



GSJ: Volume 10, Issue 4, April 2022, Online: ISSN 2320-9186

[www.globalscientificjournal.com](http://www.globalscientificjournal.com)

## **Impact of Community Involvement in Government Developmental Programmes In Rivers South-East Senatorial Zone**

**Author: Arc, Dr ANTHONY Donubari Enwin**  
**Co-Authored: IDEOZU, Samuel**

**Faculty of Environmental Science**  
**Department of Architecture, Rivers State University Nkpolu-  
Oroworuko Port Harcourt**

### **Abstract**

The paper is aimed at assessing community involvement and government developmental programmes in Rivers State. Three purposes, research questions and hypotheses guided the study. This study adopted a descriptive survey research design. This study was conducted in Rivers South East Senatorial zone and wards. The population of the study includes all councilors, community members and ward leaders. From this group data was collected on the level of awareness of political leaders and community members on the importance of community members to participate in different development activities like construction of schools, dispensaries and road construction. The researcher used a sample of 80 individuals, this helped to obtain fairly accurately the characteristic of the population. In this study the researcher used data collection method such as interviews, documentary sources and observation. The findings of the study showed the homogeneity of the respondents. The findings all indicates that community where there is collaboration in which people, voluntarily, or because of some persuasion or incentives; agree to collaborate with an externally determined development project have impact on community involvement on governmental project planning in Rivers South East Senatorial zone. The findings of the study revealed that the act of putting into action what was planned is the most vital stage of the project cycle which involves the procurement of equipment and resources, recruitment of personnel and allocation of tasks and resources within the project organization and the involvement of community have impact on governmental project execution

in Rivers East. The findings of the study revealed that there are benefits of community involvement on government developmental programmes in Rivers South-East. Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made: The researcher recommends that communities should be given the opportunity of make decisions about project selection because it is good to participate in project with their good senses and the project selected by them could be the ones to be implemented.

Keyword: Community, Government, Projects Planning and Project Execution

## INTRODUCTION

Community participation is one of the key ingredients of an empowered community. Community participation occurs when a community organizes itself and takes full responsibility for managing its problems. Taking full responsibility includes identifying the problems, developing actions, putting them to place and following through. Akinbile, Oladoja, Awoniyi and Adisa (2006) pointed out that there are considerable differences of opinion as to what community participation is, and it follows that there will be many arguments about the universal definition. The term citizen or public and participation are often used interchangeably. Alesina and Eliana (2000) sees community participation as the creation of opportunities to enable all members of a community to actively contribute to and influence the development process and to share equitably in the fruits of development. Community participation is a complex mechanism, and in effect there is no single blue print. Hence, each area is characterised by different dynamics and demographics. This view is held whilst taking cognisance the fact that development does not occur successfully if beneficiaries are not part and parcel of the process of planning and implementation of the process. Community participation is a continuous two-way process which involves the full understanding of processes and mechanisms through which development problems are investigated and solved. It covers a spectrum of activities ranging from passive involvement in community life to intensive action-oriented participation in community development. Community participation provides individual with the opportunity to influence public decisions and has long been a component of the democratic decision-making process (Asaduzzaman, 2008). This definition of citizen participation can be further divided into two categories according to the will of the people wishing to influence policy decisions; passive participation which includes simple one-way information delivery or request for information and active participation which includes formation of a consensus on specific issues, monitoring administrative activities and administrative requests.

The methods of community participation play a crucial role in terms of meaningful participation (Bizoza & Havugimana 2011). Community participation is rooted in democratic approaches to public policy, community planning and development, which assume that people have a right to make decisions that affect their lives. In short, a community that gives up the ability to make its own decisions loses "some essential humanity". Citizen participation must be understood in relation to local and regional patterns of power and powerlessness, that is, individual and collective experiences of influence, acquiescence, privilege, or exclusion based on membership in dominant or disenfranchised groups.

