for off season cultivation and fishing activities. The region is also favoured by the road network system-the ring road (with numerous corridors) linking all the seven divisions from its capital city Bamenda. Timber and other local materials and products are very much available to facilitate and promote sustainability of agricultural development projects. However, with inadequate financial power, the region has a high-level technical staff provided by the government and NGOs to backstop development efforts and ensure their sustainability [22]. The representation of the region is as shown on Figure 2.




Figure 2: Map of North West Region Showing Location of Mezam (Study Area).

Source: Adapted from Fogwe[63]

Notes:

1. the red circle in the map represents Mezam Division, the study area.
2. the research covered all the sub divisions of Mezam division, namely Bamenda 1, 2, 3, Tubah, Bafut, Bali and Santa.

According to Tambi[67], rural populations are largely responsible for agricultural production, thereby guaranteeing household food security. GOs and NGOs are promoting agricultural projects¹¹ in order to enhance productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor. Mezam division is quite interesting for this study, given that it hosts government and non-government organizations, who are involved in providing (agricultural) project related services to the population. It is therefore ideal for a comparative analysis of the sustainability of Government and NGO-led projects.

2.3 Research Design

This study employed a mixed methods research design, by combining both quantitative and qualitative research methods, through a cross sectional survey. This offered to the researcher the possibility of collecting quantitative data, and using qualitative methods to gather information which was relevant for interpreting and better understanding results from the quantitative survey. The design was very appropriate for empirically relevant studies, such as the impact of agricultural development projects [70]. The quantitative part of the study applied a structured, pretested questionnaire. This questionnaire was used to collect quantitative data on the socioeconomic characteristics of respondents, and to assess the key features on the impacts of agricultural development projects on beneficiaries. The questionnaire was divided into sections and administered to top, middle and low

¹¹ Agricultural Projects are development efforts that help improve the adequacy and timeliness of input supplies and specialised services to farming, forestry and fisheries as well as help improve the storage, processing and marketing systems of the said product(s) for improved livelihoods of humans [69].

level managers, and project beneficiaries. The questionnaire was designed for before-and-after comparison in order to capture the changes attributable to the different projects. Qualitative data collection made use of key informant interviews, and field observation of project impacts in the beneficiary communities [71]. Secondary data for this study made use of policy documents and unpublished reports from researched organizations, published articles and other documents obtained through guided literature searches in google scholar, web of science, and science direct.

2.4 Study Population, Sampling Procedures and sample

Multistage sampling approach was adopted for this study, carried out in Mezam division in the North West region of Cameroon. The division was chosen because (1) it has the highest concentration of government and NGO agricultural development organizations in the region, and (2) it is fairly safe for field work compared to other divisions, considering the ongoing socioeconomic crisis in the North West region. The study population – all agricultural development projects with operational coverage within the seven (7) sub divisions in Mezam division – was drawn from a total of 52 development organizations with offices in the study region. In total, 22 organizations met the criteria for selection of the study population, that is (1) the organisation must have, or is actively undertaking an agricultural development project, (2) either GO or NGO-led, irrespective of whether they are national or international organisations, and (3) having a head office in Mezam division. The retained (22) organisations were grouped into two for further sampling: 10 NGO and 12 GO-led agricultural development organizations.

The final sample was random. The names of all retained organisations were written on individual pieces of paper and put in separate buckets, and a child was asked to draw four (4) organisations each from each group, one at a time, without replacement. The eight retained organisations¹² therefore formed the first sample for our study. The targeted interviewees include staff and beneficiaries of the retained development projects. Based on initial visits to these organisations, staff were generally categorized as top, middle and lower management. Top management constituted of the directors/ coordinators of projects and their direct assistants. Middle level management staff included chiefs of sections (e.g. gender/development, and monitoring and evaluation officers) in the organizations, who were involved in one way or the other in the studied agricultural development project. Low level staff included extension and field workers actively working directly with beneficiaries. Based on a rapid assessment of project staff in all retained organisations, a ratio of 2:5:8 was adopted for sampling top, middle and low management staff, respectively.

To select beneficiaries, the lists of beneficiaries were obtained from each retained organisation. Only those who must have benefited from the activities of the selected projects within the last ten (10) years were retained to participate in the survey. The period of 10 years was assumed to be long enough for good impact assessments. The field staff and section heads facilitated this process in each organisation. Final lists of beneficiaries in each of the 7 sub divisions for each organisation were therefore established together with the staff. These lists provided the final sampling frame for random selection of beneficiaries in the field. A quick assessment of the final lists indicated that if each organization is to be fairly represented in the sample, it was not possible to sample over 23 beneficiaries per organization. Twenty-three was therefore set as the maximum number per organization. Beneficiaries were randomly selected for each organization without replacement, until the target (23) was met for each organization.

The final sample of the study is presented on table 1.

