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ABSTRACT

Increasing population growth and rapid urbanization over the years have outpaced socio-economic infrastructures needed to give communities a minimum standard of living. Bridging the gap therefore requires the active participation of communities in social development projects. Unfortunately, previous studies have found that communities are not adequately involved in the decision-making process of projects that affect their lives, thereby raising the questions about project sustainability and the approaches to urban community development.

Urban community development approaches in developing countries and particularly in Ghana thus have been criticized as top-down development approach which results in lack of community involvement, misplaced priority and lack of community ownership of projects. As a result of these, development practitioners and researchers have advocated for bottom-up development approach with focuses on participatory approach to urban community development.

Using Ga East Municipality as a case study, a survey was conducted by administering questionnaires to 80 representatives of organized groups. In addition, the Development Planning Officer, Presiding Member and five members of the Social Service Committee were interviewed to examine the role community members play in social development projects, the extent of their participation, their perceptions on development and how community participation affect project identification and implementation.

The results of the study showed that a large proportion of the respondents participate in social development projects by helping to outline the pressing challenges facing the community,
providing the resources to help solve those challenges like labour, and also seeing themselves as part of the projects and owning them. Community development was also seen as the responsibility of the government, Assembly and community members. The crosstab analysis revealed that participation significantly affects project identification and implementation. Based on the findings, the study recommended for the Assembly to ensure high and consistency in participation by community members in development projects.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background of the Study

Over the years, numerous academic and intellectual efforts have been made to define participation but like any social concept, “participation defies any single definition or interpretation” (Oakley, 1991, p.6). Participation according to Ahwoi (2010) means adequate citizens’ involvement in and influence over local governance. Participation enhances civic consciousness and political maturity. It involves information-sharing, consultation, partnership, citizen control and many more. In this way the citizens are given the opportunity and the power to engage in discussions and to contribute to development projects that affect their lives.

Though the concept of community participation means different things to different people, it essentially entails involving the people, who would be eventually affected by decisions or projects, in contributing to the decision making process, implementing and monitoring those decisions and projects (Bonye et al., 2013). Oakley shares similar view with Ahwoi on community participation. Oakley (1995) broadly defined community participation as “a political process in which previously excluded classes or groups seek to become involved, have a voice in and generally gain access to the benefit of social and economic development” (p.3).

During the 1980s, the concept of community participation came to influence development activities such as development planning, community development, urban planning, project monitoring and evaluation etc. At the World’s Conference on Agrarian Reforms and Rural
Development (WCARRD) in 1979, people’s participation was conceptualized and this has influenced development agencies thinking till date. The Human Development Report (UNDP, 1993) also echoed the importance of people participating in their own development, remarking that people’s participation is becoming the central issue in the face of current challenges for development. As a means, the concept leads to efficiency, effectiveness and equity when community members are allowed to take part in project identification or conception, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The ultimate end of this process is that beneficiaries become empowered and self-reliant in the quest for developing themselves and the entire community (Bonye et al., 2013).

The role that participation plays in community development particularly in urban areas cannot be underestimated. In recent time, resources from most governments and donor agencies for social development projects in urban communities are limited and shrinking. Urban community development approaches adopted must therefore seek to promote active community participation, since community development approach emphasizes self-help, the democratic process, and local leadership in community revitalization (Barker, 1991). According to Smith (1998) most community development work involves the participation of the communities or beneficiaries involved. Participation is an important tool to ensuring urban community development and it involves bottom-up approach to problem solving.

In Ghana, there is considerable academic attention for greater inclusion of citizens or beneficiaries in decision-making at the local level especially with regards to community development. However, the mechanisms to ensure effective community participation are lacking, although citizens’ participation in the decision-making process has been guaranteed by various legal provisions. For instance, the 1992 Constitution spells out how the state
should engage citizens and how citizens should also be involved in the decision-making process. The National Development Planning (System) Act, 1994 (Act 480) has also made provision for citizens’ participation in the development planning process at all levels of development. The Local Government Act, 1993 (Act 462) further makes provision for citizens’ participation in the administration of their localities.

It is therefore imperative, that community members should be the target group of any development projects that affect their lives. This situation is not so in the Ga East Municipality, where community members are not involved in social development projects and development approach has been criticized by beneficiaries (community members) to be top-down approach. This lack of involvement of target beneficiaries leads to misplaced interventions, lack of community ownership of projects and contribution to development. The World Bank (1996) demonstrated the failures of the top-down approaches to development as making the provision of public goods remain low in developing nations as well as causing most projects to suffer from a lack of sustainability. According to the World Bank (1996) involving local people in planning projects can increase their commitment to the project and helps to increase the resources available for the programme. This is a process which is ongoing and needs to be kept on track to be sustainable Thomi et al., (2000).

Through field visits, community interaction and data collected from the municipality the problem of lack of community involvement in social development projects was identified. This study therefore seeks to investigate the role of participation in urban community development in the Ga East Municipality.
1.1 Statement of the Problem

Community development, particularly in urban areas, has become a critical area of concern to governments, donor agencies, Non-Governmental Organizations, development practitioners in recent times. The United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) for the past several decades have collaborated with government authorities to improve the economic, cultural and social conditions in communities by encouraging them to participate in community development projects so that they can contribute fully to the community. Anyanwu (2002) reported that for effective participation in urban community development, members of the community need to be encouraged and motivated as well as have their capacity built. This will help them identify their needs in order to acquire the necessary skills to think and undertake interventions or embark upon actions (for instance projects or programmes) that will bring improvement to their community as well as their living conditions.

The Ga-East Municipality is one of the fastest growing districts in the Greater Accra Region. The former Ga East District which was created in 2004 and elevated to a municipality status in 2008 by Legislative Instrument (LI) 1864, has seen scores of social developmental projects such as schools, health facilities (example CHPS compounds), water and sanitation among others. These projects have been undertaken to address numerous challenges due to rapid urbanization and urban sprawl. Some of these challenges include increasing urban poverty and development of slums, rapid conversion of agricultural land into residential use, poor sanitation and waste management, high housing deficit and high rent costs, traffic congestion and pollution due to low community participation.
Community participation in developmental projects in the Ga East Municipality has been reported to be very low posing significant challenges to the Ga East Municipality (Addae-Boahene, 2007). According to him, the approaches in the municipality are top-down in nature and these approaches have little involvement of community members. As a result of this development, the assembly faces significant challenges in achieving its objectives for various phases of projects such as identification, implementation and monitoring.

Several studies have been conducted to assess community involvement in community development in developing countries. Botes and Rensburg (2000), conducted a study on obstacles to community participation in a rural environment in India. Zakus and David (1998) examined community participation in health projects and challenges facing its implementation and sustainability in multicultural environment with reference to its applications in rural development projects in Toronto, Canada. In Ghana, studies have been conducted on community participation in urban and rural community development projects in rural settings in Accra and Kumasi (Addae-Boahene, 2007; Mordzeh-Ekpampo, 2010; Takyi et al., 2014).

The above is an indication that many researches have focused on community participation in the rural and urban environment. Little is therefore known about the extent and challenges of community participation in community development within peri-urban setting, thus creating a gap for investigation. The study therefore seeks to examine the role of participation in urban community development in the Ga East Municipality.

1.2 Research Questions

The study sought to find answers to the following questions;
1. What role can community members play in social development projects?
2. To what extent are community members involved by planning authorities in social development projects?
3. What are the perceptions of community members regarding development?
4. How does community participation affect project identification and implementation?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The overall objective of the study was to determine how community members are involved in the development of their municipality. The specific objectives of the study were:

1. To examine the role community members can play in social development projects.
2. To assess the extent to which community members are involved by planning authorities in social development projects.
3. To examine perceptions of community members regarding development.
4. To examine how community participation affect project identification and implementation.

1.4 Justification for the Study

The research is expected to add and provide new knowledge to enable the planning authorities, the Assembly and other relevant authorities to gain better understanding of participation in urban community development. The research is significant because participation has now become a prerequisite for ensuring full representation of community members in decisions and projects that affect their lives. Furthermore, the research is expected to provide an opportunity for a more informed, evidence-based planning, decision-making in urban community development. The research moreover examined how local
knowledge about development can be used to promote urban development in the Ga East Municipality.

1.5 Organization of the Study

The research study was organized and presented in five chapters. Chapter One was the introduction to the study. It provides background to the study and the problem statement. It further outlines the research questions the study sought to answer and the objectives to be achieved from undertaking the research, and the justification for undertaking the research. Chapter Two presents some relevant and available literature related to the study, out of which a conceptual framework was developed and presented. Chapter Three deals with the methodology used in the study. It looks at the research design, variables of the study, the sample population and sample size determination and selection, and the method of data analysis used. Detailed information on the study area was also presented. Chapter Four provides an analysis and discussion of the findings of the study. Chapter Five is the final Chapter. It presents the research findings, conclusions and recommendations regarding the findings and other issues addressed in the study.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This section reviews some of the scholarly works that have been conducted in the area of participation of people in socio-economic development. The section begins with a quick look at the origin of the concept of participation in development discourse as well as some of the theories that have emerged to explain the various levels of participation. It narrows down to assessing some of the relevant factors that influence participation. The benefits and obstacles to people’s participation are discussed in this section. The section finally looks at community development with emphasis on urban community development and a conceptual framework on participation.