There are two broad implications of community participation which are identifiable, those that view community participation as a means and those that view it as an end. Community participation as a means or end is an issue which has bothered both development thinkers and workers. Catherine (2010) indicates that the proportion of the second view often maintains that development for the benefit of the poor cannot occur unless the poor themselves control the process through the praxis of participation. Chambers (2004) also points out that until recently the notion of participation as a means to achieve effective development still dominate to rural development practice. Karangwa (2013), state that there are two main vehicles for implementing this notion of participation; community development programmes which were aimed at preparing the rural population collaborate with government development plans and the establishment of formal organizations (cooperatives, farmers association, etc.) which were to provide the structure through which the rural people could have some contact with, and voice in, development programmes. Kinyashi (2008) provides the evidence which suggests that only a few achieved any meaningful participation and benefit by means. Long (2001) assert that this strategy has not resulted in meaningful participation of the community in rural development. In fact it is the strategy which has resulted in our current situation failing to confront the issue of the lack of meaningful community participation in rural development.

Public participation is an end in itself, and is the unavoidable sequence of the process of empowering and liberating the community to understand the process of development. Mezegibe (2011) agrees that community participation as an end is selfmobilizing where the local people themselves are in total command. There is no doubt that meaningful participation is about achieving power: which is the power to influence the decisions that affect one's livelihood.

Community participation is viewed as an end if it becomes a long-term process, the purpose of which is to develop and strengthen the capabilities of people in order to participate directly in development initiatives.

Government projects of any nation are of immense importance to the citizens and residents of that nation as it forms part of the building blocks that support national growth. The successful execution of projects serves as a visible indicator of development in a country. Despite this, in developing countries such as Nigeria, majority of projects embarked on by the government are classified as failed projects (Mwesigye, 2011). According to PMI (Project Management Institute PMBOK) guide (2013), a project is a temporary endeavour which is aimed at creating a unique result. However, Njumwa (2010) defines a project as a series of unique and related activities with a goal that must be achieved at a set time, within its cost constraints and in accordance with set specifications. There is no clear-cut definition for project failure, and there seems to be differences in its acceptable definition. Ofori (2008) defined project failure as the incapability of a project to be completed within its set time, cost and quality specifications. Olukotun (2008) however suggest that regardless of a project's completion time and cost, it can still be considered as failed if the project does not fulfil its required purpose. In addition, many studies agree that cost overruns, time overruns and substandard quality are the primary causes of project failure. Other causes include: poor planning, variation of project design and scope, inflation, contractor competence, inadequate cost estimation, just to mention a few (Sheikh, 2010).

The causes of project failure are numerous both in developed and developing nations, and studies have indicated that large amounts of funds have been lost by governments as a result of failed projects. These factors which lead to project failure consequently lead to stagnant growth in national development (Shukor, 2011). In order to curb these menace, various authors have recommended more investigation into the causes and effects of projects failure especially in developing countries. Globally, of course, project failure has resulted in the loss of large amounts of funds. Information system projects in the UK, power generation projects in Africa and construction projects in Asia are few examples that have experienced failure (Sonowabo, 2009). An example is the Home Office where £750 million e-boarder scheme whose contract was awarded in 2007 and terminated as a failed project in 2010 (Thwala, 2010). The rate of project failure in developing countries has been found to be higher than the rate in developed countries thereby creating the need to embark on more development projects. These projects however, experience several challenges such as inefficient planning, cost variation, difficult stakeholders

(Tosun, 2006). Currently in Nigeria, the rate of project failure is alarming and these failed projects have high financial implications which consequently reduce the rate of development.

Different causes of project failure have been identified. For example, Twebaze (2010) identified causes of failure as a result of delays in Kuwait's construction projects. He went ahead to state that the major causes of these delays are design and finance-related problems. Arthur and Michelle (2002) looked at delays in Nigeria road construction projects and identified the causes of these delays as poor supervision, contract modification, construction mistakes, inadequate or unavailable equipment, poor procurement practices, difficult financial processes, etc. At present, the menace of project failure has prompted researchers to look into the underlying factors leading to these failures. A rather generic approach has been taken by some researchers or have researched on project failure with regard to specific projects in certain industries. Despite the numerous causes and effects of project failure known, studies on these causes and effects and consequences of project failure on the development of developing countries, are going on.

