

DETERMINANTS OF YOUTH PARTICIPATION IN THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS IN AMBO DISTRICT, OROMIA REGION, ETHIOPIA

Birhanu Fedessa¹, Firafris Haile² & Paul Mansingh. J³

¹ *Research Scholar, Department of Rural Development and Agricultural Extension, Ambo University, Ambo, Ethiopia*

² *Dean, Institute of Co-operatives and Development Studies, Ambo University, Ambo, Ethiopia*

³ *Professor, Department of Rural Development and Agricultural Extension, Ambo University, Ambo, Ethiopia*

Received: 26 Jun 2018

Accepted: 03 Jul 2018

Published: 07 Jul 2018

ABSTRACT

The study was undertaken in Ambo district, Ethiopia, to identify the determinants of youth participation in the community development process because the participation of youth is very low. This study used cross-sectional survey research design. Primary data were collected through semi-structured interview schedule from 132 youth selected using stratified random sampling technique. A binary logistic regression model was employed to identify factors affecting youth participation. Access to information, Training and capacity building, Peer pressure, Parental Influence, Member in the cooperatives, and Employment status were significant factors on the participation of youth. Based on the findings, the following recommendations were made: Adequate information about what is happening in their community should be provided to the youth and public enlightenment programs should be organised from time to time to educate the parents and the communities as a whole on the significance of youth participating in community development process in the society.

KEYWORDS: *Community Development, Ethiopia, Participation, Youth, Youth Participation*

INTRODUCTION

Community development is a process where community members come together to take collective action and generate solutions to common problems. Community wellbeing (economic, social, environmental and cultural) often evolves from this type of collective action being taken at a grassroots level (www.peernetbc.com/what-is-community-development). The community development process is a set of steps that guide the identification of a program of work and movement toward the ultimate community development goal. These steps require the involvement of community members and serve as a guide to problem-solving, planning, and completion (Rhonda and Robert, 2009).

According to reports from UN (2015), there was 1.2 billion youth aged between 15-24 years globally in 2015, accounting for one out of every six people worldwide. In Africa, the number of youth is growing rapidly. In 2015, 226 million youth aged between 15-24 lived in Africa, accounting for 19 per cent of the global youth population. By 2030, it is projected that the number of youth in Africa will be increased by 42 per cent.

World Bank's Learning Group on Participatory Development which defined participation as "a process through which stakeholders' influence and share control over development initiatives and the decisions and resources which affect them" (World Bank, 1996). While Cleaver and Toner (2006) are critical that, youth participation has become an act of faith

in development. Program and policy planners need to better understand the role and impact of youth in the community development process. Youth are playing an increasingly important role in the development of their communities (Brennan *et al.*, 2007).

Globally there is no commonly accepted definition of the term 'youth'. The definition of the term youth seems to vary from country to country and agency to agency depending on country or agency-specific circumstances. The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE) during 2004 in its national youth policy defines youth as those aged between 15-29 years (www.youthpolicy.org/factsheets/country/ethiopia/).

Ethiopia's youth has the potential to play a significant role in the country's socio-economic and political development. The FDRE (2004) report on National Youth Policy recognizes the importance of youth, "to participate, in an organized manner, in the process of building a democratic system, good governance and development endeavors, and benefit fairly from the outcomes". However, in practice, there are many barriers that hinder youth's active participation in socio-economic, political and cultural life. Several factors may influence youth participation in the community development process. Literature cites academic performance during high school (Eccles & Barber, 1999), greater school engagement (Lamborn *et al.*, 1992), feelings of efficacy (Sherrod *et al.*, 2002), the need to be valued and taken seriously by others in the Community (Flanagan & Van Horn, 2001), recognition by the community at large (Scales & Leffert, 1999), and parental involvement (Chan & Elder, 1999) as the most influencing factors of youth participation. Individual variations are presumed to exist in young people's motivation to seek out and engage in organized activities. Differences in temperament, reactivity, and need for stimulation predispose individuals to greater and lesser degrees of interest in new experiences, new acquaintances, and group activities (Kagan & Gomez, 2014). The social and psychological processes that affect community participation are not well understood (USAID, 2005).

