Effect of Motivational Factors on Community's Projects Participation in Gidan Zakara, on Sustainable Development

[1]Abimiku John,
[2]Bawa Basil &
[3]Jacho David Sunday

[1&2]*Department of Public Administration,*
Faculty of Administration,
Nasarawa State University, Keffi
[3]*Department of Political Science,*
Faculty of Social Science,
Nasarawa State University, Keffi

Corresponding Author:
Abimiku John

Abstract

Community project participation towards sustainable development hardly takes place in a vacuum. There are barriers as well as motivating factors which propel the community to take part in sustainable development. As much, this paper is designed to access the motivating factors and barriers facing community's project participation on sustainable development. The theoretical framework for this work is system theory and the method adopted is essentially the survey method. This study shows that the barriers affecting community project participation are but not limited to: people's belief and personal perceptions, partisan politics, inadequate financial support, lack of government, NGOs and developmental experts, fear of exclusion, bureaucracy, power and privilege, gender or ethnicity, disability among others. Thus, the communities should look at the various barriers hindering their community participation which include the people's belief and personal perceptions, partisan politics, inadequate financial support, lack of government, NGOs and developmental experts as they often reflect the inequalities within the society. As such these barriers need to be recognised, acknowledged and addressed as it will be the only way in ensuring sustainable development in these communities.

Background to the Study
The cornerstone of community-based development initiatives is the active involvement of a defined community in all aspects of project design and implementation which act as a catalyst for sustainable and economic development. Community project participation involves a proactive process in which the beneficiaries influenced the development and management of development projects, rather than receiving a share benefit. Community participation creates an enabling environment for sustainability by allowing users to select the level of services for which they are willing to pay, to guide key investment and management decision and commit resources in support of these choices. When beneficiaries also make decisions, participation becomes a self-initiated action, which is known as the exercise of voice and choice or empowerment.

Community participation is assumed in policy circles as the main channel for the active involvement of community members in shaping the outcomes of the development projects. For Kaufman and Alfonso (1997), effective community participation may lead to social and personal empowerment, economic development, and socio-political transformation. The potential of community participation in reversing power relations and providing the poor with agency and voice is well noted in the development literature. As such, most development projects are expected to have some modicum of community participation revealing the widespread appeal for community participation in contemporary development thinking and practice. Community participation is a widely used concept in development policy and practice (Cornwall, 2008). Contemporary development approaches perceive community participation as one of the key ingredients for poverty reduction and sustainable development.

Apparently, this paper examines the motivational factors and barriers on community's project participation and why it is so important to the sustainable development agenda. Thus, it will increase understanding of what communities are and more importantly what sustainable communities are, linking into sustainable development. It has particularly focused on the motivators and the barriers to individual's participation within their communities towards sustainable development.

Statement of the Problem
There has been a sharp controversial debate on the participation-sustainability nexus with little consensus. Studies shows that greater community participation is associated with better community services which improve the outcomes of activities within the society, others showing that community participation leads to development projects that are more responsive to the needs of the poor, more responsive government and better delivery of public goods and services, better maintained community assets, and a more informed and involved citizenry Mansuri and Rao (2003), others that greater community participation is associated with higher project outcomes. In spite of constant effort by the government the performance of community in reducing poverty and enhancing sustainable development still fall below expectations. As such the crucial problem this paper will address is that; what are the motivating factors and the barriers to individual's participation within their communities towards sustainable development?

Research Questions

This paper attempts to ask the following questions:

i. To what extent does motivation affected community's project participation on sustainable development in Gidan Zakara?

ii. What are the barriers hindering community's participation on sustainable development in Gidan Zakara?

Objectives of the Study

The paper is designed to access the motivating factors and barriers facing community's project participation on sustainable development. Specifically, this paper attempts to achieve the following objectives;

i. To access the motivating factors on community's project participation on sustainable development.

ii. To identify the barriers hindering community's project participation on sustainable development.

Conceptual Framework

Concept of Community

Peoples sense of community stems from a sense of being linked into networks of family, friends, social groups and community organisations (Ennis and West 2010). A 'well connected community' is one which has strong internal connections but also has links with people and organisations outside of its boundaries, its edges are permeable allowing ideas, information and resources to flow both ways (Gilchrist 2000). A community is also considered a well connected community if it 'tolerates difference, celebrates diversity, promotes equality and acknowledges mutuality' (Gilchrist 2000 p272). In contrast, a homophilous community is one that has strong bonds but is closed to the outside world (Newman and Dale 2005). These communities or groups are often made up of the same 'type' of people in relation to areas such as age, sex, class, race or occupation which limits peoples world view (ibid). A well connected community can provide an alternative to the individualism that is the product of our neo-liberal economic system but the community's ability to provide assistance can be exploited by government and utilised to absolve them from having to provide social infrastructure (Lynn 2006). The notion of community is largely considered a 'good thing' conjuring up images of shared identity, cohesiveness and a sense of belonging (Gilchrist 2003). Paradoxically communities are also seen as places where social problems exist and where they can be resolved (Lynn 2006).