Undeniably, planning is a crucial part of any project and in order to achieve success, a proper plan must be made. Poor project planning is a common cause of failure. Blair (2000) suggests that in an event that clear outlines of deliverables in a project are not stated while planning, the project might fail. This simply means that projects which commence without a proper plan and knowledge of the constraints involved is at risk of failing. Studies show that poor planning is a root cause of many project failures in Iran (Chambers, 2012). Similarly, this same problem was found in the Nigerian construction projects (Chandan, 2014). According to previous literature, one of the primary factors that lead to project failure is the change of project scope. Many projects face changes in requirements before or during its execution. However these changes are not often accomplished at the expected date of completion. Chirenje, Giliba and Musamba (2013) suggest that evidence of this is predominant in IS projects.

Although changes in project scope are generally considered as a characteristic of projects, they usually have a huge effect on the project. Danny, Frances, Marilyn, Pete and Mandy (2004) stated that changes in project scope significantly affect project cost. Various past studies have shown that efficient communication is a key element in a project as it aids in providing relevant information to all project participants, which is mandatory for delivery of successful project. Hence, poor communication while planning and executing projects is likely to cause failure. According to Davids, Theron and Maphunye (2005), communication is the process of collecting vital data, processing it and distributing the information to who and where it will be needed.

Additionally, information can be defined as processed data which are presented in an understandable and meaningful format. Evidently, effective communication is the bond which aids a project team to achieve its goals while miscommunication poses a threat to project success. Ghazala and Vijayendra (2003) identified the causes of poor communication in the construction industry as: linguistic barriers, cultural barriers, poor feedback and unclear communication channels amongst others. The first two causes listed are dominant in projects that involve multicultural collaboration.

Feedback shows how project participants react to certain information and task, and it is essential to complete communication. Emphasis on the quality and timing of the feedback is therefore very essential, especially when it requires immediate attention (Green 2008). Lastly, communications channels which are not clear can pose a problem to the parties exchanging information, therefore an acceptable communication route for every project needs to be established.

Various reasons could be attributed to the causes of government project failure in Nigeria. These identified causes include, poor financial capacity, inaccurate cost estimates, corruption, incompetence and lack of knowledge, poor. It has been established that disempowerment of the local communities is a resultant effect to local communities in regions where these projects failed. Low empowerment has been established in loss of employment opportunities which develop capacity with the community within which the projects are undertaken. Alternatively, economic deprivation of the local community of the vital infrastructural development has been established to be a resultant effect of these project failures within these communities. Therefore, through the failure of these projects, the local Nigerian community intended to benefit from them gets to lose its intended empowerment enshrined in the aims of these projects which are inherently structured for altruistic reasons.

### **Statement of the Problem**

It has been observed that in spite of abundant natural, physical and human resources that Nigeria is endowed with, there is still high rate of underdevelopment in Nigeria especially in the rural areas. In Rivers State, majority of the people live in the rural areas and they depend mainly on agriculture. They operate fragmented and marginal holdings while some others concentrate on petty trade. Despite the obvious role of farming and trade in the economy of the state, rural people tend to remain poor. In general, they share several characteristics such as low levels of educational attainment, a relatively large number of children, relatively low access to material

resources, physical and social infrastructures, higher susceptibility to community-wide exogenous shocks such as weather induced crop losses and natural disasters. However, it must be noted that rural communities also vary greatly with regard to the condition of their rural economies and rural development needs.

Communities in Andoni, Tai, Gokanah and Khana Local Government Areas of Rivers State, Nigeria have been involved in community development projects over the years, but their participation output seemed not to have yielded any dividends of prosperity. It was further observed that systematic research aimed at understanding factors influencing level of participation status of the above named communities through participation in community development projects seemed to be lacking. These communities need improvement in the quality of their living standards. This, therefore, was of great concern, hence the decision to investigate the status of the four communities in the Senatorial zones through their participation in development of their rural areas. At this juncture, it became pertinent to see to what extent did the people of selected communities participate in the development of their communities through development activities. The factors influenced people's participation in community development projects. The ways in participation affect their living standards of people. What were the major obstacles to effective participation in development projects in the study area?

