



INFLUENCE OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION ON POVERTY REDUCTION IN RWANDA CASE RRC

1. **Josue HABYARIMANA: Masters Student, University of Kigali**
2. **Doctor Gashili Wilson: Lecture, University of Kigali**

© GSJ

ABSTRACT

In spite of several decades of transfers of financial aid from industrialised countries to developing countries, the numbers of the poor continue to increase and many peasants' rural poor communities still grapple with the repercussions of inadequate potable water, lack of electricity, poor health care, insufficient education and poor agricultural production. These realities, therefore, raise questions key to understanding the failure of community participation towards alleviating poverty in the developing world.

The researcher has performed a Literature Review as evidence to assist the argument that project managers should extend the probabilities of community participation success in the development projects in order to reduce the poverty in rural communities. This research supplies a significance contribution of community participation in the development projects in order to reduce the poverty among rural communities, so that those projects be effectively and efficiently managed and ensure the sustainability.

The study adopted a descriptive research design and descriptive statistic to be used in order to find mean, standard deviations, skewness and kurtosis and inferential statistic via correlation analysis to estimate the strength of relationship between the variables by the usage of Pearson correlation (r) and regression analysis and to take a look at research questions. The target population is 672 respondents with a sample size of 251 respondents comprised of selected households for livestock support in Murunda, Gihango, Ruhango Sectors in Rutsiro District.

Key Words: Community, Participation, Poverty, influence

I. . INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Challenges of poverty have become common or almost mandatory on the programs of many development agencies. It is common place to find many development programs and projects focusing at improving the conditions of the poor. The efforts of these development organisations have produced mixed results; while some projects have led to some improvement in the conditions of the poor people, others have not gained the desired results. Poverty is still widespread in many parts of the world, especially in sub-Saharan Africa.

The practitioners of community development are among the strongest proponents of citizen participation as an integral element of economic improvement and social change efforts. Over the years, there has been a decline and regrowth of interest among social science scholars regarding citizen participation in planning and decision-making processes. Recently, however, researchers have shown renewed interest in participatory processes and outcomes involving citizens at the local community level (Naparstek and Dooley, 1997; Poole and Colby, 2002; Schafft and Greenwood, 2003; Silverman, 2005).

According to the National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda, on the poverty trends analysis the level of poverty is still on 39.1% (EICV4, 2014), which means that 39.1% of the population of Rwanda including Murunda, Gihango, and Ruhango sectors still live in poverty.

The problem is to investigate the activities and the processes that have been put into actions by the NGOs through the development projects which contributed to the reduction of poverty in Murunda, Gihango, and Ruhango Sectors and in Rwanda in general.

This research paper had as general objective of showing the influence of community participation on poverty reduction in Rwanda, specifically to analyze the relationship between community participation and poverty reduction through development projects;

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

It is abundant that This part reviews relevant literature on approaches to participatory community development It also reviews previous studies done by different scholars and researchers on the related field acknowledging their contributions.

Theoretical review

This research shall be informed by the People Centered Development (PCD) paradigm as propounded by Chambers (1992). Its point of departure is the assumption that society is shrouded in suffering and oppression (Muther, 2004).

Arnstein's ladder of participation

Most of influential theories related to community participation was asserted by Arnstein. The concept of community participation is explained like: A process by which people, disadvantaged people, influence decisions that affect them. Participation means influence on development decisions, not simply involvement in the implementation or benefits of a 20-development activity, although those types of involvement are important and are often encouraged by opportunities for influence (Arnstein, 1969). According to Arnstein, it was revealed that there is an existence of several kinds of involving people in project management. Therefore, the greatest impediment to this approach, resides in a broaden nature due to diversified approaches and experiences from different stakeholders and beneficiaries. However, the provision of information and evidences to beneficiaries can undermine the quality of information provided. Convincingly. The degree of participation is expressed in different phases. Degree of Citizen Power Degree Non-Participation Figure2.2: A ladder of Citizen Participation Adapted from Arnstein, 1969 Manipulation and Therapy describe levels of "non-participation" that have been contrived by some to substitute for genuine participation. Their real objective is not to enable people to participate in planning or conducting programs, but to enable power holders to "educate" or "cure" the participants. Rungs 3 and 4 progress to levels of "tokenism" allow the poor to hear and to have a voice: informing and consultation. When they are proffered by power holders as the total extent of participation, citizens may indeed hear and be heard. But under these Citizen Control Delegated Power Partnership Placation Informing Therapy Manipulation 21 conditions they lack the power to insure that their views will be heeded.