2.1 Origin of the Concept of Participation in National Development Discourse

The term "participation or community participation" is a social concept on which there is considerable disagreement among development scholars and practitioners. According to Guimaraes (2009), there are different definitions and types of participation applied in different projects. However, Oakley, (1995) defined community participation as “a political process in which previously excluded classes or groups seek to become involved, have a voice in and generally gain access to the benefit of social and economic development” (p.3). In addition, the World Bank (1994) defines participation as a process through which stakeholders influence and share control over development initiatives and the decisions and resources which affect them. Participation has become an essential prerequisite for community development as well as good governance. In the past, adequate community
participation in Sub-Saharan Africa has largely been neglected, but is gradually being strengthened and becoming more common (Spaling, 2003).

Participatory approaches to development fundamentally involve a painful process of change and calls for a change of attitudes and structures which were treasured and cherished by those in power (Mulwa, 2008, p.14). Participatory approach has gained popularity in community development in recent time. The Integrated Rural Development (IRD) approach is seen as a way to improve community development and it adopts the concept of participation. It is believed that integration enhanced public commitment to development projects.

According to Nici and Wright (1997), the participatory approach to development was as a result of the recognition that most development failures originated in attempts to impose standard top-down programmes and projects on diverse local realities where they do not fit or meet the needs of the local people. Mulwa (2008) further noted that the use of the top-down approach in developing countries made projects very unsustainable because of the lack of ownership. Ghana embraced decentralization in order to make its public sector more efficient, accountable and responsive to the local needs of her citizens (Ayee, 2003).

Due to the failure of the top-down approach, the bottom up approach, which empowers the local people, was adopted in the planning and implementation of development projects. This approach became the main development approach in the 1980’s.

Stakeholders such as opinion leaders, beneficiaries, women local leaders, the general community etc. all has a stake in whatever is invested in the locality. It was seen that the previous development approach that excluded community members was responsible for the
slow economic growth despite increased foreign aid which did not offer any solution to the deepening poverty within developing countries (Mulwa, 2004). This was because local participation had been completely excluded and hence they did not invest their thinking in projects being put up (Barasa and Jelagat, 2013). Participation of community members in local projects therefore, has the potential to influence, challenge and change local economy for the benefit of all.

2.2 Theories of Participation

Various theories have been propounded whilst others have been adopted from other disciplines to explain the nature of participation that exists in our societies. Two of such prominent theories which are very significant to the nature of participation are Arnstein (1969) ladder of participation and International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) Spectrum of Public Participation.

2.2.1 Arnstein’s Ladder of Participation

Theoretical work on community participation was by Arnstein (1969). She recognised eight levels of participation which are manipulation, therapy, informing, consultation, placation, partnership, delegated power and finally citizen control.

The bottom rungs of Arnstein’s ladder of participation (manipulation and therapy) are described as non-participation, with the proponent merely persuading the public or beneficiaries to accept a proposed action. The middle rungs (informing, consultation and placation) are described as degrees of tokenism where the process allows the have-nots to hear and to have a voice and it involves a great deal of “information” with limited or no opportunity for the public to express concerns or influence the decision-making process. The
goal at the middle rung is simply to fulfill legal requirements, rather than committing to meaningful public engagement in the decision making process. Partnership, delegated power, and citizen control which are at the top rungs allow for an increasing amount of public power over decision-making process. At this level, according to Arnstein (1969), the public and planning agencies are considered equal partners and jointly determine solutions to identified problems. Arnstein (1969) further noted that for participation to be meaningful there must be to some extent a redistribution of power to the marginalized sectors of society. Such participation will help promote urban community development and ensure community ownership and contribution to projects as well as development that address the needs of local people. Figure 2.1 depicts Arnstein’s ladder of participation.

Figure 2.1: Arnstein’s Ladder of Participation

Source: Arnstein (1969, p.217)
2.2.2 IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation (IAP2, 2007)

Arnstein’s ladder of participation as discussed above was used as the basis to develop the spectrum of public participation by the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2). The International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) collapsed some of Arnstein’s original rungs to form a spectrum with 5 rungs. Within the IAP2 model, the lowest rung is ‘inform’ and this relates with Arnstein’s third rung and its goal is to inform the public in a neutral manner on policy, problems, and possible solutions. In both Arnstein and IAP2 model, ‘consultation’ remains with the goal to obtain public feedback. But Arnstein’s 5th rung which talks about ‘placation’ corresponds with ‘involve’ in the IAP2 model. The goal at this stage is to work with the public throughout the entire policy process. Furthermore Arnstein’s 7th rung which talks about ‘delegated power’ corresponds with ‘collaborate’ in the IAP2 model with the goal to partner with the public in each aspect of the process of designing policy. Finally, Arnstein’s ‘citizen power’ and the IAP2 5th rung which talks about ‘empower’ relatively mean the same and the goal at this stage is to place final decision-making in the hands of citizens.

In all, the five categories of engagement contain a commitment to those who are involved in the process and for the purpose of this research work, the IAP2 model is adapted. Each levels of engagement within the IAP2 spectrum are appropriate in particular situations to achieve particular outcomes and careful consideration of the levels of engagement are needed to promote community development. The IAP2 spectrum of public participation is illustrated in Figure 2.2.
2.3 Benefits of People’s Participation

The benefits of participation in community development are enormous. Generally, literature shows that participation allows people to build their capacities, and identify with the project (Barasa and Jelagat, 2013). Participation becomes an essential ingredient of good governance and development and the consensus among major stakeholders is that people everywhere have a basic human right to take part in decisions that affect their lives (Ayee, 2000; Adams, 2003; Cheema, 2005). When this occurs it leads to efficiency and sustainability. According to Majale (2008), enough evidence exists which shows the benefits of participation for sustainable development, if implemented well and maintained. Kumar (2002) identified a number of factors which he considers as benefits that come with participation of people in development projects. Firstly, participation ensures efficient utilization of resources as people work together towards achieving a particular objective that concerns their own lives. Secondly, participation increases effectiveness. It further reduces dependency and increases self-reliance. People would not always depend on the government to solve all their problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Participation Goal</th>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Involve</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Empower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.</td>
<td>To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.</td>
<td>To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.</td>
<td>To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.</td>
<td>To place final decision-making in the hands of the public.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
but would take appropriate initiative to address their problem. Moreover, participation helps ensure the flow of the benefits to the beneficiaries. Finally, the cost-effective operations can ensure that resources are available for wider coverage of weaker sections of society.

According to Dasgupta (1990), people’s participation has a great correlation with the success of national economic and social development programmes and projects. Invariably, participation of community members is expected to tap local knowledge, skills and practices that are cardinal to the socio-economic development of the community in which they live. Aside Kumar (2002), benefits of people’s participation in development projects, Oakley (1995) also outlined six benefits of people’s participation in national development: efficiency, effectiveness, self-reliance, coverage, sustainability, and capacity to exercise own abilities. In general, Oakley (1995) opined that participation of people in development enables them to assume more positive attitudes, learn and develop new skills and take on more responsibility for development initiatives. Thus, participation has the tendency of increasing people’s sense of control over issues that affect their lives, helps them to learn how to plan and implement strategies aimed at solving them (Samah and Aref, 2009).

Participation in urban community development is therefore to strengthen community capacity to identify problems and formulate plans or come out with interventions, as well as monitor and evaluate projects. It also helps to measure and analyze impacts of development interventions: projects and programmes and results and give feedback to the stakeholders and the community.
2.4 Determinants of People’s Participation

Over the years, extensive efforts have been made to enhance citizen participation by way of cultivating community social capital and community spirit through neighbourhood design (Zhu, 2015). The rational is to ensure people’s collective participation for community development.

In recent times, policies and programmes of governments, particularly in the Global South, have recognized the importance of people’s participation. Oakley (1995) believes that there are several reasons for this progress. Firstly, in many countries, democratic pressures resulting in internal political change have led to calls for greater participation. Secondly, continual economic difficulties have convinced many countries, particularly Africa, of the need to bring about more effective popular participation as a means of mobilizing resources for community’s development. Thirdly, governments have come to accept that the effective management of a country’s natural resource base requires the active participation of the people, if these resources are not to be uncontrollably exploited and degraded.

Whilst there are series of factors such as gender, culture, structural obstacle and many others that can impede the effectiveness of people’s participation in development discourses, there are also factors which can facilitate the process. Oakley (1995) grouped these factors into structural, social, organizational and operational. According to him, structural factors are political support and bureaucratic decentralization; social factors concerns traditions of community organization and mobilization; organizational factors revolve around the appropriateness of the objectives of those organizations involve and the availability of competent managers and leaders; and operational factors are the existence of project procedures to promote participation and local institutional co-operation. Oakley (1995)
believes that the ability of authorities to recognise and give attention and adherence to these factors in a participatory project design and implementation manner can greatly facilitate people’s participation. Evidence from other studies have shown that the determinants of participation can broadly be grouped into three namely neighbourhood social context, neighbourhood physical context and the socio-demographic characteristics of the community members (Zhu, 2015).