Table 1: Study sample

SN	Organisation	Type	Number of Persons Interviewed			Beneficiaries
			Top Management	Middle Management	Lower Management	
1	ACEFA	GO-Led	2	5	8	23
2	AFOP	GO-Led	2	5	8	23
3	PADFA 2	GO-Led	2	5	8	22
4	PIDMA	GO-Led	2	5	8	22

¹² ACEFA (Programme d'Amélioration de la Compétitivité des Exploitations Familiales Agropastorale), AFOP (Programme d'Appui à la Rénovation et au Développement de la Formation Professionnelle dans les Secteurs de l'agriculture, de l'élevage et de la Pêche), ProCISA (Programme Mondial Centres d'Innovations Vertes pour le Secteur d'Agriculture), PADFA (PADFA Programme d'Appui au Développement des Filières Agricole), PIDMA (Projet d'Investissement et de Développement des Marchés Agricole), PROALCAM (Platform for the promotion of Local Flour in Cameroon), SUDAHSER (Sustainable Development and Humanitarian Services).

5	Bamenda Project	Water	NGO-Led	2	5	8	22
6	GIZ-ProCISA		NGO-Led	2	5	8	23
7	SUDAHSER		NGO-Led	2	5	8	23
8	PROALCAM		NGO-Led	2	5	8	22
	TOTAL			16	40	64	180

300

Source: Own field data

2.5 Data Collection Instruments

The main data collection instrument for the study was a structured questionnaire. **Both qualitative and quantitative data was collected**, processed, analyzed and interpreted. This information was based on the socio-economic profile of respondents, understanding the key differences between government-led and NGO driven development projects in Mezam Division, the impacts of development projects on livelihood of beneficiaries and also key factors that influence the sustainability of agricultural development projects. Primary data was gathered with the use of questionnaires. This owes to the fact that a pilot study was conducted with the aimed at testing for the reliability and validity of the research instruments. The data from the questionnaire also helped us to calculate the coefficients, which in turn help the research, determine the consistency and reliability of the questionnaire for the study of the sustainability of agricultural development programs and the Accumulation of Social and Economic Capitals in Mezam. Adjustments were made on the final version of the questionnaire before wider application. It is also a diagnostic tool for effective data collection and the stakeholders' views/perception on the subject matter [73, 74].

2.6 Data Analysis and Presentation

In evaluating the sustainability of Government and NGO-driven agricultural development projects in Mezam Division, data collected was entered and analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25.0, Excel, XLSTAT. Descriptive statistics (Mean scores, frequencies and percentages) were applied to analyze any key differences between government-led and NGO driven development, with respect to social and economic capitals. The data analysed has been presented in tables and figures [75].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

3.1.1 Description of Sample Population

Analysis of demographic data showed that a majority of the respondents were male (~54%), though significantly higher for Government-led project respondents as compared to NGO-led project respondents (over 63% and 53% respectively, $X^2 = 4.415$, $p = 0.036$). The distribution of respondents by gender shows that a majority of the respondents in the entire sample were married (~59%), had farming as their main source of livelihood (~31%) and had university level of education (63.5%). It was however observed that a significantly higher proportion of the respondents for government-led projects as compared to NGO-led projects were found to be married (close to 67% and 51% respectively, $X^2 = 15.648$, $p = 0.001$). While majority of the respondents of the Government-led projects were civil servants (close to 33%), a significantly higher proportion of the respondents in the NGO-led projects were farmers (close to 39%, $X^2 = 27.453$, $p = 0.000$). It is also thought that the elites capture mostly government projects due to the ability of their political powers while most NGOs work in remote areas due to the fact that 1) they are good at reaching and mobilising the poor, 2) empower poor communities to gain control of their lives while strengthening local institutions, 3) efficiently implement projects at lower costs than GO hence, promote sustainable development [76].

Majority of the respondents for both the government-led projects and NGO-led projects had university level of education, though higher for the government-led projects (~69% and ~56% respectively, $X^2 = 7.105$, $p = 0.065$). Hence, the tendency for NGOs working with the poor are higher, compared to GO working with elites. In this sense, it is likely that GO projects are unconsciously benefiting richer farmers. Only very small proportions (1.2% for the GO-led projects and 2.7% for the NGO-led projects) were found to have no formal education.

Table 2 revealed that the mean sample age was about 37 years (37.22 ± 10.834 years), suggesting that project beneficiaries generally fall within the working age group. The average household size for the entire sample was 5 persons (5 ± 4 persons) while estimated mean monthly income was evaluated at FCFA117,640 (~US\$ 195.7697). A comparative analysis for the government-led and NGO-led projects showed no significant difference in the mean ages of the beneficiaries (38 years and 36

years respectively, $p = 0.159$). Similarly, no significant difference was observed in the average household size for the government-led and NGO-led project beneficiaries (6 persons and 5 persons respectively, $p = 0.672$), though slightly higher for the government-led project beneficiaries. However, the estimated monthly income was significantly higher for the beneficiaries of the government-led projects as compared to those of the NGO-led projects (with a monthly income of FCFA133380 and FCFA101580 respectively, a difference of FCFA 31800, $t = 3.506$, $p = 0.001$). This refers to their total income with including that generated from agricultural activities.

