The Impact of Community Participation on Community Development in Zambia: Case Study Nsanjika Area of Nsingo Ward in Luangeni Constituency of the Eastern Province

Blessing Mataka[1], Peter Rabson Nguluwe[2]

[1] *Blessing Mataka: MSc International Relations, BSc Hons Political Science, (University of Zimbabwe), Lecturer – Mulungushi University Zambia, Department of Political and Administrative Studies*

[2] *Peter Rabson Nguluwe: Bachelor of Public Administration, Staff Development Fellow, Mulungushi University Zambia, Department of Political and Administrative Studies*

ABSTRACT : This study was aimed at assessing the impact of community participation on community Development in Zambia in general and Nsanjika area of Nsingo ward in Luangeni constituency of the Eastern province in particular. The research was prompted by the gap that has been prevalent in the provision of services by government; this gap exists between 'what people need and what government provides. This gap is brought about by lack of collaboration between government and the people for which services are being provided, the aim of this study was to find ways which this gap can be closed and the impact the involvement of the people has on their development. The study is grounded in David Easton's systems theory. A triangulation inquiry was used and questionnaires and in-depth interviews were used to collect data. The data was analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and content analysis. The study revealed that inasmuch as the citizens are aware of the institutions and structures to promote community development, there was lack of citizen involvement in decision making and participation in the implementation of community projects. The study therefore recommends the a bottom up approach to the identification of community problems and the involvement of the community in the formulation and implementation of projects in their areas.

Keywords: *Development, Community Development, Community Participation.*

----

1. Study Objectives

The study sought to **a**ssess the impact of Community Participation on Community Development in Zambia.

Specific Objectives

- To assess whether community participation in community development is important.
- To investigate whether there are structures or institutions that promotes community development in Zambia at ward, zone or catchment level.
- To identify what challenges are faced in promoting community development.
- To identify measures which can be taken to enhance community development.

2.1 Definition of Concepts

2.1.1 Community: Bopp (2006:13) defines a community as "any grouping of human beings who enter into a sustained relationship with each other for the purpose of improving themselves and the world in which they live".

2.1.2 Development: According to Sapru (2014). "Development is the process through which a society passes as it enables its members to develop the capabilities to achieve both material and immaterial prosperity".

2.1.3 Community Development (CD): "the process of developing active and sustainable communities based on social justice and mutual respect. It is about influencing power structures to remove the barriers that prevent people from participating in the issues that affect their lives." (Brandt Commission)

2.1.4 Community Participation (CP): Bourdieu (1992) defines community participation as the active engagement of the mind, heart and energy of the people where there is exercise of human will, it is the capacity to focus, choose, adopt goals and complete tasks. Participation means directing our power towards a goal.

2.2 Literature Review

In order to understand the concept of community development and how it is affected by community participation in Zambia a world view of community development on how other countries and regions was adopted as a modicum of analysis. The approach focused on having an in-depth analysis of how different parts of the worldview and carry out community participation and how this has impacted the community development. The regions and countries that will be covered in this discussion include; Latin America, India, Kenya and finally Zambia.

2.2.1 The Latin America-Mexican Experience

Community Participation in IFI-Funded development projects: Latin America's Experience; Throughout Latin America, citizens are using international financial institutions own policies to defend greater participation and accountability in the large-scale development projects that affect their communities. Major developments involving infrastructure or extractive industries both in Latin America and other regions tend to be financed, either partially or totally, by international Financial institutions (IFIs). (David, 1984)

Given that these types of large-scale projects could have adverse effects on the local communities' livelihoods, cultural heritage and environment, IFIs have established mechanisms to guarantee that the projects they fund meet international environment and social standards. Though not perfect such mechanisms do at least allow organized citizens to access project information and demand concrete ways to get engaged in project decision making. Using a successful case from Mexico it can be argued that the role of an informed community in participation is a crucial factor facilitating accountability within development projects with international funding. (Nathaniel, 1983)

According to David (1983), since accountability mechanisms were created, citizens in different countries have put them to good use, demanding consultation rights, advocating for changes in development projects they did not agree with and overall protecting their communities from those projects potential negative impacts. While mechanisms have been put in place using them has not been easy. There are many cases in Latin America in which citizens used the channels to make complaints but no modifications to the projects were actually be made. On the other hand citizen participation within the IFIs process always brings some kind of changes, if not at the project level, then by highlighting structural challenges at the country and community level, as well as through putting forward specific recommendations and enabling community collaboration.