With respect to the neighbourhood social context, community participation depends to a large extent on a social environment where the local population shares a willingness to contribute to community development through acceptable form of social norms of informal social control (Zhu, 2015).

Moreover in terms of neighbourhood physical context, neighbourhood communal space has been identified in many studies as a potential for building social solidarity and collective spirit among residents and encouraging participation in community affairs (Perkins et al, 1996; Parisi et al, 2002; Manzo & Perkins, 2006; Curley, 2010).

Finally, with regard to Socio-demographic factors, there are varied socio-economic factors that influence people degree of participation in the planning and implementation of development projects that affect their own lives. For example existing literature suggests that people with more human capital (e.g., education) and economic resource (e.g., income and occupation) are more likely to be involved in organized community activities (Parisi et al, 2002).
2.5 Obstacles to People’s Participation

Participation does not take place in a vacuum but in a socio-political context. The obstacles to participation have been researched and this is used by development practitioners who are working with communities to increase participation. Kumar (2002) identified three major obstacles to people’s participation in project management. Structural obstacles were largely responsible for the differences in rural communities and formed part of the centralized political systems, which are not oriented towards people’s participation. This type of situation is typified by a “top-down” development approach adopted by development initiatives like the Integrated Rural Development Programmes.

However, local initiatives when taken at all were quite dismal and did not reflect the true self. Furthermore, the administrative structures that are control-oriented provide little significant space to local people to make their own decisions or control their resources. On the other hand, the social obstacles such as the mentality of dependency, the culture of silence, domination of the local elite or gender inequality militate against people’s participation (Kumar, 2002). The implications of these lead to failures in people’s participation which affect community development.

In Ghana like other developing countries, studies have further shown that local government officials usually feel threatened by the empowerment of local people, and usually accuse the local people of being agents of political parties and thus, hinder full commitment and participation of the local people (Wilcox, 2002; Addae-Boahene, 2007). Baku and Agyeman (2002) are of the view that the main problem inhibiting community participation in Ghana are wrong timing of meetings, responsibilities assigned to the communities by government being beyond the capability of the communities, failure on the part of authorities to share
information and finally, general lukewarm attitude of the local people arising from loss of interest towards participating in the planning process.

Kumar and Corbridge (2002) observed that the perception that local people lack sufficient knowledge and skills to take control of projects is a major challenge affecting local people’s involvement and participation in development. In addition to the obstacles identified by Kumar (2002), other obstacles include fear of exclusion, gender, power and privilege and many more. With exclusion, most people fear that they will not be accepted by a group in a development process or meetings that have great impact on their lives and this fear of exclusion can stop them from participating in development. According to Nezlek et al (2012), 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. Gender, is also another obstacle to community participation in that women are often marginalized when it comes to community participation. 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).

One of the main reasons for the minimal participation of women in politics in general and grass root participation in particular has been the assumption that women are subordinate to men as a consequence of social and institutional discrimination (Bekele, 2000). In the 1980s, the Gender and Development (GAD) approach arose out of the critique of Women in Development (WID) which constructed the problem of development as being women’s exclusion from a benign process. The approach recognized that gender roles and relations remain key to improving women’s lives, with the term ‘gender’ suggesting focus on both women and men. This promotes gender equity and enhances community development.
According to Nzomo (1994), women’s equal participation in political life is pivotal to social development. The World Bank (2005) also indicated that gender inequality disadvantages women throughout their lives and stifles the development prospects of their societies. The World Bank further states that illiterate and poorly educated mothers are less able to care for their children, and low education levels and responsibilities for household work prevent women from finding productive employment and limit their participation in public decision-making. The National Council on Women and Development (NCWD) (1998) observed in a survey conducted in Ghana that women were marginalized and remained the minority in politics. In this regard, development will not address issues that affect the lives of women. This needs to be addressed to enable equal participation by the whole community members irrespective of gender in any development process.

Power and privilege are also obstacles to participation. In every community, all groups have unequal distributions of power, where some people are leaders and others followers, even friendship groups experience this (Hogg and Vaughan, 2011). The leader often influences the decision-making process in his personal interest and this affects community development.

2.6 Community Development

Community development is a difficult, time-consuming as well as costly process. Local people are often more concerned with their daily lives than having to think about their communities and coming up with interventions to address community problems. However, residents crave for community development in a form of better social service such as quality schools, health services, housing, safe and clean environment. But without effective community participation, communities may have limited ability to make decisions about issues that affect their lives in the community. Sharma (2000) views community development
as a process by which effort of the people at grass root level is united with those of the government. The United Nations Economic, and Social Council (ECOSOC) also defines community development as the process by which the efforts of the people themselves are united with those of government authorities to improve the economic, cultural and social conditions in the communities in order to integrate these communities into the life of the nation and enable them to contribute fully to progress.

Community development is thus a process where community members come together to take collective action to address problems to transform society. According to Theron (2005), Community development focuses on the method whereby desired change could be brought about in the communities. Community development involves interaction between people and joint action to bring about change, and improvement. Development should therefore be considered as a process that promotes the involvement of local people in community development.

2.6.1 Approaches for Urban Development

Moser (1983) argues that by the end of the 1960s, bottom-up community participation initiatives started to surface along with top-down participation programmes in the form of squatter settlements around the world. The bottom-up approach came about due to the failure and criticisms of the top-down approach. According to Reddy (2002), in the top-down model of participation, the governments decide and provide for the communities which develop a sense of dependency and lethargy among the people. He therefore proposed the top-down and partnership model as shown in Figure 2.3 and Figure 2.4
Figure 2.3: Top-down Model
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Source: Reddy, 2002

Figure 2.4: Partnership Model
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Source: Reddy, 2002
From Reddy (2002) models, it is evident that community participation can be used as an important tool to promote urban community development. It is therefore important that participation be used as a tool for achieving development that addresses the needs of community members and ensure community ownership of projects.

2.7 Conceptual Framework

The study’s conceptual framework as illustrated in Figure 2.5 is based on review of literature and theories in this chapter. The study conceptualizes that certain factors such as socio-economic characteristics of the people in the community, will affect the level of participation of the local people. The socio-economic factors such as education, occupation, marital status, age and gender, are important factors that affect community participation. The educational status of community members affects participation in community development projects. People with higher education have some awareness about the significance and benefits of participation in community projects and thus participate more than those who are not. With respect to gender, men are more likely to participate than women due to the assumption that women are subordinate to men. Donald (1986) observed that for the most of human history, governance which is a political factor is seen as naturally for male, property has been seen as naturally male, ownership of anything including community projects has been seen as naturally male. Where this practice exists, women are ignored and ownership of community projects is left to men. Religion can be considered as an important part of our social structure which enabled human beings to live together in an orderly manner. Ken (1995), borrowing the work of Weber, established that protestants are more likely to participate in the worldly work compared to Catholics. He indicated that protestants tended to have only one avenue of action to combat anxiety and loneliness, and therefore throw themselves into the world of work. Hence, majority of people affiliated to Protestantism, are more likely to participate freely in any community
work as compared to those affiliated to Catholic. The occupations of community members also influence participation in community development projects. People with much time, such as the unemployed and perhaps the recently retired show more than average participation rates in voluntary work than those employed (David, 1992). With respect to marital status, people who are married and have children show lower than average participation rates in community development projects than those that are not (David, 1992).

Additionally, political factors such as the institution in charge of the project, municipality and the association or group people belong will determine whether or not community members will be made to participate in social development projects. Cultural factors also affect community participation particularly with respect to gender. The level of interaction by community members in development processes and structures prevalent in a community may largely be influenced by their culture. These factors (socio-economic, political and cultural) are the independent variables that influence community participation which is the dependent variable as well as determine who can participate and who cannot. The outcome will therefore lead to community development. Arnstein (1969) considered participation as the force behind democracy. She explained that that force ensures an equal participation of the haves and the have-nots to join in determining how information is shared, goals and policies are set, tax resources are allocated, programs are operated, and benefits like contracts and patronage are parceled out. Participation therefore opens the door for all stakeholders such as opinion leaders, beneficiaries, women local leaders and the general local community to have a stake in whatever is invested in the locality (Mulwa, 2004).

As noted earlier by Arnstein (1969) and the IAP2 (2007) spectrum, there are various stages of participation. Where the people are only to serve as spectators, just to hear of the project and
not involved in the implementation of the project in this instance, participation is more likely to be low as compared to where people are actively involved in social development projects.

