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ABSTRACT
Youth participation is a concept that has gained much of global attention which has seen many pieces of legislations and policy frameworks drafted to its effect. However, a number of reports show a low level of youth involvement in community development projects. In a bid to unravel this, many researchers have identified a raft of underlying factors precipitating this kind of phenomenon including political, socio-cultural environment, economic factors, and government policies. However, not much has been done on the irrigation scheme. Therefore, the research focused on the determinants of youth participation in community development projects in reference to the scheme. The objectives of this study was to establish how access to finance determines youth participation in Kimira-Oluch Smallholder Farm Improvement Project, to evaluate how socio-cultural environment determines youth participation in Kimira-Oluch Smallholder Farm Improvement Project, to establish the extent to which the level of education influences youth participation in Kimira-Oluch Smallholder Farm Improvement Project and to investigate how access to information influences youth participation in Kimira-Oluch Smallholder Farm Improvement Project in Homa- Bay Kenya. The study will be beneficial in influencing policy formulation and implementation on community development projects, assist project planners and implementers to enhance youth mainstreaming in all project implementation cycle in the community and to help facilitate the implementing partners; the NGO and donors to address the various challenges facing youth in development that threatens the sustainability of such initiatives and in capacity building plan. It would help the ministry of agriculture as a devolved function to address the specific challenges phasing out youth component in Kimira-Oluch Smallholders Farmers Improvement Project. The research employed a descriptive survey. A sample of 83 young farmers drawn from the project coverage that stretches in three sub-counties of Homa-bay County formed the respondents for this study, through simple random sampling. A questionnaire was the research instrument used for data collection. Data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics; frequencies, ANOVA and t-test were employed with aid of Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 25. The study established a significant relationship between level of education and youth participation (p<0.006), access to finance (p<0.033), socio-cultural factors (p<0.016) and access to information (p<0.018). The study recommends that the government should finance programs for tertiary education to enhance hundred percent transmission of students to various level of higher institutions of learning and colleges for more to participate in community projects, the government should invigorate youth enterprise fund with a focus on enhancing access to credit for the individual youths rather than group approach with low interest rates, the government and the relevant stakeholders on gender ought to up efforts on gender mainstreaming to empower young women to participate by strict implementation of a third gender rule in entire project life, and proper consideration in mobilizing more youths to take active role in development projects by incorporating their interests in the advocacy processes.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study
Youth participation is a concept that has gained much of global attention which has seen many pieces of legislations and policy frameworks drafted to its effect. Evidently, youth have shown capacity for transformative changes in various sectors of the global economy, (Checkway, 2006). However, there are a range of factors that tend to disenfranchise this active component of the world demographic profile which include but not limited to socio-cultural, economic and political factors, (World Youth Report, 2018).

The slow pace of youth involvement in development programs in communities around the world would be easily linked to lack much research work into this phenomenon. According the report by the DFID (2008), participation is often viewed in a general sense in which members of the community are focused as whole in most literature. However, a new dimension has been birthed at the global level whereby youth has come into a sharp focus following the sitting of the UN member states which adopted the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. This has elevated the role of youth in spurring the sustainable development programs around the globe through entrenchment of relevant policy framework of the World Program of Action for the youth, (World Youth Program Report. 2018).

From the reports youth participation in development cannot be overemphasized. Virtually all projects run in the community are geared towards improvement of the lives of the target beneficiaries. This can never be unless it is sustainable. However, participation of the youth in such initiatives guarantees sustainability, (USAID, 2018). Furthermore, literature shows that positive empowerment of the youth is the key to enhancing their involvement in the community projects, (UN, 2000). According to Lawal and Ali, (2014), empowerment of the youth is a process of involving the youth in the management of day-to-day affairs of the community programs which include ‘problem-solving and decision making processes’. Apart from the skills gained during such engagements, the youth will have an opportunity in which their interests and intents addressed during formulation of policies and at the execution of project implementation level.
Even though in a few systematic studies, the outcomes of youth participation in development cannot be overlooked. Meaningful and active participation of youth in development and especially in activities that impact positively on their personal growth and development tend to attract them thus enabling them to actively get involved. Youth active participation in development initiatives enhances, “analysis of issues critical to their wellbeing and for skill development and overall proactive development of self-identity and increased sense of self-worth thus enhancing self-efficiency.” (Cargo et al., 2003; Chinman & Linney, 1998; Flores, 2008; Jennings et al., 2006; Subramniam & Mondoa, 2010).

In most of the nations around the world, policy gap is recognized as one of the impediment to youth mainstreaming in various levels of decision making processes. Thus, some of them have mounted efforts to curb this scenario as studies consistently show the importance of youth in development efforts. According to Sherrod, (2000) youth can longer be spectators in development processes as they increasingly become visible and active component of community development due to their distinct role and opportunities. There are remarkable outcomes of implementation of youth mainstreaming policies in development. Australia has made considerable strides in bringing a number of youths on board in a bid to harness their efforts towards social inclusivity. A growing number of young people in the governmental programs on volunteerism is the product of such determination to achieve ultimate youth participation, (Bureau of Statistics, 2016).

While developed countries have registered low rate of population growth, Africa is on spot on an upsurge in the numbers of the populace. This unprecedented increment has ballooned out the number of young people in African soil which has been considered as a ticking timed-bomb, (World Youth Report, 2018). Youth bulge has immensely impacted negatively the socio-economic landscape of these nations. Reports show a tremendous rate of unemployment among the young people that often opens a floodgate of social ills such prostitution, crime, social exclusion and the list is endless. World Bank Report, (2010) further indicates that several projects undertaken in various localities have had no impact and sustainability concerns due to the disengagement of the youth from such initiatives.
Youth bulge phenomenon in the African soil is a resource that governments are yet to tap for socio-economic and political transformation. A few of these nations have established a workable policy framework to harness the youth for absolute participation in the development projects. Nigeria through the enactment of the national scheme which was geared towards enhancing achievement of national objectives on development by bringing youths on board is already reaping the fruits thereof. A study carried out in Nigeria by Ekong, (2003) revealed that participation of the youth in agriculture had boosted the sector in contributing to almost a quarter of the national GDP. Moreover, he posits that “60% of the youth live in rural communities where they derive their livelihood from agriculture and related activities. In all these views youths are the life wire of Nigeria a society combining their limited stock of capital and rudimentary equipment with their labour, they are the dominant economic activities in the rural sector and have been the principal vehicle for economic expansion.”

Youth participation in development implies involving them in the conception stage, decision making and project implementation process. However, countries of growing economies like Africa register very low level of this kind of involvement of its youths in economic development initiatives. A study done in Tanga on 80 respondents in quest to establish participation of youths in agriculture and water development projects in Mkinga district reveal that majority of the youth were excluded on the prime levels of projects execution processes. The quantitative and qualitative analysis established that youths were not involved and did not participate in initiation stage of the project, decision making processes and project execution stages, (Wengwe, 2015). Low involvement of the youth in such key milestones in project execution denies them the platform of getting equipped with relevant skills that would spur their cognitive and social skills which have a massive impact ones attitude on development projects.

Empirical research indicates that youth can spur economic development of African countries. These countries do not lack policies that address youth participation in development processes, but low level of education and proper skills disenfranchise them from taking part in development agenda. A study carried out by Juma, (2020) aiming to find out the constraints of youth participation in Zanzibar revealed that majority of the youths shy from participating in decision making processes, a phenomenon associated with to lack of education, appropriate skills coupled with inferiority complex (R²=0.618).
Thus, enhancing competence based learning outcomes could address the joblessness among the youth witnessed in African.

Kenya too is still grappling with the reality of youth bulge which mirrors the same challenges faced by other African countries. Literature show that majority of Kenyan youth are at the receiving end on police brutality, lack of social amenities, social segregation and lack of job opportunities in the labour market, (United Nations Development Program, 2010; Nairobi Research Institute Africa, n.d.; Murtuk, 2009). In order to address the upward trend of unemployment rate and marginalization that bewilder majority of these youth, the government enacted Kenya National Youth policy, perhaps to expand the space for youth participation across several sectors. The policy sanctioned the establishment of Constituency Enterprise Scheme, a kitty that would enhance access to finance by the youth in order to enable them participate actively in economic activities at the grass root level, (the Republic of Kenya, 2006).

Majority of the countries have undertaken youth entrepreneurship model in terms of policy formulation or program initiatives in order to harness youth into participating in economic development, (African Report, 2011). The Kenya Youth Development Policy (KYDP) (2019) is one of the most current policies geared towards invigorating participatory economic progress towards sustainable development. The government has taken stock of the diverse challenges facing the youth that delink them from active involvement in the mainstream economic development. A raft of multi-sectorial approach has been adopted. The government of Kenya is implementing several appropriate strategies and policy programs which aim at enhancing competency based learning outcome for the youth to address skill-mismatch, affirmative action on youth employment and empowerment programs to equip the youth for meaningful participation in development in order to achieve socio-economic transformation, (Hope, 2012).

Therefore, the United Nations (2002) posits that youth participation is known to be a prerequisite for the overall development of the community. It is on this premise that engaging the youth in the development process has no exception (Republic of Kenya 2007) that the research tends to examine other determinants of youth participation in development projects.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Youth participation in community development efforts is a growing concern in many countries of the world, Kenya is no exception. Youth form a significant portion in the demographic profile of the Kenyan population which has been considered a ticking-timed bomb owing to the floodgate of social ills that is witnessed, (MOYA). Similar to those from Asia and other African countries, Kenyan youth suffer social exclusion resulting into a number of social ills.