Concept of Community Participation

According to Pretty (1995), community participation can be explored from a continuum of manipulative and or passive participation, through either participation by consultation or participation for material incentives to higher forms of participation including functional participation to self-mobilization. When participation is at self-mobilization community members take the initiative independently of external organizations, developing contacts for resources and technical assistance, but retaining control over these resources. The term 'participation' can be used in many different ways and is often

used interchangeably with words such as involvement, engagement or prefixed with civil, community or public (Brodie et al 2009). There are three broad categories of community participation:-

    a. Individual – signing petitions, boycotting products (Brodie et al 2009), neighbourliness, 'doing a favour' (Williams 2011)

    b. Community or social participation – being a member of a community group, association, club, volunteering, running a church group (Brodie et al 2009)

    c. Public participation – this can also be referred to as political or civic and includes voting in elections, taking part in consultations or being a local councillor (Brodie et al 2009).

Community participation could therefore be defined as:- 'any activity which involves spending time, unpaid, doing something which aims to benefit someone(individuals or groups) other than close relatives, or to benefit the environment' (Williams 2005, 31).

This definition covers all three of the categories; individual, social and public and it should be noted that many people participate at all three levels over the course of their lives (Brodie et al 2011).

Concept of Sustainable Development

Sustainable development is defined by DEFRA as:-'enabling people to satisfy their basic needs and enjoy a better quality of life without compromising the quality of life of future generations' (DEFRA 2010, 5).

Sustainable development focuses on 3 core areas; Environment, Economy and Social (Lozano 2008).

Concept of Sustainable Communities

How you define sustainable communities will depend on whether you are coming from it from a political / policy angle an environmentalist /sustainable development angle or a personal/ individual angle. The concept of sustainable communities was developed by the Egan Review in 2004 which defines sustainable communities as follows; 'sustainable communities meet the diverse needs of existing and future residents, their children and other users, contribute to a high quality of life and provide opportunity and choice. They achieve this in ways that make effective use of natural resources, enhance the environment, promote social cohesion and inclusion and strengthen economic prosperity' (The Egan Review, 2004,)

Motivational Factors for Community Participation

The reasons people participate cover a diverse range of factors including; life stages, cultural background, socio economic factors such as education and income level as well as opportunities to be involved and simply a personal desire to be involved (Low et al 2007).

However, the following are the motivating factors for community participation:

a. Belonging Need

Belonging means acceptance as a member or part. A sense of belonging is a human need, just like the need for food and shelter. Feeling that you belong is most important in seeing value in life and in coping with intensely painful emotions. It is a basic and universal human desire to belong (Baumeister and Leary 1995). In evolutionary terms this has been beneficial for survival, finding food, caring for children and protection against predators are all best accomplished within a group rather than individually(ibid). Hogg and Vaughan (2011) states that we all belong to groups via a range of non choice factors such as our gender, ethnicity, language spoken, religion or the country we live in. There are of course groups we choose to be part of such as social groups, family groups and task groups.

Our need to belong is what drives us to seek out stable, long-lasting relationships with other people. It also motivates us to participate in social activities such as clubs, sports teams, religious groups, and community organizations. By belonging to a group, we feel as if we are a part of something bigger and more important than ourselves.

b. Feelings of Identity

Developing a strong sense of identity and self esteem is important for many reasons. People that don't have a strong sense of their own identity may be easily influenced by others. They may have trouble making decisions and may get involved in unhealthy relationships.

Identity refers to people's sense of themselves, how they view the world, how they live their lives (Crompton and Kasser 2009). People derive a high level of self esteem from group membership which gives them a positive identity (Amiot and Hornsey 2010). People often feel a sense of uncertainty and being part of a group can give them a strong sense of identity and help them to feel more comfortable (Hogg 2012; Hohman et al 2010). The group has a set of known and accepted way to behave and this makes most people feel much more comfortable with themselves as the rules are clear. Hogg (2012) states that the higher the entitativity; what makes the group groupy; the lower the level of uncertainty that a person feels. He suggests that low entitativity groups, those with ambiguous membership, no clear rules, and little agreement on group attributes all do little to fend off uncertainty making people feel uncomfortable. Transition Town groups often follow this model, with no leadership, such a wide inclusion agenda that anything goes and no desire to tell people what to do that the group can lead to fragmentation and disillusionment (Connors and McDonald 2010).

c. Social Capital

Social capital involves the networks of relationships among people who live and work in a particular society, enabling that society to function effectively.