These three factors (cultural factors, political factors and socio-economic factors) are therefore expected to determine the level of participation of community members, which will also affect community development. It must be noted that when community members are involved in social development projects, they feel part of the project and contribute to the project. Figure 2.5 illustrates the conceptual framework of the study.
Figure 2.5: Conceptual Framework on Participation
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CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter looks at the methodology of the study which helps one to understand and appreciate the role of participation in urban community development in the Ga-East Municipality. The first section of this chapter focuses on the research methodology which touches on the research design, the study population, the sampling techniques, sample size, the sources of data and the analytical processes. The second part of the chapter looks at the overview of the study area, Ga-East Municipality and presents some of the characteristics of the municipality. Understanding the nature and characteristics of the municipality, especially the developmental constraints facing them such as education, health, sanitation etc. is key to appreciating the role of participation in urban community development.

3.1 Research Design

Burns and Grove (2003) define a research design as “a blueprint for conducting a study with maximum control over factors that may interfere with the validity of the findings” (p. 195). Parahoo (1997) also describes a research design as “a plan that describes how, when and where data are to be collected and analyzed” (p.142). A Case study design was employed using both quantitative and qualitative research approach. In order to select the participants for the study, the various groups in the municipality were put into 8 clusters which are known to be organized groups in the municipality using cluster sampling techniques namely; Women Association, Landlords/Landowners, Trade Associations, Professional Associations Groups such as tailors, hairdressers, Drivers Union, Youth Groups, Person with Disability Groups and Residents Associations. Ten respondents each was then randomly selected using a
systematic random sampling approach from each cluster. This was done by writing odd and even numbers on papers and placing it into a box and asked all participants to pick; those that pick even numbers from 2 to 20 were selected to represent each. Total of 80 respondents were therefore used for the study. Qualitatively, officials of the municipality (Development Planning Officer and the Presiding Member) were engaged in an in-depth interview with the help of an interview guide to examine the processes by which the Assembly engaged the people in social development projects. In addition, five Assembly Members out of eight on the Social Services Sub Committee were also engaged in in-depth interviews due to the role their Committee plays in ensuring improvements in the social well-being of community members. This category of people was selected because they are key informant and can give relevant information concerning community participation in developmental projects in the study area.

The reason for employing these two methodologies is that the survey alone was insufficient in capturing all the necessary information needed to adequately answer the research questions that the study sought to provide answers to. As a result both questionnaires and interviews were used to gather information needed for the research.

3.2 Study Population

According to the Development Planning Officer, the Assembly invites recognised and organised groups or associations in the municipality. They include the following: traditional authorities, residents’ associations, women groups, trade associations, persons with disability and marginalized groups, landlords/land owners, self-employed artisans/professional association groups, faith based organizations, drivers’ associations/unions, youth groups, civil
society organizations, media, and representatives from Ghana National Association of Teachers (GNAT).

Aside the groups, officials of the Assembly also play a major role in social development projects. The Development Planning Officer, the Presiding Member, and the Assembly members on the Social Services Sub Committee all play important role in community development. Therefore, the organized groups within the municipality, officials of the Assembly (Development Planning Officer and the Presiding Member) as well as Assembly members on the Social Service Sub Committee constituted the population of the study. It was from these broad categories (groups, officials and assembly members) that respondents were sampled.

3.3 Source of Data

The study made use of data from both primary and secondary sources. The primary data were gathered from the field from respondents through a survey using structured questionnaire. The in-depth interview with officials of the Assembly and the Assembly members using interview guide also provided primary data for analysis.

The researcher was also interested in finding out the number of people the Assembly had involved over the years in some of the major social development projects they have undertaken as well as the extent of engagement. Thus, secondary data on the number of community members involved in major development projects and the stage of such engagement were gathered from the Development Planning Officer. This helped in establishing the facts as to whether they actually involve the community members or not.
3.4 Sampling and Sample Size

The Municipality is a peri-urban area with a total of 20 communities comprising of 12 urban communities and 8 rural communities. Majority of the organized groups involved in decision making are mainly located in the urban area. In addition, since the study looked at participation in urban community development, the research was conducted in the urban communities within the municipality.

As noted earlier, the Assembly invites 13 categories of organized groups/associations (details of which are presented under section 3.2 of this chapter) to participate in community development projects. Out of the 13 groups/associations, eight (8) of them were randomly selected because those groups were organized groups that were involved in several social developmental projects in the municipality. This was done by writing all the names of the 13 groups/associations, and the researcher randomly picked the eight groups/associations. The names of the eight groups/associations that were sampled included: Women Associations, Landlords/Landowners, Traders’ Association, Professional Association Groups (tailors, hairdressers), Drivers’ Unions (GPRTU, Protoa, taxi drivers etc.), Youth Groups, Persons with Disabled and Marginalized Groups, as well as Residents’ Associations.

The total number of 805 groups/associations was in the urban areas. Since it was practically impossible to administer questionnaires to all the 805 groups/associations, given the time constraint, the researcher decided to sample 80 of the groups/associations. Each group had more than 10 associations. Since the focus of this study is on participation in urban community development, ten associations were randomly selected from each of the eight groups. Like the selection of the groups, a number was used to represent each association and
ten respondents were randomly picked from each of the 8 groups, making a total of 80. A distribution of the sampling is shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Distribution of Respondents in their Various Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women Associations</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlords/Land ladies/land owners</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traders Association</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Association Groups (Tailors, Hairdressers)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers Unions (GPRTU, Protoa, Taxi drivers)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Groups</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disability and Marginalised Groups</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents Association</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two officers of the Assembly were purposively selected due to the essential roles they play in community developments for key informant interviews. These officers were the Development Planning Officer and the Presiding Member of the general assembly. In addition, five assembly members out of eight on the social service committee were also interviewed due to the role the committee plays in ensuring improvements in the social well-being of community members. These five members were those whose electoral areas fell within the urban areas. The remaining three had their electoral areas in rural areas. The total number of respondents who were engaged in the in-depth interviews was seven aside the 80 respondents.
3.5 Data Collection Methods and Procedure

Two major data collection techniques used in this study were survey and in-depth interview. For the survey, the Development Planning Officer provided the contact information of all the 80 groups. The representatives of each group were called and a meeting was arranged at their convenience. This therefore prolonged the period for the data collection. Some of them, who were workers and had busy schedules preferred to fill the questionnaire at their convenience. Such persons were later contacted and the questionnaire was retrieved. All the others were personally interviewed by the researcher.

Concerning the in-depth interview, an interview schedule was arranged with each of the officials at their own convenience. At the scheduled date, the researcher engaged them one-on-one and took notes as the interview went on (See Appendices A, B and C for instruments used).

3.6 Data Processing and Analysis

The data from the survey was first of all edited, coded and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS 16.0) software. The findings from the survey were presented using descriptive statistical tools such as cross tabulations, tables and graphs. For the qualitative data, a content analysis method was used in the presentation of the findings. The content analysis method which is also known as thematic analysis enables the researcher to directly quote the statements of key informants under relevant theme.

3.7 Ethical Considerations

The researcher took appropriate steps to make sure that no respondent in the study felt uncomfortable, pressured or feared to give any relevant information thinking his/her identity
may later be revealed. Data collected was treated purely as confidential. An introductory letter from Institute of Statistical Social and Economic Research (ISSER) was first given to the Municipal Chief Executive Officer of GEMA to seek for permission to conduct the study in the Municipality. After permission was given, copies of the letter were shown to the officials in the Assembly, the assembly members as well as the leaders of the organized groups who were interviewed.

After they have given their permission, they were informed about the purpose of the research. It was made known to them that the research was solely for academic purpose and there were no known risks involved in their participation.

Voluntary participation was another ethical issue that was adhered to by the researcher. Participants were not forced to participate in the research. They were made aware of their voluntary participation in the research by allowing the researcher a convenient time to interview them.

As stated earlier, another important ethical issue that was considered was confidentiality. Participants were assured that their information will not be disclosed to anyone.