4.3 Conceptual framework

Independent variables

Community participation

- Community involvement: Involving Community in all project phases
- Decision-making: Decide for their support based on their need
- Collective action

Dependent variables

Poverty reduction

- Households Economic growth: House Hold access on the basic need and living status changed.
- Empowerment: Mental transformation toward working for development

Intervening variables

www.globalscientificjournal.com

- Development projects

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study was based upon quantitative research methods, according to Martens (2005), the population includes all individuals whom the researcher is interested in obtaining the information and making inferences on. However, due to the large size of populations, researchers often cannot test every individual in the population because it is too expensive and time consuming. Therefore, the target population of this study is the direct household beneficiaries who reside in Murunda, Gihango, and Ruhango Sectors, in Rutsiro District, Western Province. Then the population for this study is 672 who are all the household's resident in those three Sectors but received project support. For sampling method research use the normal approximation to the hyper geometric distribution, for sample size researcher used

Yamane (1967:886) provides a simplified formula to calculate sample sizes. This formula was used to calculate the sample sizes in with a finite population and if the population size is known. A 95% confidence level and a standard deviation $P = 0.5\%$ are assumed for this study.

With the Yamane formula, the determined sample size is given by:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e^2)}$$

Where:

n = Corrected sample size;

N = Population size;

e = Margin of error (MoE) = 5%, $e = 0.05$ based on the research condition.

$$n = \frac{672}{1 + 672(0.05^2)}$$

$$n = \frac{672}{1 + 1.68}$$

$$n = 250.74 \approx 251$$

In this study, a sample of **251** respondents from different households was used by answering questionnaires for the purpose of getting the clear findings of the study. Those respondents are selected from 672 beneficiaries.

Sampling Techniques

In this study random sampling technique was used in collecting data. (Hedgren & Weslien, 2008), defined random sampling as a subset of individuals that are randomly selected from a population.

Data Collection techniques

Data was collected by the researchers in gathering data from the responders and other sources through documentary sources.

Data analysis

The study will employ the multiple regression analysis to analyze the relationship between the independents variables and dependent variable (Ployhart & Vandenberg, 2010). primary data was quantitative and its analysis was done by use of inferential statistics and descriptive statistics.

IV. FINDINGS

Participation of beneficiaries and its influence

Respondents were asked such kind of questions for knowing how they were participated in all project phases and how its influenced in change of their living status.

Comparison of life status towards the project

Respondents were asked to compare their life status before arrival of project and today.

The following is the data resulted from their answers:

Comparison of life status towards the project

No.	Answer	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
1	Improved	232	92.43
2	Decreased	0	0.00
3	No change	19	7.57
Total		251	100.00

Source: Author's field survey, 2022

Table 6 above shows that 232(92.43%) of the respondents said that their life status has been improved after arrival of project, 0(0.00%) said that their life status has been

decreased after arrival of project, and 19(7.57%) agreed that there is no change of their life status when they compare it towards the project before it arrives and after.

Cause of life status improvement

Respondents were asked to state the cause of their life status improvement. The following is the data resulted from their answers:

Cause of life status improvement

No.	Answer	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
1	Implication, participation, my contribution	177	76.29
2	Too much money	0	0.00
3	Implication, participation	8	3.44
4	My contribution	5	2.1
5	Participation & implication	21	9.05
6	Participation	21	9.05
	Total	232	100.00

Source: Author's field survey, 2022

Table above shows that 177(76.29%) of the respondents said that the cause of their life status improvement is that the project management implicated them in the project from start, by participating and provide their contribution during implementation; 0(0.00%) of the respondents said that they have given too much money, 8(3.44%) of the respondents said that they have been implicated and have contributed to the project; 5(2.1%) of the respondents said that they only gave their contribution to the project; 21(9.09%) have participated in all activities of the project and said that the project management implicated them in the project from start, whereas 25(9.09%) of respondents said that they only gave their participation in all the activities of the project.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

This chapter is qualitative in nature. It discusses the research findings presented in Chapter Four. Due to findings this section analyses how poverty reduction can be influenced by community participation.

