

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: THE MODERATING ROLE OF CULTURE IN SELECTED STATES IN NIGERIA

OJO, OLAWOLE (PhD)

**Department of Political Science and Public Administration,
Babcock University, Ilisan-Remo, Ogun State
Gmail: ojoole@babcock.edu.ng**

&

AKO, IKHIANOSIMHE BENJAMIN

**Department of Political Science and Public Administration,
Babcock University, Ilisan-Remo, Ogun State,
E-mail: akoi@babcock.edu.ng**

Abstract

The development of communities has been associated with the involvement of citizens in transformational programme design and implementation and which culture is perceived to be apposite. The inherent assumption is that citizens' interest in participating in the development of their community can be linked to the kind of culture that the people practice. Based on this, some communities tend to be backward than others due to lack of initiative and interest in generating development-oriented projects and working cooperatively with the governments to accomplish them. Therefore, the purpose of the study was to examine the moderating effect of community culture on the relationship between citizen participation and community development in some selected states in Nigeria. The study adopted a cross sectional survey research design which involved a selected sample from a population. The population of the study included all the 5,641 total membership from the selected States; Anambra and Kaduna as registered community associations who live within the different communities in the local government areas of both States. Simple random sampling technique was adopted to arrive at 918 as the sample size for this study. Validated questionnaire was used for data collection. The study found that community culture has no moderating effect on the relationship between citizen participation and community development in Anambra State (R^2 change = 0.002, $F_{(3,204)} = 11.536$, $p > 0.05$), and Kaduna State (R^2 Change = 0.002, $F_{(3,599)} = 104.696$, $p > 0.05$). The study concluded that community culture has no moderating effect on the relationship between citizen participation and community development. This means that the strengthening and motivating power that the citizens need in order to participate actively in development issues is not predicated on community culture. This further explains that there are other variables that are not within the purview of this study that are responsible. The study recommended that citizen enlightenment and public advocacy can be explored in order to ascertain whether they can successfully moderate the participation of citizens in community issues.

Keywords: Community Development, Citizen Participation, Moderating Role, Culture, Nigeria.

Introduction

Community development in Nigeria has historical neglect which has truncated its scope and rate of development. The discourse is conventionally focused on multidimensional constructs with methodological differences in definitions, application, and perspectives in studies and policy design. The backwardness in community development is oft associated with lack of citizens' participation in transformational program design and implementation which culture is seen as part of the hiccups. The inherent assumption is that citizens' interest in participating in the development of their community can be linked to the kind of culture that the people practice. Based on this, some communities tend to be more development-oriented than others due to varied interest in generating progressive-mindset and working cooperatively with the governments to accomplish them.

The historical narrative is that the pre-colonial period was people inclusive; community members were known to be involved in solving community issues in a communal way. Works such as building of the kings' palaces, repairing of bridges, roads, markets and provision of security were communally done. During this period, it was observed that community projects were not abandoned by community members because their participation and cooperation were success based. However, Akanle (2012) believed that the zeal and interest of community members to get involved in community issues have been weakened by the colonial administration and modern system of government. As a result, the development of modern communities is being perceived as the sole responsibility of the government without citizens' involvement. Hence, projects initiated by the government without citizens' involvement in different communities have been abandoned and uncompleted. This alienation/citizens' apathy towards involvement in governmental activities has created an enabling environment for corruption and self-interest seeking which has deprived communities of the basic infrastructures and social amenities that support the wellbeing of their members.

Nevertheless, some scholars; Buchenrieder, Dufhues, Theesfeld and Nuchanata (2017); Culture Action Europe (2018) believed that community culture plays a unique role of stimulating community members' interest, participation and involvement as evident in community development associations. These scholars equally theorized that culture possesses intrinsic elements like religion, custom, values, virtue, and belief that shape individuals' behaviour and make them act agents for their community development. This means that culture promotes a deep understanding and glue community members into a group, social capital, and social inclusion that have significant influence on the quality of life they live (Tjarve & Zemīte, 2016).

Furthermore, culture has also been perceived to encompass people's way of life which has evolved over time and informs their attempt to meet their challenges, including environmental ones. This pattern of habit gives order and meaning to different groups of people as they promote their values through their social, political, economic and religious existence which distinguish them from others (Idang, 2015). The position of Etuk (2002) as re-echoed by Idang (2015) was that the totality of the way people view themselves might impact

the way societies organise themselves and relate with their environment to ensure their survival. This implies that the concept of culture may be foundational to the values that the people exhibit as they interact socially, politically, economically and religiously.