3.8 Profile of the Study Area

This section looks at the background of the study area with respect to the location and size, population growth, climate and vegetation, education, health and many other characteristics of the Ga East Municipality.
3.8. 1 Location and Size

The Ga East Municipality is located at the northern part of Greater Accra Region. It is one of the Sixteen (16) Districts in the Greater Accra Region and covers a land area of about 85.7 square kilometres. The capital of the municipality is Abokobi. It shares boundaries with the Ga West Municipality to the west, the La - Nkwantanang Municipality to the east, Accra metropolis to the south and the Akwapim South District to the north. The Municipality is subdivided into two administrative areas, namely the Abokobi Zonal Council and the Dome Zonal Council (GEMA-MTP, 2014). Figure 3.1 shows the map of the Ga East Municipality.
Figure 3.1: Map of Ga East Municipality

Source: Ga East Municipal Assembly, 2014
3.8.2 Population Growth

The 2010 National Population and Housing Census put the Municipality’s population at 259,668 comprising of 127,258 males and 132,410 females. It has a population of 252,914 with 66,286 households and a household size 3.8. The growth of the population is mainly due to the influence of migration inflows. The communities in the municipality include Dome, Taifa, Agbogba, Ashongman, New Ashongman, Haatso, Kwabenya, Ashongman, Atomic Energy, Papao, Boi, Abokobi, Parakua Estate, Kissieman, Akpormang, Abladjei, Sesemi, Ajako, Ayimensah and Adenkrebi (GSS, 2013). The population is concentrated mainly along the urban and peri-urban areas of the municipality particularly along the border with AMA. These include Dome, Taifa and Haatso just to mention a few among others. (GEMA-MTP, 2014)

3.8.3 Rural-Urban Population

The urban/peri-urban population constitutes 87.5 percent (227,172) of the municipality’s total population with the remaining 12.5 percent (32,496) residing in the rural portion towards the Akwapim Hills. The municipality can therefore be described as urban. Indeed the level of urbanization is above the national average of 43.4 percent. The municipality’s large towns include Haatso, Dome, Taifa and Kwabenya. The other small towns in the Municipality are linked to the trunk road via feeder roads. Dome is the largest and the highest ranked community with most basic facilities and services. It functions as a commercial centre because of its threshold population that can support almost all economic activities. The second largest settlements include Taifa, Haatso and Abokobi the district capital. The third largest settlements include Papao, Kweiman, Boi and New Ashongman and Musuko. It is worth noting that even though New Ashongman is a peri-urban area, the community lacks most facilities. It is however important to note that the urban population resides in about 65
percent of the total land area of the municipality. This indicates a densely populated urban area with its associated pressure on social infrastructure and land. Land litigation, encroachment on the few open spaces; overcrowding and construction of illegal structures are some of the development challenges the Assembly has to manage. There are also pockets of slums that are fast developing in Taifa, Kwabenya, Dome and Haatso. (GEMA-MTP, 2014)

### 3.8.4 Climate and Vegetation

The municipality falls in the savannah agro-ecological zone. Rainfall pattern is bi-modal with the average annual temperature ranging between 25.1°C in August and 28.4°C in February and March. February and March are normally the hottest months. The municipality has two main vegetation namely shrub lands and grassland. The shrub lands occur mostly in the western outskirts and in the north towards the Aburi hills and consist of dense cluster of small trees and shrubs that grow to an average height of about five metres. The grassland which occurred to the southern parts of the district has now been encroached upon by human activities including settlements. (GEMA-MTP, 2014)

### 3.8.5 Education

The distribution of schools in the municipality is quite even. There are six (6) privately-owned Senior High Schools, which include Perfect Senior High School, The Masters School and Maxvic School, Dard Senior High School, Oxbert Senior High School and Christ International Senior High School (GEMA-MTP, 2014). The municipality, however, is yet to have a public Senior High School of its own. There are 31 public Basic Schools made up of Kindergarten, Primary and Junior High Schools and 109 private schools that are sited mainly in the peri-urban areas of the municipality (GEMA-MTP, 2014). Most of the schools lack libraries, ICT resource centres and recreational grounds. It is home to the University of Allied
Science that has trained many high and low level manpower management human resource needs of the municipality. It is also home to the Ghana Atomic Energy School and Research, which has done a lot of research into energy. From the Early Childhood to the Senior High School (SHS) level, the private sector owned more than two third of the schools. (GEMA-MTP, 2014)

Not surprising though, pupils in private schools have relatively better infrastructure than their public school counterparts in the municipality. The problems of inadequate and poor quality infrastructure in the public schools can be found throughout the municipality. It is also important to state that most of the school lands are also being encroached upon. Reclamation of these lands will have to be undertaken to ensure that land is available for future expansion projects.

3.8.6 Health
Malaria continues to be a major public health issue. It accounted for 25 percent of Out-Patient Department (OPD) attendance in 2013 (GEMA-MTP, 2014). Lifestyle diseases (hypertension and diabetes mellitus) are posing a challenge to the health service delivery. For three years in succession, hypertension has occupied the 3rd position. Weekly specialized clinics are organized at Madina Polyclinic for these lifestyle diseases. Regular health walks and screening of the community members have been adopted to ‘Catch them early’ and managed appropriately.

The position of diarrheal diseases has not changed. An outbreak of cholera in the region trickled down to the municipality. In 2013, three of the cases that were reported at Achimota Hospital in a neighbouring district hailed from Kwabenya, and Haatso (GEMA-MTP, 2014).
3.8.7 Sanitation

On the issue of sanitation in the municipality, a number of people have access to some type of sanitation facilities either public or private. Others also resort to indiscriminate defecation in gutters, school compound and public refuse dumps. Total sanitation coverage is estimated at 31 percent for household facilities and 29 percent for institutions. The types of facilities in use include WC toilets, KVIPs, Household VIPs and public KVIPs. Pit latrine even though not approved by the Assembly is being used by some households even in the urban communities (GEMA-MTP, 2014).

3.8.8 Waste Management

The rate of waste generation and management in the municipality is a matter of concern to the Assembly. With the increasing influx of people and the rapid urbanization, huge amounts of human and industrial waste are generated at an alarming rate. It is estimated that about 750 tonnes of solid waste is generated monthly out of which 490 tonnes are collected which represents 63 percent. This leaves a substantial amount of backlog that creates various kinds of inconveniences including health hazard to people in the municipality. Out of the 490 tonnes collected the private sector collects about 81 percent through door-to-door collection (GEMA-MTP, 2014).

Apart from the door-to-door collection, waste is collected in containers placed at vantage points by the Assembly. The situation is compounded by the inadequate machinery and equipment by the Assembly and the private collectors. Furthermore, the absence of proper engineered final disposal site is a major constraint. In addition, solid waste is brought from neighbouring municipalities that is the Adenta Municipality, Accra Metropolis and Ga West Municipality to the crude dumping site at Abloradjei. The constant burning of the waste at the
dumping site is creating serious air pollution and threatening the life of people in the surrounding communities (GEMA-MTP, 2014).
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter covers analysis of data collected from the field from different stakeholder groups in the chain of participation in the Ga East Municipality. The main objective of the study is to determine how community members are involved in the development of their municipality. The researcher in an attempt to collect data relevant to the study administered eighty (80) questionnaires which were filled, complete and returned. Additionally, the study was conducted using two institutional respondents (Development Planning Officer and Presiding Member) and 5 assembly members on the Social Service Committee at the Ga East Municipal Assembly. As a result, data analysis was based on their responses and data presented in the chapter were processed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 16.0)

4.1 Socio-economic Characteristics

This section presents the socio-economic data of the respondents that were interviewed. The socio-economic data of the local community members was based on their gender, age, level of education, their occupation, religion, marital status and length of stay in the community. Table 4.1 provides the details of these.
Table 4.1: Socio-economic Characteristics of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency N= 80</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25yrs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35yrs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45yrs</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55yrs</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moslem</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Stay in the Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10yrs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20yrs</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30yrs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 30yrs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2015

The descriptive analysis of the sex of the respondents’ showed that three out of every five respondents were males. Thus 49 of the respondents representing sixty one percent (61%) were males. Cumulatively, 16 percent of the respondents were youth. This is supportive of
the analytical report’s findings of Ga East Municipality that the population is not youthful (GSS, 2014). The data collected showed that community members were adult and hence energetic and could positively be involved in community development.

Similarly, as part of the social appraisal, the educational levels of the respondents were sought as it plays a significant role in understanding issues relating to participation in urban community development. Majority of respondents representing 94 percent were literate and six percent of the respondents were non-literate. Thus the study revealed that six percent of the respondents had had no formal education, 50 percent had basic education, 32.5 percent had secondary education, and 11.3 percent had tertiary at the time the interview was conducted. The data showed that a large proportion of the population can read and write in English which could enhance effective participation in community development. In terms of occupation, a little over half of the respondents, representing 65 percent were employed whilst 35 percent of respondents were unemployed. The data thus showed that majority of the community members were employed in Ga East Municipality.

When the respondents were further asked the number of years that they have been living in their respective communities in the Ga East Municipality, 53.8 percent of the respondents had lived in the community between 11-20 years, 22.5 percent had lived for a period between 1-10 years, 15 percent had lived between 21-30 years and the remaining 8.7 percent had lived for a period above 30 years at the time of the interview. The data therefore showed that respondents have stayed long in their communities and could have better knowledge about their communities. Additionally, majority of the respondents representing 95 percent were Christians whilst 5 percent were Muslims. The data therefore showed that Christianity remains the most dominant form of religion for the people in the municipality and can easily
be mobilised for effective participation. Concerning marital status, 43.8 percent of the respondents were married, 25 percent were single, 18.7 percent were widowed whilst 12.5 percent were separated at the time of the interview.

**4.2 Assessment of Community Infrastructure**

Infrastructure that is required for community development may be facilitated through a planned process. As part of the study, respondents were asked to provide an assessment of community infrastructure in terms of the availability and the condition since 2008. The infrastructures that were assessed included basic schools, hospitals/clinics/CHPS compound, post office, water and sanitation.