Therefore, in response to curb the adverse effects of youth budge the government has staged numerous strategies through policy formulation, implementation of programs and affirmative actions which has born many steps taken to engage the youth. For instance, the National Employment Policy which geared toward addressing the unemployment and participation in development efforts among the youth in Kenya aimed at vetting all major projects in determining their capacities to create employment opportunities for the youths before they are allowed to operate. This also applied to those applying for government tenders. (Great Lakes Conference in Nairobi, 2014). Sadly, the funds provided for in the government contracts are reportedly underutilized by the youths and many projects initiated in the community have registered little involvement of the youth.

Studies show that community development officers and experts especially in developing countries, like Kenya, have frowned at the low involvement of youths in development projects. For example, KOSFIP progress report presented to the Project Steering Committee (PSC) in June 2019 cited low youth involvement in production activities in a list of challenges the project faces. Although studies have been carried out on this subject in some parts of the country; ‘factors influencing youth participation in implementation of community based development,’ and ‘factors influencing youth participation in community based development’ (Mwei, 2016, Ayoti, 2015 & Mumbua, 2015) and ‘engaging the youth in Kenya: empowerment, education, and employment,’ (Hope, 2012), however, so little has been done on agriculture based projects prompting a recommendation for an investigation on youth involvement in community project implementation, (Ouma, 2014). For this reason, the study sought to investigate the determinants in relation to youth participation in community-based development projects in Homa-Bay County.
1.3 Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this study was to examine the determinants of youth participation in community development projects a case of Homa-Bay County

1.4 Objectives of the Study
This study was guided by the following objectives:
   i. To determine how access to finance influences youth participation in community development projects.
   ii. To examine how socio-cultural environment influences youth participation in community development projects.
   iii. To establish the extent to which the level of education influences youth participation in community development projects.
   iv. To assess how access to information influences youth participation in community development projects.

1.5 Research Question
The research was guided by the following research question:
   i. How does access to finance influence youth participation in community development projects?
   ii. To what extent does the socio-cultural environment influence youth participation in community development projects?
   iii. To what extent does the level of education influence youth participation in community development projects?
   iv. How does access to information determine influence youth participation in community development projects?

1.6 Research Hypotheses
This study tested the following hypothesis at the 5 percent level of significance:
   i. H1: There is a significant relationship between access to finance and youth participation in community development projects.
   ii. H2: There is a significant relationship between the socio-cultural environment and youth participation in community development projects.
iii. H3: There is a significant relationship between the level of education and youth participation in community development projects.

iv. H4: There is a significant relationship between access to information and youth participation in community development projects.

1.7 Significance of the Study
Youth participation in development programs is such a vital concept around the world especially among developing countries in which the findings of its study would not only add more insights to the available literature, but also help the government through various line ministries in address youth mainstreaming programs through relevant policy formulation and implementation.

Nonetheless, the findings of the study would enable the project planners and implementers to enhance youth mainstreaming in all project implementation cycle in the community. It would also facilitate the implementing partners; the NGO and donors to address the various challenges facing youth in development that threatens the sustainability of such initiatives and in capacity building plan. It would help the ministry of agriculture as a devolved function to address the specific challenges phasing out youth component in Kimira-Oluch Smallholders Farmers Improvement Project.

The study will help the projects planners and implementers with insights on challenges facing youth in light of socio-cultural practices especially the female youths, in order to enhance their participation in every component of the project circle as well as through taking up roles in project leadership positions. It will enable the project sponsors and financers to underscore the challenge on access to finance that impedes youth participation and thus formulate ways to spur capacity building on financial management skills among the youths in order to catalyze their involvement in project execution. The government would be able to focus not only in making bank loans easier to access but also to enhance financial capacities of the youth groups to encourage informal credit services to the youths.

Similarly, the study would inform decisions on project awareness creation plan at the formulation stage on the choice of appropriate informative channels that will enhance access to information as well as youth inclusion advocacy programs to heighten youth involvement
in development projects. Through this study, the government would ensure adequate empowerment programs geared towards up-scaling attainment of basic education across the country in response to the impact education plays in shaping positive attitude towards development initiatives on youths.

1.8 Limitation of the Study
It was a great challenge to gain access to respondents due to the Covid-19 pandemic situation which had gained heights on community transmission at the time of data collection. The IWUA leaders came in handy in helping to coordinate on how to meet the respondents while keeping up with MOH protocols. Since the questionnaires were dropped to be picked later after filling, there was a massive delay. However, due to close coordination with the authorities quite a number of the duly filled questionnaires were returned. The pandemic also ballooned out the stipulated budget making data collection economically strenuous. This implies that the researcher should plan well in advance to deal with any dynamics in the field to avoid inconveniences.

1.9 Delimitation of the Study
The study delimited to young farmers in KOSFIP scheme in Homa-Bay County. The research focused on 83 young farmers presumably with vast knowledge on the participation level of the youth in the scheme as they stood vantage-ground on knowing determinants of youth participation; access to finance, the socio-cultural environment, level of education and access to information and how they influence youth participation in community development projects in KOSFIP in Homa-Bay County.

1.10 Assumption of the Study
The availability of the respondents confirmed the researcher’s assumption and the information provided during the survey was reliable and valid intended and were deemed fit to address the research questions.
1.11 Definition of Significant Terms

Youth Participation: A process in which youths not only take an active role in the implementation of development initiative within their localities but are also involved in decision making.

Level of Education: It refers to the literacy level of the youth.

Access to finance: The degree to which youth are able to get financial services including credit facilities.

Access to information: The extent the information concerning the community project reaches the youth in terms of its impact and progress.

Socio-cultural environment: These are the community system of believes that influences one’s attitude and behavior.

Government policy: This refers to legislation and enactment that tend to regulate processes and social practices.

Community-Based Projects: These are development initiatives run in the community by the community members with the aim of improving their standards of living.

1.12 Organization of the Study

This study is divided into five chapters. Chapter one which is the introduction, describes the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, research hypothesis, limitation of the study, delimitation of the study, assumption of the study, and definition of significant terms. Chapter two is on literature review, where themes related to both the independent and dependent variables have been presented. The section has also heightened two key theories, conceptual framework, and identified key research gaps that study was able to fill. Chapter three outlines the study methodology, the research design, target population, sample procedure, data collection instruments, data collection procedure, data analysis methods, ethical consideration and operationalization of variables are well elaborated. Chapter four is on in-depth analysis, presentation, interpretation and discussion of data on the variables under study. Chapter five outlines summary of the findings, conclusion, recommendations of the study and suggestion for further study.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This section gives an in-depth review of the related literature on the level of education, socio-cultural factors, access to finance and access to information as determinants of youth participation in community projects, two key theories, conceptual framework, and identified key research gaps that study was able to fill.

2.2 The Concept of Youth participation in Community Development Projects
There is no commonality in the definition of youth all across the board. Despite the UN indicating that a youth is a cohort that ranges between 15-24 years of age, each country contextual what seems ideal based on their demographic profile. In Kenya, a youth is defined constitutionally as a person who is 18 and has not has not attained 35 years of age. In South African, the National Youth Policy, (2015) puts the bare minimum age of 15 years and a maximum of 35 years as the appropriate age for this cohort. Despite the variance on opinion on the standard age bracket for the youth cohort, one challenge seems common-youth disenfranchisement from the life-stream of the community processes which greatly hold the key to growth and development of various sectors of the economy. Studies show a number of challenges that edge youth out of the heart of community’s affairs, (Brennan et al., 2009), which call for appropriate mitigating approaches to this phenomenon by ensuring youth involvement in decision making process not as mere beneficiaries but as co-partners which serves the very meaning of youth participation, (Checkoway et al.,2006).

Literature reveals that youth empowerment is one of the avenues to enhance youth participation in development projects in the community. According to Jennings et a., (2006), youth empowerment guarantees acquisition of relevant skills that enable the youth to engage in meaningfully community development initiatives. Since lack of skills tops the list on why youths shy from participation in community affairs, the UN, (2010) posits that the empowerment process does not only enable the youth to have an active participation in the community development projects but it also benefit them in their individual capacity.
Literature is replete with massive benefits of youth participation in various sectors of the economy born from the empowerment endeavours by various stakeholders. However, political, socio-economic factors play a key role in inhibiting vast majority of the youth from taking active role in decision making processes and governance in the community which open a floodgate of unnumbered social ills. They form part of the poor class in the social ladder. Consequently, they are not able to access job opportunities and social amenities, (UNDP, 2010). In a study conducted by Olujide, (2017) and Ali et al., (2018) further linked level of education and attitude of the youth as among other factors that inhibit their active involvement in community initiatives.

Going by the benefits of youth participation in community endeavours, a concerted efforts ought to be in place in mainstreaming youth participation in development projects by addressing the inhibitors of their involvement since youth is a valuable asset of the economy and when rightly put to use can revolutionize development initiatives through innovation in problem identification and creative formulation of solutions, (Bamber, 2014 & Nickerson, 2010). Mainstreaming youth participation means well for the developing countries in terms of economic and social benefits, given the high statistics of youths recorded due to youth bulge compared to developed nations, (Sukarieh & Tannock, 2014). Thus addressing the challenges that hinder youth involvement in nation building through active participation in community development projects becomes inevitable.

