

**YOUTH PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT PROJECT IN OREDO LOCAL
GOVERNMENT AREA OF EDO STATE, NIGERIA**

BY

Francisca Onyeka ONYENJEN

AGR1600109

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS
AND EXTENSION SERVICES
FACULTY OF AGRICULTURE
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN
BENIN CITY**

JANUARY, 2023

**YOUTH PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
PROJECT IN OREDO LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF EDO STATE,
NIGERIA**

BY

Francisca Onyeka ONYENJEN

AGR1600109

**A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS AND EXTENSION SERVICES IN
PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE AWARD
OF THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF AGRIC(B.AGRIC) IN
AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS AND EXTENSION SERVICES**

JANUARY, 2023

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that this research work titled "**Youth Participation in Community Development Project in Oredo Local Government Area Of Edo State, Nigeria.**" was carried out by **Francisca Onyeka ONYENJEN** with matriculation number **AGR1600109** of the Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension Services, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Benin, Benin city, Edo state, Nigeria in Partial fulfilment for the award of Bachelor of Agriculture degree in Agricultural Economics and Extension Services of the University of Benin

DR. (MRS) M. J KOYENIKAN
(Project Supervisor).

DR. (MRS) M. J KONYENIKAN
(Head of Department)

Date_____

Date_____

DEDICATION

This project is dedicated to God Almighty, who is in infinite mercy provided me with everything I needed for this project to be a success .And also I dedicate it to my father for his care and support ,God will continue to bless you daddy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank God for His mercies and divine supply throughout the course of my stay in school and also thank him for the people he brought my way that impacted my life positively.

I greatly want to thank my project supervisor Dr (Mrs.) M. J Koyenikan for the professional help she extended to me which enabled me to complete this work and also for her motherly advice and support, and I pray that God will reward her abundantly.

My unreserved gratitude goes to my Dean Professor E. R Orhue, my HOD Dr(Mrs.) M. J. Koyenikan and all my lecturers Dr Steve .O. konkwo, Dr Ojogho, Prof D. U Okoedo Okojie, Dr S.U Ewansiha, Dr.(Mrs.) Izekor, Mr. igbinidu, Prof Ilavbarhe to mention a few, I want to sincerely thank you all for making my five years here at the University of Benin very memorable and Educational.

I want to specially thank my wonderful parents Mr. and Mrs. Augustine Omorojie Onyenjen for their prayers, financial support and guidance. I want to say that God will continue to bless you and you will reap the fruits of your labour. I want to also thank my amazing siblings, Sandra, Lucy, Blessing and Samuel thank you for your affection, moral, financial and emotional support throughout the thick and thin of my academic pursuit. I also want to thank Okaka Joy, Lekan and Iyiola for been there for me financially, you guys took me as your younger sister and that is something i would never take for granted, I pray God reward you abundantly.

I also want to thank my friends that stood by me for five years through thick and thin, David, Eghe, Blessing, Onyeka, Ebun, Kingsley, Adams, Oghenemaro, Maureen and Theresa, Patience, Annie, Chioma and Rita (Saranghae family) Thank you all for your support towards me and I pray God bless you all.

I specially want to thank my father once more for his care, his support financially, emotionally, spiritually and physically. Thank you for being the best father anyone could ever ask for.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Title page	ii
Certification	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgment	v
Table content	vi
List of tables	ix
List of figure	x
Abstract	xi
1.0 CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background of the	1
1.1 Problem statement	4
1.2 Objective of the	6
1.4 Justification of the study	7
1.5 Hypotheses of the study	9
2.0 CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 The Concept Of Youth	10
2.2 The Concept Of Participation	12
2.3 Youth Participation	13
2.4 Community Development	19
2.5 Youth Participation in the implementation of Community Project	20
2.6 Youth Participation in Community	29

2.7	Level of Education and Participation in the Implementation of Community	31
2.8	Individual Factors and Participation in the Implementation of Community Development projects	32
2.9	Social Factors and Participation in the Implementation of Community Development Projects	34
2.10	Decision-Making and Participation in the Implementation of Community Development Projects	35
3.0	CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	
3.1	Area and Scope of Study	37
3.2	Sampling Procedure	40
3.3	Data Collection	40
3.4	Measurement of Variables	41
3.5	Analytical Techniques	42
3.6	Hypothesis Testing	42
4.0	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	
4.1	Socio economic Characteristics of youths	44
4.2	Community Project Participation	49
4.3	Level of Participation in Community Development Project	51
4.4	Youth Participation in Programme planning, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation(PPIME)process community development projects	53
4.5	Youths participation in decision making process	56
4.6	Factors Influencing Youth Participation in Community Development	58
4.7	Constraints to youth participation in community development project	61
4.8	Hypotheses Testing	64
4.8.1	Relationship between socioeconomic characteristics and level of participation in community development projects	64

4.8.2	Relationship between factors influencing youth participation in community development and level of participation	66
5.0	CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
5.1	Summary	68
5.2	Conclusion	70
5.3	Recommendations	71
	REFERENCES	72
	APPENDIX (Questionnaire)	77

LIST OF TABLES

4.1	Socioeconomic characteristics of Youths	48
4.2	Community projects participation	50
4.3	Level of participation in community development project	52
4.4	Youth participation in programme planning, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation process in community development project	55
4.5	Youth participation in decision making process	57
4.6	Factors influencing youth participation in community development	60
4.7	Constraints to youth participation in community development project	66
4.8	Relationship between socioeconomic characteristics and level of participation in community development	65
4.9	Factors influencing youth participation in community development and level of participation	67

LIST OF FIGURES

1 Map of Edo state with Oredo Local Government Area	38
---	----

ABSTRACT

Youth participation is crucial to Community development. The success of every project depends however on their active participation in designing, implementing and sustaining the projects that affect their condition of living, has not been ascertained. The study was conducted to assess youth's participation in community development projects in Oredo Local Government Area, Edo State, Nigeria. The specific objectives includes ;to describe the socioeconomic characteristics of youth, identify the types of project that youth engage in, ascertain the levels of youth participation, identify the constraints that youth face in participating in community development project and identify the factors that influence youth to participate in community development project.

A two-stage sampling procedure was used to select 130 youths for the study. Data were collected through interview schedule using structured questionnaire however,124 copies were valid. Data collected were analysed using descriptive statistics (mean, frequency counts, percentages and standard deviation) and inferential statistics such as spearman's correlation coefficient and simple linear regression.

Results from the study showed that males and female youths participate in community development projects in the study area Majority (97.6%) of the youths in the study area have obtained various level of formal education from secondary education to postgraduate education. Also 33.9% of respondents agreed that their Parents and family influenced their participation in the implementation of community development projects. About 52.4% and 50% of youths participated in Agricultural activities and sport development activities respectively. Respondents were highly involved in skill acquisition (mean = 2.23), education (mean = 2.22) and Agriculture (mean = 2.01). Results revealed that youths were highly involved in disbursement of funds (mean = 3.09), site selection (mean =3.33) and construction work (mean 3.19). Majority of the youths were highly

involved in reporting project performance (mean = 3.32), report writing (mean 3.19), quality assessment (mean = 3.10) and evaluation committee to understand plans of the projects (mean = 3.03). The major constraints to youth participation in community development projects were inadequate awareness on community development projects (mean = 4.04), poor programme planning (mean = 4.01). There is a significant correlation between Age ($r = 0.186$; $p = 0.039$), level of education ($r = 0.432$; $p = -0.017$) and years residing in community ($r = 0.224$; $p = 0.014$) and youth level of participation in community development projects. Also, there was a significant correlation ($r = 0.202$; $p = 0.024$) between friends influence to participate in the implementation of community development projects and level of participation in community development projects. It was concluded that Youths were actively involved in various community development projects. The study recommended that development agencies should introduce project that will impact youths directly such as acquisition and economic empowerment.

CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of information

Nigeria is endowed with enormous human and natural resources which if adequately harnessed could result in development. Development can be seen as the positive change in the infrastructural, educational, social, economic status of people. According to Abuiyada (2018), development involves an improvement qualitative, quantitative or both in the use of available resources. Umar and Mohammed (2014), see development as the transformation of the rural community socially, economically and politically, educationally with the purpose of improving the quality of life of the rural community. Community development has impact potentials to improve the collective wellbeing of the citizen and make positive inclination for everyone to embrace the democratic ideals of fairness, justice, transparencies and hard work (Ginwright and James, 2002).

Ekong (2003), assert that community development in developing countries generally entails the emphasis on the participation of youth by the local community. He further stated that the participation of people in programme entail understanding the nature of the problem involved those that are directly, indirectly affected. Umar and Mohammed (2014), posit that the nature and scope of community development are very important factors upon which dimension of

development in community is a process that embraced all the spheres of the society including the youth, women and children. The key component of this process is found in the creation and maintenance of channels of interaction and communication among diverse local groups that are otherwise directed toward individual interest. During the colonial era, community infrastructures were constructed out of the community efforts with active youth participation. The infrastructures constructed were of the benefit of women, children and youth, like the construction of schools, construction of hospitals and educating the pregnant women on the benefits of regular antenatal visit, construction of technical schools so the youths in the community can learn a trade. In view of these you are seen as a lone cornerstone of their communities and their participation is known to be pre-requisite for the overall development of their communities (United Nation UN,2000).

According to the United Nation Population Fund (2020) there are 1.8 billion young people in the world today 90% of whom live in developing countries. About 1.2 billion of them are age 18-35, of this number about 1 billion live in developing countries alone. The above statistics indicate that youth constitute a serious development opportunity as well as a challenge particularly in the developing countries. It is imperative that youth develop the skills they need to contribute to their families, their countries and their communities and also participate in projects that will help their communities.

Participation can be defined as a social process whereby specific groups with shared needs living in a defined geographical area actively pursue identification of their needs take decision and establish mechanism to meet their needs (Ndekha and Hansen *et al.*, 2003). Participation in terms of results can be define as whom it is expected to involve, what it is expected to achieve, and how it is to be brought about (Agarwal 2001). Participation is the involvement of the local population actively in the decision making concerning development project or in their implementation. The participation of youths in their communities is very necessary because that is when they have control over the decision that affect them (Ndekha, and Hansen 2003).

Youth of all walks of life participate in many forms of civic engagement including grassroot organization, formal membership in community organization, community service and community development (Brennan *et al.* 2009; Checkoway and Aldona, 2013). Youth participation therefore is a mechanism that enables youth to gain these skills which simultaneously changing their communities. The participation of todays youth in community development project especially in the decision making and implementation is critical to sustainable youth development.