Other cases, like the Mexico one analyzed here, achieved concrete changes in the development project itself. This case shows how a group of organized citizens activated an IFI accountability mechanism to defend their rights, land and natural resources, even managing to stop the project and prevent the harm it would cause their community. The emphasis of the analysis will be on the contextual factors that made this experience successful and on the lessons learned that might be useful for other countries. In 2009, to the surprise of local communities construction began on the Cerro de Oro hydroelectric project in the state of Oaxaca Mexico. The project had been developed and approved without having informed, consulted or received approval from the affected communities.

Communities were not aware that the project violated human rights and national and international policies, and would have serious environmental and social impacts. The project planned to covert the existing Cerro de Oro communities' needs regarding electricity and water supply were not taken into account or even meant to be directly addressed. Though the community was not benefiting the dam and the Mexican national grid that were meant to be used are state owned and maintained through taxes. Titus (1983) therefore argues that the case of Mexico in Latin America has brought to light the need for the involvement of the local community in the provision of particular projects to avoid the cases such as one that occurred where projects with great potential harm could have been implemented. Consultation is also important in order to avoid chances of supplying the community with a completely different or wrong project from one they would actually want to have to meet their actual needs.

2.2.2 The Indian Experience

The Community Development Movement (CDM) in India, a nationwide programme started in 1952, and was perhaps the best known of these attempts. Huizer (1984) notes that the programme implicitly accepted the assumption that individuals, groups and classes in a village community have common interests, which are sufficiently strong to bind them together. It also assumed that the interests were sufficiently strong to create common general enthusiasm, and that conflicts of interests were sufficiently reconcilable. However, these assumptions proved unrealistic as in practice the affluent in the community benefited more from the programmes and a growing disparity and inequality became visible in rural areas.

Huizer (1984) further notes that participation by the people in institutions and systems that govern their lives is a basic human right and also essential for realignment of political power in favour of disadvantaged groups

and for social and economic development. Rural development strategies can realize their full potential only through motivation, active involvement and organisation at grassroots level of rural people, with special emphasis on the least advantaged, in conceptualizing and designing policies and programmes in creating administrative, social and economic institutions, including cooperative and other voluntary forms of organisation for implementing and evaluating them. However, Ghai (1977) contends that the poor have not participated in sharing the benefits from the massive development efforts of the past three decades, neither in proportion to their numbers nor their needs. The interest in indicating the number of poor participating is in development in indicated by the number of special international programmes which have been closely linked to each other development issues. The value of participation by the poor for development stems not only from such idealistic considerations as basic human rights or the rejection of authoritarian and paternalistic alternatives, but also from the inherent strength of participation as a means of articulating genuine needs and satisfying them through self-reliance and mass mobilization.

Participation of the rural poor in their own development has been measured as a key factor in the success of projects. Cohen and Uphoff (1977) observes that in an evaluation of over 50 rural development projects, local participation in decision making during implementation was more critical to project success than such participation in the initial design. Participation is an essential part of human growth that is the development of self-confidence, pride, initiative, creativity, responsibility and cooperation. Without such a development within the people themselves all efforts to alleviate their poverty will be immensely more difficult, if not impossible. This process where by people learn to take charge of their own lives and solve their own problems, is the essence of development.

2.2.3 The Kenyan Experience

Rodney (1981) notes that during the colonial period in Kenya, community participation in public development projects was quite limited as was the case in many other colonized areas of the world then, because it was characteristic of colonial governments to limit the rights and freedoms of those whom they had colonized. In most cases, community participation mainly manifested in the form of provision of manual labour and other material resources particularly land by the local communities to projects via a top-down approach because this kind of local community participation was greatly beneficial to the colonial administrators. Rodney (1981) and Smith (2008) concurs that up to the mid of the twentieth century, the top-down approach to community participation in projects was the preferred way of undertaking development projects. This was partly because many scientists and academics led people to believe in the top-down based perception that professional scientists were the ones who knew how to undertake projects (Carr 2002).