### **Aim/Objectives of the Study**

The aim of the study is to assess community involvement and government developmental programmes in Rivers State. Specifically, the study sought the following:

1. Community involvement and governmental project planning in Rivers East
2. Community involvement and governmental project execution in Rivers East.
3. Benefits of community involvement on government developmental programmes in Rivers East.
4. Constraints of community involvement on government developmental programmes in Rivers East.

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions were formulated to guide the study

1. What is the impact of community involvement and governmental project planning in Rivers East?
2. What is the impact of community involvement and governmental project execution in Rivers East?
5. What are the benefits of community involvement on government developmental programmes in Rivers East?
3. What are the constraints of community involvement on government developmental programmes in Rivers East?

## Methodology

This study adopted a descriptive survey research design. The descriptive survey research design was considered suitable because the study elicited data and information from respondents on community involvement on government developmental programmes in Rivers State.

This study was conducted in South East Senatorial zone and wards. Unit of inquiry includes population of councilors, community members and ward leaders. From this group data was collected on the level of awareness of political leaders and community members on the importance of community members to participate in different development activities like construction of schools, dispensaries and road construction. The most important unit of inquiry was community members, this is an important unit of inquiry as it is the centre of the researcher because they are the main beneficiaries of development projects hence the researcher was to collect data directly from them.

LGA	Projected population (2014)	Wards
Andoni	275,718	11
Eleme	249,421	10
Gokana	299,002	17
Khana	384,443	19
Opobo–Nkoro	197,974	11
Oyigbo	160,311	10
Tai	153,921	10

Sample size and sampling techniques



**Sample size:** Sample size is the specific number of items to be selected in the sample from where by the targeted population or total population which the researcher used. The researcher used a sample of 80 individuals this helped to obtain fairly accurately the characteristic of the population. This included community members, Councilors, local government officers and ward leaders. Rivers South East has a total of 88 wards out of which was purposely selected because the sample was homogeneous that is the sample was more or less the same. Also the study area was reached easily by the researcher. The total of development projects in Rivers South East ward was 5 including the road construction, school buildings and a market place .

**Sampling techniques:** The purpose of the study was to examine the importance of community participation in development projects in Rivers South East wards. Judgmental and convenient sampling was used to obtain key people who provided information about community participation in development projects. At local government level five people were selected, the chairmen and counselor who deals with the provision of funds for development projects with cooperation from the planning unit. At ward level four people were selected the Chief, Village head, Youth Head and Women Leader. Both Convenient type of sampling and purposive or judgmental was used to get information from citizens.

**Methods of data collection:** The nature of research design determines the data collection method. In this study the researcher used data collection method such as interviews, documentary sources and observation. The use of more than one data collection method enabled the researcher to combine strength and correct some of the deficiency's technique. In so doing it increased the validity and reliability of data collected (Bond, 2006).

**Data analysis and interpretation:** Data collected from the respondents were analyzed using mean and standard deviation to answer the research questions and t-test statistics were used to test the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. The decision for hypotheses was; if the calculated value of t (t-cal) is less than or equal to the critical value of (t-crit), accept the null hypotheses, otherwise rejected null hypothesis. The computation of the mean, standard deviation and t-test was carried out with statistical package for social sciences (SPSS).