Human beings have harnessed the natural world for their own gain over the millennia (Porritt 2007). Perhaps one of our greatest strengths was the realisation that we were more productive when organised in groups rather than working as individuals. Humans have

taken this way of organising to complex levels of legal, political and financial systems with cultural institutions for sport, arts and entertainment as well as informal networks within communities – this is social capital (Porritt 2007; Green and Brock 2005; Newman and Dale 2005).

Social capital contains an implicit belief that working in groups or networks is a better way of effecting change compared to individual effort (Newman and Dale 2005). It is this idea that is harnessed in Transition Towns and the creation of networks as a way of addressing local sustainability issues and wider global concerns (Transition Network 2011). Networks are constructive as they are based on trust and reciprocity and the more formal and informal networks the greater the trust within the community (Lowndes 2006).

d. Who Participates

Different types of people participate to varying degrees across a range of activities and across their life times (Brodie et al 2009; Low et al 2007). Many myths have existed about certain groups not participating whether that is through age, gender, ethnicity or socio economic and group.

Thus, meaningful and regular opportunities for all people to participate must be guaranteed by a democratic, economically and social political system, whether or not everyone chooses to take part. But not all people take part in community project participation, nor are the opportunities for participation equal. As such, every individual in the community should see participation as a means to community development and something that belongs to a fraction of the community but rather to the whole community at large.

e. Shared goals

A shared goal is the recognition that to achieve the goal a larger number of people working interdependently are more likely to achieve success (Hogg and Vaughan 2011). Goals that people share can be both extrinsic and intrinsic (Crompton and Kasser 2009). Extrinsic goals tend to be those that focus on status, wealth, rewards and achievements whereas intrinsic goals are focused on a sense of belonging in a community, self acceptance and affiliation (ibid). If people are concerned about environmental issues they are likely to join an environmental or conservation group as they recognise that action amongst a group of like minded people is likely to achieve more than a lone actor (Hogg and Vaughan 2011).

f. Avoiding Loneliness/Friendship

Wanting to belong, compounded by peer pressure can make beneficiary community members to participate in sustainable development. Many people join groups for the sheer pleasure of friendship (Hogg 2011). Another way of viewing this is people participate in a range of activities within their communities to avoid loneliness (Perlman and Peplau 1984). Loneliness is associated with poor mental health and depression and

people experiencing it tend to have fewer social contacts (ibid). Closely linked to friendship as a motivator for participating is 'word of mouth' or simply 'being asked'. Many people start participating because someone they know has simply told them about the opportunity (Lowndes 2006; Low et al 2007). People generally feel more comfortable getting involved if someone they know is offering support and guidance (ibid).

g.   Housing
Whether a person owns, privately rents or is a social tenant has an impact on their rates of participation. People who own their own house take part in more community and voluntary participation than do people in rented accommodation (Wallace 2010). People who own their own houses are perceived to have greater financial inclusion in society, more choice and more opportunities in the future (Bramley and Kofi, Karley 2007).

Barriers to Community Participation
The experience of 'community' is inherently considered a desirable aspect of society but this hides the many perceived and real tensions lying just below the surface (Gilchrist 2003). The range of groups, clubs and societies that exist within a community often reflect the prevailing cultural norms and can therefore perpetuate the existing inequalities such as power and privilege (Gilchrist 2000). Groups and associations can also exist for what many would not consider to be for the public good, but thought has to be given to whose definition of 'public good' is used? (Carothers 2000). Having clean air can be seen as a 'public good' but then so can low energy bills (ibid). Although many of these groups or engagement opportunities appear to be open to all there are a range of barriers to why people may not take part in community activities (Brodie et al 2009; Rai 2008; Low et al 2007). The barriers to engagement have been much researched and this is often utilised by professionals working with communities to try to increase participation. Many people running local community groups are often not trained community development professionals and therefore may not be aware of the structural, societal or personal barriers to participation.

Below are the barriers to community project participation:
a.   Fear of Exclusion
Being excluded lowers your sense of identity and belongingness as well as reducing your self esteem and for some people reduces their sense of meaningful existence (Nezlek et al 2012).