Table 2: Age, Household Size and Monthly Income of Respondents

Variable	Type of funded project	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-distribution
Age of respondent in years	Sample	37.22	10.834	$t = 1.414$
	Government-led projects	38.11	11.365	$p = 0.159$
	NGO-led projects	36.32	10.232	
Household size	Sample	5	4	$t = 0.422$
	Government-led projects	6	3	$p = 0.672$
	NGO-led projects	5	4	
Estimated monthly income/FCFA	Sample	117,640	78,340	$t = 3.506$
	Government-led projects	133,380	81,590	$p = 0.001$
	NGO-led projects	101,580	71,660	

Source: Own field Data

3.1.2 Impact on Social Capital

The beneficiaries were asked to evaluate some social capital aspects that have been improved upon by the projects which they have benefitted from. The mean scores (from 0-4) for the variables are summarized on Table 3. The results generally showed a significant change in the accumulation of social capital by both beneficiaries of the NGO-led projects and Government led projects ($p = 0.000$). For instance, it was observed that there has been a significant increase in membership in social groups and networks by all beneficiaries (a mean score of 1.58/4 before and 2.75/4 respectively, $t = -16.006$, $p = 0.000$). A comparative analysis between the beneficiaries of the NGO-led projects and Government-led projects also showed significant increase in membership in groups and networks after project implementation (a mean score of 1.54 and 1.63, and respectively 2.58 and 2.68 respectively before and after project implementation respectively, $p = 0.000$). Though slightly higher for beneficiaries of Government-led projects as compared to the NGO-led project beneficiaries, this difference showed no significance ($p > 0.05$). Note that group membership satisfies the need not only to belong, but gain information, knowledge and skills of sustainable management practices and understanding of the social environment. This will help the community achieve their bigger objectives in the short term comparatively.

A significant increase in the level of trust and solidarity among beneficiaries was also reported. This has also translated into increased reciprocity (mutual exchange) between beneficiaries and project staff. More so, results show a significant increase in level of knowledge acquired by project beneficiaries with respect to gender equality (from a mean score of 1.64 to 2.83 on 4 for the entire sample, from 1.67 to 2.86 on 4 for the Government-led beneficiaries, and 1.61 to 2.81 on 4 for the NGO-led beneficiaries, $p = 0.000$). These and the accumulation of other social capital assets is probably the reasons why the beneficiaries gave a high appreciation of their current livelihoods following the implementation of both the Government-led and NGO-led projects (a mean score of 2.79 for ALL categories, up from a mean score of 1.52 on 4 for the entire sample, 1.49 on 4 for the Government-led beneficiaries and 1.55 for the NGO-led beneficiaries before project implementation, $p = 0.000$). Besides, increased trust and solidarity among members is an awareness of shared interests. This creates a psychological sense of group unity. An increase of solidarity will definitely lead to the promotion and development of projects and hence, sustainability.

Table 3: Impact on Social Capital (Mean Scores/4).

Aspect	Organization	Before	After
Membership in groups and networks ***	Sample	1.58	2.75
	GO-led	1.63	2.8
	NGO-led	1.54	2.71
Level of trust among beneficiaries***	Sample	1.59	2.63
	GO-led	1.63	2.68
	NGO-led	1.55	2.58

Solidarity among beneficiaries***	Sample	1.64	2.78
	GO-led	1.69	2.77
	NGO-led	1.59	2.8
Solidarity between beneficiaries and project staff***	Sample	1.55	2.71
	GO-led	1.55	2.66
	NGO-led	1.55	2.77
Reciprocity among beneficiaries***	Sample	1.62	2.74
	GO-led	1.71	2.72
	NGO-led	1.56	2.69
Level of trust between project implementing organizations and beneficiaries***	Sample	1.63	2.82
	GO-led	1.6	2.86
	NGO-led	1.67	2.77
Knowledge of gender equality among beneficiaries***	Sample	1.64	2.83
	GO-led	1.67	2.86
	NGO-led	1.61	2.81
Prestige/ respect from community members***	Sample	1.6	2.86
	GO-led	1.66	2.92
	NGO-led	1.54	2.79
Good policies in the project that favour the promotion of culture and racial inequalities ***	Sample	1.58	2.74
	GO-led	1.52	2.61
	NGO-led	1.64	2.86
Project been positive to gender balance and is ameliorating the poverty situation of the beneficiary communities***	Sample	1.58	2.79
	GO-led	1.57	2.75
	NGO-led	1.59	2.83
Solidarity framework created amongst beneficiaries/community members ***	Sample	1.47	2.62
	GO-led	1.46	2.63
	NGO-led	1.48	2.61
Appreciation of livelihood situation ***	Sample	1.52	2.79
	GO-led	1.49	2.79
	NGO-led	1.55	2.79