## Results

**Research Questions 1:** What is the impact of community involvement on governmental project planning in Rivers East?

Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviation of community involvement on governmental project planning

S/NO	Item	Community Heads			LGA Administrators		
		X	SD	RMK	X	SD	RMK
1	Projects meet their operational performance goals	4.22	.856	A	4.03	.929	A
2	Projects meet their technical performance goals	3.58	.706	SA	4.02	.876	A
3	Projects meet their schedule objectives	4.09	.785	A	4.22	.932	A
4	Projects stay within budget limits	3.98	.719	A	4.39	.840	A

5	Project results meet stakeholders expectations	4.17	.921	A	4.03	.982	A
6	Stakeholders are satisfied with project results	4.11	.994	A	3.98	.744	A
7	Programs implementation reflect the strategy	4.27	.877	A	3.88	.982	A
8	Programs impact exceeds stakeholders expectations	3.93	.863	A	4.07	.923	A
9	Programs achieve cost-benefits objectives	4.34	0.86	A	3.63	0.59	A
10	The budget allocation between projects in the portfolio reflects the strategy	3.55	0.67	A	3.86	0.49	A
<b>Grand Mean</b>		4.02	0.83	A	4.01	0.83	A

Data in Table 1 revealed that Community Heads had a mean range of 3.55-4.34 and standard deviation range of 0.67 - 0.99. While the LGA Administrators had a mean range of 3.63-4.39 and standard deviation range of 0.49 - 0.98. The standard deviation shows the homogeneity of the respondents. The mean shows that the respondents agreed on the impact of community involvement on governmental project planning in Rivers East.

**Research Question 2:** What is the impact of community involvement on governmental project execution in Rivers East?

Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviation of community involvement on governmental project execution

S/NO	Item	Community Heads			LGA Administrators		
		X	SD	RMK	X	SD	RMK
1	Sets out the objectives and targets for the project	4.23	.834	A	4.07	.838	A
2	Links the project objectives to business objectives and company policies	4.40	.821	A	4.09	.808	A
3	Defines the scope and context for the project	4.09	.722	A	4.04	.947	A
4	Sets out the organisational design for the project	4.18	.658	A	4.19	.766	A
5	Describes the agreed plans for project execution	4.05	.924	A	4.12	.982	A
6	Outlines the key project management mechanisms and processes to ensure successful delivery of project objectives	4.19	.953	A	4.39	.774	A
7	Allows consistent communication	3.99	.881	A	4.19	.860	A

	across the integrated team for the project's plans and processes to execute the required scope						
8	Provides a reference document for project team members	3.95	.990	A	4.26	.856	A
9	Stakeholder Communications Plan	3.98	1.03	A	4.32	.776	SA
10	Work Breakdown Structure	4.19	1.04	A	4.21	.725	A
	<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>4.13</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>4.19</b>	<b>0.83</b>	<b>A</b>

Data in Table 2 revealed that Community Heads had a mean range of 3.98-4.40 and standard deviation range of 0.65 - 1.04. While the LGA Administrators had a mean range of 4.40-4.39 and standard deviation range of 0.72 - 0.94. The standard deviation shows the homogeneity of the respondents. The mean shows that the respondents agreed on the impact of community involvement on governmental project execution in Rivers East.

**Research Questions 3:** What are the benefits of community involvement on government developmental programmes in Rivers East?

Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviation on benefits of community involvement on government developmental programmes

S/NO	Item	Community Heads			LGA Administrators		
		X	SD	RMK	X	SD	RMK
1	It will lead to better designed projects	4.23	.881	A	4.34	.797	A
2	Better targeted benefits.	4.44	.926	A	4.16	.902	A
3	It is more cost effective.	4.11	.858	A	3.70	1.059	A
4	It will lead to more equitable distribution of project benefits	4.26	.897	A	3.86	1.025	A
5	It will lead to less corruption.	4.09	.989	A	4.17	.891	A
6	It strengthens the capabilities of the citizenry to undertake self-initiated development activities	4.18	.889	A	4.25	.830	A
7	It improves the match between what a community needs and what it obtains	3.97	.954	A	4.26	.809	A
8	Participation which allows these people to have a voice in determining objectives	4.04	1.017	A	4.32	.827	A
9	support project administration and to make their local knowledge	3.88	.880	A	4.02	.979	A
10	Participation will extend the coverage, bringing more people within the direct influence of development activities	3.61	0.99	A	4.02	1.06	A
	<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>4.08</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>4.11</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>A</b>

Data in Table 3 revealed that Community Heads had a mean range of 3.61-4.44 and standard deviation range of 0.88 - 1.02. While the LGA Administrators had a mean range of 3.70-4.34 and standard deviation range of 0.79 - 1.06. The standard deviation shows the homogeneity of the respondents. The mean shows that the respondents agreed on the benefits of community involvement on government developmental programmes in Rivers East.