Therefore, this research was undertaken in order to have a clear understanding of the factors influencing youth participation in the community development process in the study area where the participation of youth is very low.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in Ambo district, West Shoa zone, Oromia Regional State, Ethiopia. Ambo district was purposively selected because of the participation of youth is very low in the community development process (Ambo district youth and sports office, 2015). This study used cross-sectional survey design. The researcher used both primary and secondary sources of data. Primary data were collected from selected youths in the study area. Secondary data were collected from reports of different departments and agencies working in the field of community development.

After the discussion with the district youth and sport sector/department about the youth participation in the district, all thirty-three (33) kebeles were ranked into low, medium and high on youth participation. One (1) kebele from each low, medium and high participation kebeles was selected. Thus, GosuQora, Elamu Muja, and Amaro were selected purposively from low, medium and high participation kebeles, respectively.

Finally, 132 sample youth respondents (between 15-29 age) were selected from 1,043 total youths in the selected three kebeles. The sample size was determined by using the formula proposed by Kothari (2004).

The number of respondents to be selected from each kebele was decided by using probability proportional to size method and the respondents were selected using stratified random sampling technique from each kebele after the youth population in the selected kebeles was stratified into male and female.

The details of the youths selected from the three selected kebeles are presented in the Table1.

Table 1: Selected Youths from Each Kebele

No.	Study Area	Selected Kebeles	Total Number of Youths			Selected Youths		
			Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1	Ambo district	GosuQora (Low)	172	131	303	22	16	38
		Elamu Muja (Medium)	203	185	388	26	23	49
		Amaro (High)	180	172	352	23	22	45
Total			555	488	1,043	71	61	132

Source: Ambo District Youth Affairs Office (2015)

To achieve the objectives of the study, both qualitative and quantitative data were used. Quantitative data were obtained from personal interviews with the selected 132 respondents. Semi-structured interview schedule was used to conduct the interview. Qualitative data were collected through focus group discussions (FGD) and key informant interviews (KII). In this study, a total of three focus group discussions were conducted. One focus group discussion in each kebele was conducted. The participants of the focus group discussion were youths (men and women). From each kebele, one Kebele advisory committee chairperson/secretary (male or female), one woman’s affairs expert (female) and Ambo woreda youth advisory committee chairperson/secretary were selected as key informants. Finally, from the three kebeles, six (6) different individuals and one person from wore da level were selected for key informant interviews.

The dependent variable, participation in the community development process, in this case, is a dummy variable (binary), which take a value of 1 if participated and 0 for non-participation. However, the explanatory variables are either continuous or discrete. A binary logistic regression model was employed to identify factors affecting youth participation in the community development process. The logistic regression model is simpler in estimation than the probit model. Therefore, a binary logistic model is preferred to analyze the determinants of participation of youth.

The participation in the community development process is therefore, dichotomous between two mutually exclusive alternatives: participated or not participated. The probability that an individual makes a particular choice is influenced by a vector of explanatory variables. A particular choice is made when the combined effect of the vector of the explanatory variables reaches the critical level (breaking point). Thus, a decision to participate in the community development process will occur only when the combined effect of the explanatory variables ($X_i'\beta$) reaches a certain unobservable critical value Y_i^* . So that:

$$Y_i = 1 \text{ if } X_i'\beta > Y_i^* \text{ OR } Y_i = 0 \text{ if } X_i'\beta < Y_i^* \tag{1}$$