However, from mid twentieth century, there was increased criticism of the top down approach (Smith, 2008). Top-down participation in projects is structured around the use of professional leadership that is provided by external resources to plan, implement, and evaluate development projects or programmes (Macdonald, 1995). The advantages of this approach include better professional skills, better services and a variety of material resources which may not be available within the local communities.

Nonetheless, according to Smith (2008), there has been a growing backlash against the top-down approach especially in the area of environmental management throughout the world. This backlash is because the top-down approach tends to prioritize and solely appreciate professional and scientific 'expert' knowledge while ignoring local and cultural knowledge. This gives the approach a potentially exclusive and paternalistic nature, which can be alienating to local people and their internal resource management schemes. Smith (2008) further argues that the implication of using the top-down approach is that local communities get very little space within which they can contribute to development projects. Disenchantment with the top-down participation is partly what led to the rise in the use of alternative participation approaches that characterize the undertaking of public development projects in Kenya today.

2.2.4 The Zambian Experience

The Community Development situation in Zambia and how it is affected by Community Participation is not very different from that in Latin America Mexico, India and Kenya. This can be noted from the various Zambian experiences that are similar to those looked at from the countries and regions earlier discussed. For instance like in Latin America-Mexico Zambia also has had a number of cases like has already been indicated where a project that had negative effects on the lives of the community was implemented without the consultation of the community such has happened in the Zambian setting and has yielded negative response from the communities in which such projects where implemented.

Zambia's community participation also in comparison to that of Kenya shares similarities especially with regard to the extent to which communities where allowed to participate during and after the colonial rule. In Zambia like in the case of Kenya the level of community participation during the colonial era was lower as compared to that which existed in the post-independence this was done as a measure to limit Zambians in the community development agenda of the country hence easily deny them their deserved services.

The absence of community participation in the operations of community development has yielded negative impacts on the rate and impact of community development in Zambia. This is evident in the number of projects that are sometimes started and are discontinued because contractors stop operations and due to lack of sense of ownership which is brought about by community participation in the programmes and helps to make the community be able to hold the contractor accountable for the proper execution of projects or programmes designed to facilitate the community development required to the particular people.

The negative impact of the lack of community participation in Zambia on Community development can be seen from the number of projects which the government has tried to implement which however have been either been abandoned or have been done in a manner below expected standards, this can be attributed to lack of Community participation because if the concerned community are involved it then facilitates a checks and balances between the government and the people for whom these projects are carried out, this also fulfills the need to meet public interest which is the main reason for carrying out all government projects.

This can be better understood by looking at the case study of what transpired in the central province during a project inspection which. It has become a norm to hear of stories where Zambian contractors have abandoned or left government funded projects before they are actually completed. During a tour of government funded projects in Central Province the Deputy Secretary to the Cabinet Peter Kasanda who was accompanied by Central Province Permanent Secretary Edwidge Mutale, Permanent secretary Policy Analysis Coordination and Division (PACD) Bernard Kapasa, found that most of the government projects were below standards they attributed this to lack of seriousness among Zambian contractors in general. (Kabaila 2014). This can also be attributed to lack of community participation in the selection of which projects and which contractor should handle them.

The government has commissioned a number of projects however not implementation has taken place. Political will and lack of adequate resources accounts for abandonment of government projects. An example of this is a school project that was abandoned in Ngwembe district because the contractor was not paid by government (Ngoma, 2017). Another negative effect brought about as a result of lack of or inadequate community participation is the wrong provision of required public goods and services. These are situations where the government has provided very essential public goods and services but are not in line with the needs of the people for which they are being provided, this is brought about as a result of the government not involving the community in the choice of what is to be provided to them. Most of these projects are either not used for the right purpose or they end up being abandoned or neglected in extreme cases even rejected by the community.