2.2.1 Level of Education and Youth Participation in Community Development Projects

Empirical studies link success of projects to community participation or involvement, in a study carried out in Sweden objectively to establish the importance of participation in government projects, (Axelsson, 2010). Although it established a significant associate of project success to community participation, but it failed to point out the determinants of community participation from the analysis of secondary data drawn from the e-government projects. However, this study investigated the determinants of participation in community projects with special focus on the youth which is a valuable asset for projects’ success and sustainability.
Education is an important ingredient in enhancing the intensity and extent of youth participation in development efforts. Findings from a study carried out in Garowa District by Mohamud et al., (2018) linked education to altitude of youth towards participation. It is worth noting that education imparts and enhance desirable qualities that motivate the youth to be more concerned with issues that not only influence their lives but also impact in their surroundings. Subsequently, more educated youths often show positive attitude towards community progress and development, resulting to active involvement in the community development projects.

Moreover, a study by Otieno et al., (2018) investigating the relevance of formal education among 360 rural youth participation in planning of community projects in Turkana, revealed a significant correlation of the level of education and youth participation. Otieno et al., (2018) deduced that youths with higher level of education show positive attitude towards involvement in community development initiatives, reflecting the views of Oduor & Muriu (2013) who asserted that inadequate education and training form part of the myriad barriers to participation for Kenyan youths.

Reports show that there is a high involvement among the youth with high education attainment in participatory activities related to community development as compared to their counterparts. Education enhances cognitive development among learners imparting in them ‘analytical skills’ valuable in tackling life challenging situation. Hence educated youth possesses the qualities needed not only in decision making processes but also in problem solving processes, which boost their attitude on participation in development programs in their communities, (DFID, 2014).

From various empirical and case studies, a lack of formal education among the youth especially the female gender is widely associated with low productivity in varied economic fields. However, this is determined significantly by attainment of ‘quality of education’ (United Nations Human settlements Program, 2010), which Hope (2012) posits that the quality is measured by gaining ‘appropriate skills’ which enable learners to be relevant in handling the contemporary issues that they face in their environment. However, this is far from reach, for reports show that most of education systems fail to impart to the young people appropriate skills that would enable them to “participate in decision-making
processes, when they develop the necessary analytical skills for problem-solving through participatory, active learning.” (DFID, 2010).

The evidence of a lack of appropriate skills among the youths ails major economies of the third world countries with a greater percentage of their energetic populace left out of active involvement in economic progress. For instance, the Kenyan government too recognizes that majority of the graduates from various institutions of learning bear skills that don’t fit the requirement of the labor market. As result vast majority of the youth are not absorbed into the job market resulting to high rate of unemployment in the country, (MOYAS, 2012). Youths can be harnessed to become active partners in meeting the demands of the economy only if proper policy formulation institutionalizes competency based learning outcomes in the education sector in order to spur active participation of youth in economic development.

2.2.2 Access to finance and Youth Participation in Community Development Projects

‘Access to finance’ refers to the ability of an individual or an entrepreneur to acquire and utilize financial services at affordable cost including “risk management services,” (GOK, 2013). Financial access is not only to have the ability to acquire and utilize financial services but also the accessibility to the financial institutions. “Financial access has four main dimensions namely: physical access, affordability, appropriateness to the user’s needs and terms that do not effectively exclude any category of a potential user”, (Musamali and Tarus, 2013). In the formal banking sector, financial services such as loans and insurances are accessed under certain terms and conditions. Often the laid down prerequisites are unattainable thus lock out many disadvantaged group including the youth.

OECD (2014), reports that lack of collateral is a fundamental barrier for the less fortunate groups among the entrepreneurs in accessing finance as majority of them lack highly priced assets that can guarantee the recovery of the loans issued by the formal banks. Youth entrepreneurs being a part of the most under-represented or disadvantaged group in the society are on the receiving end as few own assets such as real estate, vehicles or land.

The expressed preference to already established business over SME is also a real impediment to the access of finance by a number of people or businesses which are at the startup level. Coupled with the “oligalistic” nature of banking sector many, potential groups so energetic such as the youth with the ability to invest, fall short of the capacity to utilize such services,
(Waita 2012). Most of the SME in Africa suffer discrimination in the credit industries. Formal banks cite cost incurred in monitoring these small scale borrowers and the risk of failing to reimburse as among other factors that disqualify them from acquiring and utilizing such products and services, (Yahie, 2011).

Empirical studies show a significant association of the age of the borrower and the ability to access finance. In his study, Gemma (2014) sought to investigate creation of employment through entrepreneurship financing. He found out that youths who are below 26 years are likely to be disadvantaged in terms of access to finance. This implies that the older youths are likely to gain access to finance including loan services from the formal banks. Older youths have an edge over the younger ones based on their financial and business management skills which tend to give the lending agencies the confidence on their ability to reimburse. This often make majority of youth entrepreneurs not to utilize debt financing due to the prescribed terms and conditions for borrowing from the formal financial institutions,( Adebajo, 2010).

Due to high rate of unemployment witnessed in most parts of developing countries, majority of the youth tend to run business ventures to meet the demands of an ever soring economic situations. The empirical research shows that formal banks that have had youths as their target for credit services have so far registered an upsurge in the numbers of clients served, (Bartokva and Durcova, 2013). Therefore, it is by minimizing the stringent requirements attached on borrowing from the formal institutions and improved accessibility to such entities that youths will be enabled to access finance that in turn facilitating their participation in entrepreneurial activities.

Financial literacy, business planning and management skills is lacking among most youths, making them unable to benefit from debt financing from formal credit institutions. Records from banks indicate that a lot of application forms from youths are rejected at the preliminary level of scrutiny as many are submitted unduly filled. Thus, mentorship schemes and financial education programs are of necessity to help the youth acquire relevant skills, to enable them to come up with well documented business plans that can appeal to the financial institutions and financial management skills that would be beneficial for running of the daily financial obligations of their ventures for growth and expansion.
2.2.3 Socio-Cultural Environment and Youth Participation in Community Development Projects

Although there are various definitions of socio-cultural factors however, Kottak (2002) asserts that socio-cultural factors involve both social and cultural elements that shape the values, customs and beliefs of a given community. The society and culture within which an individual youth finds him/her is bound to influence the extent to which he or she participates in community development initiatives. A youth’s social setting, cultural practices, and belief system greatly impact an individual’s attitude, personality, and lifestyle. Youths who have not had opportunities to participate in development agenda in their communities especially in societies that embrace patriarchal systems of beliefs which breeds male dominance rendering young women unworthy in development projects outside the homestead.

Most assuredly peer pressure is one of the fundamental social factors that influence either positively or negatively on the youth’s desire to participate in community development projects. A study done in Garowe District, Somalia by Mohamudi et al., (2018) established that peer pressure amounts to one of the key factors in youth involvement in community development initiatives. Peer pressure often impacts negatively on the youths than otherwise except in few cases where it helps youth to struggle to feel identified with any particular group or organization.

In certain cultures the old are given pre-eminence which often dilutes the impact of the youth. According to Abdi, (2013) the Somali culture deem the old men to be sound in judgement. Such traditions the elders have a universal sway on the youth to the extent they dictate virtually everything to them, as a results young people become passive in matters development within the community being excluded from decision making processes.

Reports from DFID (2010) indicate that the big time challenge that the youth face is social exclusion. A fragmented community through social strata often breed injustices and exclusion of the dis-advantaged group especially the youth rendering their participation an uphill task. It is impossible for such a society to offer equal chances for its constituents especially the less fortune. Youth fail to participate in community development projects for lack of inclusion in project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation stage due lack of sense of ownership.
Patricia et al., (2014), youths within a favourable social climate that encourages cooperation, enhances capacity building, personal growth and development; the ingredients for participation in development projects. Communities that enjoy cooperation often spur some sense of belonging among members. A sense of belonging enables members of the society to coalesce, motivating a collective approach to activities in the community as a result. Therefore, youths can be encouraged to form partnerships with one another in a drive to execute development initiatives.

Empirical studies further show that peer pressure to some extent can spur youth participation in community development projects. Botes and Rensburg (2000), indicate that a community with strong united front among its constituents motivates participation by all in any given endeavour. In such communities where youths have strong organizations, participation will be enhanced since no one of the members wishes to be isolated from the rest in a sense of wanting to belong.

Culture also plays a critical role in developing social segregation and exclusion like the caste system which to a greater degree influences youth participation in community projects. The caste system is a practice that classifies its population with members who belong to lower cadre believed to be cursed hence they are to remain in such status and are excluded from participating in development (Col Gurnam Singh, 2012). Since this caste system uses the economic prowess for its classification into social strata then youth whose data show to be among the poorest population in the developing world suffer most in social exclusion making them fewer participants in the community development initiatives. In Kenya, the state of affairs is not so distance from what literature points to. Here youth are socialized to believe that their time has not yet come; they are the leaders, men, and women of positions tomorrow. This old adage grind youth down to a powerless state in which they don’t exploit their potential for the betterment of the soring state of their economic situation. This culture has slowed down the development process because youths’ potential has not been adequately harnessed for maximum impact on the community development projects.

Culture has also made land access to youth a complex endeavour that otherwise would be used as collateral to access credit finance to aid their involvement in economic initiatives. Since land ownership is pegged on inheritance especially in African counties, majority of women are disadvantaged. The global data indicate about 98% of the available land is owned
by men. This shows that majority of women do not enjoy land rights and land ownership, (FAO, 2010). The report indicates that this situation is precipitated by the statutory and customary laws that govern most land rights in the community. Although the Kenyan constitution 2010 gives equal rights on land ownership to both gender, but ‘traditional and customary laws’ still impedes the implementation of such policies. These laws put women on the beneficiary quartile through a relationship with the male, (Cotula, 2011).