It is important that youth participate actively in all relevant levels of decision making process because it affect their lives today and has implication for their

futures. In addition to the intellectual contributions and their ability to mobilize support. They bring unique perspectives that need to be taken into account.

The participation of youth and their active collaboration with adult contribute to the local community development, while presenting opportunities for personal self-growth, skill enhancement and leadership development. It is also evident that successful adult partnership encourages youth to develop the capacity to serve in organization and can actively become a community leader.

Despite the potential of youth they are still constraint that hinder them from participating in activities in the community. The post-school periods is characterized by unemployment which is capable of sending disturbing signals to all segment of the society. Other constraints as to participation of youth in community development are bad leadership, corruption, political instability, insecurity, poverty and poor economic management of the nation. This in turn creates lack of direction for youth and lack of interest in their participation in community development project.

1.2 Problem statement

Youth are the most vital resource for community development, the ability and capacity of the youth to derive benefit from and contribute to community development depends on whether they are correctly guided adequately mobilized and inadequately centred for the development process. Thus a direct need exist for

programmes and policy planners to better understand the role in the development of their communities.

Youth participation in community development programmes can be beneficial for both the community and the development of the youth but due to the deficit thinking over the last century, young people are often perceived as problem or risk and as trouble. This type of thinking curtails young people's potential for positive contribution in society. In some communities, young people do not get enough opportunities to allow them to engage in activities that allow them to be agents of their own change in their communities. However, the communities in trying to solve this challenge involve most of the youths in the passive instead of active parts of community development activities. This has not given the youth the needed opportunities to fully participate and develop potentials needed for the success of community development programme because the youth are more or less passive.

This study will therefore seek to inquire into the youth participation in community development programmes in order to ascertain the areas of youth participation, factors that influence effective/active youth participation in community development programmes and therefore suggest practical steps to encourage youth participation in community development programmes. This was achieved by answering the following research questions;

- i. What are the socioeconomic characteristics of youths in Oredo Local Government Area?
- ii. What are the types of project youths engage in towards community development in Oredo Local Government Area?
- iii. What are the levels of youth participation in community development project in Oredo Local Government Area?
- iv. What are the factors influencing youth participation in community development projects in Oredo Local Government Area
- v. What are the constraints to youth participation in community development project in Oredo Local government Area?

1.3 Objective of the study

The main objective of this study was to assess the youth participation in community development projects in Oredo Local Government Area of Edo State, Nigeria. The specific objectives of the study are;

1. describe the socioeconomic characteristics of youths in Oredo Local Government area.
2. Identify the types of project youth engage in towards community development in Oredo Local Government Area;
3. examine the level of youth participation to community development in Oredo Local Government Area

4. identify the factors influencing youth participation in community development projects in Oredo Local Government Area.
5. identify the constraints of youth participation to community development in Oredo Local Government Area

1.4 Justification of the study

This study is based on the fact that there have been several projects and studies conducted on community development project, Based on the scholarly articles and literature reviews, Mba and Onyesom (2020) on Youth Participation in Community Development Programmes In Rumu-Woji Communities In Port Harcourt Metropolis; Udensi *et al.* (2013) on Youth Participation in Community Development (CD) Programmes in Cross River State. However, there are little or no studies on youth participation in community development projects in Oredo Local Government Area thus necessitating this study so as to bridge the existing knowledge gap. This study depicts the strategic factors influencing youth participation in the implementation of community development projects as the problem statement into which this study will focus on. The notion of youth participation in the implementation of community development projects has been gaining momentum regarding the youth empowerment and development. The development scholars in the recent past have seriously advocated for the involvement of youth participation in the implementation of community

development projects as they believe the objectives of any project cannot be fully achieved unless youth and other people in the community actively and meaningfully participate in it. Youth participation in community development projects may help bring effective social change rather than impose an external culture on society. Similarly, referring to the experience of community development programs, community participation by the youth in the management and design of a project greatly enhances the likelihood of project success due to improved and increased sustainability.

The outcome of this study will help bring to the limelight the benefits of youth participation in community development project with the information they will get from youth about community development projects and the level of their participation involved. It will also help community leaders equip and train the youth on community development project so they can effectively help out with projects concerning the community, Government and policy makers will also be aware of the constraints of youth participation in community development project and therefore will be expected to make policies that will help in mitigating these problems.

1.5 Hypotheses of the study

The following hypotheses stated in the null form were tested

H0₁: There is no significant relationship between respondents socioeconomic characteristics and their level of participation in community development project.

H0₂: there is no significant relationship between level of participation and factors influencing youth participation in community development projects.

CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 The concept of youth

The United Nations, for statistical purposes, defines ‘youth’, as those persons between the ages of 15 and 24 years, without prejudice to other definitions by Member States. The Secretary-General first referred to the current definition of youth in 1981 in his report to the General Assembly on International Youth Year (A/36/215, para. 8 of the annex) and endorsed it in ensuing reports (A/40/256, para. 19 of the annex). However, in both the reports, the Secretary-General also recognized that, apart from that statistical definition, the meaning of the term ‘youth’ varies in different societies around the world. When the General Assembly, by its resolution 50/81 in 1995, adopted the World Programme of Action for Youth to the Year 2000 and beyond, it reiterated that the United Nations defined youth as the age cohort of 15-24. The General Assembly resolution A/RES/56/117 in 2001, the Commission for Social Development resolution E/2007/26 and E/CN.5/2007/8 in 2007 and the General Assembly resolution A/RES/62/126 in 2008 also reinforce the same age-group for youth.

Entity/Instrument/ Organization	Age	Reference
UN Secretariat/UNESCO/ILO	Youth: 15-24	UN Instruments, Statistics
UN Habitat (Youth Fund)	Youth 15-32	Agenda 21 ⁷
UNICEF/WHO/UNFPA	Adolescent: 10-19, Young People: 10-24, Youth: 15-24	UNFPA ⁸
UNICEF /The Convention on Rights of the Child	Child until 18	UNICEF ⁹
The African Youth Charter	Youth: 15-35	African Union, 2006 ¹⁰

Source: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA).
(2013)

Youth, in a very general definition, is a period of life in-between childhood and adulthood. It is described as a time of experimenting with roles and identities, still void of the burden of social norms and obligations, yet slowly preparing the youngsters for their lives as full members of the social collective. During this process of social integration young people find themselves in a complex social system, composed of such elements as tradition, history, social demands, hopes, and individual future prospects, all of which they have to incorporate into a coherent picture in order to build a proper foundation for their personal life. Step by step they have to obtain new social roles and extend their range of social performances.

2.2 Concept of participation

One of the cornerstone of democracy is the participatory decision making process which is required by those in government (Tshabalala, 2006). Kumar (2002) states that participation means different things to different people. The way participation is defined largely depends upon the context and background in which participation is applied. Aref and Redzuan (2009) stressed that participation needs the intentional and independent involvement of individuals in contributing to the development effort; sharing impartially in the benefits derived thereafter and decision making in respect of setting objectives, formulating policies, planning and establishing economic and social development programmes. Reid (2000) viewed participation in terms of power sharing and organized efforts to increase control over resources and regulative institutions. In this sense, participation is viewed as an active process in which the participants take initiatives and actions that are stimulated by their own thinking and deliberations over which they exert effective control. Raniga and Simpson (2002) observed that participation might mean that societies are allowed to have direct and final control in taking decision concerning their affairs. The partaking of people in elections, attendance of community meetings, and donating/contributing money to developmental projects form parts of community participation.

Community participation is a key component of the Empowered community (Reid, 2000). Community participation takes place when the society is organized and has

full responsibility for the management of its problems. The United Nations (2005) observed the Community participation as a means of enabling all members of society to actively participate in the development process, to influence it and to live up to the fruits of development. The participation of people is necessary to create an economic and political relationship within the broader community, not only to participate in project activities but also to enable rural people to organize themselves, to identify their own needs and to participate in the project design, implementation and evaluation of participatory action (Kumar, 2002).

2.2 Youth Participation

The merging of community development and youth development has been at the core of current research literatures (Nitzberg, 2005; Kubisch, 2005; Cahn and Gray, 2005; Lynn, 2005; Brennan, Barnett, and Lesmeister, 2006). Community development literature emphasizes the importance of citizen participation as a means of strengthening communities (Flora, Flora, and Fey 2004). Advocates and practitioners of rural community development also believe that citizens should be meaningfully involved in community decision-making. The above imply that, for development to occur there is need for a greater participation of local people in development process which will change the nature and direction of development intervention as well as result in a type of development which will have local people's support and recognition. Youth participation according to Cornwall (2010) refers to the involvement of youth in responsible, challenging action that

meets genuine needs, with opportunities for planning and/or decision-making affecting others in an activity whose impact or consequence is extended to others i.e., outside or beyond the youth participants themselves. Udensi *et al.* (2013) notes that, it is only through participation that youth develop skills, build competencies, form aspirations, gain confidence and attain valuable resources. This shows that youth participation therefore is a product and strategy of sustainable human development.

Youth comprise nearly 30 per cent of the world's population, these large numbers of young people are an opportunity; an investment to their communities. Youth participation in community development programmes therefore:

Strengthens young people's abilities to meet their own subsistence needs;

Prevents and reduces vulnerabilities to economic, political and socially unstable environments;

Promotes ownership and sustainability of change interventions;

Helps gain entry into target communities and build up trust and social capital.

Youth participation is a process of involving young people in the institutions and decisions that affect their lives. It includes initiatives that emphasize educational reform, juvenile justice, environmental quality, and other issues; that involve populations distinguished by class, race, gender, and other characteristics; and that operate in rural areas, small towns, suburbs, and neighbourhoods of large cities in developing areas and industrial nations worldwide.

As expressions of participation, young people are organizing groups for social and political action, planning programs of their own choosing, and advocating their interests in the community. They are raising consciousness, educating others on matters that concern them, and providing services of their own choosing. No single strategy characterizes all approaches to participation.

Activities like these can be conceptualized in various ways. For example, Roger Hart (1997) identifies activities and places them on the rungs of a vertical “ladder of participation” in accordance with the power they exercise; Danny HoSang (2003) analyzes youth organizing, youth development, and other models on a horizontal continuum; and David Driskell (2002) describes several “steps in the process” from gathering information to program evaluation. These activities have potential to produce outcomes at multiple levels.

Studies of several population groups show that participation can strengthen social development, build organizational capacity, and create changes in the environment. There has been relatively little systematic study of youth participation outcomes at multiple levels, but the research with other populations suggests that studies with youth will find positive effects on such measures as personal confidence, social connectedness, civic competencies, and leadership development. At present, however, the potential benefits of participation on youth have not been identified by systematic research.

Youth participation is about the real influence of young people in institutions and decisions, not about their passive presence as human subjects or service recipients.