Source: Own filed Data

***= Significant at 1%

3.1.3 Impact on Economic Capital

In addition to social capital accumulation, an analysis of the changes in economic capital of the beneficiaries was conducted both for the NGO-led projects and Government-led projects. The results on Table 4 show significant increase in economic capital accumulation for both groups. Just as was the case with the accumulation of social capital, significant increase in economic capital was observed. For instance, in the engagement of the beneficiaries in income generating activities before and after project implementation though slightly higher for the NGO-led than Government-led beneficiaries (from a mean score of 1.56 to 2.85 on 4 for the entire sample, 1.61 to 2.74 on 4 for the Government-led beneficiaries, and from a mean score of 1.51 to 2.95 on 4 for the NGO-led beneficiaries, $p = 0.000$). Also, there has been a significant increase in the level of engagement in savings by the beneficiaries following the implementation of the projects (from a mean score of 1.4 to 2.6 on 4 for the entire sample, 1.34 to 2.53 on 4 for the Government-led beneficiaries and 1.45 to 2.66 on 4 for the NGO-led beneficiaries, $p = 0.000$). This is probably related to the fact that employment opportunities for beneficiaries have been increased through project activities. As reported by the beneficiaries, the implementation of the various projects have improved their skills to be able to transform subsistence activities in to economic ones (from a mean score of 1.23 before project implementation to 2.62 after project implementation for the entire sample, 1.19 before project implementation to 2.46 after project implementation for the Government-led beneficiaries 1.28 before project implementation to 2.77 after project implementation for the NGO-led beneficiaries, $p=0.000$). Generally, there has been a significant increase in the financial sustainability of the beneficiaries following the implementation of the various projects (from a mean score of 1.35 before project implementation to 2.61 after project implementation for the entire sample, from a mean score of 1.29 before project implementation to 2.53 after project implementation for the Government-led beneficiaries and from a mean score of 1.42 before project implementation to 2.68 after project implementation for the NGO-led beneficiaries, $p = 0.000$).

As confirmed by a female beneficiary of PIDMA Project in Awing, Santa Sub Division during data collection:

“Though not highly sustainable, some of these projects have come to improve on our financial challenges through an enhancement in our livelihoods.our cooperatives can now boast of a tractor which has been a source of income generation we never thought of”. Field observation confirmed presence of the tractor.

Table 4: Impact on Economic Capital (Mean Scores/4)

Aspect	Organization	Before/4	After/4
Engagement in income generating activities by beneficiary***	Sample	1.56	2.85
	GO-led	1.61	2.74
	NGO-led	1.51	2.95
Engagement in savings activities***	Sample	1.4	2.6
	GO-led	1.34	2.53
	NGO-led	1.45	2.66
Engagement in credit activities***	Sample	1.39	2.62
	GO-led	1.39	2.32
	NGO-led	1.4	2.45
Profits from project-related activities***	Sample	1.38	2.62
	GO-led	1.39	2.61
	NGO-led	1.37	2.62
Rate of reliability of transactions with suppliers and retailers***	Sample	1.39	2.52
	GO-led	1.34	2.42
	NGO-led	1.44	2.61
Innovative activities that created value, promoted new products***	Sample	1.34	2.62
	GO-led	1.28	2.48
	NGO-led	1.39	2.75
Transforming subsistence activities into economic ones***	Sample	1.23	2.62
	GO-led	1.19	2.46
	NGO-led	1.28	2.77
Employment opportunities for beneficiaries***	Sample	1.3	2.73
	GO-led	1.24	2.69
	NGO-led	1.36	2.76
Overall financial sustainability of beneficiary***	Sample	1.35	2.61
	GO-led	1.29	2.53
	NGO-led	1.42	2.68

Source: Own filed data

***= Significant at 1%.

3.2 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

3.2.1 Description of Sample Population

The socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents indicate that the average age of the respondents was 37 years with an average household size of five persons. 53.7% of the sample were male and 42.7% were female. However, population was higher in terms of response in the Government-led projects with the percentage of Male/female being 63.3%/36.7% as opposed to 53%/47% respectively for the NGO-led development projects. The results are not in resonance with previous studies in the region contending that women are the backbone of agriculture [67, 77]. Unfortunately, both GO and NGO projects do not sufficiently target them. This gender discrepancy is probably explained by gender-specific obstacles including inadequate access to land and capital perpetuated by existing patriarchal systems [10], which limit women's access and control to resources needed to benefit from these development projects.

3.2.2 Impact of Development Project on Social Capital accumulation

With respect to social capital, the factors under study were robust and highly significant with the mean average score increasing from 1.4/4 before project realization to 1.71/4 after project implementation for the GO-led projects. For NGO-led projects, an increase from 2.58/4 before project implementation to a mean of 2.92/4 after project implementation was recorded. This has created a mean positive difference for the NGO-led projects of 1.21. The existence of this difference can be related to the fact that NGOs are organizations that operate independently of government and most often are involved in a wide range of activities such as social services, advocacy and research. Meanwhile, GO are

typically responsible for providing public services and enforcing laws and regulations. This indicates that the importance of social capital variables under study has been felt by the implementing organisation. This is a prerequisite as the social structure is undergoing changes due to the growing income opportunities through the use of natural resources. Significant contributions to global knowledge originated with local people from generation to generation and closely interwoven with people's cultural values. This significant contribution has also increased the level of trust, reciprocity and solidarity among beneficiaries and staff of implementing organisations ranging from 1.4/4 to 1.71/4 for GO-led to between 2.58 to 2.69 for NGO-led projects. This is important in building a sense of community in organizations, particularly within the crisis context where adverse working conditions prevail. This captures what Buzás & Faragó said- "Organisational adaptation is an imperative especially during crisis situation p.9". This boils down to the assumption that staff of NGOs enjoy more social capital than those of the GOs because of the increase tolerance of people working together effectively to achieve a common objective while maintaining high degree of trust, shared identity and respecting the norms, values and culture of the community[78].