For instance Samuel (2011) observes that the government through the Constituency Development Fund (CDF) initiated a borehole-drilling project in chief Mpuka's area in Feira Luangwa district of Lusaka province. The main purpose of carrying out this project was to provide an alternative of water because the people used to fetch water from the Luangwa river were they were prone to attacks from crocodiles and hippo's and this was occurring at an alarming rate. Despite the many advantages that came with the execution of such a project the people in that particular area to a certain extent did not accept the project because according to them the water from the Luangwa river was fresh and clean and the one from the borehole was testing rusty and was not healthy for human consumption.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

2.3.1 Systems Theory

This study adopted the systems theory in order to understand the impact of community participation on community development in Zambia. The systems theory was propounded by a contemporary sociologist, Talcott Parsons (1937) and political scientist David Easton (1953), who perceived society to be complex whole and constituting parts which are interdependent and work together for the good of not one part but the whole society. According to the systems theory societies are open systems in active exchange with their environments.

Conceptually a system is an organized unitary whole composed of two or more independent parts, components or subsystems and delineated identifiable boundaries and supra environment. A system can also be defined as, an arrangement of interrelated parts, arrangement and interrelated parts describe interdependent elements forming an entity, the system itself (Kotter, 1988). When taking a systems approach one begins by identifying the individual parts and seeks to understand the nature of their collective interaction, systems denote interdependency, inter connectedness, and inter relatedness among elements in in a set that contributes to an identifiable whole which suggest a level of stability. All open systems have inputs, through puts and outputs mechanisms.

Each of these system processes must work well if the system is to be effective and survive. Every system is delineated by a boundary, what is inside the boundary is the system and what is outside the boundary is the environment. A good rule of thumb for drawing the boundary is that more energy exchange occurs within the boundary than across the boundary. Boundaries of open systems are permeable in that they permit exchange of information, resources and energy and many more between the system and the environment. Open systems have purposes and goals, the reasons for their existence. These purposes must align with purpose or needs in the environment. Application of theory

The elements of the systems theory are therefore effective in helping understand the role of community participation in community development in Zambia. It should be construed that Zambia's community development is a complex whole, and community participation is part of this entire system is and how it operates in turn affects the results obtained by the entire system the community is within inside the system and provides inputs, whereas the government is outside the system and provides through puts and outputs. The level of participation in a community ultimately affects the level of community development in a particular area, in this case Nsanjika area. In this regard, lack of adequate community participation in community development in Zambia will negatively affect the rate at which community development occurs and will make the system dysfunctional. Taking into consideration the tenets of the systems theory is likely to solve the problem of lack of community participation in community development process in Zambia in that as an interrelated part of the entire community development system, community participation needs to be enhanced and increased in order to foster community development in Zambia. Therefore an increased level and rate of community participation is crucial to community development.

There is interdependence in terms of agencies and institutions that are in charge of the implementation of community development programmes, these must work in liaison and proper collaboration within the delineated boundaries of the system in order to successfully implement the required programmes. Furthermore, it is also imperative to note that the application of the systems theory in Zambia's community development processes especially in matters of community participation tends to enhance the rate at which community development will occur. This is due to the salient fact that community participation plays a pivotal role in the Community Development of an area. The system theory is one that does not place any part as more important than the other, instead it regards all parts of a system as important as they play their respective roles and complement each other in their day-to-day functioning.

3. Research Design and Methodological Underpinnings

The study was underpinned on a case study research design focusing on the co-relationship between community participation and community development of Nsanjika area in Luangeni constituency on the Eastern province of Zambia. The collection and analysis of data involved both qualitative and quantitative approaches. In this regard, the primary data was collected through questionnaires for the respondents and in-depth interviews were conducted with key informants. The data was analysed using the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS version 16.0) were responses where coded and fed into the software and results presented through frequency tables each with a brief qualitative explanation of what is contained in the tables. The study was done to understand the gap that exists sometimes between 'what people need and what the government provides'. As such the study boarded largely on what government is doing and how the people are involved to collaborate with government to enhance their own development.