The results from the analysis showed that as high as 84 percent of the respondents noted that their communities had basic schools but regarding their conditions, 61 percent indicated that there had not been any change in the condition of the basic schools since 2008. Whereas 23 percent had seen an improvement in the condition of the basic schools, 16 percent indicated that the condition had worsened. Table 4.2 provides respondents’ view on community infrastructure.
Table 4.2: Respondents’ Assessment of Availability and Condition of Community Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community infrastructure</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N= 80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>Has Improved</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>Has worsened</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stayed the Same</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital/Clincs/CHPS compound/Health centre or health post</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Has Improved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Has worsened</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stayed the Same</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Has Improved</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Has worsened</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stayed the Same</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>Has Improved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>Has worsened</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stayed the Same</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2015

In terms of health infrastructure (hospital/clinic/CHPS compound/health centre or health post), 60 percent of respondents indicated that they did not have some in their communities. However, those who indicated that they had, noted that there had not been any change in its condition. For post office, as high as 86 percent of the respondents’ said there was none in their communities. Those who indicated that they had post office in their communities noted that the condition had worsened as 64 percent of them indicated that the condition of post office had rather worsened. Moreover, in terms of water facility, half of the respondents said they had access to water but the remaining half answered otherwise. Whereas the condition of water according to 50 percent of the respondents who indicated they had access to water had
not changed since 2008, 43 percent indicated that the condition had worsened. Finally, with respect to sanitation, two-thirds of the respondents (67.5%) mentioned that they had sanitation facilities in their communities. In terms of the condition, a little over half of the respondents (51.9%) indicated that the condition of the sanitation infrastructure had worsened and 41 percent of respondents noted that the condition had not changed. The data collected from the field therefore showed that there were social development projects that had been implemented in the respondents’ respective communities since 2008 in which they could be involved.

Furthermore, the research sought to find out community members’ ability to identify principal problems within their communities. When respondents were asked the principal problem in their communities that they thought required urgent attention, 77 out of 80 respondents (33.5%) were of the view that electricity was the major problem in their communities; this was followed by problem with health centers that also recorded a 29.1%. The least problem recorded however was access to roads, market and toilet facility representing 7.8% of the respondents.

It is an undeniable fact that no community in Ghana is free from challenges pertaining to their socio-economic development. More often than not, the perception of people is that it is the government’s responsibility to solve all these problems. However, communities can in diverse ways, contribute towards solving some of these problems confronting them. The ability of community members to identify these problems is therefore key towards a collaborative effort in providing solutions to community problems. This is supported by the interview with the Presiding Member who stated, “the Assembly must make effort to effectively engage the local people in development activities so that their problems can be addressed on
The responses of the respondents on principal problems in their community are illustrated in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Respondents View on some Principal Problems that Requires Urgent Attention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Problems</th>
<th>Freq. n=80</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electricity/power</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health centres</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads, market and toilet facility</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>230</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2015

4.3 Role of Community Members in Social Development Projects

People generally play various roles in social development projects for several reasons. The researcher in an attempt to find out the role community members can play in social development projects posed questions to respondents asking them to indicate the role community members can play in community development if the Assembly actively involved them. They indicated that the community members if involved at the grassroots by the Assembly can help outline challenges facing community. Table 4.4 shows the roles community members can play in social development projects if the Assembly actively involved them.
### Table 4.4 Role Community Members can Play in Social Development Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can help outline the pressing challenges facing them that need urgent attention</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer better alternatives to solving some of the challenges</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can provide the resources to help solve the challenges like labour,</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2015

The data showed a good initiative by community members towards community development. It is important to note that when people are able to identify the problems facing them, they can make effective contributions in finding solutions to the problems. This is therefore positive in ensuring increased participation toward community development. Other issues that were raised by respondents had to do with helping to ensure project sustainability and accountability.

The data thus support conceptualization of the term ‘participation’ by earlier scholars such as Arnstein (1969) who considered participation as the force behind democracy. She explained that the force ensures an equal participation of the haves and the have-nots to join in determining how information is shared, goals and policies are set, tax resources are allocated, programs are operated, and benefits like contracts and patronage are parceled due to equal community participation. Participation therefore opens the door for all stakeholders such as opinion leaders, beneficiaries, women local leaders and the general local community to have a stake in whatever is invested in the locality (Mulwa, 2004).
4.4 Extent of Community Participation in Social Development Projects

When respondents were asked whether they had participated in any development projects in the Ga East Municipality since 2008, majority of the respondents representing (85%) answered in the affirmative. The responses are shown in Figure 4.1.

Figure 4.1: Participation in Development Projects

```
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Participants Non-participants

Source: Field survey, 2015
```

The 85 percent of the respondents who participated in development projects did that in diverse ways. Table 4.5 depicts how respondents participate in development projects. These included participating in clean-up exercise (31%); help in assessing community needs (28%); and contributing money and labour to development (22%). The 12 respondents who had not participated in any social development projects in their communities since 2008 cited reasons such as; lack of interest, not part of their responsibility, no time and lack project to participate in.
Table 4.5: Participation and Reasons for Non-participation Since 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How groups Participate</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribute money and labour to development</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute money for road maintenance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute resources and share ideas to solve problems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help in assessing community needs</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in clean-up exercise</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Non-Participation</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not part of our responsibilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No project available to participate in</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2015

4.4.1 Invitation to Participate in Social Development Projects

When respondents were asked whether the Ga East Municipal Assembly had ever invited them to participate in any developmental projects over the past eight years, 86.2 percent answered in the affirmative. It must be noted that the Assembly cannot involve all the people in the community even though effort must be made to ensure increased community participation. The Development Planning Officer at the Assembly even emphasized on this point that the Assembly makes effort to get a fair representation of community members to participate in community development projects. With such a huge number of respondents invited by the Assembly to participate in social development projects, showed that the Assembly is making effort to ensuring participatory development. The Figure 4.2 depicts their responses.
The means of invitation as shown in Figure 4.3 was either through telephone, assembly members, other people or formal written letter. The research reveals that 36.3 percent of the respondents were invited through the Assembly members and 32.5 percent were invited through formal written letters. Assembly members are the representatives of community members at the Assembly. Invitation through Assembly members or through formal written letters is still acceptable and an effective way to increase community participation.
Figure 4.3: Means of Invitation by the Assembly

Source: Field survey, 2015

4.4.2 Extent of Community Participation in Social Development Projects

Moreover, the study sought to assess the extent of participation by community members in social development projects. Table 4.6 depicts the extent of community participation in social development projects.

Table 4.6: Extent of Community Participation in Social Development Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mean±SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Identification</td>
<td>1.9±0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Preparation and Formulation</td>
<td>1.2±0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Review and Approval</td>
<td>1.7±0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation and Monitoring</td>
<td>1.8±0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2015

Table 4.6 shows the means, standard deviations and the various activities performed by the respondents in social development projects. The results indicated that most of the members
participate more in project identification since it had the highest mean value of 1.9. Project implementation and monitoring was the next activity with mean value of 1.8, followed by project review and approval with a mean value of 1.7. The lowest mean value of 1.2 was obtained for project preparation and formulation; this means that most of the respondents do not mostly take part during the project preparation and formulation phases of social development projects. The mean levels of ranking activities performed by community members in social developmental projects in a decreasing order of ranking is as follows: Project Identification> Project Implementation and Monitoring> Project Review and Approval> Project Preparation and Formulation. The research further revealed that community members had never been involved in project evaluation. This was confirmed by the interview with the Municipal Development Planning Officer who stated, “we have not undertaken project evaluation before and so community members have never been involved in project evaluation.”

4.5 Perceptions of Respondents on Community Development

The views of respondents were sought on whose responsibility it is to provide resources for community development. One out of every two respondents (51.3%) noted that it was the responsibility of the Municipal Assembly to provide resources for community development. Thirty five percent however noted that it was the responsibility of the government, while 13.7 percent said it was the responsibility of community members. The ability of the community members to recognize that they have a role to play in addition to efforts by authorities showed that to some extent they can participate in the development of their community. Oakley, 1995 reported that political factors such as the institution handling of project, municipality and the association or group people belong will determine whether or not community members will be made to participate in social development projects. Cultural
factors also affect community participation particularly with respect to gender. The level of interaction by community members in development processes and structures prevalent in a community may largely be influenced by their culture. These factors (socio-economic, political and cultural) are the independent variables that influence community participation which is the dependent variable as well as determine who can participate and who cannot. The outcome will therefore lead to community development. The responses are illustrated in Figure 4.4.

Figure 4.4: Respondents View on Whose Responsibility to Provide Resources for Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>51.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal assembly</td>
<td>13.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2015

4.5.1 Role of Assembly in Community Development

Community development process can be difficult, time-consuming and costly and thus requires the participation of key stakeholders particularly the local authorities to bring about improvement in the lives of people. The respondents were therefore asked the role of the Assembly, which is the representative of government in community development. The responses as presented in Table 4.7 showed that the role of the Assembly is to implement and monitor projects (26.3%), mobilize revenue (22.5%) and plan development (22.9%).
The roles outlined by the respondents to be performed by the Assembly are more of technical and managerial roles. These roles when discharged effectively will promote community development and improve human welfare.