Where Y_i^* is a latent variable and represent the unobserved level of participation in the community development process. By the application of probability theory, the probability that a given youth participates in community development process is given by

$$p = \text{Prob} (Y_i=1) = f(X_i' \beta) \tag{2}$$

And the probability that a given youth does not participate in the community development process is given by

$$1 - p = \text{Prob} (Y_i=0) = 1 - f (X_i' \beta) \quad (3)$$

In this study, binary logit is employed to estimate the probability of participation in the community development process. The logit model specified for the study is stated as

$$L = \text{Log} \left[\frac{p_i}{1-p_i} \right] = \beta_0 + \sum \beta_i X_i + U_i \quad (4)$$

Where: p_i = the probability that youth actively participate in the community development process, the binary variable, $p_i=1$ for participant youth and $p_i=0$ for non-participant youth; β_0 = the constant term; β_i = a vector of β unknown coefficients of the determinants of participation in community development process; X_i = a vector of independent variables that determine participation in community development process and includes age, education and access to credit among others; U_i is the stochastic error term and $i = 1, 2, 3 \dots N$ observations. The Z statistic is used to test the significance of the individual parameters. The likelihood ratio test (LRT) is employed in testing the fitness of the model. In this study, the two tests were conducted by using the SPSS version 23.

The independent variables that expected to affect youth participation in the community development process in the study area are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Summary of Explanatory Variables Hypothesized to Explain Youth Participation

S.No.	Variables	Nature/Type of the Variables	Unit of Measurement	Expected Influence on Dependent Variable
Dependent Variable				
	Participation in CDP	Dummy	1, if the youth participated in CDP and 0, otherwise.	
Independent Variables				
1. Demographic Factors				
	Age of youth	Categorical	1, if 15-19 2, if 20-24 3, if 25-29	+ve
	Gender	Dummy	1, if male and 0, otherwise	-ve
	Educational status	Categorical	0, if Illiterate 1, Primary 2, Secondary 3, Preparatory 4, Diploma and Degree or Certificate	+ve
	Marital status	Dummy	1, if married and 0, otherwise.	+ve
	Religion	Categorical	1, if Muslim 2, if Orthodox 3, if Protestant 4, if Other	+ve
	Occupation	Categorical	1, if Farming 2, if Business 3, if Private sector 4, if Government service 5, if Other	+ve
	Health status	Dummy	1, if health status is good and 0, otherwise	+ve

Table 2 Contd.,				
S.No.	Variables	Nature/Type of the Variables	Unit of Measurement	Expected Influence on Dependent Variable
2.	Sensitization and Advocacy Factors			
	Access to information	Dummy	1, if youth have the access and 0, otherwise.	+ve
	Awareness of community development activities	Dummy	1, if the youth are aware and 0, otherwise	+ve
	Participation in training and capacity building program	Dummy	1, if the youth participate in training and 0, otherwise.	+ve
3.	Political Factors			
	Attitude towards government policy and strategy	Dummy	1, if the youth has positive attitude and 0, otherwise.	+ve
	Membership in political organization	Dummy	1, if the youth is member and 0, if not.	+ve
4.	Social /Institutional Factors			
	Peer pressure	Dummy	1, if youth participation is forced by peers and 0, otherwise.	+ve
	Parental influence	Dummy	1, if youth participation is forced by parent and 0, otherwise.	+ve,
	Membership in cooperatives	Dummy	1, if youth is a member in cooperative and 0, otherwise	+ve
	Membership in community based organization	Dummy	1, if a youth is member in community-based organization and 0, otherwise.	+ve
	Existence of gender-related roles in youth activity	Dummy	1,if youth activities are separated by gender and 0, otherwise	+ve
5	Economic Factors			
	Annual income	Continuous	Annual income from all the sources is measured in Ethiopian birr	+ve
	Access to credit facility	Dummy	1, if the access to credit facility and 0, if not	+ve
	Employment status	Dummy	1, if a youth are employed and 0, otherwise	+ve

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Factors Influencing Youth Participation in the Community Development Process

To study the factors influencing youth participation in the community development process, data gathered from 132 youths aged between 15-29 years, were subjected to binary log it regression analysis. Prior to the estimation of the parameters of the model, the data have been tested for multi-colinearity and normality problems using SPSS version 23. Multi-colinearity problem arises when at least one of the independent variables is a linear combination of the others. If there is multi-co linearity problem: standard errors are inflated (creates very large standard errors), a sign of the estimated regression coefficients may be opposite of hypothesized direction, smaller t-ratios that might lead to

wrong conclusions (Wooldridge, 2011).