The implementation also sees a degree of prestige/respect from other community members to the innovative adopters of the projects who are reaping the benefits of the project idea(s) as well as to the implementing organisations [45]. Generally, there has been no significant difference registered but rather a significant impact in the level of implementations of the both projects creating a difference before and after on the state of the social capital of beneficiaries as reported. This mirrors contentions of previous studies that participating in agricultural/livelihood training programs often leads to social capital accumulation[56, 79]. In some cases, the accumulation of social capital leads to punctured caste-based discrimination, reduction in gender based violence and early marriage, reduced marginalization and illiteracy especially amongst women and girls that develop the capacity to improve household and communal bonds and reduce welfare losses [80, 81]. This was however, not captured in this research but can be interesting in future research.

3.2.3 Impact on Economic Capital Accumulation

Changes in economic capital was captured using a number of variable including: engagement in income generating activities, engagement in savings, engagement in credit activities, profits generated from project-related activities, rate of reliability of transactions with suppliers/retailers, beneficiary employment opportunities, transforming subsistence activities into economic ones. The results show significant increase in economic capital accumulation for both groups with an average mean impact difference of 1.11 on 4. This has led to an engagement in income generating activities by beneficiaries with increased income, profits and savings as end products. Therefore, participating in both GO and NGO-driven agricultural programs allowed beneficiaries to acquire and implement more skills and capacity that allowed them to generate more income or profits. *As one of the field staff from an NGO said during the key informant interviews "Our project beneficiaries have expanded and/or intensified their activities. Many of them now own accounts in local financial institutions, and report an increase in farm investments and savings".* This statement was confirmed through observations in the field, and casual conversations with beneficiaries. Our study results tie with that of Yaseen in Pakistan and Pasa in Hapur, who reported an increase in income earnings for over 76% and 100% of their beneficiaries respectively, after project interventions[79, 82]. This increase in income is expected to increase annual savings and allow the beneficiaries to consistently direct financial resources to basic necessities for their families, including better nutrition, medicines, educational opportunities. For cases in Cameroon, visit [16, 53, 55, 82, 83].

Participating in agricultural livelihood programs thus seems to be a key component in increasing access to finances for beneficiaries especially through the adoption of improved agricultural technologies, up-scaled farm output and farm income, leading to a corresponding increase in net farm profits, reduced poverty and sustained livelihoods[84]. This is of interest to the community as it is a source of employment opportunity to a majority of the population especially the youths. This scenario is same as postulated by Tambi in 2019, reported that about 40% of the world population live below the National Poverty line and spend about one third of their income on food[67]. This increase in income generating activities has some degree of business relations within the division that has led to an increase reliability of economic transactions with suppliers and retailers since the economic dormancy period is undergoing breakage. GO and NGO play a major complementary role in that they institute policy development, regulation, facilitation and internal sustainability management through setting goals, driving change, and leading by example[85]. They differ in that policy levels, the GO develop new policies to steer and enable sustainable innovations while the NGO develop partnership

approaches in which they fund and work with other organisations, direct funding through donors, responding to relief work on international emergencies. Based on regulations, all GO initiatives are initiated with decrees and enforced by legal institutions same as the NGO. Management of GO is by the corporate social responsibility of the state as an economic actor while the NGOs collaborates with government and society in order to achieve sustainability policy objectives [32].

4. CONCLUSION

This study has examined the comparative contribution of agricultural development projects in Mezam Division, using primary data from 300 beneficiaries of eight agricultural projects from four (4) governmental Led and four (4) non-governmental led organisations. The study focused on analyzing the changes in social and economic capitals accumulation, attributable to each organizational form, and the differences between the organisations. The overall findings of this study show that agricultural projects implemented by both GO and the NGO-led organisations have positive impacts on social and economic capital accumulation for beneficiaries, though slightly higher for NGO-led projects as compared to GO-led projects. This study concludes that there were significant improvements in the social, and economic assets of beneficiaries who participated in both NGO-led and GO-led agricultural development projects in the study site. Agricultural development projects training programs play an imperative role in facilitating farmers to overcome social and financial constraints in Mezam, in the North West region of Cameroon. However, women who are the backbone of agricultural production in the study region were less targeted by GO-led projects. This might have long term implications on the sustainability of agricultural development efforts, unless measures are taken to better include the main agricultural stakeholders-women in future projects. Our results seem to suggest that the organizational form does not matter. What matters, or factors that explain differences when they exist should be researched. We recognize that our study is an isolated one. Thus while it eases the theoretical tension between the role of Governments and NGOs in the (agricultural) development process. Further studies are needed to ground our results. Future research in the study site should include more organizations and beneficiaries to be of more use to development policy at least in the study area.

REFERENCES.