Although participation studies often assess activities in terms of their scope—such as their number, frequency, and duration—quality is their most significant measure. Just because a number of young people attend a number of meetings and speak a number of times, is no measure of their effect. Quality participation shows some effect on outcomes, including its effect on community change.

Youth participation includes efforts by young people to plan programs of their own choosing; by adults to involve young people in their agencies; and by youth and adults to work together in intergenerational partnerships. However, the issue is not whether the effort is youth-led, adult-led, or intergenerational, but rather whether young people have actual effect.

Youth participation is consistent with the view of “youth as resources,” and contrasts with the image of “youth as problems” that permeates the popular media, social science, and professional practice when referring to young people.

For example, the media often portray young people as perpetrators of crime, drug takers, school dropouts, or other problems of society. With these images in mind, many adults think of young people as problems, and young people accept adult images of their deficiencies rather than viewing themselves as agents of change.

Social scientists reinforce this view with studies of poverty, racism, and other forces that cause poor housing, broken families, and worsening social conditions, and result in youth violence, drug abuse, and other social pathologies that require intervention.

Social workers and other professionals who adopt this view of young people seek to save, protect, and defend them from conditions that affect them. When the curricula

at professional schools construct youth as victims of society, professionals are prepared roles in helping them and their families do something about their terrible personal and social conditions.

When people focus on others' needs and deficiencies, it de-emphasizes their assets and strengths, weakens their ability to help themselves, and empowers the professionals who serve them. However, another view that portrays young people as competent citizens with a right to participate and a responsibility to serve their communities provides a significant alternative. Proponents of this view want to build on the strengths of youth by enabling them to make a difference in ways that provide them with tangible benefits and develop healthier communities. Young people who view themselves as change agents, and adults who are their allies, are instrumental to this approach.

Social workers are strategically situated to promote youth participation, but many of them have been conditioned to "care" about young people rather than to "empower" them. Those social workers who emphasize the rights of young people to participate in society and their responsibilities to serve the community are not typical of the field. Youth participation can be expected to increase in the future. Several private foundations have increased their funding for community organizations and civic agencies; national associations have expanded their support for local initiatives; and intermediary organizations have broadened their training and technical assistance. Recent conferences and publications have increased awareness among popular and

professional audiences, and there is talk of a “youth participation movement” in the making.

More knowledge of youth participation as a subject of study will contribute to its quality as a field of practice. We surmise that participation has several strategies, that their activities have effects at multiple levels, and that their outcomes are influenced by forces that facilitate or limit that more knowledge of participation will strengthen their practice.

This volume provides new perspectives on youth participation in organizations and communities. It considers the changing context of youth participation, models and methods of participatory practice, roles of youth and adults, and the future of youth and community in a diverse democracy. It includes approaches which promote participatory community-based research and evaluation, and involve youth groups in economically dis-invested and racially segregated areas. Some authors address the roles of young people as peer facilitators. Nance Wilson, Meredith Minkler, Stefan Dasho, Roxanne Carrillo, Nina Wallerstein, and Diego Garcia describe the training of high school

and graduate students as peer facilitators of a university-community partnership which involves elementary school students in research among underserved elementary school youth. Their work represents a youth-to-youth model in which some young people learn best from others who are slightly older and have more experience than they.

Collaborative teams in which youth and adults work together in intergenerational partnerships. Because young people are often isolated from adults, this approach enables them to connect with adult allies, gain adult support, and collaborate in activities which have potential for community change.

Youth development or youth organizing? Although social workers often conceptualize youth participation as a form of youth development and distinguish this from traditional provision of services to at-risk youth, young people also play roles as organizers and planners of initiatives which increase their involvement and build healthier communities.

2.4 Community Development

Community development according to Udensi *et al.* (2013) is a social process by which human beings can become more competent to live with and gain some control over local conditions and the changing world. Bringing the foregoing to bear, there is need to give the main actors due opportunity to gain control over local conditions and to harness resources through effective leadership at the community levels. In the words of Kleiner, *et al.* (2004), community development has a longer history. And it's as old as human existence, because it seeks to improve man's standard of life. Community members who have the capacity to do something to enhance their quality of life are portrayed as having the ability to think, to decide, to plan and to take action in determining their lives. Therefore, in any community development programme both economic and individual growth

must be given equal attention to ensure that the process of community development achieves its due balance (continuity and sustainability through adequate participation of all the key players in the community). Community development in the words of Gilchrist, (2004) helps local community residents to identify unmet needs. It seeks to build capacity by improving skills and knowledge for individual and community as a whole. Central to the idea of community development is that it allows community residents to come together to plan, generate solutions and take action towards developing the social, economic, environmental and cultural aspects of community (Hackett, 2004). The whole process of community development according to Kuponiyi (2008) emphasizes the importance of participation as a means of strengthening local communities. Finally, community development occurs when people strengthen the bounds within their neighborhoods, build social networks, and form their own organizations to provide a long-term capacity for problem solving (Rubin, and Rubin, 2001). The foregoing shows that every community development programmes should be aimed at changing an undesirable situation. Given that the youth population is on the high side in Nigeria communities, programmes directed at them become imperative and with their full, active and frequent participation, capacity for a long term problem solving can be developed.

2.5 Youth participation in the implementation of community development projects

There is a dynamic momentum on youth participation in the implementation of community development projects. Governments globally have increased support for youth ministries, youth programs, and currently there is greater recognition that the youth are the future of their communities' and countries' development. However, there is still a lot to be done to realize this potential.

The term youth participation refers to the youth taking part or having a share in the development projects in the community. According to Armitage (2010), participation is defined as a process where the community acts in response to the concerns of the public, raise their opinions on the decisions that affects them and thus take responsibility for the changes that affects them and the entire community. The youth participation according to Chappel, (2008) the youth participation could be as a result of the traditional sense powerlessness felt by the community especially the youth when it comes to participating in the decision making processes in the government decisions. There are various definitions for the youth therefore the definitions depend largely on the context and who is defining the term. A number of organizations have different definitions based on their contextual approach. The United Nations (UN) defines youth as a person who is between 15 and 24 years.

There is a dire need for Extension agents and policy planners to better understand the importance of youth participation in the implementation of community development projects. It is also important to recognize that a need exists to better

realize the benefits and opportunities that can be achieved through youth involvement in the implementation of community development projects. Therefore, extension agents and programs play a crucial role in engaging youth through interactions with the local community, particularly in the implementation of community development activities. This is because the youth can actively contribute to a variety of Extension activities that enhance local life. If youth are included in programs to meet their needs and empower their communities.

In South Africa, a youth is defined as a person who is between the age of 15 and 35 years. The National Youth Policy (NYP) of 2002 in Kenya defines youth as a person between the age of 15 and 30 years. According to the constitution of Kenya, the youth is defined as a person in the republic of Kenya who has attained the age of 18 years but not yet 35 years. This is also the age bracket that is largely targeted by the Nigerian government in the implementation of development programs for the youth. Therefore, youth participation is an informed, voluntary and active involvement of the people who are between 18 and 35 years in the decision making processes and implementation of implementation of community development projects. The youth participation in implementation of community projects, social, political and economic affairs in the community puts the youth at the center of development and thus enables them to exercise their right to be part of the decision making processes on matters that affects them. The youth should therefore be part of the solution to global, national and local problems affecting

the community and specifically the youth. The United Nations General Assembly sought to harness the youth initiatives, energy and imaginations through proclaiming an international year for the youth. The youth are seen as the first promoters of social reconciliation in the community; therefore, their role as agents of change and developments in their respective communities enhances their competence and participation in the implementation of community development projects. According to the World Youth Report (2003) the youth desire to be treated with respect and their voices heard.

According to Shrimpton (2009), community development project have been depicted as an integral component of economic development and a fundamental element in the effort to uplift countries out of poverty so as to meet the millennium development projects. These projects have become a driving force for the community's economic growth, creation of employment, and poverty eradication in developing countries. Community development projects are a means through which accelerated economic growth and rapid industrialization can be realized.

According to Mulwa (2007), youth participation in the implementation of community development projects brings forth a proactive process in which the youth influence the development and management of community development projects through monitoring and evaluation rather than merely receiving a share of project benefits. The scholar further notes that community participation of the

youth creates an enabling environment for sustainability by allowing them, as a group to select the level of services for which they receive and willing to pay for, to guide key investment and management decisions, and also to make decisions and commit resources in support of the implementation community development projects.

Shane and Baron (2007) summarized indicators of youth participation in the implementation of community development projects and management as involvement in decision-making, contribution to the community, responsibility, representation, authority and well informed decisions that bring forth economic advancement to the community through entrepreneurship. It is therefore important for all factors related to project development and implementation to be based on youth preferences. Youth must have the necessary information to understand options, and on available alternatives and associated costs, to help them in making rational and socially optimal decisions. Furthermore, the youth need to participate willingly in the development and operation of the community development projects and not to be forced to participate. The youth who are responsible for the implementation of community development projects should depict the diversity within the community so that others should not feel that they have been marginalized. The youth need to take responsibility for the implementation of community development projects through realizing that their economic growth largely depend on their investment in terms of time, and financial capital. The

youth also should have the authority to make decisions when it comes to the implementation of community development projects. On the other hand, the youth should be able to make relevant decisions in order to determine the outcome of their decisions.

According to Nikkhah and Redzuan (2009), it is impossible to realize community development without the youth participation and involvement in particular projects. The scholars further emphasize on participation of youth in the implementation of community development projects as a means as to economic growth. Participation as a means to an end ensures that the youth are directly involved in the implementation of community project and they can take responsibility and control of decision that they make. Furthermore, youth participation as an approach to development enhances the well-being and consequently provides access to a sustainable development. The level of youth involvement and participation in community development projects is still low in most developing countries including Kenya. Beierle (2000) argues that youth participation in the implementation of community development projects is based on local youth consent taking part in public decision making processes.

According to Chess and Purcell (2009), they observed that lessons from successful community projects in Western Canada suggest that a sustainable community development must be demand driven. The implementing of community development projects programs provide an enabling environment, and

that youth be legally empowered to assume control, ownership and responsibility for the completed projects. They further noted that participation in which the youth get directly involved in community projects ensures that they can take control of their decisions that has direct influence in their lives. They concluded that youth involvement in the implementation of community development activities would lead to youth empowerment. If the community's economy is to be uplifted, all agents of change ought to guide the youth in the community towards involvement and full participation in the implementation of community development projects which are meant to improve well being of the youth. There is dire need to emphasize on equal participation between youth and older people in decision-making process, implementation, operation and evaluation of community projects. With regard to the decision-making process, the older people participate actively and attend meetings more regularly than the youth (Chess and Purcell, 2009). However, Youth use the facilities derived from these projects more often than older people on the other hand, the youth lack of general knowledge and this makes the youth unable to do maintenance community development tasks. This therefore means that the sustainability of community project is threatened because youth are not participating actively in the implementation of community development projects. Therefore, it is important to involve both the youth and the older people in the community effectively in the implementation phases for these projects to be sustainable. In the results of a

study in Mali, Brett, Margaret and Tammo (2007) indicated that while implementation of community development projects is a positive step in responding to the needs of the youth, the operation process and consultative participatory approaches extension will not necessarily provide sustainable community development.