Many people fear that they will not be accepted by a group and this fear of real or perceived exclusion can stop them from participating in the first place (ibid). This fear can also lead people, who disagree with the group decision, to conform for fear of being disapproved of and alienated by the group and thus their participation is not inclusive (Hogg and Vaughan 2011).

Within groups, members may exclude someone who is not behaving as the group requires causing everyone anxiety, and exclusion from the group gives everyone back their identity (ibid). This form of exclusion is particularly common in adolescent groups (Wolfer et al 2012).

b. Bureaucracy

For many people a major barrier to participation is the fear of overly complex bureaucracy particularly in the formal volunteering category (Low et al 2007). As many volunteering opportunities are in the social care sector, organisations have to be mindful of safeguarding children and vulnerable adults and therefore references and criminal record bureau checks are an essential part of the recruitment process along with interviews for the positions. The complex bureaucracy and hierarchical structures are often also given as barriers to participating in the public arena (Rai 2008). Public participation often involves formal meetings, possibly held in formal venues such as Town Halls, recording of minutes, public speaking and rules on how to behave (Rai 2008; Lowndes et al 2006). Bureaucratic processes act as barriers particularly to people from lower socio economic groups who often have a lower educational level and have limited experience of these structures within their lives (Low et al 2007).

c. Socioeconomic group

The socio economic group a person belongs to has an impact on the level and type of participation they are involved in (Brodie et al 2009).Using the narrow definition of community participation as belonging to formal community groups then in deprived areas only 7% of unemployed people in the 2000 General Household Survey had been actively involved in a local organisation compared to 29% of people from more affluent areas (Williams 2005). Widening the definition to include 'doing a favour for a neighbour', then the difference between socio economic groups is lessened, with 67% from deprived areas and 78% from more affluent areas participating (ibid).

Government policy has funded and encouraged the more formal 'public' definition of participation as a way to engage some of the most economically deprived community (Brodie et al 2009). Research has demonstrated that more deprived communities have a reciprocity culture and when these forms of one to one engagement are counted as participation they have similar engagement rates to more affluent areas (Williams 2011; Merrill 2007). Community workers and social activists working in more deprived communities should not try and engage people in groups but should look at mutual exchange schemes with an informal structure (Williams 2011). Continuing to parachute in a form of participation that is foreign to the community, then accusing them of being 'hard to reach' is not a supportive way forward to improve participation rates and demonstrates a weak understanding of community. People from lower socio economic groups often have less access to resources and practical support making participation difficult (Brodie et al 2009). A simple lack of money, access to transport, childcare support plus a lack of knowledge of how to get involved can all be barriers to participation (Low et al 2007).

d. Gender

Gender is still an issue in community participation as women from more deprived backgrounds often experience low self confidence which acts as a barrier to their participation (Greene 2005). Low educational attainment and a lack of a voice as well as

caring responsibilities can make it difficult for women to get involved (ibid). Further barriers impact on women with disabilities or women of colour who often feel greater alienation as well as experiencing discrimination and stereotyping than white able bodied women (Rai 2008; Low et al 2007). Paradoxically more women (64%) than men (54%) take part in formal volunteering within the community and this is linked to the fact that much formal volunteering is in the social welfare field which has greater links to feminine stereotypes(Low et al 2007). However, women are far less represented in the public participation arenas and this could be linked to societal values placed on the different types of participation (Green and Brock 2005).

e. Disability

Disability impacts in a range of ways including access to venues, being hidden in the community, activity is not appropriate for those with learning difficulties or other participant's uncomfortableness with mental health issues (Verdonschot et al 2009). Staff working in residential accommodation can operate as gatekeepers to participation as their support and interest is vital to the individual's ability to participate (ibid). This can also apply to family members who are carers.

f. Ethnicity

The level and type of participation are all impacted on by a person's ethnicity (Low et al 2007). Black women do not generally experience any negative responses from their own or the wider community when they become involved in public participation whereas women from Asian backgrounds have experienced greater issues due to negative stereotyping and cultural norms (Rai 2008). In formal volunteering studies Asian communities are found to be less engaged whereas over a range of informal and formal volunteering the ethnic division was less clear (Low et al 2007).

g. Power and privilege

All groups have unequal distributions of power, where some people are leaders and others followers, even friendship groups experience this (Hogg and Vaughan 2011). A leader in a group plays a powerful role in making members feel certain about their identity. Leaders of groups can use their positions to exert power over its members and encourage particular decision making. As humans being have a strong sense of identity and a need to belong these can be exploited. This need is often caused by feelings of uncertainty (Hogg and Vaughan 2011) and this can be exploited by leaders. Politicians are good examples of this exploitation. In the run up to elections they use people's fears or uncertainties over issues such as terrorism or the weak economy to encourage them to vote for their 'group' (Hohman et al 2010). This can backfire, as if a leader has not been identified by the individual as someone they have strong bonds with the individual will go and join another group (ibid).