The cultural practices that form the habits do not only promote cooperation within the community members, but also engenders a productive relationship between the citizens and government in an attempt to ensure the wellbeing of communities. It therefore means that any development programme that does not relegate or play down on the culture of the people may be embraced by the people whole heartedly. Hence, there is the need to investigate empirically whether culture gives impetus as revealed in the literature when it is interacted with citizen participation in matters regarding community development. The assumption therefore is to examine the moderating effect of community culture on the relationship between citizen participation and community development in some selected states in Nigeria.

Literature Review

Empirical studies have been carried out in the areas of culture, citizen participation, and community development by different researchers (Dang, 2018; Loeurt, 2016, Adelesi, 2015). Also, constructs have been defined by scholars; Tjarve and Zemite (2016); Obasi and Lekorwe (2014); Che (2018), as influenced by context, perspectives and dispositions which needed conceptual clarification and refinement. As a result, the review was centered on past related studies, ideas, and knowledge that helped to deepen insight and enhanced the discussions.

Community Culture

Culture as a concept is an embodiment of factors that underlie social relations and groups' activities in any given community. It is the collective programming of the mind (Hofstede & Minkov, 2010) to act in a certain way. Others perceive it as not only the glue that binds a community together, but also the compass that provides direction for such entity (Mangla, 2014). This means that culture determines practices, habits and attitude of people in their inter-relationship and inter-dependency with their environment in a way to make their existence better and wellbeing sustainable (Tjarve & Zemite, 2016). As observed by Idang (2015), culture gives order and meaning to different people, making them outstanding in the promotion of their values through their social, political, economic and religious existence which distinguish them from others. This concept explains the *ethos* upon which behavior is based as people interact socially and politically and cooperate with one another and make attempt to find solution to their problems (Etuk, 2002; Idang, 2015).

Community members perceive these activities as very important because they espouse some societal values which are taught and passed down from generation to generation (Amos, Ajike, Akinlabi, & Kabuoh, 2014). By implication, these activities do encourage community togetherness and motivate people to work cooperatively as community members in a bid to solve a perceived problem for the common good of the people. Akanle (2012) noted that community culture does not only promote respect and cooperation within a traditional setting, but also engenders community action that supports development. In addition, Ajekwe (2017) recognized the value of cooperation among the Nigerian communities and averred that the purpose why most communities work in different groups is because they have the knowledge that the result an individual produces is limited when compared to group effort. Deductively, it is expected that this cooperative value can as well propel the citizens to

cooperate with the government officials and development agencies to engender development programmes in their respective communities.

Citizen Participation

From functional perspective, citizen participation was conceptualised as the “involvement of citizens in a wide range of policymaking activities, including the determination of levels of service, budget priorities, and physical construction of projects” (Armstrong, 2013, p. 11). This seems to be the position of Fitzgerald, McCarthy, Carton, Connor, Lynch and Adam (2016) when they perceived citizen participation as a process by which all relevant people within the sphere of a government influence and share control over development initiatives and the decisions and resources that affect them. Perhaps, it is in light of this that Obasi and Lekorwe (2014) conceived citizen participation as the interactive processes that enable citizens to deliberate with the government officials with the focus of engendering meaningful contributions to public development in a transparent and accountable manner.

Scholars like Elekwa and Eme (2013), perceived citizen participation as an activity that means more than voting exercise and passing information relating to the agenda of government to the citizens. The work (Elekwa&Eme, 2013) argued that citizen participation portrays citizens’ active involvement in the planning and execution of development programmes in their different communities. In line with this thought, Quick and Bryson (2016) viewed citizen participation as a process that allows groups that will be affected by the outcome of decisions or policies to influence the content through their meaningful contributions. In relation to the above conceptualization, Fox and Stoett (2016) posited that through citizen participation, stakeholders are able to disregard top-down policies and influence decisions concerning the development of their communities.

Community Development

Community development is an amalgam of two words; community and development. Akinsorotan and Olujide (2007) defined as a place that people do not only live, play, work and meet together, but where children grow up, learn, make choices and friends. Precisely, community has also been conceptualised as a group of people with shared identity, living together to meet their needs, resolve conflicts, and improve their living standards, good health care and education (Udu&Onwe, 2016). Development, on the other hand, is a process that gives rooms for alternatives (Che, 2018). It means new ways of looking at things and anticipating a positive change that is germane to people’s wellbeing (Adah and Abasilim2015). Development means a change that is directed to improve the vitality, participation, flexibility, equity, attitudes and function of institution for quality of the lives of the citizens (Stoddart, 2011;Emas, 2015).