Considering the problem of multi-collinearity, stepwise regression was used to identify the relevant independent variables that influence the participation of youths (respondents). Both continuous and discrete explanatory variables were checked for the existence of multi-collinearity problem.

There are two measures often suggested to test the presence of multi-collinearity. Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for association among the continuous explanatory variables and contingency coefficient for dummy variables (Gujarati, 2003). The technique of variance inflation factors (VIF) was employed to detect the problem of multi-collinearity among the continuous variables.

$$VIF (X_i) = \frac{1}{1-R_i^2}$$

Where R_i^2 is the square of multiple correlation coefficients that result when one explanatory variables X_i is regressed against all other explanatory variables. The larger the value of VIF (X_i) the more “difficult” or collinear the variable X_i is. As a rule of thumb, if the VIF values for continuous variable exceed 10, there is multi-collinearity problem; whereas very small (less than 10) indicating the absence of multi-collinearity between the independent variables.

Similarly, contingency coefficients were computed to check the existence of multi-collinearity problem among the discrete explanatory variables. The contingency coefficients are computed as follows:

$$CC = \sqrt{\frac{\chi^2}{N-\chi^2}}, \text{ where}$$

CC = Contingency coefficients, χ^2 is Chi-square random variable and N represents the total sample size. Contingency coefficient values range between 0 and 1 and as a result of chi-square variable with the contingency coefficient below 0.75 shows weak association and value above 0.75 indicates the strong association of variables.

The decision rule for contingency coefficient is that when its value approaches 1, there is a problem of association between discrete variables. The contingency coefficient for the dummy variables included in the model was less than 0.75 that shows multi-collinearity is not a serious concern. Therefore, the dummy variables were included in the model. Hence, all the explanatory variables were included in the final analysis.

Table 3: Multi-Collinearity Test for Continuous Explanatory Variables

Continuous Explanatory variables	Collinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
Annual income	1.000	1.000

Dependent Variable: Youth Participation in the Community Development Process
Source: Model Output (2017)

Table 4: Multi-Collinearity Test for Dummy Explanatory Variables (Correlation Coefficients)

Correlation	Partic	Ag	Sex	Edu	Mar	Relig	Occ	Heal	Info	Awar	TraicA	AttitG	Memp	PeerI	ParentI	MemC	MemCb	Gend	Credit	Emplo
Partic	1	.00	-.119	.035	.143	.015	.033	-.091	-.142	.098	.150	.104	.079	.146	-.186*	-.059	-.032	.150	.006	-.205*
Age		1	-.024	-.069	-.089	-.112	.039	.032	.024	.181*	-.052	.193*	.044	-.099	-.230**	-.115	-.032	.021	-.098	-.063
Sex			1	-.057	.106	.089	-.005	-.085	.027	.080	-.034	-.094	.021	.008	.008	-.003	.116	-.021	-.048	.194*
Edu				1	.053	-.105	.094	.028	.015	-.003	.099	.090	.001	-.034	-.057	-.116	.038	.106	.074	-.088
Mar					1	-.013	-.042	.155	-.101	-.011	.147	-.015	-.161	.076	.106	.107	-.109	.019	.230**	-.158
Relig						1	.048	-.133	-.014	.056	-.185*	-.080	.083	-.044	.056	.048	.053	.069	-.035	.261**
Occ							1	.056	-.049	-.078	.009	.034	-.052	-.066	-.025	.040	-.147	-.109	.186*	-.036
Heal								1	-.007	-.107	.004	.022	-.233**	-.260**	.125	.067	-.040	-.010	.113	-.175*
Info									1	-.048	.103	.058	.107	.027	-.006	.093	-.057	.083	-.173*	-.056
Awar										1	-.212*	.233**	.176*	-.105	-.290**	.040	.205*	.038	-.044	-.038
TraicA											1	.033	.059	.158	.190*	.282**	-.108	.051	-.059	-.066
AttitGP												1	.153	-.062	-.094	-.013	.080	.071	-.091	-.036
MemPo													1	-.087	-.015	.033	.018	.073	-.150	.034
PeerI														1	.132	.184*	-.018	-.092	.044	.101
ParentI															1	.153	.015	-.092	.044	.071
MemC																1	-.103	-.069	-.013	.020
Memcbo																	1	-.095	-.040	.011
Gend																		1	-.062	.036
Credit																			1	-.105
Emplo																				1