Participatory research and evaluation are ways to involve young people in community change. In contrast to the usual pattern in which knowledge development is viewed as a process in which technical experts conduct research and ordinary people play passive roles, participatory research is an approach in which people collaborate in defining problems, gathering information, analyzing findings, and using the knowledge. Although this approach is increasing among adult groups distinguished by class, race, gender, and other characteristics, young people are not normally at the table.

Our authors have a different take. For example, Kysa Nygreen, SooAh Kwon, and Patricia Sánchez assume that young people can and should participate in the research process, and report on efforts to involve three different groups of urban youth who are normally marginalized, namely a multi-ethnic school-based group of students transforming curriculum in an alternative high school, a Latina group conducting research on transnational experiences, and pan-ethnic Asian and Pacific Island groups focused on youth organizing and social justice. They conclude that these youth are a vital resource for community transformation.

Ahna Ballonoff Suleiman, Samira Soleimanpour, and Jonathan London examine efforts by young people to participate in research projects in seven school-based health centers. The notion that the schools are a vehicle for using research as a form of education for democracy is not new, but the promise of this approach is generally not realized. The authors describe specific strategies and reflect on the lessons learned from these initiatives.

Caroline C. Wang describes photovoice as a particular participatory action research tool for involving young people in communities. She describes an approach in which youth employ cameras to record their community's strengths and concerns, promote critical dialogue about community issues through group discussion of photographs, and communicate their concerns to policy makers. She draws upon data from ten projects in which youth used photovoice to advocate community health and well-being.

Youth participation in research and evaluation is an international movement, which is also represented by our authors. For example, Reima Ana Maglajli_, Jennifer Tiffany, and their colleagues describe participatory research in Bosnia and Herzegovina, an area affected by political violence in recent years. With support from a global UNICEF initiative, adults launched a project in which young people in three towns assessed conditions related to HIV/AIDS, drug use, and human rights. Young researchers gathered information and produced recommendations.

Louise Chawla and David Driskell describe the Growing Up in Cities Project supported by UNESCO, an initiative inspired by the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child to promote participation in communities. They describe a case study in Bangalore, India in which young people played active roles. They conclude that young people are able and willing to participate in this way, that the most effective approach is when youth and adults work together, and that adult decision makers do not always have accurate information about such possibilities. Who has responsibility for facilitation of youth participation? Although participation initiatives might be youth-led, adult-led, or intergenerational in their origins, we recognize that none of the ones described here is truly youth-led. However, we reiterate that the quality of participation is not contingent on this approach, and that it is as likely that quality youth participation might be adult-led or intergenerational as it is that youth leadership might not be participatory.

2.6 Youth participation in community development

In general, youth spend a substantial amount of time in extra-curricular activities in school and the community, including participation in the implementation of community development projects, school and local sports teams, and school-based clubs. All of these, and the interaction with individuals within them, directly influenced youth involvement in their participation in community development projects.

Previous studies support the fact that participation in the implementation of community development projects is related with the behavioral well-being among the youth. Influences on youth participating, such as increasing academic level, increasing the likelihood of college attendance greater community engagement and reinforcing positive social values or setting an example have been found to affect the youth participation in the implementation of community development activities and projects.

On the other hand, there are other factors that have been reported by studies as influencing the youth's need for participation and willingness to be a part of a greater good through participation in the implementation of community development projects. These include: feelings of efficacy, the need to be valued and taken seriously by other members in the community, increasing their own self-esteem, and having a responsibility toward society and the sense of ownership and identity. Recognition by the community at large is part of feeling valued and provides great motivation for the youth to participate in community development activities.

Moreover, other factors such as parental involvement can influence the youth greatly on involvement in the implementation of community development projects. Youth, whose parents are actively involved in the community projects are more likely to be active themselves when it comes to participation in the implementation of community development projects. Youth whose parents do not

participate in community development activities may on the contrary still become active in their communities; however, a supportive parental engagement may play a vital role in the youth contribution to participation and involvement in the community development projects. Perhaps as a result of an increased awareness of the advantages for youth, parents play a significant role in linking youth to the world around them. In this study, youth participation is modified to mean the youth taking part in implementation of community based development projects.

2.7 Level of education and participation in the implementation of community development projects

According to Department for International Development (2014), Education systems is critical in preparing the youth to adequately to participate in the implementation of community development projects and decision-making processes in their communities. Education enables the youth to develop the necessary analytical skills that help them to be critical thinkers and problem-solvers through participating in community development projects. Youth who have a high educational level, according to DFID, have been depicted to be more involved in participatory activities relating to community development.

Nikkhah and Redzuan (2009) argued that education enables youth to have desirable qualities that promotes them to participate in the implementation of

community development projects. They further reiterated that educated youth have strong interest towards development and therefore are more involved in the implementation of community development projects. Educated youth are more concerned with economic empowerment than their uneducated counterparts who are depicted to have a strong apathy towards community development. The development of a community currently depends largely on youth participation. This therefore means that to enhance community development, youth should be empowered in terms of their academic achievements.

According to Lewis Memorial Conference (2008), the accessibility and attainment of high quality education serves as a catalyst of attaining further opportunities for the development of social mobility and relations. Education level therefore enables the youth to enhance a prosperous socio-economic development in the community. Moreover, high education level enhances personal development. Educated youth focuses more on development of the community and social cohesion, thus are more concerned with participation in the implementation of community development projects especially with regard to decision-making processes, monitoring and evaluation of projects in the community.

2.8 Individual factors and participation in the implementation of community development projects

USAID CMM 2005 depicts that individual factors is also one of the hindrance to youth participating in the implementation of community development projects. It

ascertains that men who are married are more proactive when it comes to participation community development projects because of the sense of responsibility unlike their single counterparts. On the contrary, married women have the responsibility of taking care of their families and therefore are less likely to participate in the implementation of community development projects. The gender factor also plays a critical role in the youth participation in the implementation of community development projects.

The overall difference between males and female youth, in participation in the implementation of community development projects according to Vroom, (1990) depicts that women face more barriers when it comes to participation in the implementation of community development projects as opposed to their male counterparts. The research found out that males are more concerned with participation in the implementation of community development projects than female. In Kenya, where there are diverse cultural practices, especially with regard to the girl child, women are perceived to be the subordinates of their male counterparts and hence should not take part in the implementation of community development projects. He father reiterated that age also is an important factor that limits youth participation in the implementation of community development projects. The transition into adult roles in the contemporary society becomes an inhibiting factor as marriage plays a significant role. In the Kenyan contemporary society, leadership is perceived as a role belonging to the married individuals and

hence positions in the community is given to the married, leaving the unmarried youth outside these position and this greatly affects their participation in the implementation of community development projects.

2.9 Social factors and participation in the implementation of community development projects

According to Maccoby (2010), youth who experience the security of adoring family and attachments to their parents are in a position to reach out to relate well with others and thus are more likely to participate in the implementation of community development projects. According to attachment theory, youth who enjoy close attachment with family uses this relationship as a supporting platform. Therefore, they will be more likely to relate to others well and hence get involved in participating in the implementation of community development. Through proper interactions with family, an individual will be in a position to relate well with others and hence capable of participating in community development projects. Culture also plays a critical role in influencing youth participation in the implementation of community development projects. In Nigeria, some communities still do not give equity to women. Some cultures prohibit women in participating in decision-making, though, through affirmative action, this is

slowly fading away. This, therefore, means that young women are less likely to participate in the implementation of community development projects.

Wanting to belong, compounded by peer pressure can make beneficiary community members to participate in development. As Botes and Rensburg (2000) argue, a critical factor influencing the motivation to participate is often the composition of a community. Moreover wanting to belong, based on existence of traditional forms of community cooperation, makes individuals to collectively give priority to the goals of the larger group they belong to which often results in actions of individuals leading to service to the community or society (Bamberger, 1988; Ardichvili, Maurer, Wentling, and Stuedemann, 2006). Similarly, participation of community members in any organization is dependent on the opportunity that the organization provides for inclusion (Goodman *et al.*, 1998). Further, community acceptance of one another by offering each member the safety of knowing that they are accepted for who they are can be a militating factor in community participation as a way of wanting to belong (Reid, 2000). Working on the old adage of unity is strength, participation is a means of exerting influence or bargaining power which motivates communities to work collectively in development processes because it serves to enhance social cohesion and it makes communities recognise the value of working in partnership with each other (Khwaja, 2004; Burns *et al.*, 2004).

2.10 Decision-making and participation in the implementation of community development projects

Rajani (2010) recognizes that the active engagement of youth is to a successful implementation of community development projects. He further affirms that full and effective participation of youth in the community and decision-making process is an important factor to realizing a sustainable development in the community. The indicators of youth participation can be evaluated their participation in decision-making process, Youth's attendance to development meetings in the community, their industriousness and their participation in the evaluation and monitoring of development projects in the community.

According to Stasser and Stewart (1992), open source community programs have become increasingly popular with a number of projects depicting a positively noticeable trend especially with regard to youth participation in the decision-making processes. The presence of institutions, both governmental and non-governmental organizations have played a crucial role in encouraging the youth to participate in decision making processes; this is evident even in Kenya where youth have been given an opportunity to have a say in leadership roles. This has encouraged the youth to participate in community projects.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Area and scope of study

The study was conducted in Oredo Local Government Area (LGA), Edo State Nigeria(See Fig.1). Oredo LGA has an area of 249km² and a population of 374,515 at the 2006 Census. The age distribution comprises of 0-9 years 84,249, 10 -19 years 77,389, 20-29 years 88,826, 30-39 years 52,552, 40-49 years 31,739, 50-59 years 19,341, 60-69 years 10,109, 70-79 years 5,859 and 80 year and above 4,451. The United Nations, for statistical purposes, defines those persons between the ages of 18 and 35 as youth without prejudice to other definitions by member States. Based on this definition and 2006 census figures, the total number of youths in Oredo Local government Area is 166,215 making up 44.38% of the total population.