Table 4.7: Role of Assembly in Community Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of the Assembly</th>
<th>Freq. n=80</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Planning</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Mobilization</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Funding</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation &amp; Monitoring</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2015

4.5.2 People Who Participate more in Community Development

Additionally, respondents’ views were sought on which of the gender categories normally participate more in community development. The results showed that both men and women representing 45 percent participate in community development. However 35 percent of respondents said men participate more than women, 6.2 percent said women participate more than men whilst 13.8 percent did not have any idea as to who participate more in community development. Table 4.8 illustrates the various categories who participate more in community development.
The data showed that men participate more in community development projects as compared to women. As reviewed in the literature, gender inequality militates against women’s participation, in that women are often marginalized when it comes to community participation. Green & Brock 2005 reported that gender is also another obstacle to community participation in that women are often marginalized when it comes to community participation. 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. This must be addressed to ensure equal participation by both men and women in community development.

It was also found that both adults and youth representing 91.3 percent participate in community development. However about 4 percent of respondents mentioned only youth and 5 percent mentioned only adults. Once again, at this stage, it was the aim of the researcher to
find out whether the Assembly ensures equity in community participation in terms of the aged and the youth. This is because when the Assembly ensures equity in the representation of the aged and the youth the specific needs of the age groups will be addressed to promote meaningful development.

In terms of the employment category, both the employed and unemployed representing 58.8 percent participate in community development. However, 25 percent of the respondents mentioned the employed groups (workers) as those who participate more in community development whilst 16.2 percent mentioned the unemployed category as those who participate more in community development.

In all the categories of people who participate in community development, the data showed that participation is not only the sole duty of men, adults or the employed but the duty of all.

Cross tabulation was further carried out between community participation and other variables such as age, education and length of stay in the community. The table thus provides a wealth of information about the relationship between the variables. Table 4.9 and Table 4.10 show the relationship between community participation in developmental projects and education and the number of years members had stayed in their respective communities.

Table 4.9 illustrated the relationship between community participation and the educational level of the respondents. The respondents with secondary and JSS education were the once who participated most. The Chi-Square test statistics also showed that community participation in developmental projects was statistically significant with respect to their level of education (Chi-Square value=60.517, P-value = 0.00001<0.05).
Table 4.9: Community Participation in Development Projects by Educational Level of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>No School</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Tertiary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since 2008, has your group ever participated in any development projects in your community?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square value = 60.517 Pr = 0.00001

Source: Field survey, 2015

With respect to the number of years that respondents have lived in the study area and its influences on participation in development projects, the relationship was not statistically significant (Chi-Square value = 5.865, P-value = 0.118 > 0.05). However, the respondents who have lived for a period between 11-20yrs were the highest group that participated more in community development projects. This is illustrated in Table 4.10

Table 4.10: Community Participation in Development Projects by Length of Stay in the Community by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Stay in Community</th>
<th>1-10yrs</th>
<th>11-20yrs</th>
<th>21-30yrs</th>
<th>31-40yrs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since 2008, has your group ever participated in any development projects in your community?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square value = 5.865 Pr = 0.118

Source: Field survey, 2015
4.6 How Community Participation affects Project Identification and Implementation

When asked if respondents were aware of any government project(s) in their community since 2008, 63.8 percent of the respondents answered in the affirmative. Out of the 80 respondents, 48.7 percent indicated that they were aware of educational projects (schools) that the government had undertaken in their community, 22.5 percent of the respondents indicated that they were aware of other government projects such as post office, streetlights and market facilities in their communities. A few indicated that they were aware of only water and sanitation projects (16.2%) in their communities. Figure 4.5 illustrates the projects that respondents identified.

Figure 4.5: Kinds of Government Projects Identified by Respondents

When asked how respondents were involved in the identification and implementation processes of the various government projects, 77.5 percent out of 68 respondents indicated that their participation had mainly been through Assembly members and 22.5 percent said they participated in the government projects through Assembly meetings. One of the appointed assembly members on the Social Service Sub Committee noted, “He and his electorates were involved through Assembly meetings in identifying projects that need urgent
attention as well as project implementation but most often he represent them as well.” Figure 4.6 shows how they were involved in project identification and implementation processes.

Figure 4.6: How Respondents were Involved in Project Identification and Implementation Processes

Source: Field survey, 2015

A crosstab analysis was conducted to examine how participation influences project identification and implementation. The results basically showed that as high as 52.5 percent of the respondents had played a role in identifying and implementing government projects. The remaining 47.5 percent of the respondents had not played any role in the identification and implementation of the projects since 2008. The results presented in Table 4.11 showed that of the 85 percent respondents (68) who had participated in development projects in their communities since 2008. The chi-square test of the relationship between participation and role played in the identification and implementation of projects was statistically significant since the p-value of the test was less than 0.05 (Chi-Square value=8.684, P-value=0.003<0.05).
Table 4.11: Community Participation by Project Identification and Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Role played in the identification and implementation of projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in projects</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2015

The respondents were further asked if community participation had any relevance for project identification and implement. The results presented in Table 4.12 indicated that as high as 72.5 percent of the respondents indicated that participation indeed had relevance for project identification and implementation. The crosstab analysis showed that there is statistically significant relationship between community participation and relevance for project identification and implementation as the p-value was less than 0.05 (Chi-Square value =6.732, p-value = 0.009<0.05).

Table 4.12 Relevance of Participation in Project Identification and Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Relevance for participation for project identification and implementation (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in projects</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2015

As noted above, 72.5 percent of the respondents indicated that participation had relevance for project identification and implementation. The respondents were asked to give reasons why they thought participation was relevant to project identification and implementation. The
results presented in the Table 4.13 showed that out of the 58 respondents who indicated that participation had relevance for project identification and implementation, 31 percent noted that participation helped to develop their skills to participate in development projects. The results also showed that participation enhanced social cohesion (25.9%) and helped community members to provide authorities with alternative ways to address their problems (15.5%). This is shown in Table 4.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address community challenges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute resources to support community projects</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing social cohesion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps to identify pressing community needs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It leads to community ownership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We can provide alternative ways to address our problems</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing our skills to participate in development projects</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2015

In all, the study revealed that community participation in project identification and implementation served as an initiative that helped people to develop the skills needed to promote community development. In addition, community participation also enhanced social cohesion as well as contribution of resources by community members towards community development.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

The study sought to investigate the role of participation in urban community development in the Ga East Municipality. This was to identify the role community members can play in social development project, to ascertain the extent to which community members were involved by planning authorities in social development projects, to identify the perceptions of community members regarding development and to determine how community participation affect project identification and implementation. This chapter presents a summary of findings, conclusion and recommendations. The findings were presented based on the specific issues which were analysed in Chapter Four.

5.1 Main Finding

Socio-economic Characteristics

The analysis of the socio-economic characteristics of respondents showed that education significantly influence community participation in development projects. Thus, those who were educated have participated more in development projects. However, the length of stay in the community did not significantly influence community participation in development projects.

Assessment of Community Infrastructure

A large proportion of the respondents also noted that their communities had basic schools, water and sanitation infrastructures. Whereas there had not been any improvement in the conditions of the basic schools and the water facilities in the communities, the sanitation
condition had worsened. All the people noted that their communities did not have a secondary school and a large proportion of the people also mentioned that they did not have a hospital/clinic/CHPS compound/health centre or health post and post office. For the few who noted that they had these facilities in their communities, stated that condition had stayed the same or worsened.

The study moreover revealed that community members were able to identify principal problems that they face in their communities. A large proportion of the respondents indicated electricity/power, employment and lack of schools as principal problems in their communities. Other challenges were lack of toilet and market facilities as well as poor roads. The ability of community members to identify these problems in their communities was key towards a collaborated effort in providing solutions to the problems.

Role of Community Members Play in Social Development Projects

The study identified key roles that community members can play in social development projects. The respondents indicated that if involved by the Assembly they can help outline challenges facing them, offer better alternatives to solve challenges, provide resources like labour as well as help to ensure project sustainability and accountability.

Extent of Community Participation in Social Development Projects

In considering the context and the significance of the role community members can play in social development projects in the Ga East Municipality, it was established that the Assembly invites community members to participate in development projects. Majority of the respondents representing (86.2%) said the Assembly invites them to participate in development projects.
Additionally, most community members had participated in several development projects since majority of the respondents (85%) had participated in development projects in diverse ways since 2008. The major ways community members participated in development were by helping to outline the pressing challenges facing them that need urgent attention, providing the resources to help solve those challenges like labour, and also help in assessing community needs. This makes projects more sustainable. However, there were a few respondents who had not participated in any community development projects since 2008. Their reasons were that they had no interest in the projects, it is not part of their responsibility, they had no time and finally, there were no projects in the community to participate in. These were identified as major obstacles of community members to participate fully in community development projects.