2.2.4 Access to Information and Youth Participation in Community Development Projects
Information and advocacy are inseparable components of youth empowerment process that go in handy. It is possible to attain youth active involvement in development initiatives in most parts of the globe when appropriate approaches on advocacy process are applied, through creation of forums whose objectives are to enhance exchange of ideas meant to have them gain knowledge and skills akin to United Nation Annual Youth Assembly of August 2010. In this forum youth leaders from around the world were properly equipped with appropriate skills on leadership, conflict and conflict resolution with an aim to have a clear understanding of their role and responsibilities in enhancing youth participation in development initiatives.

Empirical studies shows that as opposed to the popular view, youth are so much concerned with what affects their lives in their varied forms such as employment, health, education, the environment and their sexuality even though they are not actively involved in the echelon of ‘power’ and community processes that can greatly impart their lives positively, (Hallett, 1999). In support of this view a study conducted in Australia on Processes in the Substance Care System, a young man-a respondent in the survey expressed his displeasure on youth exclusion in decision-making processes even on critical issues that pertains his life, “Decisions that involve me are basically my life. This is my life, why are you talking about it as if I don’t exist” (NSW, 1998). Hence for youths to take a central and active part in development initiative in their community, they should be part of decision-making processes.

Since information and advocacy revolves on dissemination of relevant information relevant to the youths, the choice of the communication channels is critical. In a research carried out by Courtney Crosson in 2004-2005 in Kibera Slums in Nairobi on Youth Information Networks in Kenya, established that the Radio, Television and Poster ranked high among
other sources of information to the members of the public. It was further revealed that Radio and posters were trusted sources with any information that pertains to any community issues. Therefore, to increase youth participation in community development projects, youth awareness and inclusion mainstreaming programs ought to have priority among planners and executors of such programs. Furthermore, the awareness campaign should be mounted to sweep away the prevailing negative attitude that the majority of the society has on youths through appropriate informative channels.

2.3 Theoretical Framework
This section contains the discussion on the theories adopted by the study: Arnstein’s theory on community participation and social system theory and how they invariably link to the objectives of the research. In addition, conceptual framework with the details of indicators on each research objective is highlighted.

2.3.1 The Arnstein’s theory on Community Participation
Although there are several theories brought forward in a bid to explain human behaviour in the society, the study is underpinned by ‘Arnstein’s theory of community participation’, (Arnstein, 1969). This theory explains participation in a range of types from ‘manipulation of the community members, therapy, informing, consultation, placation, partnership, delegated power, and citizen control.’ This theory draws a dichotomy between the actual optimal participation and feigned one that appears to be community participation but no more than a masquerade.
In his theory, Sherry Arnstein depicts a ladder of participation in the community. A number of factors have been cited by the proponent to be influencing participation in the community including ‘power centres, processes issues, technical capacity, leadership and attitude of members of the community.’ He posits that youth empowerment is a concept that has gained much of attention in addressing participatory approaches. It is an idea that has gained prominence which tends to view the community members as ‘consumer where there are choices among the alternatives, which are seen as a means through which power can be accessed. Under this theory, people are expected to be technically responsible for them and should, therefore, engage comprehensively in decision-making processes’ where participatory approach is needed in community projects. Education and access to information are variables that extensively relate to this theory thus informing its choice by the researcher.
2.3.2 The Socials Systems theory
This theory is also adopted for the study. It is a theory that tends to look at the interrelationships between and amongst the ‘systems’. This theory views the community as a structure with several components or groups that do not only get influenced by the culture and the norms, but also have great impact on determining the social behaviour of the constituents. It best explains the socialization process in the society and how it impacts on the youth in the community. Youths are influenced by the peer to a greater extends in relation to what they do or choose not to do. Thus through ‘sub-systems’, young people can be a fordable force in implementation of community projects. Similarly, socio-cultural perspectives play a key role in undertaking the role and purpose of social actors in society. Thus ‘social system emphasizes the socialization process and close relation between the individual and society because it affects the involvement of an individual in the participation of group activities.’ This informed the researcher’s choice on it as it invariably relates to information access and social-cultural factor.

2.3.3 Conceptual Framework
Conceptual framework presents the view of the researcher on the concept being presented in the study, (Kothari, 2004). It defines the relationship between variables deemed important. The conceptual framework below shows the relationship of variables on the determinants of youth participation in community development projects. It demonstrates that youth participation in development projects is influenced by various factors which include level education as expressed in numbers of years of study, highest certificate awarded and professional training. In regards to access to finance as a variable, there are indicators that evaluate and measures the level of access to finance by the participants such as lack of access to the credit institution, lack of collateral and risk factors. Youth involvement in development projects is also determined by socio-cultural factors that were evaluated with the extent of a gender stereotype, existence of peer groups and number of youth in the project. Similarly, access to information tends to affect youth participation in development projects evaluated through a number of forums on capacity building attended by the youths, awareness campaigns on participation and the widely used channel of communication by the youth. It is hypothesized that these variables directly determine youth participation in development initiatives being dependent variables.
2.4 Conceptual Framework

**Independent variables**

- **Level Education**
  - Number of youth who can read and write.
  - Number of youth with college level education

- **Access to Finance**
  - Number of youth accessing bank loans.
  - Number of youths in Merry-go-round VSL

- **Socio-cultural**
  - Number of female youths in farmers organization, IWUA
  - Number of youths in the project

- **Access to Information**
  - Awareness campaign on participation
  - Inclusion advocacy programs
  - Information channels promoting participation

**Moderating Variables**

- **Government Policy**
  - Gender Policy

- **Youth Participation in Community Development Projects**
  - Number of youth involved in development projects.
  - Number of youth holding leadership posts in development projects.
  - Amount of time spent by youth in development projects.

---

**Figure 1 Conceptual Framework**
2.5 Knowledge gap
This section outlines the research findings, the areas addressed, the areas that have not been effectively addressed and how the current study addressed those gaps.

Table 2.1 Knowledge Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Researcher/Author</th>
<th>Findings/Conclusion</th>
<th>Knowledge gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) To determine how access to finance influences youth participation in community development projects</td>
<td><strong>Ann Chebet, 2016</strong></td>
<td>The study that focused on factors influencing access to credit by young entrepreneurs in Sotik, established youths’ main sources of finance were: friends, relatives, credit from microfinance institutions and banks. Therefore, lack of collateral, huge interest rates and cumbersome application procedures limit youth entrepreneurs’ access to credit.</td>
<td>This study found out that youths do not utilize the informal loaning sector such as Merry-go-rounds for credit access and they possess negative attitude towards credit facility from formal banks due to the implications for failure to reimburse. Therefore, access finance influences youth participation in development initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii). To examine how socio-cultural environment influences youth participation in community development projects</td>
<td><strong>Aminia &amp; Kimara, 2016</strong></td>
<td>The study found out that social inequalities, generational difference between adults and the youth, young women over-occupied with domestic chores and rural-urban migration negatively influence youth participation in agricultural development projects.</td>
<td>This study established that peer pressure, gender roles and cultural perception of the community hinder youth participation in development projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iii) To establish the extent to which the level of education influences youth participation in community development projects

Olive Jerop Mwei, 2016

The research established that high level of education empowers youth participation in implementation of community development projects. This study found out that uneducated youth are unwilling to be in positions of responsibilities and they never get appointed into community project leadership. Thus education influences youth participation in development projects.

iv) To assess how access to information influences youth participation in community development projects

Stellamaris Mumbua, 2015

The study sought to investigate how awareness strategies influence youth participation in development projects in Maili Saba slum in Nairobi. The findings established that most youth projects are not published, majority of youths are not included in the project advocacy programs and most awareness channels used for promoting participation are ineffective. Thus awareness strategies negatively influence youth participation.
participation in community development initiatives.

The researcher found out that sensitization and advocacy in terms of training, seminars or workshops greatly influence youth advocacy processes and few attend participation in community projects in Emuhaya, Kenya.

The study established that majority of the youth are never involved in the sensitization meetings tailored to urge active participation.

2.6 Summary of the Literature
This chapter has highlighted on the concept of participation, literature review, where themes related to both the independent and dependent variable have been presented. The researcher elaborated on the theoretical frameworks that underpin the study and a demonstration of the relationship that exist in the study variables through a conceptual framework. From the literature reviewed, it is clear that not so much exists and especially on the knowledge of the youth participation in development projects in the community more so in the schemes.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter discusses the research methodology employed in the study. It describes the research design, study area, study population, sample design, data collection, validity, and reliability. It focuses on ethical considerations during data collection process, operationalization of variables and data analysis methods employed in the research.

3.2 Research design
The study employed a descriptive research design which often utilizes interviews as model of collecting relevant data drawn from a sample of the population under study. Descriptive studies do not just revolve around the collection of data but rather entail classification, analysis, measurement, comparison, and interpretation of data. This design was applicable for this study since it determined and reported issues such as behaviour as they occur in the environment based on the phenomenon under study; the level of education, access to finance, socio-cultural and access to information. The descriptive survey enhanced collection of data from a large number of respondents targeted by the study, as well as a wider range of information on the phenomena by indicating the attitudes, behaviour, perceptions, values and past behaviour of youths towards participation in community development projects.

3.3 Target population
A population constitutes of a group of people with shared or common characteristics from which the youth or units of analysis selected out of the population for study. The target population for the study was the 3000 farmers (KOSFIP Report, 2019) and an estimated 20% as the percentage of youth (aged between 18-35 years) of the farmers’ population. The target population was 600 drawn from 97 blocks of the project area were considered for the study.
3.4 Sample Size and Sampling Procedure
This section researcher describes the sample procedure employed for the study and the sample size.