4. Study Findings, Presentation and Analysis

4.4.1 Impact of Age, Gender and livelihood on Community Development

Figure 1: Gender Distribution

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	156	45.0	45.0	45.0
	Female	191	55.0	55.0	100.0
	Total	347	100.0	100.0	

On the question to what extent gender, age and livelihood/occupation affects ones willingness to participate in community development , the responses from the 347 respondents in Nsanjika area figure 1 indicates that 55%of the respondents were female while 45% were male, the highest percentage of the respondents were those aged between 38-50 were 56.2%, then 18.2% were aged 25-37, 13.5% of respondents were those 51 and above and the least percentage was those aged between 12-24 had 12.1%. Figure 2 (overleaf) indicates that farmers were 59.7%, those doing business 18.2%, housewives were 9.2%, Dependants 8.6% and those formally employed 4.3%.

From this information it can be deduced that one's gender does not significantly affect ones willingness to take part in community development as there is just 10% difference between male and female, whereas age significantly affects ones willingness to take part in community development as can be seen that the 56.2% representation from those aged 38-50 and 12.1% from those aged 12-24. Ones live hood or occupation can also be noted to have a significant impact of influence on ones willingness to take part in community as the highest percentage recorded is from farmers at 59.7% and the formally employed have the least percentage 4.3%.

Figure 2: Form of Livelihood/Occupation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Formally employed	15	4.3	4.3	4.3
	Farmer	207	59.7	59.7	64.0
	Business	63	18.2	18.2	82.1
	House Wife	32	9.2	9.2	91.4
	Dependent	30	8.6	8.6	100.0
	Total	347	100.0	100.0	

4.4.2 Effect of Knowledge on Willingness to Participate in Community Development Activities

On the questions to what extent ones knowledge about community development affected their willingness to participate in community development activities, the findings indicated the following, respondents who indicated 'yes' as to having heard about community development where 85.6% of the respondents while those indicated 'no' where 13.8% this is as presented in figure 3 above, the activities they were involved in include upfront material mobilisation 47.3%, project identification 26.2% and 4.9 % in project planning. The rate of participation is as shown in figure 4 which indicated 54.8% as having participated 'always', 16.1% ;rarely', 15.6% 'sometimes', 9.2% 'never participated', one season/ once a month is at 4.0%.

Figure 3: *Knowledge about Community Development Activities*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	297	85.6	85.6	85.6
	No	48	13.8	13.8	99.4
	3.00	2	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	347	100.0	100.0	

Figure 4: *Rate of Participation in Community Development Activities*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Always	190	54.8	54.9	54.9
	Rarely	56	16.1	16.2	71.1
	Sometimes	54	15.6	15.6	86.7
	Never participated	32	9.2	9.2	96.0
	One season / once a month	14	4.0	4.0	100.0
	Total	346	99.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.3		
Total		347	100.0		

From these findings it can be deduced that one's knowledge about community development has an effect on the willingness to take part or not in community development activities, as can be noted from the information above the 85.6% of the respondents heard about community development before, this also affected their willingness to take part in community development activities as can be seen from the 47.3% that took part in upfront material mobilisation the knowledge also influenced the rate of participation as can be noted in figure 16 where 54.8% participated always. Therefore the need to inform communities about community development is vital as it will enhance their willingness to take part in community development activities.

4.4.3 Structures promoting community development

On the question whether government ministries, departments, institutions have existing structures which promote community development. Information obtained from the key informants who represented various government ministries, department, institutions as presented in figure 5 which indicated a 100% in that all key informants indicated 'yes', to having structures promoting community development, whether these structures are present at ward, zones or camp level all it was 100%.

Figure 5: Institutional Structures Promoting Community Development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	7	100.0	100.0	100.0

The respondents in Nsanjika area where also asked about the presence of these structures and 92.5% indicated 'Yes' while 7.5% indicated 'No'. The respondents further indicated specific structures and institutions that promoted community development as follows, 16.7% indicated Associations/Churches, 16.4% Nsanjika Community Development Centre, 11.0% Co-operatives/Committees, 6.6% Village Bank Committee, Agricultural blocks, camps, Zones 6.1%.

From the findings it can be confirmed that government ministries, departments, institutions have structures that are promoting community development and they are doing their best to ensure their presence is felt as can be noted from the 92.5% positive response to the presence of these structures from the respondents. It is therefore important that government should continue to support such structures and disaggregate them even to levels lower than the ward so they can meet community developmental needs in a more specific way.