The study area is located between latitude 6.35°N and longitude 5.3°E. It is characterized by evergreen vegetation typical of a lowland rainforest belt. Due to its geographical location, Oredo LGA experiences a tropical climate with two major seasons; wet and dry. Annual rainfall ranges from 2300-2700mm, concentrated in two peaks; July and September usually separated by a dry spell in August. Average annual temperature ranges from 20-25°C with a mean monthly humidity range of 60- 95%.

The LGA comprises of the following villages and districts GRA, Etete, Ibiwe, Iwegie, Ugbague, Ihogbe, Isekhere, Oreoghene, Ibiwe, Ikpema, Eguadase, New Benin I, New Benin II, Ogbe, Ogbelaka, Nekpenekpen, Oredo, Unueru, ogboka, Urubi, Evbiemwen, Iwehen, Uzebu. The LGA hosts many socio-economic activities in the primary, secondary and tertiary sectors, dominated by government in the formal sector and brass casting, wood carving and blacksmith in the informal sector. Major markets are located within LGA Oba and New Benin markets.



Fig.1 Map of Edo State with Oredo Local Government Area indicated in red rectangle. (Green White Green, 2019)

3.2 Sampling Procedure

A **two stage sampling** technique was used to select respondents for the study. The first stage included a random selection of 10 communities with ongoing and completed community development projects through the states ministry of works. The second stage involved the random selection of thirteen(13) respondent per community to give a total of 130 respondent.

3.3 Data Collection

Data for the study were collected through structured questionnaire comprising qualitative and quantitative data. The questionnaire was administered among youths and also through interview schedule. Interview were carried out to fill the questionnaires in cases of illiterate youths. The questionnaire was design into section (Section A: Socioeconomic characteristics, Section B: factors influencing youth participation in community development, Section C: community projects participation, Section D: youths involvement in monitoring of community development projects and Section E: constraints to youth participation in community development project) in other to capture all required data will based on: Demographic information of youths and participation levels and activities in community development projects.

3.4 Measurement of variables

Independent variables

Socioeconomic characteristics: variables such as Age, Sex, Marital status, household size, education qualification, years residing in communities and annual income was measured.

Age was measured by asking respondents to state their age in years,

Sex was measured by asking respondents to identify if they are male or female.

Male was coded as 1 while female was coded as 2

Marital status was measured by asking respondents to state their marital status as either single, married, divorced, or widow. Single were assigned a value of 1, married was 2, divorced 3 and widow 4.

Participation in community development projects was measured by asking respondents to identify the various project they have participated in and was assign dummy variables of yes and no coded as yes = 1 and No = 0.

Constraints of youth in participating in community development projects was measured on five point likert scales coded as follows; Very Serious (VS) 5 points.

Serious (S) 4 points. Undecided (U) 3 points. Slightly Serious(SS) 2 points and Not Serious(NS) 1 point.

Dependent variables

Level of participation was measured on a three point Likert scale coded as very high = 3, high = 2, low = 1

3.5 Analytical Technique

Data collected were analysed using descriptive and inferential Statistics. Descriptive statistics will include Frequency count, Percentage, Mean and standard deviation. Inferential statistics tools included Spearman's Correlation Coefficient and simple linear regression.

Objective one

Socio-economic characteristics of farmers was analysed using descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation, percentages, and frequency distribution. Results presented in tables

Objective two. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentages were used to achieve this objective.

Objective three Descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentages were used to achieve this objective.

Objective four Descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentages were used to achieve this objective.

Objective five Descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentages were used to achieve this objective.

3.6 Hypotheses testing

Hypotheses one and two were tested using Spearman's Correlation Coefficient

The model is given below:

$$r_s = 1 - \frac{6 \sum d^2}{n(n^2 - 1)}$$

Where:

r = Correlation coefficient

d_i = difference in paired ranks

n = number of samples

CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Socioeconomic characteristics of youths in Oredo Local Government Area

4.1.1 Sex

As shown in Table 1, a higher proportion (54.8%) of youths in the study area were males while 45.2% were females. This implies that both males and female are present in Oredo Local Government Area and are involved in community development projects in the study area which shows a gender balance. This result agrees with findings of Dimelu, Umoren and Chah, (2020) who reported in their study that majority of youths who participate in agricultural activities of community development were males.

4.1.2 Age

As shown in Table 1, more than half (52.42%) of youths in the study area were between the age of 26 – 35 years while 47.58% were between the age 16 – 25 years with an average of 26 years. This result confirms to the age grouping of youths as designated by the United Nations Assembly resolution in 2001. This also conforms with the Cognitive Impairment Associated with Psychosis CIAP's categorisation of youths as people within the 13- 40 age bracket (Torimiro, 2012).

The implication of this is that the respondents would be able to use their youth characteristics, such as an inclination to innovate and development, greater physical strength, a greater propensity for knowledge acquisition, a faster rate of learning, and a high business orientation.

4.1.3 Marital status

Results in Table 1 revealed that more (66.9) youths in the study area were single while 31.5% were married. The high percentage of single youths can be attributed to their age distribution and current economic challenges resulting from high level of unemployment and high cost of living in the study area and Nigeria as a country. However, this can influence youths participation in community development project. Married youths will tend to participate more in community development projects to meet up with family needs through income received from their participation.

4.1.4 Highest level of education

As shown in Table 1, majority (54%) of youths had attained university education level as their highest level of education 32.3% had attained secondary education, 11.3% had obtained postgraduate degree while only 1.6% had primary education level. This implies that youths in the study area well educated and hence can participate in community development projects that requires educational

qualifications in terms of decision making and being aware of modern technologies and innovations in community development process.

4.1.5 Years residing in community

The average number of years youths have been residing the in community as shown in Table 1 was 15 years. About 30.32% of youths have been residing the community for 11 – 20 years while 41.13% have been residing the in the community for 1 – 10 while 11.29% have been residing the community for 21 – 30 years. This implies that majority of the youths have been residing in the community since they were born and must have been part of various community development projects in their communities and majority of them are indigenes of the community.

4.1.6 Annual income

The annual income distribution of respondents as shown in table 1, revealed that majority (91.13%) of youths in the study area earned between ₦26,000 to 1,025,999 annually from their various sources of income while 8.06% earned between ₦1,026,000-2,025,999 as annual income with a mean income of ₦613443.54 This implies that youth in the study area are gainfully engaged in various economic activities they earned income on a monthly or annual basis.

4.1.7 Get paid for participating in community development

As shown in Table 1, most (65.3%) of the respondents reported that they are not being paid for participating in community development project. However, about 34.7% of the respondents said they get paid for participating in community development projects. This implies that majority of the youths who participate in community development project participated on a voluntary basis. Hence participation is not influenced by motive to make money but to oversee the development of their communities. This can be attributed to the fact that participation of youth in community projects, social, political, and economic affairs place the youth at the centre of development, allowing them to exercise their right to participate in decision-making processes on issues that affect them rather than focusing on personal gains.

Table 4.1 Socioeconomic characteristics of youths

Socioeconomic characteristics	Frequency	Percentage	Mean
Sex			
Male	68	54.8	
Female	56	45.2	
Age			
16-25	59	47.58	
26-35	65	52.42	26
Marital status			
Single	83	66.9	
Married	39	31.5	
Separated	2	1.6	
Highest level of education			
No formal education	1	.8	
Primary level	2	1.6	
Secondary level	40	32.3	
University level	67	54.0	
Postgraduate	14	11.3	
Years residing in community			
1-10	51	41.13	
11-20	50	40.32	15
21-30	14	11.29	
31 and above	9	7.26	
Annual income			
26,000-1,025,999	113	91.13	
1,026,000-2,025,999	10	8.06	613443.54
9,026,000-10,025,999	1	0.81	
Get paid for participating			
Yes	43	34.7	
No	81	65.3	

Source: field survey, 2022

4.2 Community projects participation

As shown in table 4.2, majority (70.2%) of respondents have participated in skill acquisition projects. 70.2% also participated in educational programmes also 52.4% and 50% of youths participated in Agricultural activities and sport development activities respectively. However, there was low level participation community water project (60.5%), construction rehabilitation of market (60.5%), construction/rehabilitation of town hall (65.3%), Construction/rehabilitation of roads and drainage (65.3%), Electricity/Street Lighting (55.6%) and waste management. This implies that youths in study area major participated in self development project that will empower them rather than community development projects/activities. Hence majority of youths have acquired various skills in agriculture and other vocations. This result agrees with findings of Udensi, Daasi, Emah, and Zukbee, (2013) who reported that youths showed a strong level of youth participation in programmes by showing a high level of emphasis on programmes such as skill acquisition, agriculture and sport that they derive direct benefit.

Table 4.2: Community projects participation

Programmes/project	Participation			
	Yes		No	
	Frq	%	Frq	%
Skill Acquisition	87	70.2	35	28.2
Education	87	70.2	35	28.2
Agriculture	65	52.4	57	46.0
Sports development/activities	62	50.0	60	48.4
Community Water project	47	37.9	75	60.5
Construction/rehabilitation of Market	47	37.9	75	60.5
Construction/rehabilitation of town hall	41	33.1	81	65.3
Construction/rehabilitation of roads and drainage	41	33.1	81	65.3
Electricity/Street Lighting	53	42.7	69	55.6
Waste management	50	40.3	72	58.1

Source: field survey, 2022

4.3 Level of participation in community development project

Results in Table 4.3, shows the level of youths participation in various community development projects. Result showed that respondents were highly involved in skill acquisition (mean = 2.23), education (mean = 2.22) and Agriculture (mean = 2.01). The low participation in Sports development/activities, Community Water project, Construction/rehabilitation of Market, Construction/rehabilitation of town hall, Construction/rehabilitation of roads and drainage, Electricity/Street Lighting and Waste management shows that respondents are interested in personal development projects that will empower them. This results are inline with findings of Brennan, Barnett and Lesmeister (2008) who reported that youths are highly involved in self development programmes when given such opportunities.