3.4.1 Sample size
A sample refers a representation of the population under study upon which the researcher intend to draw information. The information collection is assumed to apply to the larger population. The sample size of the 83 respondents was used. Survey monkey online calculator provided a simplified formula to calculate sample sizes. The sample size was computed as:

Where:
Population size (N) = 600
Confidence level = 95%
Margin error = 10%
Sample size (n) = 83 respondents.

3.4.1 Sampling Procedure
The research targeted 83 youth respondents. Using simple random sampling, the researcher selected 83 blocks and from each one youth was chosen randomly.

3.5 Data Collection Instruments
A structured questionnaire was deemed fit for data collection which the researcher administered to the respondents.

3.5.1 Pilot Test
Pilot study is an exercise geared towards testing the research instruments. It is often informs the validity and the reliability of the instruments before the actual study is conducted. It enabled the researcher to check whether the questionnaires were properly worded and whether they were understood by the respondents. The researcher selected 24 respondents from Wahambla irrigation scheme in Ndhiwa, Homa-Bay County to participate in pilot survey. Through pilot study, some statements and questions were modified to enhance simplicity and clarity. Some vital information was added to the research instrument that enhanced the content in relation to the variables under study.
3.5.2 Validity of Research Instruments

Validity of a research instruments assess the extent to which the instrument measures what it is designed to measure, (Robson, 2011). The researcher assessed the content validity to ensure that statements and questions on the instruments were in tandem with the research objectives. Construct validity was assessed to ensure that statements and questions on the instruments were clearly and correctly stated. The researcher also employed validation strategies including consulting with the supervisor to ensure that the instrument measures correctly the concepts under study, (Pallant, 2011).

3.5.3 Reliability of Research Instruments

Reliability of research instrument is the ability of the instrument to yield consistent results after repeated trials. In order to ascertain the reliability of the questionnaire, the researcher selected randomly 10 respondents from other blocks other than the ones designated for the study. The test and re-test was conducted within a span of one week. The analysis of the sets of data yielded a positive correlation of 0.72 of coefficient of Cronbach’s alpha as shown in table 3.1, meaning that the research instruments had a good reliability level hence deemed fit for actual data collection.

Table 3.1 Reliability Statistics

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Items</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Data Collection Procedures

Having been cleared to carry out data collection the researcher had a formal session with the IWUA leadership on the planned data collection among the young farmers in the project. The 83 respondents randomly sampled were taken through consenting process in which they accepted to participate. The researcher assured the respondents that the information obtained from them would be used for academic purposes and were to be treated with uttermost confidentiality. Each respondent was issued with structured questionnaires which upon filling were returned on time.
3.7 Data Analysis Methods
The researcher employed descriptive statistics in the analysis of the data, having collected the questionnaires issued out from the respondents. Data was coded, tabulated and presented in frequencies and percentages. A narrative on interpretations and discussions on each thematic area focused by the study was done. Inferential statistics was employed in which ANOVA and t-test was used to test the association of the study variables with the aid of specialized Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

3.8 Ethical Considerations
In order to abide by the ethical standards that govern research, the researcher sought to gain permission from relevant authorities. The respondents were taken through the consenting process in order to enable them make informed choice to participate in the study with full assurance that the anonymity and confidentiality in data collection, analysis and dissemination.
### 3.9 Operationalization of Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Type of the Variables</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Specific Indicators</th>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>Type of Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>To establish the extent to which the level of education determines youth participation in community development projects.</td>
<td>Independent; Level of Education</td>
<td>The number of literate youths. The number of youth with a college-level of education.</td>
<td>Number of literate youth. Number of literate youth.</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>To determine how access to finance determines youth participation in community development projects.</td>
<td>Independent; Access to finance.</td>
<td>A number of youth accessing loans. The number on merry go rounds.</td>
<td>Number of the youth of youths investing in the project Youth participating in merry go round/VSL.</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Quantitative description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>To assess how the socio-cultural environment determines youth participation in a community development project</td>
<td>Independent; Cultural environment.</td>
<td>Peer pressure Number of youth females in the project</td>
<td>Number of youth in the project Perception of youth.</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>To assess how access to information determines youth participation in community development projects.</td>
<td>Independent; Access to information.</td>
<td>Awareness campaign and advocacy programs targeting youths Inclusion channels used</td>
<td>Attendance of youth to the forums The number of youth reached.</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent; Level of youth participating in development Projects</td>
<td>Number of youth in developmental projects. Number of youth in leadership position.</td>
<td>Number of youth in developmental projects. The number of youth leaders in positions if the project.</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction
This chapter deals with data analysis and presentation on determinants of youth participation in community project, a case of Homa-bay County. The discussions on the findings of thematic sections of the research is preceding by the demographic profile of the sample of youth farmers in KOSFIP projects which are presented in form of frequency and percentage tables.

4.2 Questionnaire Return Rate
Out of the 83 youths sampled for the study, 79 of them responded and returned duly filled questionnaires yielding a response rate of 95.18%, which was deemed good for analysis and reporting. This was achieved due to proper coordination between the researcher, research assistant, the IWUA leadership and adequate induction of the respondents on the importance of the study to the project.

4.3 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents
The study sought to look at the demographic trends on the sampled respondents in relations to gender, age group and level of education as discussed below.

4.3.1 Gender of the Respondents
The respondents were asked to indicate their gender and the response was as follows:

Table 4.1 Respondents’ Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study reveals that majority of youth farmers are males 51(64.56%) while females were 28(35.44%). It reflects a gender bias situation in most sectors of the economy especially in community development projects in the country. Kenya being a patriarchal society, males
often tower and dominate in ownership of factors of production such as land. Consequently, they form large part of the registered farmers in KOSFIP project as compared to females.

4.3.2 Age of the Respondents

In order to establish the age group of the youth farmers, the respondents were asked to select the appropriate age category as shown in table 4.2

Table 4.2 Classification of Respondents’ Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 – 24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 35</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the youths 54(68.35%) are aged between 31 to 35 years old who are involved in the production activities in KOSFIP project representing a class of those who might have settled down and have to fend for their families as opposed to the 6(7.60%) ranging between 18-24years old who might be still pursuing their education and thus have no time and intent to participate in community projects. The age group of 25-30 years of the youths registered low numbers. This is a phenomenon that could be associated to the influx of young people into urban areas often precipitated by a search of job opportunities, disadvantaging the rural economic growth.
4.3.3 Occupation of the Respondents

It was essential to establish the source of livelihood among the youths participating in community development project. Hence below are the responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service providers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 shows that majority of the respondents are involved in the informal employment sector with agriculture topping the list. Data reveals that 38(48.10%) are in agriculture as their occupation, 25(31.65%) in labour, 10(12.65%) are in business and 6(7.60%) as professional service providers. This demonstrates that majority of the youth in this community largely depend much on agriculture as the source of livelihood. This collates with the literature that indicate that agriculture accounts for 53% of the workforce of the total employment in developing countries, (Aksoy, 2012). Furthermore, reports show that in Kenya agriculture forms the basis of economic growth in the rural areas in which it provides up to 88% of both formal and informal employment opportunities, (MOA, 2010). Moreover, low numbers of professional service provider among the young farmers could be associated to the impacts of rural-urban migration exhibited by the majority of the youths and negative attitude towards agriculture.
4.3.4 Level of Education of the Respondents

The researcher was interested in establishing the highest educational attainment by the respondents. Below are the responses.

**Table 4.4 Distribution of Respondents’ Educational Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Certificate</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Diploma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not gone to School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study reveals that most of the respondents have attained the elementary level of education in which 29(36.71%) and 28(35.44%) have primary and secondary level education respectively. However quite a few of the sampled youths in the project have attained the tertiary level of education with 21(26.58%) certificate and diploma holders and one graduate in the farm. With just a few with high level of educational attainment in the project, participation level is likely to be hampered. Studies show that the higher the level of education the higher the level of participation. Education impacts positive attitude towards involvement in community development projects among the youths by equipping with relevant skills on problem solving and decision-making processes. (DFID, 2014). This implies that KOSFIP project is likely to lack the creativity and capacity to adapt to the prevailing conditions for sustainability.
4.4 Level of Education and Youth Participation in Community Development Projects

The first objective of this research was to establish the level of education as a determinant of youth participation in community development projects. The respondents were asked to indicate the extent in which they agree or disagree with the following statements in likert scale of rating 1-5, where; SA=5, A=4, N=3, D=2 and SD=1

Table 4.5 Influence of Education on Youth Community Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Educated youths are better empowered for participation in community development</td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(48.10%)</td>
<td>(27.85%)</td>
<td>(3.80%)</td>
<td>(11.39%)</td>
<td>(8.86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Level of education is considered for one to be elected in the project leadership, IWUA.</td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(59.49%)</td>
<td>(20.25%)</td>
<td>(2.53%)</td>
<td>(7.59%)</td>
<td>(10.14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Despite their level of education youths get an equal chance to participate in community projects</td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10.13%)</td>
<td>(6.33%)</td>
<td>(12.66%)</td>
<td>(18.99%)</td>
<td>(51.89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Uneducated youth often are not willing to take leadership role in the community development projects</td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(40.51%)</td>
<td>(27.85%)</td>
<td>(5.06%)</td>
<td>(18.99%)</td>
<td>(7.59%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, N=Neutral, D=Disagree, & SD= Strongly Disagree

The perusal of table 4.5 shows that most of the respondents 38(48.10%) strongly agreed that educated youth are better empowered to participate in community projects. Majority of the youths interviewed perceived that level of education is considered in election of one into the project leadership (IWUA) accounting for 47(59.49%) who strongly agreed to the statement. Meanwhile, 41(51.89%) strongly disagreed that youths get equal chance to participate in community development initiatives despite their educational level. 32(40.51%) strongly agreed that uneducated youths often are not willing to take up the leadership role in the community projects.
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These findings collate with other studies showing that education influences the intensity and pattern of participation, (Otieno et al., 2018). Effective participation in development efforts often require communicative skills and human relation skills which must be learned. Therefore individuals with higher level of education would possess favourable attitude towards involvement in development projects, (Angba, 2009). Through education, youths develop analytical skills that help them become critical thinkers and well as imparts to them problem solving skills that spur their usefulness in community development initiatives, (DFID, 2014). Youth can adequately participate in development efforts when endowed with appropriate skills that only education imparts. Thus, educational attainment is essential for youth participation in the community development.