**Research Questions 4:** What are the constraints of community involvement on government developmental programmes in Rivers East?

Table 4: Mean and Standard Deviation on constraints of community involvement on government developmental programmes

S/NO	Item	Community Heads			LGA Administrators		
		X	SD	RMK	X	SD	RMK
1	Political intervention in project selection	3.57	.692	SA	3.81	1.039	A
2	Locally elected representatives personal interests	3.56	.732	SA	4.11	.859	A
3	Lack of dissemination of project related information	4.28	.750	A	4.35	.719	A
4	Poor Centralization of decision – making	4.93	1.004	A	3.95	.932	A
5	Lack of Transparency	4.16	.941	A	4.42	.844	A
6	Lack of Leadership qualities	4.95	.875	A	4.09	.860	A
7	Socio-Economic Factors	4.25	.931	A	4.32	.736	A
8	Literacy levels	4.99	1.088	A	4.31	.790	A
9	Politico-Cultural Factors	4.05	.990	A	4.42	.625	A
10	Political Interferences	4.31	0.88	A	4.19	0.83	A
	<b>Grand Mean</b>	3.57	.692	SA	3.81	1.039	A

Data in Table 1 revealed that Community Heads had a mean range of 3.56-4.99 and standard deviation range of 0.69- 1.08. While the LGA Administrators had a mean range of 3.81-4.42 and standard deviation range of 0.71-1.04. The standard deviation shows the homogeneity of the respondents. The mean shows that the respondents agreed on the constraints of community involvement on government developmental programmes in Rivers East.

## Discussion of Findings

The findings of the study showed the homogeneity of the respondents. The findings all indicates that community where there is collaboration in which people, voluntarily, or because of some persuasion or incentives; agree to collaborate with an externally determined development project have

impact on community involvement on governmental project planning in Rivers East. This is in line with Hussein (2013) who explained that participation is the collaboration, in which people, voluntarily, or because of some persuasion or incentives; agree to collaborate with an externally determined development project, often by contributing their labor and resources in return for some expected benefits. Project planning: is part of project management, which relates to the use of schedules such as Gantt charts to plan and subsequently report progress within the project environment. It is used to organize different areas of a project, including project plans, workloads and the management of teams and individuals. Community participation: is a social process whereby specific groups with shared needs, often but not always living in a defined geographical area, actively pursue identification of their needs, make decision and establish mechanism to meet these needs (Nibyiza, 2015).

The findings of the study revealed that the act of putting into action what was planned is the most vital stage of the project cycle which involves the procurement of equipment and resources, recruitment of personnel and allocation of tasks and resources within the project organization and the involvement of community have impact on governmental project execution in Rivers East. This is in agreement with Olukotun (2017) who stated that implementation is perhaps the most vital stage of the project cycle involving the procurement of equipment and resources, recruitment of personnel and allocation of tasks and resources within the project organization. Under the project implementation plan, resources are mobilized, activities determined and control mechanism established so that the project inputs can produce project outputs in order to achieve the project purpose. Hence local people's participation at this stage is conducive to the successful operation of projects.

The findings of the study revealed that there are benefits of community involvement on government developmental programmes in Rivers East. The findings are in line with Richardson (2018) who pointed out the importance of community participation as follows: the approach helps the project to be sustainable as communities themselves learn how to adopt and correct changes resulting from the project; partnership or participation helps to protect interest of the people concerned; it enhances dignity and self-reliance among people, that is, they are enabled to obtain and do things by themselves; communities become aware of the project implementation as they have a great store of wisdom and skills. They understand their local needs and the nature of their environment better than outsiders; participation makes local people to act as multiplier of new project which they achieve. They can easily transmit the new knowledge they acquired to other communities, thus cause a rapid increase in growth of the new idea; participation promotes a sense of ownership among the community of equipment used in the project, and even projects itself. For example, they will protect and maintain the project through

their own means e.g. school buildings; it also enhances empowerment to community members by building their capacity to identify, define, solve and implement various social and economic issues that affect their lives; and participation creates sense and attitude of self-reliance; this especially happens when the project developer leaves the project to the indigenous community.