Community projects go through five basic phases. The first phase is project identification; second, project preparation and formulation; third, project review and approval; fourth, project implementation and monitoring; and fifth, project evaluation. With respect to the extent to which respondents participated in social development projects, the results indicated that the Assembly involved community members a lot at the first phase of the project; project identification. Only a few were involved at the second and third phase (project preparation and formulation, and project review and approval) but they were not involved at all at the final phase (project evaluation). The Development Planning Officer at the Assembly indicated that they had not undertaken project evaluation before and so community members had never been involved in project evaluation. This little or non-involvement of community members at some phases of projects may be due to technical expertise, knowledge and specialized skills, which not all people within the groups had which is in consistence with a similar report by Mulwa (2004).
Perceptions of Community Members on Development

On the perceptions of respondents regarding community development, 51.3 percent of the respondents considered community development as the responsibility of the Assembly, while others also saw it as the responsibility of government to provide resources for development. Moreover, apart from authorities responsible for providing resources for community development such as the Assembly, community members also saw it as their responsibility to provide resources for development. The ability of community members to recognize that they had a role to play in addition to efforts by authorities showed that to some extent they can participate effectively in community development.

How Participation Affects Project Identification and Implementation

With respect to how community participation affects projects identification and implementation, the study revealed that there is a statistically significant relationship between project identification and implementation. The crosstab analysis of the relationship between participation and role played in the identification and implementation of projects was statistically significant since the p-value of the test was less than 0.05 (Chi-Square value=8.684, P-value=0.003<0.05). (Mulwa, 2004). Barasa and Jelagat (2013), reported that local participation had been completely excluded from project implementation and hence they did not invest their thinking in projects being put up. Participation of community members in local projects therefore, has the potential to influence local economy for the benefit of all.

5.2 Conclusion

This study sought to investigate the role of participation in urban community development in the Ga East Municipality. It had established that participation is a vehicle to community
development. The structures and dynamics of communities are changing and becoming more complex as a result of increasing population and urbanization. Given the resource constraints confronting Assemblies in Ghana, communities can only achieve reasonable level of socio-economic development if authorities involve all the stakeholders to participate in the development process.

The study has clearly shown that since 2008 to date, a larger proportion of community members had been involved in community development. While some had taken the initiatives to help in identifying the principal problems confronting them, others had gone further by providing resources such as money and labour to support development projects. The data showed that participation is a vehicle of community development.

There is however a concern regarding the extent to which the Assembly involves community members. The findings of the study revealed that the Assembly actively involved the people in project identification. This therefore calls for a review of the Assembly’s participatory approaches to increase and sustain the level of participation at every stage of the project cycle, as this will enable the people to identify themselves more with the projects, own them and make them more sustainable.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study in the Ga East Municipality, the following recommendations are worth considering in the quest to deepen participation in urban community development.

- The study recommends that community members should be empowered through education to enable them participate effectively in community development. This is
because the study revealed that there was a relationship between community participation and education. When community members are well educated their skills improve and they are able to contribute to development.

- In addition, the social infrastructures like schools, water and sanitation in the municipality must be increased with improved conditions by the Municipal Assembly. This will improve the living conditions of people in the municipality and promote community development. This can be achieved through collaborative efforts between the Assembly and community members.

- The study moreover revealed that community members participate in social development projects in their communities. In view of this finding, the study recommends that the Assembly must put in place measures to ensure equity in participation toward community development. This when achieved will help address the needs of community members and promote community development. Additionally, community participation in social development projects should move beyond organized groups in the communities. It must be noted that not all people in the communities are part of organized groups as there are many elites, well-resourced community members who can contribute greatly to community development. The Assembly therefore periodically must organise community meetings and engage the whole community. Such broader participation will achieve much bigger output than limiting it to only organized groups in the community.

- The study also revealed that community members were not only useful in identifying community problems but they also mobilize resources such as money and labour to solve community problems. This therefore means that through active participation of community members, resources can be mobilized to easily provide public toilets, schools, rehabilitate roads, and provide waste bins at vantage points among many
others. The Assembly should take advantage of community members’ recognition that they also had responsibility to provide resources for development and extend participation to all community members to promote community development.

- Finally, the study recommended that the Assembly should ensure high and consistency in participation by community members at every stage of the development project. This is because the findings revealed that most of the community members participated more at the project identification stage. However, most of the community members were mostly not involved by the Assembly during the project preparation and formulation stage. When community members are directly involved in community development it increased their confidence, self-esteem, chance to acquire new skills as well as bring about improvement in the quality of life.
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APPENDIX A

UNIVERSITY OF GHANA

INSTITUTE OF STATISTICAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH (ISSER)

“QUESTIONNAIRE ON PARTICIPATION IN URBAN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: A CASE STUDY OF GA EAST MUNICIPALITY.”

I am a student of the Institute of Statistical Social and Economic Research (ISSER), University of Ghana; conducting a research on “Participation in Urban Community Development: A Case Study of Ga East Municipality.” I would appreciate it if you could make time to answer the questions in this study.

All responses that you will give shall be kept confidential

Please do I have your permission to go on? 1. Yes 2. No. Thank you.

Section A: Demographic Characteristics

1. Name.................................................................
2. Age ..............
4. Religion
   [4] Other Christians……………………
8. How long have you been living in this community? …………………
Section B: Assessment of Community Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Basic School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Hospital/Clinic/sCHPS compound/Health center or health post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What are the principal problems in this community that you think require urgent solution? *(Multiple responses if applicable)*


Section C: Role community members play in social development projects

12. What role(s) do you think the community members can play in social development projects if the Assembly actively involves them?

[1] Can help outline the pressing challenges facing them that need urgent attention

[2] Offer better alternatives to solving some of the challenges

[3] Can provide the resources to help solve the challenges like contributions labour, materials, and others

[4] Other (specify)…………………..

Section D: Extent of Community Participation in Social Development Projects

13. Since 2008, has your group ever participated in any development projects in your community?


14. If yes, how?
15. If No to Q13, what are the reasons why your group has not been actively involved in any projects towards community development?
(Multiple responses if applicable)
[1] Not part of our responsibilities
[2] Not interested
[3] No time
[6] Other
(specify) …………………

16. Since 2008, how often have you as a group met to think about the community’s development?

[1] Always
[2] Never
[3] Once

17. Since 2008, has the Ga East Municipality ever invited your group to participate in any social development projects?

[1] Yes
[2] No [Skip to Q26]

18. If yes, how many times?

[1] One
[2] Two
[3] Three
[4] Four & more

19. What was the means of invitation?

[1] Formal written letter
[2] Word of Mouth
[3] Invitation through other people
[4] Telephone invitation
[5] Other means (specify)

20. To what extent does your group participate in the following activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Project Identification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Project Preparation and Formulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Project Review and Approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Project Implementation and Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Project Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section E: Perceptions of Respondent on Development

26. Whose responsibility is it to provide the resources for the development of the community?
   (Specify)…………………….

27. What is the role(s) of the Assembly in the development of communities?
   (Multiple responses if applicable)
   [1] Development Planning
   [2] Revenue Mobilization
   [3] Law Enforcement
   [4] Provide Funding
   [5] Project Implementation & Monitoring
   [4] Other (Specify)…………………….

28. Which of the Gender categories participate more in the community development?

29. Which of the Age categories participate more in the community development?

30. Which of the Employment categories participate more in the community development?

Section F: How Participation Affects Project Identification and Implementation

31. Do you know of any government project(s) in your community since 2008?

32. If yes, what kind of project(s) is it?
   (Multiple responses if applicable)
   [5] Others, (Specify)…………………….

33. Did your group play any role in the identification and implementation of the project(s)?
34. If yes, what role did your group play?

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
…..

35. How were you involved in the project identification and implementation processes?
(Specify)………………………………

36. Does community participation have relevance for project identification and implementation?

37. Please explain your reasons for Q31.
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………

Thank you
APPENDIX B
UNIVERSITY OF GHANA

INSTITUTE OF STATISTICAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH (ISSER)

PROJECT TOPIC: “PARTICIPATION IN URBAN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: A CASE STUDY OF GA EAST MUNICIPALITY”

Interview Guide: Development Planning Officer/Presiding Member

Thank you for your acceptance

1. How long have you been in the Department/Office?

2. What are your experiences over the past years?

3. What are your main responsibilities?

4. How does your Department/Office involve community members in social development projects (initiating, planning, design, implementation or maintenance)?

5. How has your Department/Office helped to improve participation?

6. How does your Department/Office ensure equity in community participation?

7. Do you have any additional comments about the interview?
APPENDIX C
UNIVERSITY OF GHANA

INSTITUTE OF STATISTICAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH (ISSER)

PROJECT TOPIC: “PARTICIPATION IN URBAN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: A CASE STUDY OF GA EAST MUNICIPALITY”

Interview Guide: Assembly Member, Social Service Sub Committee

Thank you for your acceptance

1. Which electoral area do you represent?

2. How many communities are in your electoral area?

3. For how long have you been an assembly member?

4. What role does your committee play in the development of the Assembly?

5. How were you and your electorates involved in social development projects?

6. How were you and your electorates involved in the preparation of Medium Term Development Plans?

7. How were your views and that of your electorates integrated into the decision making process?

8. Do you have any additional comments about the interview?