Relationship between community participation and poverty reduction

There was a significant relationship between beneficiary empowerment and the level of participation. Participation of the beneficiaries in training programmes was high in the

sampled communities. Higher percentage of the project beneficiaries were provided with skills training empowering them participate effectively in the project. As it was given in section 1.5, the first specific objective deals with the analysis of the relationship between community participation and poverty reduction in Rwanda through development projects; the initiatives of poverty reduction that use the community as the main channel for mobilization and involvement must focus on the dynamics and the specificity of context as different kinds of participation imply significantly different levels of engagement.

With reference on the data presented in the table 4.6, table 4.7 can justify the relationship is between community participation and poverty reduction. Where in table 4.6 data shows that 92.4% of respondents improved due to project interventions. Among 92.4% of respondents said that their life was improved, they stated also the cause of their life improvement as appear in table 4.7, where 177(76.29%) said that their life status improvement is that the project management implicated them in the project activities from start, by participating and provide their contribution during implementation; 0(0.00%) they have given too much money, 8(3.44%) they have been implicated and have contributed to the project; 5(2.1%) of the respondents said that they only gave their contribution to the project; 21(9.09%) have participated in all activities of the project and said that the project management implicated them in the project from start, whereas 25(9.09%).

Based on the response of respondents, it shows that 76.29% of respondents said that their life status improved duet they were implicated in the project activity from start through participation, and in table 2, 125 respondents said that support based on the need of households. From the data presented above its prove that there is relationship between community participation and poverty reduction.

Descriptive

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	Between-Component Variance
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Pig	74	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1	
Goats	110	1.00	.000	.000	1.00	1.00	1	1	
Sheep	67	1.57	.908	.111	1.35	1.79	1	3	
Total	251	1.15	.530	.033	1.09	1.22	1	3	
Model			.469	.030	1.09	1.21			
Fixed Effects									
Random Effects				.184	.36	1.94			.094

Change of life status compared to the beneficiary's choice for livestock

Conclusion and Recommendations

For concluding this research, a researcher wants to show how research objectives achieved with the research findings. This research has to analyze the relationship between community participation and poverty reduction through development projects; to elaborate the process of community participation in development projects for poverty reduction and to establish the influence of community participation on poverty reduction in Rwanda as specific objectives.

For relationship between community participation and poverty reduction, findings show that there is a significant relationship 92.4% of respondents improved life status due to project interventions. Among these 92.4% of respondents 76.29% said that their life status improvement is due to the project management implicated them in the project activities from start, by participating and provide their contribution during implementation; 0(0.00%) they have given too much money, 8(3.44%) they have been implicated and have contributed to the project; 5(2.1%) of the respondents said that they only gave their contribution to the project; 9.09% have participated in all activities of the project and said that the project management implicated them in the project from start, 9.09%. From the

data presented above its prove that the participation activities performed contributed for improvement of supported beneficiaries on level of 92.4%

Recommendation

“Community participation is an active process by which beneficiary client groups influence the direction, execution of a development project with a view to enhancing their wellbeing in terms of income, personal growth, self-reliance or other values that they cherish” (Paul, 1987).

During project implementation managers should consider ideas, need and capacity of beneficiaries because project will be implemented towards responding the beneficiaries ‘needs



© GSJ

References

- Bakhit, I. (1996). *Mass poverty in developing countries: a cultural perspective*. In: Marburg, (ed.). (1996). *Attacking the roots of poverty*. Marburg: Marburg Consult.
- Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Chambers, R. (1997). *Whose reality counts?* IT Publications: London.
- Cote, S. (2001). *The contribution of human and social capital in new economies and societies*. ISUMA: Pintemps.
- Crook, R and Jerve, A. M. (1991). *Government and participation: institutional development, decentralisation and democracy in the third world*. Bergen: Michelson Institute.
- Collier, P. (2002). *Social capital and poverty: a microeconomic perspective*. In: Van Bastelaer, T. (ed.). (2002). *The Role of Social Capital in Development*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Unpublished documents, journals and reports

- Ahmed, A. (2003). *The role of social capital and NGOs in community-based management of open water inland fisheries of Bangladesh*. Paper presented at the workshop on common pool resources and institutions in South Asia, Bangalore, India.
- Aldridge S. Halpern D. And Fitzpatrick S. (2002). *Social Capital: a discussion paper, performance and innovation unit*, London. 20-81
- Anneli K. and Eve P. (2007). *Individual-level determinants of social capital in Europe: differences between country groups*. University of Tartu - Faculty of Economics and Business Administration Working Paper Series 56, Tartur, Estonia.
- Bastagli, F. (2010). *Poverty, inequality and public cash transfers lessons from Latin America*. ERD Conference on Experiences and Lessons from Social Protection Programmes across the Developing World, Paris, France, 17-18 June, 2010.
- Berreman, G. D. (1999). *Anthropology, Development and Public Policy*. *Journal of the Central Department of Sociology and Anthropology Occasional papers in Sociology and Anthropology*. Kirtipur Kathmandu, Tribhuvan University, . 4: 1-32
- Botes, L. and Van Rensburg, D. (2000). *Community participation in development: nine plagues and twelve commandments*. *Community Development Journal*. Oxford University Press. 35(1):41-58.