The findings of the study revealed the constraints of community involvement as the influence of demographic characteristics (age, gender, occupation, and location of residence) had on community' preferences about involvement in the project development, the study also explained that other possible factors besides socio-demographic characteristics forms constraints of community involvement on government developmental programmes in Rivers East. This is in accordance with Chambers, (2004), identified two broad categories of barriers to participation. These are structural barriers which comprise socio-cultural, economic, political and administrative barriers and non-structural barriers emanating from project planning and implementation problems (Stone & Stone, 2010).

## **Conclusion**

Community involvement is very crucial because it creates awareness among stakeholders, people become aware of their material resources, their leadership, their technical expertise and the kind of help they are likely to need from outside, people should be mobilized through education and training on the importance of their projects and to make them feel that projects belongs to them, with mobilization, various village resources should be identified and daily recognized within the rules and institutions that creates predictable and transparent framework of both private and public sector. In this manner, people will be in a position to make decision on matters concerning their social development. Involvement of people in ongoing project gives them power to make decisions pertaining to their social development, where people enjoy awareness of all the processes related to their social economic needs and inclinations.

## **Recommendations**

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

The researcher recommends that communities should be given the opportunity of make decisions about project selection because it is good to participate in project with their good senses and the project selected by them could be the ones to be implemented.

The researcher recommends that communities considered as project beneficiaries should have a regular training in order to increase their understanding about the project and gaining skills and

knowledge about the project maintenance. This is because if the beneficiaries are not equipped with skills on project management and maintenance the sustainability of the project can be challenged and overpowered. It advisable that community involvement should not only consider the project in the case study but should consider all the projects funded.

The researcher recommends that before the implementation of any project the implementers should identify factors that can influence and prevent household from participation and give chances to them in decision making during project selection.

Conclusively, the level of participation of community members in project planning and implementation should be increased so as to attain high level of sustainability of such projects.

## Reference

- Akinbile, L.A., Oladoja, M.A., Awoniyi, F.M., & Adisa, B.O.,(2006). Effects of community participation on perception of sustainability of rural water projects in Oyun localgovernment area of Kwara State, Nigeria. *Journal of Food, Agriculture & Environment* Vol.4 (3&4), 257-261.
- Alesina, A., & Eliana F., (2000). Participation in Heterogeneous Communities. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* .
- Arthur, A. S. and Michelle, R. D. (2002). *Community Involvement: Theoretical Approaches and Educational Initiatives*. Wiley-Blackwell Publishers. ISBN: 978-1-405-10793-8.
- Asaduzzaman, M. (2008). *Governance in Practice: Decentralization and People's Participation in the Local Government of Bangladesh*. University of Tampere Press.
- Bizoza R. A & Havugimana J.M., (2011). Land use consolidation in Rwanda. A case study of Nyanza District , Southern Province. National University of Rwanda
- Blair, H. (2000). Participation and Accountability at the Periphery: Democratic Local Governance in Six Countries. *World Development*. Volume. 28, Issue 1, pp21-39.
- Catherine F.W. (2010). Women participation in project planning and implementation: A case of Tasaf project in Rufiji District – Tanzania
- Chambers, R. (2004, April). Institute of Development Studies. Retrieved March 21, 2022, from [www.ids.ac.uk: http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/particip/research/pranotes04.pdf](http://www.ids.ac.uk: http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/particip/research/pranotes04.pdf)
- Chambers, R. (2012). *Provocations for Development*. Bourton on Dunsmore: Practical Action Publishing.