h. Disassociated

People living in deprived areas often have negative feeling towards the area they live in (Greene 2005). These people are often keen to move away from the area and therefore they do not want to play any part in trying to improve it (Greene 2005). They feel that any

association with the area is negative and they purposely make a choice to not participate (ibid). Disassociation can be linked with housing tenure (Bramley and Kofi Karley 2007). Owner occupiers have a financial stake in the area and therefore often have a strong association compared to social tenants (Wallace 2010).

Effect of Motivational Factors and Barriers on Community's Projects Participation
From this study one could actually see the effect of the motivating factors and barriers on community's project participation, as the motivators encourage individuals to effectively take part in community project such as building of waters ways, drilling of beholes/ to boost water supply, building of drainages and engaging in other youth empowerment programme towards sustainable development of the community.

However, the barriers tend to discourage individuals in active community's project participation which comes in form of fear of exclusion in decision making, gender inequalities, disability and ethnicity among others. Thus, when all these exist in the mind of the individuals, it gradually reduce their participation in community project as they done longer consider building of waters ways, drilling of beholes/ to boost water supply, building of drainages to control erosion and engaging in other youth empowerment programme towards sustainable development of the community as that which will enhance economic activities of the entire community.

Benefit of Community Participation
Community participation benefits enormously especially when people participate without gender, age, race, religion or socio-economic bias (Merrill 2007). The benefits go beyond the immediate community and impact on the sustainable development agenda (Newman and Dale 2005). By participating in their community, people's intrinsic values, their concern about family, friends and the wider community are strengthened (Crompton and Kasser 2010). Research has shown that the more people prioritise intrinsic values the more concern they show for environmental issues (ibid). Therefore communities with high levels of community participation could lead the way in furthering the sustainable development agenda.

Theoretical Framework
The theoretical underpinning for this paper is systems theory. Easton (1953) is the first major political scientist who has developed a systematic framework on the basis of the systems analysis approach for the study of politics instead of merely adapting it from anthropology or sociology. "The system theory sees development as an output of the community. According to Easton, (1953) it is the making of binding or authoritative allocation, which distinguishes the political system both within and outside the overall society that form the environment of the political system. Easton treats all political system as both open and adaptive systems and concentrates mainly on the study of the nature of the exchanges and transaction that takes place between a political system and its environment.

Therefore, for the purpose of this work, which center on community participation on sustainable development, system approach has been adopted because it deals with units and part of a system, so also with the community and wards, without the coming together of this various communities, the system will not function and operate the way it should towards achievement of its goals in ensuring that sustainable development is achieve and poverty is reduce to the barest minimal. To this fact, System Theory is seen as the relevant theory to be used for this paper.

Methodology
The method adopted for this study is survey method. The population of the study comprise of 784 household from Gidan Zakara. The sample size of 200 was chosen to effectively carry out the research study. This is capable of providing an effective study devoid of size complexity and other inconsistencies. For the purpose of this research study, data were collected from two main sources which are primary and secondary source of data.

Data Presentation and Analysis
Table 1: Programmes supporting community participation in your communities towards sustainable development.

Option	Number of Respondents	Percentage %
Yes	148	79.1%
No	39	20.9%
Total	187	100%

Source: Field Survey, 2021.

A critical look from the above table revealed that a majority of 148 respondents representing 79.1% believe that there are programmes supporting community participation in their communities towards sustainable development, while 39 representing 20.9% disagreed.

Table 2: How does Gidan Zakara community participate in enhancing sustainable development of their communities?

Option	No. of Respondent	Percentage %
Through payment of tax by households	33	17.6%
Voluntary participation in digging drainages	41	21.9%
Voluntary participation in renovation of class rooms	54	28.9%
Voluntary participation in drilling of community boreholes and bridges liking various communities	59	31.6%
Total	187	100%

Source: Field Survey, 2021.

Form the above analysis, 33 respondents, representing 17.6% said that their community participate in enhancing sustainable development through payment of tax by households to meet urgent need. However, 41 respondents representing 21.9% of the population said they participate through voluntary digging of drainages, 54 respondents representing 28.9% said their community voluntary participate in renovation of community schools and class rooms, whereas 59 respondents representing 31.6% said they participate in drilling of community boreholes and repairing of bridges liking various communities.