1. International labour organisation. World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends 2020 International Labour Office-Geneva. 2020.
2. Howard-Grenville, J., Davis, G. F., Dyllick, T., Miller, C. Thau, S., & Tsui, A. S. Sustainable development for a better world: Contributions of leadership, management, and organisations. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 2019; 5(4), 355-366.
3. Castro, Gema Del Río, Maria Camino Gonzalez Fernandez, and Angel Uruburu Colsa. "Unleashing the convergence amid digitalization and sustainability towards pursuing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): A holistic review." *Journal of Cleaner Production* 280. 2021; 122204.
4. Bond, R., & Hulme, D. Process approaches to development: theory and Sri Lankan practice. *WorldDevelopment*. 1999; 27(8), 1339-1358.
5. Tanzile, R., Domapielle, M. K., & Fielmua, N. Empowering women for sustainable development through semi-mechanized sheabutter processing in rural North-Western Ghana. *Scientific African*. 2023; 21, e01790.
6. Enemark, S., & Ahene, R. Capacity building in land Management-Implementing land policy reforms in Malawi. *Survey review*. 2003; 37(287), 20-30.
7. Hill, P. S. Organizational responses to a changing aid environment: The German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ). *The International journal of health planning and management*. 2002; 7(3), 213-227.
8. Searchinger, T., Hanson, C., Ranganathan, J., Lipinski, B., Waite, R., Winterbottom, R., & Ari, T. B. *Creating a sustainable food future*. 2014.
9. Mosse, David. "Authority, gender and knowledge: theoretical reflections on the practice of participatory rural appraisal." *Development and change* 25.3.1994, 497-526.
10. Balgah, R. A. Applying participatory rural appraisal to unlock gender group differences in some communities in rural Cameroon. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology*. 2016; 12(3), 1-11. DOI: 10.9734/AJAEES/2016/28327.
11. Kimengsi, J. N., Mukong, A. K., & Balgah, R. A. Livelihood diversification and household well-being: Insights and policy implications for forest-based communities in Cameroon. *Society & Natural Resources*. 2020; 33(7), 876-895.

12. Bell, K., Hickel, J., Arbon, R., & Zoomkawala, H. Which direction for sustainable development? A time series comparison of the impacts of redistributive versus market policies in Bolivia and South Korea. *Sustainable Development*. 2023.
13. Mhlongo, S. S., & Rautenbach, J. V. The Effectiveness of an Income-Generating Project in a Rural Community. *OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development*. 2023; 16(12), 135-148.
14. Singirankabo, A.U., & Ertsen, W.M. Relations between land tenure security and agricultural productivity: Exploring the effect of land registration. *Land*. 2020; 9(5), 2-18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land9050138>Sobti, R. C.
15. Azadi, H., Moghaddam, S. M., Burkart, S., Mahmoudi, H., Van Passel, S., Kurban, A., & Lopez-Carr, D. Rethinking resilient agriculture: From climate-smart agriculture to vulnerable-smart agriculture. *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 2021; 319, 128602.
16. Balgah, R.A., Mbue, I.N., & Ngwa, K.A. The impacts of renewable energy on livelihoods: A case study of biogas adoption in Cameroon. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*. 2018; 220-239. www.isdsnet.com/ijds.
17. Kumar, A., & Pant, S. Analytical hierarchy process for sustainable agriculture: An overview. *MethodsX*. 2023; 10, 101954.
18. Xu, X., Xu, Y., Li, J., Lu, Y., Jenkins, A., Ferrier, R. C., ... & Mathijs, E. Coupling of crop and livestock production can reduce the agricultural GHG emission from smallholder farms. *IScience*. 2023; 26(6), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2023.106798>.
19. Antonella, Z., & Pietro, P. Circular Business Models for Sustainable Development: A "Waste is Food" Restorative Ecosystem. *Business Strategy and the Environment*. 2019; 28(2), 274-285.
20. Muluh, G. N., Kimengsi, J. N., & Azibo, N. K. Challenges and prospects of sustaining donor-funded projects in rural Cameroon. *Sustainability*. 2019; 11(24), 6990.
21. Mmbengwa, V. M. *Capacity building strategies for sustainability farming SMMEs in South Africa*. 2009.
22. Balgah, R.A., Valentinov, V., & Buchenrieder, G. Non-profit Extension in Rural Cameroon: A Study of Demand and Supply Determinants. *International Journal of Social Economics*. 2010; 37(5), 391-399.
23. Vahabi, M. Introduction: a symposium on the predatory state. *Public Choice*. 2020; 182(3-4), 233-242.
24. Tshiyoyo, M. The role of the state in ensuring sustainable development in the sub-Saharan African region. 2014.
25. Qu, H. Risk and diversification of non-profit revenue portfolios: Applying modern portfolio theory to non-profit revenue management. *Non-profit management and leadership*. 2019; 30(2), 193-212.
26. Thornton, T. F., Mangalagiu, D., Ma, Y., Lan, J., Yazar, M., Saisel, A. K., & Chaar, A. M. Cultural models of and for urban sustainability: assessing beliefs about Green-Win. *Climatic Change*. 2020; 160, 521-537.
27. Weber, M. *Economy and society two volume set, with a new foreword by Guenther Roth*. 2013.
28. Hamilton, N. *The limits of state autonomy: post-revolutionary Mexico*. Princeton University Press. 2014. 673.
29. Greenberg, E. S. State change: Approaches and concepts. *Changes in the state: Causes and consequences*. 1990; 11-(38).
30. Miller, A. J. Pierre Bourdieu and the perils of allodoxia: Nationalism, globalism and the geopolitics of intellectual exchange. *Cultural Studies*. 2003; 17(3-4), 553-571.
31. Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. *Research methods for business students*: Pearson education. 2009.
32. Smith, M., Hargroves, K., Palousis, N., & Desha, C. A taste of best practice in engineering sustainable solutions. In *National Environmental Engineering and Sustainability Conference*. 2005; 7(18), 1-15.
33. Anderson, J. E. Government and the economy: what is fundamental? *Fundamentals of the Economic Role of Government*. 1989; 17-23.
34. World Bank. *World Development Report*. Washington, DC. 1997.
35. Liu, D., Peng, J., & Zhao, Z. Impact of agricultural mechanization on agricultural production, income, and mechanism: evidence from Hubei province, China. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*. 2020; 10(53).
36. Liu, Y., Zhang, Q., Liu, Q., Yan, Y., Hei, W., Yu, D., & Wu, J. Different household livelihood strategies and influencing factors in the inner Mongolian grassland. *Sustainability*. 2020; 12, 1-15, [Doi:10.3390/su12030839](https://doi.org/10.3390/su12030839).