Table 4.3: Level of participation in community development project

	Very high		High		Low		Mean	Std dev.	remark
	Frq.	%	Frq.	%	Frq.	%			
Skill Acquisition	48	38.7	57	46.0	19	15.3	2.23*	0.700	high
Education	47	37.9	57	46.0	20	16.1	2.22*	0.705	High
Agriculture	21	16.9	83	66.9	20	16.1	2.01*	0.577	High
Sports	25	20.2	73	58.9	26	21.0	1.99	0.644	Low
development/activities									
Community Water project	24	19.4	67	54.0	33	26.6	1.93	0.677	Low
Construction/rehabilitation of Market	40	32.3	40	32.3	44	35.5	1.97	0.826	Low
Construction/rehabilitation of town hall	39	31.5	30	24.2	55	44.4	1.87	0.865	Low
Construction/rehabilitation of roads and drainage	50	40.3	35	28.2	39	31.5	2.09*	0.846	High
Electricity/Street Lighting	51	41.1	33	26.6	40	32.3	2.09*	0.856	High
Waste management	50	40.3	37	29.8	37	29.8	2.10*	0.834	high

Source: Field survey, 2022 Significant participation ≥ 2.00

4.4 Youths participation in Programme planning, Implementation Monitoring and Evaluation (PPIME) process community development projects

4.4.1 Programme planning

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of involvement in programme/project planning. Respondents were highly involved in needs assessment (mean = 3.35), community survey (mean = 3.65), mobilization and orientation (mean = 3.65), preparing time and cost estimate (mean = 3.33), youths recommendations are sought after in decision making on community development projects (mean = 3.00). however, youths were not involved in the appointment of the evaluation committee during community development projects (mean = 2.83). There was also low involvement in issuing general press release to the public (mean = 2.50)

4.4.2 Implementation

As shown in Table 4.4, respondents were highly involved in project/programme implementation activities. Results revealed that youths were highly involved in disbursement of funds (mean = 3.09), site selection (mean = 3.33) construction work (mean = 3.19). however, respondents were not involved in inspection of materials (mean = 2.81) and Quality assurance (mean = 2.80). this implies that youths are involved in less sensitive part of project implementation during community development projects.

4.4.3 Monitoring

Youths participation in monitoring of projects as shown in Table 4.4, shows that youths are involved in checking or observing project activities (mean = 3.35), Recording what is happening as well as what is not happening (mean = 3.31) Collecting facts and figures on activities and results (mean = 3.11). Also, 25% of youths were highly involved in Monitoring the implementation of community development project, while 25% had low involvement in Assessing whether implementation is going in the right direction

4.4.4 Evaluation

Results in Table 5 shows that majority of youths were highly involved in reporting project performance (mean = 3.32), report writing (mean 3.19), quality assessment (mean = 3.10) and evaluation committee to understand plans of the projects (mean = 3.03). however, there was low participation in Providing feedback to donor agencies (mean = 2.89). This implies that youths are highly involved in project evaluation during community development projects.

Table 4.4: Youths participation in Programme planning, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation of community development projects

Involvement in monitoring	Highly involved		slightly Involved		Undecided		Low involvement		Not involved		Mean	Std Dev.
	Frq.	%	Frq.	%	Frq.	%	Frq.	%	Frq.	%		
PROGRAMME PLANNING												
Needs assessment	25	20.2	46	37.1	19	15.3	16	12.9	18	14.5	3.35*	1.332
Community surveys	41	33.1	27	21.8	34	27.4	16	12.9	6	4.8	3.65*	1.203
Mobilization and orientation	45	36.3	27	21.8	21	16.9	14	11.3	17	13.7	3.56*	1.427
Preparing time and cost estimate	27	21.8	32	25.8	33	26.6	19	15.3	13	10.5	3.33*	1.267
Appointment of the evaluation committee	23	18.5	20	16.1	24	19.4	27	21.8	30	24.2	2.83	1.441
My recommendations are sought in decision making of the community projects	23	18.5	22	17.7	31	25.0	28	22.6	20	16.1	3.00*	1.343
Situation analysis	21	16.9	27	21.8	31	25.0	22	17.7	23	18.5	3.01*	1.352
Setting Program Objectives and Solutions	21	16.9	35	28.2	28	22.6	22	17.7	18	14.5	3.15*	1.307
Goal setting	30	24.2	24	19.4	30	24.2	23	18.5	17	13.7	3.22*	1.365
Issuing general press release to the public	11	8.9	22	17.7	32	25.8	12	9.7	47	37.9	2.50	1.382
IMPLEMENTATION												
Disbursement of funds	18	14.5	41	33.1	19	15.3	26	21.0	20	16.1	3.09*	1.331
Am involved in site selection	38	30.6	24	19.4	22	17.7	21	16.9	19	15.3	3.33*	1.452
Involved in construction work	35	28.2	15	12.1	35	28.2	17	13.7	22	17.7	3.19*	1.441
Inspection of materials	16	12.9	33	26.6	19	15.3	23	18.5	33	26.6	2.81	1.418
Quality assurance	17	13.7	25	20.2	25	20.2	30	24.2	27	21.8	2.80	1.355
MONITORING												
Checking or observing the activities	31	25.0	35	28.2	18	14.5	27	21.8	13	10.5	3.35*	1.345
Recording what is happening as well as what is not happening	32	25.8	29	23.4	27	21.8	17	13.7	19	15.3	3.31*	1.392
Collecting facts and figures on activities and results	22	17.7	26	21.0	37	29.8	22	17.7	17	13.7	3.11*	1.283
Monitoring the implementation of community development project	31	25.0	21	16.9	30	24.2	24	19.4	18	14.5	3.19*	1.387
Assessing whether implementation is going in the right direction	25	20.2	29	23.4	16	12.9	31	25.0	23	18.5	3.02*	1.431
Checking if projects meets specification	23	18.5	29	23.4	15	12.1	45	36.3	12	9.7	3.05*	1.318
EVALUATION												
Reporting project performance	25	20.2	45	36.3	17	13.7	19	15.3	18	14.5	3.32*	1.347
Report writing	34	27.4	30	24.2	17	13.7	11	8.9	32	25.8	3.19*	1.564
Providing feedback to donor agencies	19	15.3	24	19.4	33	26.6	20	16.1	28	22.6	2.89	1.369
Quality assessment	25	20.2	33	26.6	18	14.5	26	21.0	22	17.7	3.10*	1.413
I am involved in the evaluation committee to understand plans of the projects	26	21.0	23	18.5	23	18.5	33	26.6	19	15.3	3.03*	1.385

Source: Field Survey, 2022 high participation: means ≥ 3.00

4.5 Youths participation in decision making process

Results on youths involvement in decision making during community development projects as shown in Table 6 showed that majority of respondents were involved in recognition of community development projects needs (mean = 3.33), playing a greater role in shaping the decisions that affect the implementation of community development projects (mean = 3.30), Involving youth in decision making process results in better quality decisions of the projects (mean = 3.64), providing technical experts during the projects decision making process (mean = 3.36). however, there was low involvement in increasing conflicts in the decisions concerning the community development projects (mean = 2.79) and being too emotional to be involved in the decision making of the community projects (mean = 2.44).

Table 4.5: Youths involvement in decision making process

Involvement in decision making	Strongly agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Mean	Std Dev
	Frq.	%	Frq.	%	Frq.	%	Frq.	%	Frq.	%		
I am involved in recognition of community development projects needs	20	16.1	41	33.1	27	21.8	32	25.8	4	3.2	3.33*	1.124
I plays a greater role in shaping the decisions that affect the implementation of community development projects	32	25.8	23	18.5	26	21.0	36	29.0	7	5.6	3.30*	1.288
Involving youth in decision making process results in better quality decisions of the projects	42	33.9	29	23.4	23	18.5	26	21.0	4	3.2	3.64*	1.239
Youth provide technical experts during the projects decision making process	25	20.2	36	29.0	25	20.2	35	28.2	3	2.4	3.36*	1.164
Youth increases conflicts in the decisions concerning the community development projects	20	16.1	18	14.5	19	15.3	50	40.3	17	13.7	2.79	1.308
Youth are too emotional to be involved in the decision making of the community projects	16	12.9	14	11.3	15	12.1	43	34.7	36	29.0	2.44	1.357

Source: Field survey, 2022 Highly Significant ≥ 3.00

4.6 Factors influencing youth participation in community development

As shown in Table 4.6, various factors influenced youths' participation in community development projects in the study area. 33.9% of respondents agreed that their Parents and family influenced their participation in the implementation of community development projects. 47.6% strongly agreed that their friends influenced their participation in the implementation of community development projects. However, 26.6% of respondents strongly disagree that not being aware of the implementation of community development projects influenced their participation in community development projects. Age of the youth was also found to influence their participation in the implementation of community-based projects as 39.5% agreed that their participation in community development projects was influenced by their age. This implies that in selecting youths to participate in community development projects their age is a major factor. Marital status of respondents was also found to influence youths' participation in community development projects (mean = 3.56). This implies that single youths are most likely to participate in community development projects than their married counterparts. Also, respondents agreed that married youth ladies do not participate in community development activities (mean = 3.45). This result implies that various factors are responsible for youth participation in community development activities. However, Ahaibwe, Mbowa and Lwarga, (2013) reported that socioeconomic characteristics of respondents and access to credit are the

major factors that influence youths participation in agricultural and development activities.

Table 4.6: Factors influencing youth participation in community development

Factors	Strongly agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly disagree		Mean	Std. Deviation
	Frq.	%	Frq.	%	Frq.	%	Frq.	%	Frq.	%		
My Parents and family influence me to participate in the implementation of community development projects	40	32.3	42	33.9	22	17.7	6	4.8	14	11.3	3.71*	1.280
My friends influence me to participate in the implementation of community development projects	59	47.6	23	18.5	32	25.8	5	4.0	5	4.0	4.02**	1.126
I am not aware of the implementation of community development projects	23	18.5	23	18.5	32	25.8	13	10.5	33	26.6	2.92	1.452
Age of the youth influence their participation in the implementation of community-based projects	27	21.8	49	39.5	38	30.6	6	4.8	4	3.2	3.72*	.967
My Marital status influence my participation in the implementation of community development projects	38	30.6	35	28.2	21	16.9	18	14.5	12	9.7	3.56*	1.321
Male youths participate in the implementation of community development projects more than female.	57	46.0	21	16.9	23	18.5	9	7.3	14	11.3	3.79*	1.387
Married youth ladies do not participate on community activities	36	29.0	34	27.4	24	19.4	10	8.1	20	16.1	3.45*	1.405
Motivated youth participate on community activities	66	53.2	28	22.6	21	16.9	3	2.4	6	4.8	4.17**	1.102

Source: field survey, 2022 serious factors influencing participation: Means \geq 3.00

4.7 Constraints to youth participation in community development project

The constraints encountered by youths participating in community development projects are presented in Table 4.7. The major constraints to youth participation in community development projects were inadequate awareness on community development projects (mean = 4.04), poor programme planning (mean = 4.01). Respondents participation in community development projects also include tradition and culture (mean = 3.33), non inclusion of youths in the planning stage of projects (mean = 3.83), lack of fund from the government on community development projects (mean = 3.99), anticipated benefit are not worthwhile (mean = 3.40), Government policies are inconsistent (mean = 3.97). others constraints such as Problem of the community, Fraudulent Activities of members, Bad leadership and Youth problems also affected youth participation in community development projects. To results above, Ekong (2010) asserts that, research have shown that participation in community programmes in Nigeria is affected by the citizens' perception of the share of the anticipated benefit which will accrue to them as individuals. Moreover, the extent to which community member will take the initiative and also fully participate in community development programmes, depends on their perception of their roles vis-à-vis the role of the government with respect to that particular social issue or problem.