Table 3: Motivational factor influencing effective participation of your community towards sustainable development

Option	Number of respondents	Percentage %
Orientation and belief system of the people	27	14.4%
Financial support, aids and grants	49	26.2%
The present of NGOs and developmental experts	34	18.2%
Good policies	30	16%
The presences of government in the community	33	17.6%
Belonging need and feelings of identity in the area	14	7.5%
Total	187	100%

Source: Field Survey, 2021.

From table 3 above, 27 respondents representing 14.4% of the total sampled population said that orientation and belief system of the people has been the motivational factor influencing effective participation in Gidan Zakara community towards sustainable development, 49 respondent representing 26.2% said that financial support, aids and grants has been their motivational factor. On the other hand, 34 persons (18.2%) are of the view that the present of NGOs and developmental experts is a motivational factor, 30 respondents representing 16% said good policies is a motivational factor, also, 33 respondents representing 17.6% said the presences of government in the community is a motivational factor whereas 14 respondents representing 7.5% said that belonging need and feelings of identity in the area as always been the motivational factor influencing effective participation of the community towards sustainable development.

Table 4: To what extent does motivation affected community's project participation on sustainable development in Gidan Zakara?

Option	Number of Respondent	Percentage %
To a large extend	144	77%
To a small extend	43	23%
Total	187	100%

Source: Field Survey, 2021.

Form the above table 4 analyses, 144 respondents representing 77% said motivation affected community's project participation on sustainable development in Gidan Zakara to a large extend whereas43 respondents representing 23% of the population are of the contrary.

Table 5: Barriers affecting community project participation towards sustainable development in Gidan Zakara.

Option	Number of Respondent	Percentage %
The Peoples belief and personal perceptions	44	23.5%
Partisan politics	49	26.2%
Inadequate financial support	54	28.9%
Lack of government, NGOs and developmental experts in the communities	40	21.4%
Total	187	100%

Source: Field Survey, 2021.

Form the above table 5 analyses, 44 respondents representing 23.5% said the Peoples belief and personal perceptions have been the barriers affecting community project participation towards sustainable development in Gidan Zakara. However 49 respondents representing 26.2% of the population affirmed that partisan politics have been the barrier affecting community project participation, also, 54 respondents representing 28.9% said that inadequate financial support has always been a barrier affecting community project participation while the remaining 40 respondents representing 21.4% said lack of government, NGOs and developmental experts in the communities is a barrier affecting community project participation towards sustainable development in Gidan Zakara.

Table 6: Ways to improve on community projects participation towards sustainable development in Gidan Zakara.

Option	Number of Respondent	Percentage %
There should be proper sensitization of the vulnerable ones in the community	34	18.2%
Adequate financial support should be provided to the host communities	39	20.9%
Promote active and representative participation toward enabling all community members to meaningfully influence the decisions that affect their lives	31	16.6%
Engage community members in learning about and understanding community issues, and the economic, social, environmental, political, psychological, and other impacts associated with alternative courses of action.	23	12.3%
Partisan politics and nepotism should be discouraging from the communities	32	17.1%
There should be a bottom-up development model that will provide the critical infrastructure necessary in the communities	28	15%
Total	**187**	**100%**

Source: Field Survey, 2021

A critical look from table 6 above 34 respondents representing 18.2% affirmed that there should be proper sensitization of the vulnerable ones in the community, 39 respondents representing 20.9% said that the way forward is by providing adequate financial support should be provided to the host communities. However, 31 respondents representing 16.6% said that the way to improve on community projects participation is by promoting active and representative participation toward enabling all community members to meaningfully influence the decisions that affect their lives, 23 respondents representing 12.3% agree that the way to improve on community project participation is by engaging community members in learning about and understanding community issues, and the economic, social, environmental, political, psychological, and other impacts associated with alternative courses of action, also, 32 respondents representing 17.1% agree that when partisan politics and nepotism is discourage from the communities it will improve community project participation whereas, 28 respondents representing 15% said that there should be a bottom-up development model that will provide the critical infrastructure necessary in the communities for when this is done it will improve on community projects participation towards sustainable development in Gidan Zakara.

Conclusion and Recommendations
This paper attempted an overview of conceptual issues in community participation on sustainable development looking at its motivators and barriers. That the pride of any community is the attainment of higher value level of development in such a way that its

citizens would derive natural attachment to governance as well as to make the society to operate more effectively towards sustainable development.