37. Scoones, I. *Sustainable livelihoods and rural development*. Rugby: *Practical Action Publishing*. 2021.
38. Guo, A., Wei, Y., Zhong, F., & Wang, P. How do climate change perception and value cognition affect farmers' sustainable livelihood capacity? An analysis based on an improved DFID sustainable livelihood framework. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*. 2022; 33, 636-650.
39. Natarajan, N., Newsham, A., Rigg, J., & Suhardiman, D. A sustainable livelihoods framework for the 21st century. *World Development*. 2022; 155, 105898.
40. Chiwaula, L. S., Witt, R., & Waibel, H. An asset-based approach to vulnerability: The case of small-scale fishing areas in Cameroon and Nigeria. *The Journal of Development Studies*. 2011; 47(2), 338-353.
41. Devereux, S., Sabates-Wheeler, R., & Longhurst, R. (Eds.). *Seasonality, rural livelihoods and development*. Routledge. 2013.
42. Mensah, E. J. The sustainable livelihood framework: A reconstruction. 2011.
43. Gayatri, S., & Vaarst, M. The implementation of Indonesia's Beef Self-Sufficiency Programme (BSSP) as seen from a farmer-family perspective. *Journal of Rural and Community Development*. 2015; 10(2).
44. Savari, M., Damaneh, H. E., & Damaneh, H. E. The effect of social capital in mitigating drought impacts and improving livability of Iranian rural households. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. 2023; 89, 103630.
45. Minato, W. L., Curtis, A. L., & Allan, C. Understanding the role and influence of social norms: lessons for NRM. *Local Environment*. 2012; 17(8), 863-877.
46. He, R. W., Guo, S. L., Deng, X., & Zhou, K. Influence of social capital on the livelihood strategies of farmers under China's rural revitalization strategy in poor mountain areas: A case study of the Liangshan Yi autonomous prefecture. *Journal of Mountain Science*. 2022; 19(4), 958-973.
47. Yanuartati, B. Y. E. Understanding the Framework of Sustainable Rural Livelihoods in the Implementation of Market-led Rural Development. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan IPA*. 2023; 9(5), 3800-3807.
48. Stoian, D., Donovan, J., Fisk, J., & Muldoon, M. Value-chain development for rural poverty reduction: a reality check and a warning. 2016.
49. Scoones, I., Borrás Jr, S. M., Bavisakar, A., Edelman, M., Peluso, N., & Wolford, W. Climate Change and Critical Agrarian Studies. 2024.
50. Nasrnia, F., & Ashktorab, N. Sustainable livelihood framework-based assessment of drought resilience patterns of rural households of Bakhtegan basin, Iran. *Ecological Indicators*. 2021; 128, 107817.
51. Serrat, O. The sustainable livelihoods approach. *Knowledge solutions: Tools, methods, and approaches to drive organizational performance*. 2017; 21-26.
52. Finders, J. K., Rothwell, D. W., & Ottusch, T. Asset poverty among children: A cross-national study of poverty risk. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 2019; 96(1), 409-419.
53. Tah, C., & Ngwa, K. Biogas Production: Impact on Farmers' Incomes", *International Journal of Emerging Trends in Multidisciplinary*. 2015; 1(10), 199-210.
54. FAO: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. SAFA, sustainability assessment of food and agricultural systems, tool. User manual version 2.2.40. 2019.
55. Riddley, M. N., Loveline, K. N., Anastasia, K., & Harry, M. W. Biogas Energy & Livelihood Sustainability Within Rural Households in the North West Region of Cameroon, *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*. 2020; 5(8), 635-641, DOI: 10.38124/IJISRT20AUG245
56. Hiruy, K., & Wallo, M. T. Impact Assessment: assessing the social dimensions of fisheries research projects in the Asia-Pacific Region. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*. 2018; 36(6), 444-455.
57. Béné, C., Headey, D., Haddad, L., & von Grebmer, K. Is resilience a useful concept in the context of food security and nutrition programmes? Some conceptual and practical considerations. *Food Security*. 2016; 8(1), 123-138. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-015-0526x>
58. Ngwang, N. N., & Bime, M. J. E. Drivers of Financial Inclusion among Cocoa Producers in the Southwest Region of Cameroon. *Finance & Economics Review*. 2023; 5(1), 1-13.
59. Mudavanhu, C., & Mandizvidza, C. Sustaining rural livelihoods through donor funded agricultural inputs scheme in Zimbabwe: the case of Goromonzi District. *International Journal of Science and Technology Research*. 2013; 2, 284-290. Corpus ID: 653807.
60. Hamlin, A. Assessment of Social and Economic Impacts of Biogas Digester in Rural Kenya. Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection. 2012.