4.4.1 The Extent of Influence of level of Education on Youth Participation in CDP

The researcher further sought to have the view of the respondents on the extent the level education determines youth participation in the project. The data is shown in Table 4.6.

**Table 4.6 Responses on the Extent to which Education influence Youth Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Great Extent</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Extent</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Great Extent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Extent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Extent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly less Extent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data shows that majority of the youths 62(78.48%) agreed that the level of education influence youth participation to a very great extent, while 8(10.13%) viewed education to be influencing participation to a great extent. 5(6.32%) of the interviewed perceived the influence of education on participation to a slightly great extent, while 2(2.53%) agreed that education influence youth participation to a moderate extent. Therefore the study shows that level of education determines youth participation in development projects in the community.
4.4.2 Testing of the Hypothesis (1): Level of Education and Youth Participation in Community Development Projects.

H₀: There is no significant relationship between level of education and youth participation in community development projects.

Using ANOVA, the hypothesis was tested in order to establish whether there exist a significance relationship between level of education and youth participation in community development projects and the results were as shown in table 4.7 below.

**Table 4.7 Testing Hypothesis Using ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.451</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>3.917</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>16.296</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19.747</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the results above, the study reveals that level of education is significantly associated with youth participation in community development projects (p<0.006) at 95% level of confidence. Since the P-value is less than the chosen significance level (α=0.05), H₀ is rejected.

4.5 Access to Finance and Youth Participation in Community Development Projects

The researcher sought to investigate the affordability of running farm production and the extent to which access to finance determines youth participation in community development projects.

4.5.1 Cost for running a farm in KOSFIP Project

The respondents were asked whether it is costly to run a production in farms and below are the responses.
The study reveals that 44 (55.70%) youths interviewed agreed that the cost of running a farm in the project area is high, while 35 (44.30%) were of the contrary opinion. This portrays that one has to have an averagely high amount of money in order to comfortably do production in farms in the project area, thereby confirming the costly nature of agriculture is in the country. Since majority of the rural youths are disadvantaged economically, there is still a lot in terms of cost involved in production to be done for the KOSFIP project to attract more youths to participation.

### 4.5.2 Access to Finance and Youth Participation in Community Development Projects

The researcher intended to investigate the extent to which the respondents agree or disagree with the following statements in regards to access to finance and its influence on youth participation in community development projects in a rating of 1-5, where SA=5, A=4, N=3, D=2 and SD=1. Below were the responses.
Majority of the respondents 51(64.56%) strongly disagreed that most youths get loans from Merry-go-round and Village Savings and Loaning groups to invest in farm productions, on the other hand 64(81.01%) of those interviewed strongly agreed that few youths access bank loans. In addition, 56(70.89%) of the respondents strongly agreed that most youths have negative attitude towards bank loans for fear of failure to payback at the same time majority of the young farmers 44(55.70%) strongly agreed that youths rarely access bank loans due to the legal requirements laid down by the banks such as collateral.

Majority of the respondents perceived that acquiring credit is a major setback to youths which agrees with reports indicating that despite the fact that financial institutions tries to revolutionize credit accessibility to many, often youths tend to shy away from such services for fear of lack of ability to reimburse, (FAO,2010).

**Table 4.9 Influence of Access to Finance on Youth Participation in CDP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Most youths get loans from Merry-go-round and Village Savings and Loaning</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>groups to invest in farm productions</td>
<td>(10.13%)</td>
<td>(12.66%)</td>
<td>(3.80%)</td>
<td>(8.86%)</td>
<td>(64.56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Few youths access bank loans</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(81.01%)</td>
<td>(11.39%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(6.33%)</td>
<td>(1.27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Most youths have a negative attitude towards banks loans for fear of</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>failure to payback</td>
<td>(70.89%)</td>
<td>(10.13%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(12.66%)</td>
<td>(6.32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Youth rarely access bank loans due to the legal requirements laid down</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by the banks such as collateral</td>
<td>(55.70%)</td>
<td>(26.58%)</td>
<td>(6.33%)</td>
<td>(7.59%)</td>
<td>(3.83%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, N=Neutral, D=Disagree, & SD= Strongly Disagree
On the other hand, young people who wish to acquire credit facility have to prove to the banks their credit worthiness through savings or collateral which hamper accessibility to such services, (Herbel et al., 2010).

The fear factor for credit financing among the youth is not only witnessed with the formal financial institutions but also the government funds set aside for economic empowerment with reports indicating underutilization. With the majority youths incapable or accessing adequate finance to engage in development projects, they shy from participating in development efforts in the community.

4.5.3 The extent to which Access to Finance Influence Youth Participation in CDP

In answer to the second objective of this research, it was necessary to assess the extent to which access to finance influence youth participation in community development projects.

Table 4.10 Responses on the Extent to which Access to Finance influence Youth Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Great Extent</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Extent</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Great Extent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Extent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Extent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly less Extent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 79 100.00

From the analysis, majority of the respondents 42(53.16%) agreed that access to finance influence youth participation in community projects to a very great extent while 29(36.71%) of the interviewed agreed that the influence of access to finance on youth participation in development initiatives is moderate. 1(1.27%) of the respondents agreed that the extent to which access to finance influence is less and 2(2.53%) viewed it at a slightly less determinant of youth participation. This implies that access to finance determines the youth participation in community development projects.
4.5.4 Hypothesis testing (2): Access to Finance and Youth Participation in CDP

H₀: There is no significant relationship between access to finance and youth participation in community development projects

Using t-test, the hypothesis was tested in order to establish whether there exists a significance relationship between access to finance and youth participation in community development projects and the results were as shown in table 4.12 below.

Table 4.11 Group Statistics for Access to Finance and Youth Participation in CDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent that access to finance determines youth participation in development</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very great extent</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less extent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12 Testing Hypothesis Using T-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in community development</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>2.068</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>-.482  to  1.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.0120  to  .042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the P-value is less than the chosen significance level (α=0.05), the null hypothesis is rejected. This study concludes that there is a significant association between access to finance and youth participation in community development projects (p<0.033) at 95% level of confidence, implying that the difference in means is significant as shown in the table 4.12.
4.6 Socio-Cultural Factors and Youth Participation in Development Projects
In order to establish the influence of socio-cultural factors on youth participation in community development, the researcher investigated the level of youth recognition and cultural issues and the extent they hinder participation in community projects.

4.6.1 Recognition of Youths by the Community
The researcher wished to know whether youths are recognized by the larger community as component so essential in the society. Table 4.13 shows the responses.

Table 4.13 Responses on Youth Recognition in the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the youth farmers 47(59.49%) agreed that the community recognizes young people, while 32(40.51%) did not agree to that fact. It is clear that youths enjoys the good will of the community hence failure of the youth to get involved in any development initiatives might not be community driven.
4.6.2 Socio-Cultural Factors influences on Youth Participation in CDP

Using the likard scale of rating 1-5, where; \( \text{SA}=5, \text{A}=4, \text{N}=3, \text{D}=2 \) and \( \text{SD}=1 \), the respondents gave their view on the extent they agreed or disagreed with the following statement on socio-cultural factors and youth participation in development initiatives.

**Table 4 14 Responses on Socio-Cultural Factors on Youth Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>The participation of female youth is way below that of male youth in the</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project.</td>
<td>(88.61%)</td>
<td>(6.32%)</td>
<td>(1.27%)</td>
<td>(2.53%)</td>
<td>(1.27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Peer pressure negatively influence youth participation in community</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development projects</td>
<td>(56.96%)</td>
<td>(15.19%)</td>
<td>(2.33%)</td>
<td>(12.66%)</td>
<td>(12.66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Most married female youths tend to be involved in domestic work at the</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expense of community projects</td>
<td>(67.09%)</td>
<td>(13.92%)</td>
<td>(6.33%)</td>
<td>(5.06%)</td>
<td>(7.60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Youth don’t actively participate because of the cultural perception of</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the local community</td>
<td>(74.68%)</td>
<td>(8.86%)</td>
<td>(5.06%)</td>
<td>(3.80%)</td>
<td>(7.59%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, N=Neutral, D=Disagree, & SD= Strongly Disagree

The study reveals that 70(88.61%) of the respondents strongly agreed that the participation of the female youth is way below that of male counterparts in the projects. In addition, majority 45(56.96%) strongly agreed that most married female youths tend to get involved in domestic work at the expense of community projects. 45(56.96%) of the interviewed strongly agreed that peer pressure negatively influence youth participation in community development projects, nonetheless, majority of the respondents 59(74.68%) did strongly agreed to the fact
that cultural perception in the local community hinder youth’s active participation in development projects.