- Chandan, K. P. (2014). Practicing Participatory Rural Appraisal – A Comprehensive Approach for Learning from the People. *Advances in Extension Education and Rural Development*. Volume II. India: Agrobios.
- Chirenje L. I., Giliba R. A. and Musamba, E. B. (2013). Local Communities' Participation in Decision Making Processes through Planning and Budgeting in African Countries. *Chinese Journal of Population Resources and Environment*. Volume 11, Issue 1. Pp 10 – 16.
- Danny B., Frances H., Marilyn T., Pete W. and Mandy W. (2004). Making community participation meaningful: A handbook for development and assessment. Published for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation by The Policy Press. England.
- Dauids I., Theron F. and Maphunye, K. (2005). Participatory Development in South Africa: A Development Management Perspective. Pretoria, South Africa: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Ghazala, M. and Vijayendra, R. (2003). Community Based and Driven. Development: A Critical Review Development Research Group. The World Bank Development.
- Green K.O. (2008). A Seat at the Table: A Study of Community Participation in Two Healthy Cities Projects: Critical Public Health. Volume 18. Issue 3. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09581590801959337>.
- Hussein, A. (2013). Determinants of Community Participation in the Implementation of Development Projects: A Case of Garissa Sewerage Project. University of Nairobi.
- Karangwa, L. (2013). Celebrating Sustainable affordable Water and Sanitation Services: Milestones of WASH project. Kigali: SNV, Rwanda.
- Kinyashi, Z. S. (2008). Analysis of Community Participation in Projects Managed by Non-Governmental Organizations: A case of World Vision in Central Tanzania. UK: IDS: Institute of Development Studies. UK.
- Long, C. (2001). Participation of the Poor in Development initiatives: Taking their rightful place. UK: Earth Scan Publication.
- Mezegibe, E. A., (2011). An Assessment on the Role of Community Participation on Rural Water Supply Project: The Case of Debatie Woreda, Benishangul Gumuz Regional State.
- Mwesigye, H. (2011). Role of community participation in the design and Implementation of community interventions. Kampala: my brog.
- Njumwa, K. (2010). Community participation as a tool for development: local community's participation in primary education development in Morogoro, Tanzania. A Case of Kilikala and Mindu Primary Schools. University of Agder.



- Ofori, B. (2008, January). Strategies for community participation in dam development. Issue Paper . Accra, West Africa Regional Office, Ghana: International Water Management Institute.
- Olukotun, G. (2008). Achieving Project Sustainability Trough Community Participation. *Journal of Social Science* 17(1), 21-29.
- Olukotun, G. A. (2017). Achieving Project Sustainability Through Community Participation. *Journal of Social Sciences*. Volume 17, Issue 1, pp 21-29.
- Richardson, G. P. (2018). Using a Group Decision Support System to Add Value to Group Model Building. *SystDyn Rev*. Volume 26, Issue 4, pp 335-346.
- Sheikh, N. (2010). People's Participation in Development Projects at Grass-root Level: A case of a Lampur and Jagannathpur Union Parishad. North South University, Bangladesh.
- Shukor, E. A. (2011). A review on the success factors for community participation in the solid waste management. *International Conference on Management* (pp. 963-976). Skudai Malaysia: Unversity of Technology Malaysia .
- Sonowabo, P. (2009). Community Particpition in Solid Waste Management in High - Density Low-Income Areas: The case of C-Section in Duncan illage. University of Hale.
- Stone, L. S. and Stone, T. M. (2010). Community-Based Tourism Enterprises: Challenges and Prospects for Community Participation; Khama Rhino Sanctuary Trust, Botswana. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Volume 19, Issue 1. pp 197-114
- Thwala, W. (2010). Community participation is a necessity for project success: A case study of rural water supply projects in Jappes Reefs, South Africa. *African Journal of Agricultural Research* Vol. 5(10)., 970-979.
- Tosun, C. (2006). Expected nature of community participation in tourism development. *Journal of Tourism Management*, 27(3), 493-504.
- Twebaze, J. (2010). Community Monilization in Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Programs:How Effective is It? “A case of Wakiso District- Uganda. Kampala: Makerere University.