Thus, the best way to achieve sustainable development is through community participation. For communities to be able to hear these messages they have to be attuned to an intrinsic value base not a neo liberal extrinsic one. Intrinsic values can be enhanced though community participation as it supports the creation of social networks which is social capital. There are ranged of barriers to engaging with community participation. These barriers often reflect the inequalities within our wider society. Inequalities, including but not exclusively, of power and privilege, gender or ethnicity, disability and education are common within our communities. To ensure that the future does not reflect the past these barriers need to be recognized, acknowledged and addressed. The different forms of engagement common in many 'deprived' communities need to be valued equally alongside other more accepted forms of engagement. This is the way to ensure a more inclusive, egalitarian community within the environment.

However, there is an urgent need for the communities to take a decisive step towards the community participation in other to tackle the problem of sustainable development in this country. There is a need as a matter of priority for communities to implement the following recommendations.

i. Communities should ensure that community participation is encouraged as it will challenge the will of people, to bring out their various talents towards sustainable development of their communities.

ii. Effort should be made by the people of Gidan Zakara to encourage their community participate in enhancing sustainable development as the study revealed that they through payment of tax by households to meet urgent need. However, 41 respondents representing 21.9% of the population said they participate through voluntary digging of drainages, 54 respondents representing 28.9% said their community voluntary participate in renovation of community schools and class rooms, whereas 59 respondents representing 31.6% said they participate in drilling of community boreholes and repairing of bridges liking various communities.

iii. The people of Gidan Zakara should as a matter of concern should sustained the good orientation and belief system of the people, partake in more community effort to attract financial support, aids and grants, and to be consistent in making good policies so as to invite the present of NGOs and developmental experts, for when these are sustained it will boost their feelings of identity in the area which has been the motivational factors influencing their effective participation towards sustainable development.

iv. The communities should look at the various barriers hindering their community participation which include the people's belief and personal perceptions, partisan politics, inadequate financial support, lack of government, NGOs and developmental experts as they often reflect the inequalities within the society. As such these barriers need to be recognised, acknowledged and addressed as it will be the only way in ensuring sustainable development in these communities.

v. There is need for the sensitization of the vulnerable ones in the community who are mostly affected by these barriers to adopt a positive mind-set towards community participation as it will go a long way on sustainable development and as a means towards poverty reduction within the community in Gidan Zakara communities and provision of adequate financial support should be provided to the host communities.

vi. Gidan Zakara should as a matter of concern promote active and representative participation that will enable all community members to meaningfully influence the decisions that affect their lives, and also by engaging community members in learning about and understanding community issues, and the economic, social, environmental, political, psychological, and other impacts associated with alternative courses of action,

vii. The issues of partisan politics and nepotism should be discouraged from the community as it is the best way to recognise the true concept of community participation.

viii. Finally, the government should ensure bottom-up development model that will provide the critical infrastructure necessary for growth such as electricity, schools, hospitals, water treatment, job creation and cottage industries for youths and women in other to increase their participation in the community as when this is put in place, it will boost economic activities as well as lead to sustainability of the area in general.

By and large, for true development to take place in the community policy makers, practitioners and stakeholders are to design strategies that will look at the various barriers hindering community participation among which are; people's belief and personal perceptions, partisan politics, inadequate financial support, lack of government, NGOs and developmental experts, fear of exclusion, bureaucracy, gender, ethnicity etc. and these could only be achieved when the community tolerates difference, celebrates diversity, promotes equality, see need to belong, identify with each other, participates together, shared goals, avoiding loneliness by making friendship and acknowledges mutuality.

References

Amiot, C. E. & Hornsey, M. J. (2010). Collective self-esteem contingency and its role in predicting intergroup bias, *Self and Identity.* 9, 62-86.

Baumeister, R. F. & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation, *Psychological Bulletin.* 117 (3) 497 -529

Bramley, G. & Kofi-Karley, N. (2007). Homeownership, poverty and educational achievements: School effects as Neighbourhood effects, *Housing Studies.* [Online] 22 (5) 693 – 721.

Brodie, E, Cowling, E. & Nissen, N. (2009). *Understanding participation: A literature review,* Published at National Council for Voluntary Organisations.

Brodie, E., Hughes, T., Jochum, V., Miller, S., Ockenden, N. & Warburton, D. (2011). *Pathways Through Participation: What creates and sustains active citizenship.* [Online] National Council for Voluntary Organisations.

Carothers, T. (2000). *Civil society*: *Foreign policy magazine, New York.* Winter 1999 – 2000

Connors, P. & McDonald, P. (2011). Transitioning communities: Community, participation and the transition town movement, *Community Development Journal* [Online] 46 (4) 558-572.

Cornwall, A. (2008). Unpacking participation: Models, meanings and practices, C*ommunity Development Journal*, 43 (3), 269–283.