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
 ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
 Source: Model Output (2017)

Binary Logistic Regression Analysis

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

The Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficient in the last iteration shows that, the addition of each variables in the model is statistically significant that is p=0.000, which is less than cut off the value of 0.05 (Table 5).

Table 5: Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	Df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	68.082	34	.000
	Block	68.082	34	.000
	Model	68.082	34	.000

Source: Model Output (2017)

Model Summary

Model summary in logistic regression which assumes that nonlinear relationship is employed in the study. R² is based on the log likelihood for the model compared to the log-likelihood for a baseline model (Cox and Snell, 1989). However, with categorical outcomes, it has a theoretical maximum value of less than 1 even for a perfect model. In this study, it has a value of .403 which is less than 1. After testing the multi-co linearity, all the twenty variables were entered into the binary logistic regression analysis. The R² of Binary Logistic Regression is not that much accurate as one in multi- linear regression. The Nagelkerke R² is .567 in the present study, which implied that 56.7% of variation in the dependent variable was explained by explanatory variables considered. Cox and Snell R² and Nagelkerke R² in Table 6 indicate that 40.3% and 56.7% of the variation in the dependant variable are due to explanatory variables, respectively.

Table 6: Model Summary

Step	-2 Log Likelihood	Cox & Snell R ²	Nagelkerke R ²
1	95.488 ^a	.403	.567
Estimation terminated at iteration number 7 because parameter estimates changed by less than .001.			

Source: Model Output (2017)

Test of Goodness Fit of the Model

In this study, Hosmer and Lemeshow Test were used. Hosmer and Lemeshow Test were used to reject or accept the null hypotheses. If the significance level of the test is less than 0.05 the null hypotheses is accepted.

However, Table 7 indicates the significance of 0.000 which means that it is statistically significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted justifying the model has adequately described the data.

Table 7: Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Step	Chi-square	Df	Sig.
1	29.446	8	.000

Result of Binary Logistic Regression Analysis

Logistic regression analysis was employed to predict the probability of the independent variables considered as the factors of the youth participation in the community development process. The data in Table 8 shows that the logistic regression coefficient results, standard errors, Wald (chi-square test) statistics, associated p-value and odds-ratio (Exp(B)) for each of the predictors. Accordingly, the statistical significance and the result of each of the predictor variables were discussed in this study. The Wald statistics is used to test the unique contribution of each predictor. Out of twenty variables, six variables were significant factors on the participation of youth in the community development process, while, the other variables were not significant on the participation of youth in the community development process. The results of binary logistic regression are presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Binary Logistic Regression Estimates of Determinants of Youth Participation