4.4.4 Importance of community participation in community development

On the question of whether community participation in community development is important, the information obtained was from both key informants and respondents. From the respondents there was a 100% response indicating in affirmation to the posed question. While the respondents had 91.6% indicating 'Yes' and 8.4% indicated 'No'. The reasons as to why community participation is considered were also sought and the respondents, indicated as follows 42.9% of key informants indicated that it creates dialogue, 28.6% indicated sustainable development is attainable another 28.6% indicated that it awakens ownership and respondents had divergent and sometimes similar views to those of key informants and they indicated the following reasons, 35.2% indicated that it brings services closer by providing a link between the government and the

community, 24.8% cited that improved standard of living thereby reducing poverty, while 20.7% indicated that it brings a sense of ownership and self-reliance, 12.1% indicated that it was a source of income and a cheaper way of buying farming inputs and finally 7.2% indicated it had no direct benefit.

Figure 6: *Reasons for Community Participation Importance*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Creates dialogue	3	42.9	42.9	42.9
	Sustainable development attainable	2	28.6	28.6	71.4
	Awakens ownership	2	28.6	28.6	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

From the findings above it can be deduced that community participation in community development is regarded as important by both key informants and respondents of Nsanjika area and one common reason for which both parties have for considering community participation as important is that it provides a platform for dialogue and creates a link between the people and government as can be noted from the 42.9% from the key informants and the 35.2% from the respondents respectively.

4.4.5 Challenges faced in promoting community development

The study undertaken also indicates the challenges that are faced in promoting community development, both key informants and respondents were asked if they faced any challenges and they indicated as follows, 100% from key informants was recorded, while the respondents has divergent views with 56.5% of respondents indicating that no challenges were faced and 42.7% indicating the presence of challenges.

Figure 7: *Specified Challenges In Promoting Community Development Activities*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Financial	2	28.6	28.6	28.6
	Inadequate staff	1	14.3	14.3	42.9
	Lack of infrastructure	1	14.3	14.3	57.1
	Information technology	2	28.6	28.6	85.7
	Lack of transport for field staff	1	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

The specific challenges faced by key informants and the respondents were different perhaps due to their differences in roles in the community development process. For key informants the challenges faced were financial as indicated by 28.6%, Information technology was at 28.6%, Inadequate staff 14.3%, lack of infrastructure 14.3% and lack of transport for field staff 14.3%, respondents on the other hand indicated lack

of co-operation within community and failed local leadership as indicated by 17.3%, Lack of funding & infrastructure 10.1%, Delayed E-voucher card activation and delayed village banking cycles 7.2%, High illiteracy levels at 6.1% and inadequate technical support and no on spot checks 3.2% as indicated in figure 7.

From the information above it can be deduced that challenges faced in promoting community development by key informants and respondents are to some extent different and there appears to be a difference in that there is 100% response to presence of challenges for key informants whereas respondents have 42.7% response in agreement to existence of challenges and because of this therefore, it can be noted that there is more need to handle challenges faced by key informants as those challenges are external such as financial and Information technology both standing at 28.6% this will in turn positively affect the respondents whose major challenge is internal sited as lack of co-operation among themselves as represented by 17.3% and lack inadequate technical support which has to be provided by key informants.

4.4.6 Measures to enhance community participation in community development
On the question what measures can be taken to enhance community participation in community development the key informants indicated the following, 71.4% indicated the need to Encourage people involvement always, 14.3% indicated improvement of employee conditions while another 14.3% indicated need provide more funding and frequent supervision. The respondents on the other hand indicated the following, 28.8% indicated the need for government to be more responsive and complement community efforts, 26.5% Improve infrastructure and funding, 25.6% Activate E-voucher cards early and carry out on spot checks and 19.0% cited the need to deploy more staff.