The research revealed that culture determines youth participation in development initiatives which collates with Mohamud, (2018) who established that both peer pressure and culture have negative influence on youth participation in community development projects.

4.6.3 The Extent of Socio-Cultural Factors influence on Youth Participation in CDP

Below were the responses on the extent to which socio-cultural factors determines youth participation in the community development projects.

**Table 4.15 Responses on the Extent to which Socio-Culture influence Youth Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Great Extent</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Extent</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Great Extent</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Extent</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Extent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly less Extent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.15 indicates that majority of the respondents 43(54.43%) agreed that socio-cultural factors determine youth participation in development initiatives to a very great extent. 9(11.39%) of the respondents indicated that socio-cultural factors determines youth participation to a great extent, while 10(12.66%) perceived a slightly great extent of socio-cultural influence on youth participation and 9(11.39%) and 5(6.33%) of the youth farmers indicated a moderate extent and less extent respectively. While the least, 3(3.80%) of the youths indicated that socio-cultural determines participation to a slightly less extent. This implies that socio-cultural factors play a role in determining youth participation in community development projects.
4.6.4 Hypothesis Testing (3): Socio-Cultural Factors influence on Youth Participation

H₀: There is no significant relationship between socio-cultural factors and youth participation in community development projects

Using t-test, the hypothesis was tested in order to establish whether there is exist a significance relationship between socio-cultural factors and youth participation in community development projects and the results were as shown in

| Table 4 16 Group Statistics for Socio-cultural factors and Youth Participation in CDP |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Extent that socio-cultural determines youth participation in development | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| very great extent | 49 | 2.58 | .499 | .074 |
| Less extent | 4 | .75 | .500 | .250 |

| Table 4.17 Testing Hypothesis Using T-Test |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Participation in community development | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Equal variances assumed | -.661 | 47 | .016 | -.172 | .261 | -.697 | .352 |
| Equal variances not assumed | -.120 | .554 | .061 | -.102 | .261 | -.934 | .589 |

From the cross tabulation and the test, the P-value is less than the chosen significance level (α=0.05), the null hypothesis is rejected. This study concludes that there is a significant association between socio-cultural factors and youth participation in community development projects (p<0.016) at 95% level of confidence, as shown in the table 4.17.
4.7 Access to Information and Youth Participation in Development Projects
The fourth objective sought to establish how access to information determines youth participation in community projects through indicating of the channels adopted by the project team, channels often utilized by the youths in the project area and the extent in which access to information influence their participation.

4.7.1 Channels for Relevant Information on Production in KOSFIP Project
Asked about the most appropriate channel or medium through which youths get informed of the production activities in the project area, below are the responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.18 Responses on Channels for Relevant Information on Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters/Banners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy campaign for the youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the youths 61(77.19%) got informed on the activities of the project through their peers, while 12(15.19%) were reached with information through advocacy campaigns for the youths. 4(5.06%) and 2(2.53%) of the respondents utilize other channels for information such as media and posters respectively.

Studies show that the choice of an informative channel is important in making youth access information on community issues. In this case using youths to reach out to others is the best approach as majority interviewed accessed information related to KOSFIP projects through their peers. This collate with other research findings which indicate that youths often are influenced to do what majority of their peers do in order to have the sense of belonging, (Mohamud, 2018).
4.7.3 Informative Channels for the Project

The research sought to assess how effective the channels adopted by the project management team in reaching out to the youth. Asked to indicate how effective the channels are, below are the responses.

Table 4.19 Effectively the Informative Channels chosen by the Project Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Effective</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Effective</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Effective</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Effective at All</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly less Extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 4.19, majority of the respondents 32(40.05%) indicated that the informative channels employed by the project team are less effective, while 19(24.46%) viewed the channels as moderately effective. 14(17.72%) of the young farmers agreed that the informative channels are effective and 9(11.39%) said they are very effective. 5(6.33%) of the interviewed saw the channels not effective at all.

This implies that majority of the youths never access information about the community development project. Consequently, the greater percentage might be missing the relevant information that would impart positive attitude towards participation in development initiatives, hence few get involved.
4.7.4 Access to Information and Youth Participation in Community Projects.

Respondents were asked to rate the following statements on access to information and youth participation on a likert scale of 1-5, where; **SA=5, A=4, N=3, D=2 and SD=1** as shown below.

Table 4.20 Responses on Influence of Access to Information on Youth Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Few youths are reached with awareness campaigns encouraging youth participation in community development projects</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(45.57%) (41.77%) (1.27%) (5.06%) (6.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Interest of the youth is considered in advocacy programs and awareness creation processes for the project.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(16.46%) (24.51%) (7.59%) (40.05%) (11.39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Few youths are involved in advocacy and awareness creation about the project in a bid to youth participation in KOSFIP project.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(45.57%) (17.73%) (10.13%) (12.65%) (13.92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Few youths show up in sensitization meetings meant to teach &amp; encourage youth participation in community development.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(50.63%) (26.58%) (1.27%) (8.86%) (12.66%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, N=Neutral, D=Disagree, & SD= Strongly Disagree

Data reveal that majority of the respondents 36(45.57%) strongly agreed that few youths are reached with awareness campaigns encouraging youth participation in community development projects, while 40(50.63%) strongly agreed that few youths show up in sensitization meetings meant to teach and encourage youth participation. 36(45.57%) strongly agreed that few youths are involved in advocacy and awareness creation about the project in a bid to enhance youth participation in KOSFIP project while 32(40.05%) disagreed that
interests of the youth are considered in advocacy programs and awareness creation processes for the project.

Literature concurs with this study that access to information spurs youth participation in development since a well-informed youth will make rational decisions about the projects in the community. Akinboye, (2007), further established a significant relationship between access to information and youth participation in community development projects.

4.7.5 Extent of Access to Information and Youth Participation in Community Projects.
The respondents were asked to state to what extent access to information influence youth participation in community development and below is the responses.

Table 4.21 Responses on the Extent to Access to Information on Youth Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Access to Information</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Great Extent</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Extent</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Extent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Extent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Less Extent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study revealed that majority of the youths 39(49.37%) indicated that access to information influence participation in community projects to a very greater extent, while 26(32.92%) agreed that youth participation in development initiatives are influence by access to information to a great extent. 10(12.65%) of the respondents agreed that access to information influence youth involvement to a moderate extent while 3(3.80%) said that it has a less extent. Moreover, 1(1.27%) of the interviewed agreed that access to information determines participation of youths in development projects to a slightly less extent.
4.7.6 Hypothesis Testing (4): Access to Information and Youth Participation in CDP

H₀: There is no significant relationship between access to information and youth participation in community development projects.

Using t-test, the hypothesis was tested in order to establish whether there exist a significance relationship between access to information and youth participation in community development projects and the results were as shown in table 4.23 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent that access to information determines youth participation in development</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very great extent</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less extent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.22 Testing Hypothesis Using T-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in community development</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>2.115</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>11.172</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.697 to .532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>2.015</td>
<td>12.343</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>7.172</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.934 to .589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the P-value is less than the chosen significance level (α=0.05), the null hypothesis is rejected. This study concludes that there is a significant association between socio-cultural factors and youth participation in community development projects (p<0.009) at 95% level of confidence, as shown in table 4.23.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter discusses the summary of the findings, discussion, conclusion, recommendation of the study and area for further research. The study focused on establishing the determinants of youth participation in community development project, a case of Homa-bay County.

5.2 Summary of the Findings.
The research established that level of education influences youth participation in community development projects. This is as a result of a majority of the respondents 38(48.10%) who strongly agreed that educated youth are better empowered to participate in community projects. Majority of the youths interviewed strongly agreed that level of education is considered in election of one into the project leadership, IWUA which accounted for 47(59.49%). Meanwhile, 41(51.89%) strongly disagreed that youths get equal chance to participate in community development initiatives despite their educational level. 32(40.51%) strongly agreed that uneducated youths often are not willing to take up the leadership role in the community projects. Therefore, a significant relationship was established (p<0.006).

From the findings, majority of the respondents 51(64.56%) strongly disagreed that most youths get loans from Merry-go-round and Village Savings and Loaning groups to invest in farm production, on the other hand 64(81.01%) of those interviewed strongly agreed that few youths access bank loans. In addition, 56(70.89%) of the respondents strongly agreed that most youths have negative attitude towards bank loans for fear of failure to pay-back at the same time majority of the young farmers 44(55.70%) strongly agreed that youths rarely access bank loans due to the legal requirements laid down by the banks such as collateral. The study found a significant association between access to finance and youth participation in development projects (p<0.033).

Majority of the respondents 70(88.61%) strongly agreed that the participation of the female youth is way below that of male counterparts in the projects. In addition, majority 45(56.96%) strongly agreed that most married female youths tend to get involved in domestic work at the expense of community projects. 45(56.96%) of the interviewed strongly agreed that peer pressure negatively influence youth participation in community development projects, nonetheless, majority of the respondents 59(74.68%) did strongly agreed to the fact that cultural perception in the local community hinder youth’s active participation in
development projects. Thus the study shows a significant relationship between socio-cultural factors and youth participation in community projects (p<0.016).