Variables	B	S.E.	Wald	Df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
Age	.623	.690	.813	1	.367	1.864	.482	7.213
Sex	.563	.550	1.050	1	.305	1.756	.598	5.158
Education	.583	.903	.417	1	.519	1.791	.305	10.507
Marital	-.462	.597	.598	1	.439	.630	.196	2.031
Religion	-.238	.787	.092	1	.762	.788	.169	3.684
Occupation	-.862	1.141	.570	1	.450	.422	.045	3.954
Health	-.021	.615	.001	1	.973	.979	.293	3.267
Information	1.243	.578	4.617	1	.032**	3.466	1.115	10.769
Awareness CD	-.562	.603	.868	1	.352	.570	.175	1.860
Training	-1.529	.656	5.439	1	.020**	.217	.060	.783
Attitude	-.390	.571	.466	1	.495	.677	.221	2.075
Member Poli	-.567	.672	.711	1	.399	.567	.152	2.118
Peer pressure	-1.442	.617	5.456	1	.020**	.236	.070	.793
Parental	1.387	.580	5.716	1	.017**	4.001	1.284	12.470
Member Coop	1.072	.633	2.870	1	.090*	2.920	.845	10.090
Member CBO	-.600	.628	.914	1	.339	.549	.160	1.878
Gender roles	-.944	.678	1.939	1	.164	.389	.103	1.469
Annual income	.000	.000	.149	1	.700	1.000	1.000	1.000
Access Credit	-.074	.581	.016	1	.899	.929	.297	2.900
Employ Status	1.505	.638	5.565	1	.018**	4.505	1.290	15.730
Constant	.591	1.499	.155	1	.694	1.805		

Variable(s) entered on step 1: Age, Sex, Educational status, Marital status, Religion, Occupation, Health status, Access to information, Awareness of community development activities, Training and capacity building, Attitude towards government policy and strategy, Member in political organization, Peer pressure, Parental influence, Member in cooperatives, Member in community-based organization, Roles separated by gender, Annual income, Access to credit facility, Employment status.

Interpretation of Empirical Results

Access to Information

The binary model output confirmed that access to information is positive and statistically significant at less than 5% probability level. For a unit increase in access to information of the respondents, the odds ratio in favor of youth participation increases by 10.769 units controlling the impacts of all other variables constant. Information is very much essential for the creation of knowledge. Awareness knowledge precedes how to do and principle knowledge. Lack of access to information may result in a low level of awareness among the youth regarding community development activities. This finding is similar to the finding of Akinboye *et al.*, (2007) that there was a significant relationship between the youths' occupation, level of education and access to information and youths' participation in community development projects.

Training and Capacity Building

This variable was expected to influence youth participation positively. The result of the binary model shows that, this variable is statistically significant at less than 5 percent probability level. By controlling the influence of all other variables, a unit increase in the training and capacity building of the respondents, the odds ratio in favor of youth participation increases by 0.783 units. The finding was supported by the report of the Annual Youth Assembly of the United Nations (2010), which seeks to empower the youth with skills and knowledge on: leadership, conflict and conflict resolution, and assertion to make them have their rights.

Peer Pressure

The result of the binary regression model confirms that there is a significant and positive relationship between peer pressure and participation at less than 5% probability level. According to the results of the model, the odds of the ratio in favor of youth participation in the community development process increases by a factor of 0.793 for those who have high peer pressure, keeping all other factors constant. The result of this study is in line with the findings of: Coleman's early studies of peer cultures (1961) which suggest that among youth in general and disaffected youth in particular, decisions regarding participation in primary support activities or extra-curricular activities are heavily influenced by peers and Evans (1987) review of participation in UK youth organizations cites a number of studies confirming the power of peer attitudes.

Parental Influence

The result of the binary model shows that the parental pressure affected the dependent variable positively and statistically significant at less than 5 percent probability level. The odds ratio in favor of participation in the community development process increases by 12.470 times controlling the influences of all other variables. Study on parental influences on participation in the community, political and extra-curricular activities, and church attendance by Hultsman (2013) suggest that parents influence participation in certain activities through their own behavior modeling. However, since parents are often a major influence on the choices of youth, the findings of Hultsman (2013) and DiacinandDeSensi (2013) suggests that a parent's prior experience in various organizational settings may affect how they influence their children's participation in similar settings, other things being equal.