Figure 8: Measures to Promote Community Participation in Community Development Activities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Improves employee conditions	1	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Encourage people involvement always	5	71.4	71.4	85.7
	Provide more funding and supervise frequently	1	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	7	100.0	100.0	

From the information above it can be deduced that the measures which can be taken in order foster community participation in community development both the key informants and the respondents are advocating for the need of collaboration between the government and the communities for which the development is being undertaken, this can be noted from the 71.4% from key informants on encouraging people involvement and the 28.8% from the respondents which was suggesting the need for government to be more responsive and complement the efforts being made by the community in the quest to achieve community development.

5.1 Conclusion

The study revealed that 25.6% respondents needs to activate E-voucher cards early and carrying out of on spot checks to ensure that the activation has indeed been done. In order for the better actualisation of community participation, the study established that there is need to deploy more workers in various ministries, departments and institutions in order to enable better implementation of programmes at community level as lack of technical support was cited as one of the challenges faced in the promotion of community participation in community development activities. This way the government will be more visible in communities as its employees will be on the ground to provide constant supervision to government programmes so that they deliver the intended objectives. In this regard therefore, government will be able to respond quickly to the suggestions that community presents and should complement the efforts the community makes in fostering community development. The study also noted with concern the lack of community involvement in project identification, as was reflected by the 4.9% as involvement percentage of the community in project planning and project identification was at 26.2% most respondents were involved in upfront material mobilization at 47.3% which meant that they only involved at a later stage giving them little or chance to have a say on what their priority was, therefore there is need to apply an approach that involves the people from the onset so as to guarantee meeting the right needs at all times.

5.2 Recommendations

The study therefore recommends that:-

- The government should deploy more workers to implement programs at community level.
- Government should be more responsive and complement community efforts by providing the necessary inputs and materials as well as political capital. This will in turn enable the government to attain process legitimacy.
- There should be on the spot checks on implementation of projects, programs in the community.
- Promote bottom up approach in project identification, planning and implementation.

6. References

1. Central Statistics Office (2010), *National Economic Census*, Lusaka: Zambia
2. Baker, T.L (1994) *Doing Social Research*, 2 edition, New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.
3. Barclays Report (1983).
4. Bopp, M., & Bopp, B., J (2011) *Recreating the World: A Practical Guide to Building Sustainable Communities*, Calgary, AB: four World Press.
5. Butcher, H. G, A., Henderson, P and Smith, J (1993) *Community and Public Policy*, London: Pluto Press.
6. Butcher, D (1993) *Understanding community Resilience in the context of National Health Security*, Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
7. Bryman, A (2004*) Social Research Methods*, 5th edition, Oxford University Press.
8. Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, I. (1992*) An Invitation to Reflective Sociology,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
9. Cohen. J, M and Uphoff, N. T (1977) *Rural Development Participation*: Cornell University.

10. David, N. T (1983) *The Making of Community Work*, London: Harper Collins Publishers Ltd.

11. Ghai, D. P., Khan, A. R., & Lee E.L.H & Alfthan, T (1977) *The Basic Needs Approach to Development: Some Issues Regarding Concepts and Methodology,* ILO: Geneva.

12. Goyet, C (1999) *The Role of WHO in Disaster Management*: Relief, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction.

13. Huizer, G. (1984) *Harmony vs. Conflict,* Rome.

14. Moses, K (2014) *Contractors Shoddy Jobs Delaying Projects,* Lusaka, and Times of Zambia Newspaper.

15. Paul, N (2017) "Unpaid Contracts abandoned Ngwambe Government Projects", Lusaka, and *The Mast Newspaper*. January 23rd.

16. Peter, S (2010) *Understanding Community: Politics, Policy and Practice,* 2nd edition, New York: McGraw.

17. Sapru R. K (1994) *Public Policy: Formulation, Implementation and Evaluation*, Sterling: New Delhi.

18. Saunders, M.N.K, Lewis, P., & Thorn hill, A (2012) *Research Methods for Business students*, 6th edition, Harlow, England: Pearson Education.

19. Skinner, S. J., Ferrel, O. C., & Dubinsky, A. J., (1988). "Organisational Dimensions of Marketing Research Ethics", *Journal of Business Research*, 16, 209-223.

20. Younghusband, E.L (1959) *Report of the working party on Social Workers in the local Authority Health and Welfare Services,* London: HMSO.