Data reveal that majority of the respondents 36(45.57%) strongly agreed that few youths are reached with awareness campaigns encouraging youth participation in community development projects, while 40(50.63%) agreed that few youths show up in sensitization meetings meant to teach and encourage youth participation. 36(45.57%) strongly agreed that few youths are involved in advocacy and awareness creation about the project in a bid to youth participation in KOSFIP project while 32(40.05%) disagree that interest of the youth is not considered in advocacy programs and awareness creation processes for the project. Therefore, the study established a significant association between access to information and youth participation in community development projects (p<0.018).

5.3 Conclusion
The study focused on establishing the determinants of youth participation in community development projects and concluded the following:

The level of education determines youth participation in community development projects. Majority of the youths in the project have attained the elementary level of education with just a few with tertiary level of education resulting to low level of participation since high level of education attainment is linked to high level of participation. Education enables youths to have positive attitude toward development. Moreover education was indicated as prerequisite in electing officials into project leadership, IWUA and most uneducated shy from such assignments.

Access to finance is a determinant of youth participation in development initiatives. Majority of the youths do not get bank loans or credit services from Merry-go round for the purposes of investing in the production processes in the project despite the high cost in running a farm in the project area. The study revealed that the regulations governing issuance of credit from formal banks and the fear to reimburse make majority of the youth to keep off such services. Therefore, they shy off from participation for lack of funds to run a farm in the project.

Socio-cultural factors determine youth participation in community projects as majority are negatively influenced by cultural perception and peer pressure. The project registered a few female young farmers as most of them are perceived to be engaged in domestic work as opposed to their counterpart males who because of the social responsibility as breadwinners,
take active part in farm production in the project area, which seems to be a major source of livelihood going by the number of responses.

Access to information also determines participation of youth in the development initiatives. The study revealed that the channels used by the project team in advocacy programs targeting the youth are ineffective as indicated by the majority of the respondents. This could be translating to a low turnout of youths in educative forums aimed at sensitizing them on need to actively get involved in the project. In addition, interests of the youth are not prioritized; they are not involved in advocacy programs and awareness creation in a bid to sway youth into active participation in the project.

5.4 Recommendation for the Study
The study concluded that level of education, access to finance; socio-cultural factors and access to information determine youth participation in community development projects and recommended the following:

With minority of youth have gained tertiary level of education, thus emphasis is needed to prompt youth to further their education beyond primary and secondary education. Financial programs for tertiary education ought to enhance to enable hundred per cent transmission of students to various levels of higher institutions of learning and colleges. As a result, many will become more active in development initiatives in their communities.

The government should invigorate youth enterprise fund focused on enhancing access to credit for the individual youths rather than group approach with less regulations and interest rate preceded with capacity building on financial management and training on entrepreneurship. This will make each to take responsibility to put concerted efforts to reimburse and at long run be able to gain financial heights thus enhancing their participation in development projects in the community.

The government and the relevant stakeholders on gender mainstreaming ought to up efforts to empower young women to participate by strict implementation of a third gender rule in entire project life. Proper civil education on young women inclusion in economic activities outside the domestic environs should be emphasized so that the society appreciates the role of women in projects run in the community. Furthermore land policy should be reconsidered to favour women and the youth at the prime of their age rather than await inheritance from parents or
enjoy it use through a relationship with a man in case of women as dictated by the customary laws.

Since majority of the youth do not access information concerning the community issues such as development programs due to choice of ineffective informative channels. Proper consideration is needed in order to reach out to as many as possible. Moreover, the interest of the youth ought to define the advocacy objectives and programs. Therefore more youths will be attracted to the projects within their localities since whatever that touches their welfare would be received with a lot of enthusiasm and in the end, quite a number will be swayed to take up active roles in community projects. This includes but not limited to involving them in the advocacy programs to enable them influence their peers into participation more easily.

Formulation and implementation of youth mainstreaming policy in any development project alongside National Employment Policy should be given an upper hand in order to realize more youths getting involved in the development programs in the country. This will bridge the gap between the existing policies and practice. Youth mainstreaming in is key to enhancing sustainability of community development projects.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Research.
The study recommends a similar study be done in other irrigation schemes other than Kimara-Oluch in order to collate the findings and much more such as:-

1. Determinants of female youth participation in development projects in the community.
2. An investigation on youth participation and project sustainability.
3. Influence of peer pressure on youth participation in community development projects.
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Appendix 1: LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

P.O BOX 96 -40300
HOMA-BAY.
Tel: 0706444831

Dear Sir / Madam,

RE: RESEARCH PROJECT

I am a postgraduate student at the School of Open and Distance Learning of the University of Nairobi, Kisii Campus. I am carrying out a study on Determinants of Youth Participation in Community Development Projects in Homa – Bay County at Kimira-Oluch Smallholder Farm Improvement Project in Homa Bay County as part of my assessment. The purpose of this letter therefore, is to seek for permission to collect data from farmers in the irrigation scheme.

The information obtained shall be exclusively for the study. I will be pleased to share the findings therein.

I am looking forward for a fruitful engagement and assistance.

Thanks in advance.

Yours faithfully,

Fredrick Ouma Were
Appendix 2: Questionnaire
Dear Respondent,

You are hereby selected to participate in a survey that seeks establish the determinants of youth participation in the community development projects; A case of Homa Bay county, Kenya.

It is my wish that you will be true and honest in your response since the information obtained shall be treated with uttermost confidentiality.

Your contributions will be highly appreciated.

In the sections below indicate your choice by a tick (√). Kindly answer all the questions

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION:

1. Please indicate your gender
   Male [ ]   Female [ ]

2. Indicate your age
   18 – 24 years [ ]   25 – 30 years [ ]   31 – 35 years [ ]

3. Indicate your occupation
   Agriculture [ ]   Professional Service providers [ 7 ]
   Labour [ ]   Business [ ]   Others (Specify)………………………………

4. Kindly tick appropriately below the boxes to indicate your level of education
   Primary School [ ]   Secondary School [ ]   College Certificate [ ]
   College Diploma [ ]   Degree and above [ ]   Not gone to school [ ]
SECTION A: Education

This section presents on the level of education as a determinant of youth participation in community projects.

5. Using the scale shown below, determine the extent to which the level of education as a determinant of youth participation in community development in your area, where Strongly Disagree (SA), Agree (A), Neutral (N), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Educated youths are better empowered for participation in community development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Level of education is considered for one to be elected in the project leadership, IWUA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Despite their level of education youths get an equal chance to participate in community projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Uneducated youth often are not willing to take leadership role in the community development projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. To what extent does education and training influence youth participation in this project?
   - Very Great Extent [  ]
   - Great Extent [  ]
   - Slightly Great Extent [  ]
   - Moderate Extent [  ]
   - Less Extent [  ]
   - Slightly Less Extent [  ]

SECTION B: ACCESS TO FINANCE
This section presents the access to finance as a determinant of youth participation in community projects.

7. Youth need to have an averagely high amount of money in order to run a farm production in KOSFIP

YES [ ]                   NO [ ]

8. Using the scale shown below, determine the extent access to finance as a determinant of youth participation in community development in your area, where

   Strongly Disagree (SA), Agree (A), Neutral (N), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Most youths get loans from Mary-go-round and Village Savings and Loaning groups to invest in farm productions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Few youths access bank loans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Most youths have a negative attitude towards banks loans for fear of failure to payback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Youth rarely access bank loans due to the legal requirements laid down by the banks such as collateral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What extent does access to finance determines youth participation in development project in this area?

   Very Great Extent    [ ]
   Great Extent         [ ]
   Moderate Extent      [ ]
   Less Extent          [ ]
   Slightly Less Extent [ ]

SECTION C: SOCIO-CULTURAL FACTORS
This section presents the socio-cultural factors as a determinant of youth participation in community projects.

10. Youth are recognized by other members of the community. (Tick appropriately)
   Yes [    ] No [   ]

11. Using the scale shown below, determine the extent socio-cultural factors as a determinant of youth participation in community development in your area, where Strongly Disagree (SA), Agree (A), Neutral (N), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>The participation of female youth is way below that of male youth in the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Peer pressure negatively influence youth participation in community development projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Most married female youths tend to be involved in domestic work at the expense of community projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Youth don’t actively participate because of the cultural perception of the local community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. What extent does socio-cultural factors determines youth participation in development project in this area?
   Very Great Extent [    ]
   Great Extent [    ]
   Slightly Great Extent [    ]
   Moderate Extent [    ]
   Less Extent [    ]
   Slightly Less Extent [    ]

SECTION D: ACCESS TO INFORMATION
This section presents the level of access to information as a determinant of youth participation in community projects.

13. Through which channel or method did you learn much of the production activities in the project

- Media [ ]
- Posters/Banners [ ]
- Peers [ ]
- Roadshows [ ]
- Advocacy campaign for the youth [ ]

14. Using the scale shown below, establish the extent in which access to information as a determinant of youth participation in community development in your area, where

Strongly Disagree (SA), Agree (A), Neutral (N), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Few youths are reached with awareness campaigns encouraging youth participation in community development projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Interest of the youth is considered in advocacy programs and awareness creation processes for the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Majority of the youths are involved in advocacy and awareness creation about the project in a bid to youth participation in KOSFIP project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Majority of youths show up in sensitization meetings meant to teach &amp; encourage youth participation in community development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. How effective is the information channel chosen by the project management in reaching out youths for participation in the project production.

Very Effective [ ]
16. What extent does access to information determines youth participation in development project in this area?

- Very Great Extent [ ]
- Great Extent [ ]
- Moderate Extent [ ]
- Slightly Less Extent [ ]
- Less Extent [ ]