In addition to Ekongs' findings above, Udoh (2012) observed that, the problem of participation is perceived in terms of whether the people know what they want.

Some local people ask for the impossible things, or merely repeat a long list of conventional development which has been told should want and sometimes they say they do not want anything to change.

Table 7: Constraints to youth participation in community development project

Constraints	Very serious		Serious		Undecided		Slightly Serious		Not serious		Mean	Std dev
	Frq.	%	Frq.	%	Frq.	%	Frq.	%	Frq.	%		
Inadequate awareness	47	37.9	47	37.9	19	15.3	10	8.1	1	0.8	4.04	0.966
Poor programme planning	40	32.3	54	43.5	22	17.7	7	5.6	1	0.8	4.01	0.897
Tradition and culture	21	16.9	40	32.3	30	24.2	25	20.2	8	6.5	3.33	1.167
Non inclusion of youths in the planning stage	37	29.8	54	43.5	14	11.3	13	10.5	6	4.8	3.83	1.117
Lack of fund from the government	61	49.2	27	21.8	20	16.1	6	4.8	10	8.1	3.99	1.259
Anticipated benefit are not worthwhile	24	19.4	41	33.1	27	21.8	24	19.4	8	6.5	3.40	1.188
Government policies are inconsistent	50	40.3	44	35.5	13	10.5	10	8.1	7	5.6	3.97	1.161
Problem of the community	29	23.4	49	39.5	22	17.7	21	16.9	3	2.4	3.65	1.091
Fraudulent Activities of members	48	38.7	42	33.9	15	12.1	14	11.3	5	4.0	3.92	1.152
Bad leadership	54	43.5	36	29.0	15	12.1	8	6.5	11	8.9	3.92	1.273
Youth problems	25	20.2	44	35.5	26	21.0	19	15.3	10	8.1	3.44	1.205
Parental Influence	28	22.6	39	31.5	20	16.1	20	16.1	17	13.7	3.33	1.354
Lack of cooperation from other community members	24	19.4	41	33.1	34	27.4	16	12.9	9	7.3	3.44	1.157
Inadequate recognition of youth	44	35.5	38	30.6	19	15.3	17	13.7	6	4.8	3.78	1.207

Source: Field survey, 2022

4.8 HYPOTHESES TESTING

4.8.1 Relationship between socioeconomic characteristics and level of participation in community development projects

The regression result in Table 8 shows the relationship between the socioeconomic characteristics of youths and their level of participation in community development projects. Result showed a significant relationship between Age ($r = 0.186$; $p = 0.039$), level of education ($r = 0.432$; $p = - 0.017$) and years residing in community ($r = 0.224$; $p = 0.014$) and youth level of participation in community development projects. This implies that age significant affect the type and nature of participation in community development project. This can be attributed to age grade system in rural areas were task and participation are assigned based on age grade. Years residing in community also significant affected level of participation in development projects which implies that years of residing can be considered as experience and also increased awareness about community projects. As years of residing increase, there is increase in level of participation This results is in line with findings of Obisesan and Adekemi (2019) who reported that age and educational qualification and household size drives youths participation in community development projects.

Table 8: Relationship between socioeconomic characteristics and level of participation in community development projects

	Coefficient	Prob. Level	Decision
Sex	-0.023	0.797	Not significant
Age	0.186	0.039*	Significant
Marital status	0.008	0.926	Not significant
Highest level of education	0.432	-0.017*	Significant
Years residing in community	0.224	0.014*	Significant
Annual income			

Source: Field survey, 2022 significant at $p \leq 0.05$

4.8.2 Relationship factors influencing youth participation in community development and level of participation

The relationship between factors influencing youths participation in community development and level of participation in community development projects shown in Table 9 shows that there is a significant correlation ($r = 0,202$; $p = 0.024$) between friends influence to participate in the implementation of community development projects and level of participation in community development projects. This implies that level of participation in influence by peer pressure. As other youths are participating this tends to influence other youths decision to participate. Result also showed a significant correlation ($r = 0.207$; $p = 0.021$) Marital status influence my participation in the implementation of community development projects and level of participation. This implies that more married will tend to participate more in community development projects by taking responsibilities that will improve their community and household. This results conforms with Oghuvbu (2000) who stated that participation in an action to influence and personal decision resulting from demographic profile of individuals.

Table 9: Factors influencing youth participation in community development and level of participation

Factors	Coefficient	Prob. Level	Decision
My Parents and family influence me to participate in the implementation of community development projects	-0.061	0.503	Not significant
My friends influence me to participate in the implementation of community development projects	0.202*	0.024	Significant
I am not aware of the implementation of community development projects	-0.092	0.307	Not significant
Age of the youth influence their participation in the implementation of community-based projects	0.047	0.602	Not significant
My Marital status influence my participation in the implementation of community development projects	0.207*	0.021	Significant
Male youths participate in the implementation of community development projects more than female.	-0.011	0.902	Not significant
Married youth ladies do not participate on community activities	0.100	0.271	Not significant
Motivated youth participate on community activities	0.121	0.181	Not significant

Source: Field survey, 2022: Significant at 0.05 level of probability

CHAPTER FIVE

5.1 SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 SUMMARY

The study was conducted to assess youths participation in community development projects in Oredo Local Government Area, Edo State, Nigeria. This was achieved by address the following objectives; describe the socioeconomic characteristics of youths in Oredo Local Government area; identify the factors influencing youth participation in community development projects in Oredo Local Government Area; identify the types of project youth engage in towards community development in Oredo Local Government Area; examine the level of youth participation to community development in Oredo Local Government Area and identify the constraints of youth participation to community development in Oredo Local Government Area.

Results from the study showed that both males and female youths are actively involved in community development projects in the study area majority of youths in the study area have obtained various level of formal education from secondary education to postgraduate education. Also 33.9% of respondents agreed that their Parents and family influenced their participation in the implementation of community development projects. 47.6% strongly agreed that their friends influenced their participation in the implementation of community development projects. However, 26.6% of respondents strongly disagree that not being aware

of the implementation of community development projects influenced their participation in community development projects. 52.4% and 50% of youths participated in Agricultural activities and sport development activities respectively. respondents were highly involved in skill acquisition (mean = 2.23), education (mean = 2.22) and Agriculture (mean = 2.01). Respondents were highly involved in needs assessment (mean = 3.35), community survey (mean = 3.65), mobilization and orientation (mean = 3.65), preparing time and cost estimate (mean = 3.33). Results revealed that youths were highly involved in disbursement of funds (mean = 3.09), site selection (mean = 3.33) construction work (mean = 3.19). Majority of youths were highly involved in reporting project performance (mean = 3.32), report writing (mean = 3.19), quality assessment (mean = 3.10) and evaluation committee to understand plans of the projects (mean = 3.03). The major constraints to youth participation in community development projects were inadequate awareness on community development projects (mean = 4.04), poor programme planning (mean = 4.01). However, none of the socioeconomic characteristics showed any significant relationship with their level of participation in community development projects. There is a significant correlation between Age ($r = 0.186$; $p = 0.039$), level of education ($r = 0.432$; $p = -0.017$) and years residing in community ($r = 0.224$; $p = 0.014$) and youth level of participation in community development projects. Also there was a significant correlation ($r = 0.202$; $p = 0.024$) between friends influence to participate in the implementation

of community development projects and level of participation in community development projects.

5.2 CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study it was concluded that; Both males and female youths are involved in community development projects.

Youths are actively involved in various community development projects

There are various constraints limiting youth participation in community development projects

Youths are highly involved in personal development projects

There is high level of participation in community development projects among youths in the study area.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of the study it was recommended that

1. It is Imperative that youth with higher level of education are involved in community development project because it affect their lives today and has implication for their futures in addition to their intellectual contribution and their ability to mobilize support, they bring unique perspective that need to be taken into account .
2. Development agencies should introduce project that will impact youths directly through acquisition and economic empowerment

3. Awareness campaign on the importance of project should be carried out to encourage youths participation in community development projects.

REFERENCES

- Abuiyada R (2018). Traditional Development Theories have failed to Address the Needs of the majority of People at Grassroots Levels with Reference to GAD. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*. 9(9):115-119
- Agarwal B (2001) Participatory Exclusions, Community Forestry, and Gender: An Analysis for South Asia and a Conceptual Framework. *World Development* 29, 1623-1648.
- Ardichvili, A., Maurer, M., Li, W., Wentling, T., and Stuedemann, R. (2006) "Cultural influences on knowledge sharing through online communities of practice. *Journal of Knowledge Management*", 10 (1): 94–107.
- Assembly resolution United Nations (2007). A/RES/56/117 in 2001, the Commission for Social Development resolution E/2007/26 and E/CN.5/2007/8 in 2007 and the General Assembly resolution A/RES/62/126 in 2008 also reinforce the same age-group for youth.
- Bamberger, M. (1988). *The Role of Community Participation in Development Planning and Project Management*. Washington: World Bank
- Botes, L and Rensburg, D. V. (2000) "Community participation in development: nine plagues and twelve commandments". *Community Development Journal*, 35 (1): 41–58
- Brennan, M.A. Barnett, R and Lesmeister, M. (2009). An exploration of factors shaping youth involvement in community development: Findings from a survey of Florida youth, *Journal of the Community Development Society*, 38(4):13-27.
- Brennan, M.A. Barnett, R. and Lesmeister, M. (2008). An exploration of factors shaping youth involvement in community development: Findings from a survey of Florida youth, *Journal of the Community Development Society*, 38(4):13-27.
- Brennan, M. A. Barnett, R. and Lesmeister, M. (2006). Enhancing leadership, local capacity, and youth involvement in the community development process: findings from a Survey of Florida youth, *Journal of the Community Development Society*, (forthcoming).
- Brett, G., Margaret, P., and Tammo, L. (2007). *Analysis of Community Participation in Projects Managed by Non-Governmental Organizations A Case of World Vision in Mali*. World Vision Studies.