61. Mieila, M. Measuring Sustainable Development and the Green Investments in Contemporary Economics. Valahia University of Targoviste: Târgovis, te, Romania, 2018
62. Wenda, B. D. S., Engwali, D. F., & Ofeh, M. A. Assessing the contribution of micro credit financing to Maize production in Mezam division, North West Region of Cameroon. *International Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 2020; 5(1), 9-17.
63. Fogwe, Z. N. Biking acculturation incidence on the cameroon urban activity fluxes: A traffic congestion Panacea or Palliative in Bamenda. *International Journal of Global Sustainability*. 2020; 4(1), 40.
64. Olayiwola, A. M., Eludoyin, A. O., & Ekecha, A. E. Land Use Change in the Mezam Division of the North-West Province, Cameroon from Landsat Imageries (1988 and 2001) . *Ethiopian Journal of Environmental Studies and Management*. 2011; 4(1).
65. Kimengsi, J.N., Mukong, A., Kechia, M.A., Balgah R.A., Pretzsch, J. & Kwei, J. Households' Assets Dynamics and Ecotourism Choices in the Western Highlands of Cameroon. *Sustainability*. 2019; 11(1844), 1-16.
66. *Institut National de la Statistique (INS), Annuaire Statistique du Cameroun*. 2010.
67. Tambi, M. D., & Bime, W. J. Adequate financing and agricultural production: response to new generation agriculture in Cameroon. *JASc (Journal of Agribusiness Sciences)*. 2019; 3(1), 1-15.
68. Balgah, R.A., Ngwa, K.A., Buchenrieder, G.R. and Kimengsi, J.N. Impacts of Floods on Agriculture-Dependent Livelihoods in Sub-Saharan Africa: An Assessment from multiple Geo-Ecological Zones. *Land*. 2023; 12, 334. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land12020334>.
69. Venkataraman, R. R., & Pinto, J. K. *Cost and value management in projects*. John Wiley & Sons. 2023.
70. Sileyew, K. J. Research design and methodology. *Cyberspace*. 2019; 1-12.
71. Ugoani, J. (2019). Management by emotional intelligence and why it matters in organizational excellence. *American Journal of Marketing Research*. 2019; 5(4), 42-53.
72. Ali, D., Arrey E. D, Cosmas T, Ilham M; Tanda T, & Loveline A. Situational report of OCHA-the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (<https://response.reliefweb.int/cameroon/north-west-and-south-west-crisis>). 2023.
73. Rose, R., & Shevlin, M. The development of case studies as a method within a longitudinal study of special educational needs provision in the Republic of Ireland. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*. 2016; 16(2), 113-121.
74. Abdullah, L., Jaafar, S., & Taib, I. Ranking of human capital indicators using analytic hierarchy process. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 2013; 107, 22-28.
75. Unguryanu, T. N., & Grijbovski, A. M. Brief recommendations on description, analysis and presentation of data in scientific papers. *Ekologija Cheloveka*. 2011; (5), 55.
76. Muntoh, E. M. (2020). An Appraisal of the Involvement of Humanitarian Missions in Cameroon's Conflict Zones (North-West and South-West Regions). *International Journal of Legal Studies (IJOLS)*. 2020; 8(2), 147-166.
77. Ntiga, L. H. N., Buoyed, O. N., & Belmondo, T. V. Fiscal policy and industrial sector production in Cameroon. 2023.
78. Buzás, B., & Faragó, K. Organizational adaptation to working from home in a crisis situation (COVID-19): the interaction between leaders' openness and followers' voice. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2023; 14, 1181807.
79. Pasa, R.B. Role of Capacity and Skill Development Trainings in Rural Livelihood: A Case Study of Hapur, Dang. *Journal of Training and Development*. 2019; 3, 1-9, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3126/jtd.v3i0.18229>.
80. Eneyew, A., & Bekele, W. Determinants of livelihood strategies in Wolaita, southern Ethiopia. *Agricultural Research and Reviews*. 2012; 1(5), 153-161.
81. Nguyen, D. L., Nguyen, T. T., & Grote, U. Shocks, household consumption, and livelihood diversification: a comparative evidence from panel data in rural Thailand and Vietnam. *Economic Change and Restructuring*. 2023; 56(5), 3223-3255.
82. Riddley, M. N., Loveline, K. N., Anastasia, K. K., & Harry, M. W. Biogas Energy and Livelihood Sustainability Within Rural Households in the North West Region of Cameroon, *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*. 2020; 5(8), 635-641, DOI: 10.38124/IJISRT20AUG245
83. Takwa, A.C., & Kimengsi, J. N. An Empirical Analysis of PACA's Role in Rural Development in Mezam Division of Cameroon. *African Journal of Social Sciences*. 2016; 7(4), 3-12.
84. Zemlyakova, Natalia. Economic risks in the activity of agro-industrial complex enterprises in conditions of import substitution. In : *E3S Web of Conferences*. EDP Sciences. 2023; 371.

85. Barquera, S., White, M., Argumedo, G., Batis, C., & Rivera-Dommarco, J. Role of Government and Non-Government Organizations in the Obesity Pandemic and Its Prevention. In *Handbook of Obesity*. 2024; 2(79-87). CRC Press.

UNDER PEER REVIEW