Member in the Cooperatives

Youth participation is greatly influenced by membership in the cooperatives. Member in cooperatives was hypothesized to have a positive relationship with youth participation. The result of the binary regression model confirms that there is a significant and positive relationship between youth participation at less than 10% probability level. Therefore, according to the results of the model, the odds of the ratio in favor of youth participation increase by a factor of 10.09 for those who are members keeping all other factors constant. This finding is in contradiction with the finding of Israel *et al.*, (1993) that Community organizations may be uncertain of the role or impact that youth may have in their efforts.

Employment Status

This variable was hypothesized to have a positive relationship with participation. The result shows a positive and significant relationship at less than 5% probability level. The odds ratio in favor of participation in the community development process increases by 15.730 for those who are employed keeping all other variables constant. This finding is in contradiction with the finding of Akinboye *et al.*, (2007) in a study carried out in Ogun State Nigeria where many educated youths looked down upon manual activities or work engaged by various rural youth groups.

CONCLUSIONS

Logistic regression analysis was employed to predict the probability of the independent variables considered as the factors of the youth participation in the community development process. Out of twenty variables, six variables namely, Access to information, Training and capacity building, Peer pressure, Parental Influence, Member in the cooperatives, and Employment status were significant factors influencing the participation of youth in community development process. Based on the findings, the following recommendations were made:

- Youth should be provided with entrepreneurship training as the more business assistance a young entrepreneur obtains the better his or her awareness on community participation in the community development process.
- Adequate information to the youth should be provided so that they will have first-hand information about what is happening in their community.
- Public enlightenment programs should be organized from time to time to educate the parents and the communities as a whole on the significance of youth participating in the community development process in the society.

REFERENCES

1. Akinboye, O.A., E. Ayanwuyi, F.A. Kuponiyi and Oyetoro, J. (2007). *Factors Affecting Youth Participation in Community Development in Remo North Government Area of Ogun State, The Social Sciences*, 2, (3): pp.307-311. <http://medwelljournals.com/abstract/?doi=sscience.2007.307.311>
2. Brennan, M.A., Barnett, R., & Lesmeister, M. (2007). *Enhancing Local Capacity and Youth Involvement in the Community Development Process, Journal of the Community Development Society*, 38(4), 13-27. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15575330709489816>

3. Chan, C. G., & Elder, G. H., Jr. (1999). *Family influences on civic involvement*. Unpublished manuscript cited in Fletcher, A. C., Elder, G. H., Jr., & Mekos, D. (2000). *Parental influences on adolescent involvement in community activities*. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 10, 29-48. https://libres.uncg.edu/ir/uncg/f/A_Fletcher_Parental_2000.pdf
4. Cleaver, F. & Toner, A. (2006). *The evolution of community water governance in Uchira, Tanzania: The implications for equality of access, sustainability and effectiveness*. *Natural Resources Forum*, 30(3), 207-218. DOI: 10.1111/j.1477-8947.2006.00115.x
5. Coleman, J. (1961). *The Adolescent society: The social life of the teenager and its impact on education*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe. http://media.hoover.org/sites/default/files/documents/ednext20061_40.pdf
6. Cox, D. R. and Snell, E. J. (1989). *Analysis of Binary Data (second edition)*. Chapman & Hall/CRC. ISBN 9780412306204 - CAT# C0620
7. Diacin M., & DeSensi J. T. (2013). *Parents' Value Assessments, Outcome Expectations and Support Towards their Child's Recreational Sport Participation Experiences*. *The Cyber Journal of Applied Leisure and Recreation Research*, 16 (2): pp. 1-13. <http://larnet.org/2013-02.pdf>
8. Eccles, J. S., & Barber, B. L. (1999). *Student council, volunteering, basketball, or marching band: What kind of extracurricular involvement matters?* *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 14, (1): pp. 10-43. <http://www.rcgd.isr.umich.edu/garp/articles/eccles99h.pdf>
9. Evans, K. (1987). *Participation of young adults in youth organizations in the United Kingdom: A review*. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 1, (1): pp. 7-31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02673843.1987.9747622>
10. FDRE (2004). *National Youth Policy*, Ministry of Youth, Sports and Culture, Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. Addis Ababa. http://www.youthpolicy.org/national/Ethiopia_2004_National_Youth_Policy.pdf
11. Flanagan, C., & Van Horn, B. (2001). *Youth civic engagement: Membership and mattering in local communities*, Focus, 4-H Center for Youth Development, University of California, Davis. <http://4h.ucanr.edu/files/1230.pdf>
12. Gujarati, D. N. 2003 *Basic econometrics*, McGraw Hill. ISBN 0071123423, 9780071123426
13. Mas Roro Lilik Ekowanti & Dewi Casmiwati, *Partnership Model of Cooperation Agency in Coastal Community Development*, *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (IJHSS)*, Volume 6, Issue 4, June-July 2017, pp. 145-154
14. Hultsman, W. Z. (1993). *The influence of others as a barrier to recreation participation among early adolescents*. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 25 (2): pp. 150-164. ISSN: 0022-2216 Record Number: 19931856918
15. Israel, G. D., D. L. Coleman, and Ilvento, T. W. (1993). *Student involvement in community needs assessment*, *Journal of Community Development Society*, 24, (2): 249-271. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15575339309489911>