- Carroll, F. T. (2001). *Social capital, local capacity building, and poverty reduction*. *Social Development Papers*. Asian Development Bank, Manila, Working Papers 3: 31-56.
- Cheng, TC. (2012). *Intimate partner violence and welfare participation: A longitudinal causal analysis*. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(4), 808-830.
- Cobbinah, P. B., Black, R., & Thwaites, R. (2013). *Dynamics of poverty in developing countries: Review of poverty reduction approaches*. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 6 (9), 25-35.
- Miller, J. (2005). *Local level development and decentralisation in Ghana*. Unpublished PhD. Thesis, Oslo, University of Oslo.
- Minujin, A., Delamonica, E., Davidziuk, A., & Gonzalez, E. D. (2006). *The definition of child poverty: A discussion of concepts and measurements*. *Environment and Urbanization*, 18(2), 481-500.
- Naparstek, A. J. and Dooley, D. (1997) *Community building*, in R.L. Edwards, ed-in-chief, *Encyclopaedia of Social Work*, 19th edition, 1997 Suppl, National Association of Social Workers/NASW Press, Washington, DC, pp. 77-89.
- National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda (NISR) (2012). *Rwanda Poverty Profile Report 2013/14*. Kigali: NISR.
- Pantoja, E. (1999). *Exploring the concept of social capital and its relevance for community-based development: the case of minin areas in Orissa, India*. South Asia Infrastructure Unit, World Bank
- Paulo, F. (1970). Cited in Mansure, G. and Rao, V. (2004). *Community based driven development*. *The World Bank Research Observer*. 19(1: 4):1-39.
- Poole, D. L. and Colby, I. C. (2002) *Do public neighbourhood centres have the capacity to be instruments of change in human services?* *Social Work*, 47(2), 142-152.
- Portes, A. (1998). *Social capital: its origins and applications in contemporary sociology*. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 24:1-24.
- Putnam, R. D. (1993). *The prosperous community: Social capital and public life*. *The American Prospect*. 4 (13): 1-11.
- Schafft, K. A. and Greenwood, D. J. (2003) *Promises and dilemmas of participation: action research, search conference methodology, and community development*, *Journal of the Community Development Society*, 34(1), 18-35.
- Shinns, L., & Lyne, M. C. (2004). *Symptoms of poverty within a group of land reform beneficiaries in the Midlands of KwaZulu-Natal: Analysis and policy recommendations*. *Agrekon*, 43 (1), 74-88.

Internet sources

Adejumobi, S. (2006). Governance and poverty reduction in Africa: A critique of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs). Retrieved from <http://www1.lanic.utexas.edu/project/etext/llilas/cpa/spring06/welfare/adejumobi.pdf>.

Bold, C., Porteous, D., & Rotman, S. (2012). *Social cash transfers and financial inclusion: Evidence from four countries* (Focus Note No. 77). Retrieved from <https://www.cgap.org/sites/default/files/Focus-Note-Social-Cash-Transfers-and-Financial-Inclusion-Evidence-from-Four-Countries-Feb-2012.pdf>.

Jennings R. 2000. *Participatory development as new paradigm: the transition of development professionalism*.

Karshenas, M. (2001). *Measurement and nature of absolute poverty in least developed countries* (SOAS, Economics Working Paper Series No. 129). Retrieved from <https://www.soas.ac.uk/economics/research/workingpapers/file28849.pdf>.

Laderchi, C. R., Saith, R., & Stewart, F. (2003). *Does it matter that we don't agree on the definition of poverty? A comparison of four approaches* (Working Paper No. 107). Retrieved from <http://www3.geh.ox.ac.uk/pdf/gehwp/gehwps107.pdf>.

McCaston, M. K., & Rewald, M. (2005). *A conceptual overview of underlying causes of poverty*. Retrieved from