- Cahn, E. S. and Gray, C. (2005). Using the co-production principle: no more throwaway kids. Putting youth at the center of community building, new directions for youth development, 106: summer.
- Checkoway, and Aldona (2013). Involving young people in neighbourhood development. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 20:765–795
- Chess, C. and Purcell, K. (2009). Youth participation and the environmental community projects: Do we know what works? *Environmental Science and Technology* 33 (16), 2685–2692.
- Cornwall, G. P. (2010). Youth participation in local (community) level development: A development strategy, paper presented at the 11th Annual Salises Conference St. Augustine Trinidad, March 24-26.
- Dimelu, M. U. Umoren, A. M. and Chah, J. M. (2020). Determinants of Youth Farmers' Participation in Agricultural Activities in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Science*; 12(12);18-35.
- Ekong E. E. (2003) *An Introduction to Rural Sociology*. Dove Educational Publisher, 80 Wellington Barry way Uyo pp. 323 – 324.
- Ekong, E. E. (2010). *Rural sociology*, 3rd ed. (Uyo: Dove, 2010).
- Flora, C. B., Flora, J. L. and Fey, S. (2004). *Rural communities: legacy and change*, 2nd ed. (Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Gilchrist, A. (2004). *The well connected community: A networking approach to community development*. (UK: The policy press.
- Ginwrights I. and James. A. (2002). *Social Justice Organization and Youth Development*. New direction in Youth development
- Goodman, R. M., Speers, M. A., McLeroy, K., Fawcett, S., Kegler, M., Parker, E., Wallerstein, N. (1998) "Identifying and defining the dimensions of community capacity to provide a basis for measurement. *Health Education and Behavior*, 25(3):258–278.
- Hackett, H. (2004). Community capacity building, paper presented at the conference of social assistance professionals in the provincial and municipal sector, 2004, available online at: <http://www.ranaprocess.com/articles/community>, retrieved 29th may 2009.

- Khawaja, A (2004) "Is Increasing Community Participation Always A Good Thing?" *Journal of the European Economic Association* 2(2–3):427– 436.
- Kleiner, B Rave, K. Silverstein, G. Bell, R. and Well, J. (2004). Evaluation of the Appalachian regional commission's community capacity building projects (Washington D.C.: Appalachian Regional Commission.)
- Kubisch, A. C. (2005). Comprehensive community building initiatives--ten years later: what we have learned about the principles guiding the work, putting youth at the center of community building, new directions for youth development, No.106, summer.
- Kuponiyi, F. A. (2008). Community power structure: The role of local leaders in community development decision making in Ajaawa, Oyo State, Nigeria, *Anthropologist*, (4):239-243.
- Lewis Memorial Conference (2008). The Development Challenges in the 21st Century-. The presentation was entitled .Youth in Participatory Development. Augustine Campus.
- Lynn, C. (2005). Youth using research: Learning through social practice, community building, and social change. putting youth at the center of community building, new directions for youth development, No. 106, summer.
- Mba, R. A. and Onyesom, B. C. (2020) Youth Participation in Community Development Programmes In Rumu-Woji Communities In Port Harcourt Metropolis. *International Journal of Innovative Human Ecology and Nature Studies* 8(1):19-27.
- Mulwa F. W (2007) Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Projects. Community Based Project Monitoring, Qualitative Impact Assessment and People Friendly Evaluation Methods.
- Ndekha A, Hansen EH, Molgaard P, Woelk G, and Furu P (2003) Community participation as an interactive learning process: experiences from a schistosomiasis control project in Zimbabwe. *Acta Tropica* 85, 325-338.
- Nikkhah H. A. and Redzuan M (2009). Participation as a Medium of Empowerment in Community Development. *European Journal of Social Sciences* – 11(1):25-38.

- Nitzberg, J. (2005). The meshing of youth development and community building, putting youth at the center of community building, new directions for youth development, No. 106, summer.
- Obisesan, Adekemi A. (2019). What drives youth participation and labour demand in agriculture? Evidence from rural Nigeria. *6th African Conference of Agricultural Economists, September 23-26, 2019, Abuja, Nigeria*
- Oghuvbu, E. P.(2000). Supervision in Education for Administrators, Teachers and Students. Ibadan: End-Time Publishers Ltd.
- Rubin, J and Rubin, S. (2001). Community organizing and development, 3rd ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon).
- Shane, S. A and Baron, R. A (2007). Entrepreneurship a Process Perspective, Thomson Learning, Academic Resource Center.
- Shrimpton, R. (2009), "Community participation, growth monitoring, and malnutrition in the third world," Human Ecology Forum, Vol. 17.
- Stasser, G.and Stewart, D. (1992). Discovery of Hidden Profiles by Decision-making Groups: solving a Problem versus making a Judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*
- Udensi, L. O., Daasi, G. L. K., Emah, D. S. and Zukbee, S. A. (2013). Youth Participation in Community Development (CD) Programmes in Cross River State: Implications for Sustainable Youth Development in Nigeria. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) Volume 13(5):61-67*
- Udensi, L. O., Daasi, Gibson L.K., Emah, D. S., Zukbee, S. A. (2013). Youth Participation in Community Development (CD) Programmes in Cross River State: Implications for Sustainable Youth Development in Nigeria. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) Volume 13(5): 61-67.*
- Udensi, L.O., Daasi, G. L.K., Emah, D. S., Zukbee, S. A. (2013). Youth Participation in Community Development (CD) Programmes in Cross River State: Implications for Sustainable Youth Development in Nigeria. *Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) 13(5): 61-67*
- Udoh, E.A. (2012). Participation and sustainable community development: The case of Eastern Obolo community development foundation, masters thesis, department of sociology and anthropology, University of Uyo, Nigeria, (2012).

- Umar, L. Y. and Mohammed, A. M. (2014). An Assessment of Youth Participation in Community Development programmes in Damaturu Local Government Area Yobe State, Nigeria. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science* (IOSR-JHSS) 19(7):13-24
- United Nation (2002). <http://www.un.org>. United Nation Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. Youth participation manual.
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA). (2013). Definition of Youth. Pp1-3
- Vroom, V. H. (1990). Some personality determinants of the effects of participation. 3rd Ed. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall
- White, A (1981). Community participation in water and sanitation: Concepts, strategies and methods.

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS AND EXTENSION
SERVICES
FACULTY OF AGRICULTURE
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN

I am a final year student of the above named Department. The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain information on YOUTH PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT IN OREDO LOCAL GOVERNMENT. You are therefore requested to participate in the study by filling in this questionnaire. The information you will provide will be used solely for the purpose of the study and will be treated with utmost confidentiality. Therefore, fill free to respond to all the questions contained in this questionnaire as to the best of your knowledge.

*Your name:

SECTION A: SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

1. Sex (a) Male [] (b) Female []
2. Age _____years
3. Marital status (a) Single [] (b) Married [] (c) Divorced [] (d) Separated []
4. Highest level of Education attained (a) Primary level [] (b) Secondary level [] (c) University Level [] (d) Post graduate [] (e) No Formal education []
5. Years residing in community_____ Years
6. What is your annual income _____ Naira
7. Do you get paid for participating in community development project? (a) Yes [] (b) No []
8. If yes what is the maximum amount you have received for participation _____

SECTION B: FACTORS INFLUENCING YOUTH PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

9. Which of these factors influence your level of participation in community development project?

Factors	5	4	3	2
My Parents and family influence me to participate in the implementation of community development projects				
My friends influence me to participate in the implementation of community development projects				
I am not aware of the implementation of community development projects				
Age of the youth influence their participation in the implementation of community-based projects				
My Marital status influence my participation in the implementation of community development projects				
Male youths participate in the implementation of community development projects more than female.				
Married youth ladies do not participate on community activities				
Motivated youth participate on community activities				

Strongly agree (SA) = 5, Agree (A) = 4, Undecided(U) = 3, Disagree(D) = 2, and Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1.

SECTION C: COMMUNITY PROJECTS PARTICIPATION

10. Which of these community development programmes/project have you participated in?

Programmes/project	Participation/engaged in		Level of participation		
	Yes	No	Very high	High	Low
Skill Acquisition					
Education					
Agriculture					
Sports development/activities					
Community Water project					

Construction/rehabilitation of Market					
Construction/rehabilitation of town hall					
Construction/rehabilitation of roads and drainage					
Electricity/Street Lighting					
Waste management					
Others(Specify)					

SECTION D: YOUTHS INVOLVEMENT IN MONITORING OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

11. Does youth involvement in the monitoring of the youth projects influence the community-based youth projects? Yes [] No []

Please indicate the areas youths are involved in monitoring community development projects

Involvement in monitoring	5	4	3	2	1
PROGRAMME PLANNING					
Needs assessment					
Community surveys					
Mobilization and orientation					
Preparing time and cost estimate					
Appointment of the evaluation committee					
My recommendations are sought in decision making of the community projects					
Situation analysis					
Setting Program Objectives and Solutions					
Goal setting					
Issuing general press release to the public					
IMPLEMENTATION					
Disbursement of funds					
Am involved in site selection					
Involved in construction work					
Inspection of materials					

Quality assurance					
Others(Specify)					
MONITORING					
Checking or observing the activities					
Recording what is happening as well as what is not happening					
Collecting facts and figures on activities and results					
Monitoring the implementation of community development project					
Assessing whether implementation is going in the right direction					
Checking if projects meets specification					
Others(Specify)					
EVALUATION					
Reporting project performance					
Report writing					
Providing feedback to donor agencies					
Quality assessment					
I am involved in the evaluation committee to understand plans of the projects					
Others(Specify)					

Highly involved (HI)=5, slightly Involved (SI)=4, Undecided(U)=3, Low involvement (I)=2, and Not involved (NI) = 1.

12. Does involvement of youth in decision-making influence youth participation in the implementation of community development projects? Yes [] No []

13. If yes, which of these decision making process are you involved in?

Involvement in decision making	5	4	3	2	1
I am involved in recognition of community development projects needs					
I plays a greater role in shaping the decisions that affect the implementation of community development projects					
Involving youth in decision making process results in better					

quality decisions of the projects					
Youth provide technical experts during the projects decision making process					
Youth increases conflicts in the decisions concerning the community development projects					
Youth are too emotional to be involved in the decision making of the community projects					

Strongly agree(SA)=5, Agree(A)=4, Undecided(U)=3, Disagree(D)=2, and Strongly Disagree(SD)=1.

SECTION E: CONSTRAINTS TO YOUTH PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

14. Which of these constraints do you encountered while participating in community development projects

Constraints	Very serious	Serious	Undecided	Slightly Serious	Not serious
Inadequate awareness					
Poor programme planning					
Tradition and culture					
Non inclusion of youths in the planning stage					
Lack of fund from the government					
Anticipated benefit are not worthwhile					
Government policies are inconsistent					
Problem of the community					
Fraudulent Activities of members					
Bad leadership					
Youth problems					
Parental Influence					
Lack of cooperation from other community members					
Inadequate recognition of youth					