Crompton, T. & Kasser, T. (2009). *Meeting environmental challenges: The role of human identity,* [Online] World Wildlife Fund.Godalming.

DEFRA (2010). *Measuring progress: Sustainable development indicators* [Online] Available from: http://sd.defra.gov.uk/documents/SDI2010_001.pd [Accessed 28th November 2011]

Dolder, E., Vinnicombe, S., Gaughan, M. & Sealy, R (2012). *Gender diversity on boards: The appointment process and the role of executive search firms* [Online] equality and human rights commission, Research Report 85. Manchester.

Dorling, D. (2011). *Injustice: why social inequality persists,* Bristol: The Polity Press.

Easton, D. (1953). *The political system,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ennis, G. & West, D. (2012). Using social network analysis in community development practice and research: A case study, *Community Development Journal*

Gilchrist, A. (2000). The well-connected community: Networking the 'edge of chaos, *Community Development Journal.* 35 (3) 264-275.

Gilchrist, A. (2003). Community development in the UK-possibilities and paradoxes, *Community Development Journal,* UK 38 (1) 16-25.

Green, M. C. & Brock, T. C. (2005) Organisational Membership versus informal action: Contributions to skills and perceptions that build social capital, *Political Psychology.* 26 (1) 1-28.

Greene, S. (2005). Including young mothers: Community-based participation and the continuum of active citizenship, *Community Development Journal* [Online] 42(2), 167-180.

Hogg, M. & Vaughan, G. (2011). *Social psychology.* 6th edition, [e-book] Harlow, Pearson.

Hogg, M. (2012). Uncertainty-identity theory. In: Kruglanski, A, Van Lange, P, Higgins, E (eds) *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology,* 2. [E-book] London. Sage.

Kaufman, M. & Alfonso, D. (1997). *Community power and grassroots democracy,* London: Published at Zed Books.

Kneale, D. (2011). *Can localism work for older people in urban areas.* [Online] The International Longevity Centre-UK, London.

Low, N., Butt, S., Ellis, P. A., & Davis, S. J. (2007). *Helping Out: A national study of volunteering and charitable giving.* [Online] Cabinet Office. London.

Lowndes, V., Pratchett, L. & Stoker, G. (2006). *Locality matters: Making participation count in local politics,* Institute for Public Policy Research. London.

Lozano, R. (2008). Envisioning sustainability three-dimensionally, *Journal of Cleaner Production.* [Online] 16, 1838-1846.

Lynn, M. (2006). Discourses of community: Challenges for social work, *International Journal of Social Welfare.* [Online] 15 (2) 110 – 120.

Mansuri, G. & Rao, V. (2003). *Evaluating community-based and community-driven development: A critical review of the evidence,* The World Bank, Washington, D. C.

Newman, L. & Dale, A. (2005). The role of agency in sustainable local community development, *Local Environment.* [Online] 10 (5) 477-486.

Nezlek, J. B., Wesselmann, E. D., Wheeler, L., Williams, K. D. (2012). Ostracism in everyday life, *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice.* [Online] 16 (2) 91 – 104.

ODPM (2003). *Sustainable communities: building for the future*, HMSO. London.

Perlman, D. & Peplau, L. A. (1984). *Loneliness research: A survey of empirical findings. In: Peplau, L. A. & Goldston, S. (eds.) Preventing the harmful consequences of sever and persistent loneliness.* US Government Printing Office, 13 – 46.

Porritt, J. (2007). *Capitalism: As if the world matters 2nd edition*, London. Earthscan

Rai, S. (2008). *Routes and barriers to citizen governance,* New York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Transition Network (2011). *What is the transition initiative*? [Online] Available from: http://www.transitionnetwork.org/support/what-transition-initiative

Verdonschot, M. M. L., de Witte, L. P., Reichrath, E., Buntinx, W. H. E., Curfs, L. M. G. (2009). Impact of environmental factors on community participation of persons with an intellectual disability: A systematic review, *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research* 53 (1) 54-64.

Wallace, A. (2010). *Public attitudes to housing,* New York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation, Housing market taskforce.

Williams, C. (2005). A critical evaluation of hierarchical representations of community involvement: Some lessons from the UK., *Community Development Journal* [Online] 40 (1) 30-38.

Williams, S. C. (2011). Geographical variations in the nature of community engagement: A total social organisation of labour approach, *Community Development Journal.* [Online] 40(2) 213-228.

Wolfer, R., Bull, H. D., Scheithaue, H. (2012). Social interaction in youth: Insights from a social network perspective, *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice.* [Online] 16 (2) 138-147.