16. Kagan, S. L., & Gomez, R. E. (2014). *One two buckle my shoe: Early mathematics education and teacher professional development*, (pp.1-28). In Ginsburg, H., Hyson, M.& T. Woods (Eds.) (2014). *Preparing early childhood educators to teach math*, Brookes Publishing, Baltimore.<http://archive.brookespublishing.com/documents/ginsburg-early-math-professional-development.pdf>
17. Kothari, C. R. (2004), *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*, (Second Edition), New Age International Publishers. ISBN 8122415229, 9788122415223
18. Lamborn, S., Brown, B., Mounts, N., & Steinberg, L. (1992). *Putting school in perspective: The influence of family, peers, extracurricular participation, and part-time work on academic engagement*. In F. M. New mann (Ed.). 1992. *Student engagement and achievement in American secondary schools*, Teachers College Press, New York. ISBN 0-8077-3183-8, ISBN 0-8077-3182-X (pbk.)<http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED371047.pdf>
19. Rhonda P. and Robert H. P. (Ed.) (2009). *An Introduction to Community Development* Routledge, New York. ISBN 0-203-88693-3 Master e-book ISBN.
20. Scales, P. C., & Leffert, N. (1999). *Developmental assets*, Search Institute, Minneapolis. ISBN 1-57482-338-8
21. Sherrod, L. R., Flanagan, C., & Youniss, J. (2002). *Dimensions of citizenship and opportunities for youth development: The what, why, when, where and who of citizenship development*. *Applied Developmental Science*, 6(4), 264-272.http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S1532480XADS0604_14
22. United Nations (2009). *World Population Prospects: The 2008 Revision, Highlights*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division, Working Paper No. ESA/P/WP.210, United Nations, New York.http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/wpp2008/wpp2008_highlights.pdf
23. United Nations (2015). *Population Facts*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, Washington: D.C. <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/documents/youth/fact-sheets/YouthPOP.pdf>
24. USAID (2005) *Youth and Conflict: A Toolkit for Intervention*. Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation, U.S. Agency for International Development, Washington, DC 20523. http://toolkit.ineesite.org/toolkit/INEEcms/uploads/1037/Youth_and_Conflict_A_Toolkit_for_Intervention.pdf
25. Wooldridge, J.M. (2011). *Student's Solutions Manual and Supplementary Materials for Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*. MIT Press. ISBN-13: 978-0262731836, ISBN-10: 0262731835
26. World Bank (1996). *The World Bank Participation Source Book*. Washington D.C., World Bank. ISBN 0-82113-3558-8