Hence, community development has been described as a social transformation that does not only bring changes in the awareness and behaviour of individuals, but also in their relationships with others and as well as groups within the community (Che, 2018). It is a change that is initiated by community members without any imposition which induces learning, growth and development of the community members (Andy & Norman, 2013). This means that any development project that is being undertaken in any community, whether it

is a school building project, water project, or health project, the people need to be fully involved so that they can learn and grow in the process.

In addition, community development means a process whereby the citizens of a particular community actively get involved in community affairs directed to enhance the social, economic and environmental situation of the people (Vadevello&Singaravelloo, 2013). Dobson (2010) adumbrated that community development is built on certain elements that make it to thrive especially at the local level. Adelesi (2015), conceptualised community development as a process whereby those who are marginalised are enabled to gain self confidence to join with others and participate in productive activities that can bring about a change in their situation in the community. As observed by Abugu (2014), community development occurs when the citizens are fully involved in the development of their community from the identification of a need or problem, and the ways and means they will want to solve it. Dobson (2010) averred that the local government authorities need to recognize that the input of the citizens in developing and delivering services for their community is important. He added that the involvement of the community people, community based agencies and local business persons in decision making process about issues concerning the community will engender balanced decisions that are problem- solving oriented. Closely related to the above statement is Barikor in Onyenemazu (2014) who observed that community development is a significant process that combines the efforts of the citizens, government and voluntary organisations for the single purpose of improving the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the community.

Community culture, Citizen participation and Community development

People's culture has been found to stimulate participation of citizens in policies and development projects in their environment. A study carried out by Dang (2018) revealed that unlike the hierarchical kind of culture that promotes top-down approach to issue, egalitarian culture stimulates collective citizens' involvement in decision making, policy design and development of their environment. The study of Tjarve and Zemite (2016) also revealed that the cultural life of people does not only determine the inhabitants' satisfaction with life, but also influences their participation in community activities for development.

Loeurt (2016) conducted a study in order to determine the nature of community participation in education in a remote district in Cambodia. Using a case study approach to explore this phenomenon, the author equally used a mixed research methods for data collection. The perspective of this study was on the forms and processes of participation by parents, community members and stakeholders of primary education. The findings revealed that the degrees of participation varied depending on the types of participation and the participants. The study also revealed that parents do not only participation through their contribution for the development of the school, the also get involved in the decision making and development of the school through School Support Committees. The author added that this participation is a true reflection of the traditional culture of participation of the Cambodian society.

Theoretical Framework

The theory that this study is rooted on is the modernization theory. This theory which emerged after the World War II was motivated by the United States government when it became clear that capitalism could not reposition the developing nations on the part of development. The theory which was heralded and elaborated by a political Scientist, Walt Whitman Rostow in the late 1940s (Freire & Lima, 2018), had two major aims: a) It made an attempt to explain that cultural and economic conditions may be some of the pre-inhibiting factors that make it difficult for developing countries to achieve their development quest. b) It also explained that the introduction of Western values and culture could play a key role in bringing about development.

This theory advocated that some traditional values such as religious beliefs, stronger community and family bonds, collectivism, affective relationships and patriarchy prevent development growth in developing nations. The theory suggested that modern values that promote rational decision making; weaker community and family bonds, meritocracy and gender equality inspire change that brings about the desire development. Rostow believed that through training and education from the western countries inform of aids would not only mitigate the inhibiting preconditions of culture, but will further provoke development in the developing nations. This study adopted this theory based on the fact that the citizens of Anambra and Kaduna States have been trained and education in a manner that they have understood citizens' participation in relation to development in the communities in Anambra and Kaduna States. This means that their culture and traditional values will not pose a barrier to citizens' involvement in development issues in these two states.

Methodology

The study adopted a cross sectional survey research design which involves a selected sample from a population. The population of the study included all the 5,641 total membership from the selected States; Anambra and Kaduna (i.e. 1779 and 3862) as registered community associations who live within the different communities in the local government areas of both Anambra and Kaduna States. The two States and their local governments were purposely selected because of the development agencies activities in the area of enlightenment programme of citizen participation. Therefore, it is expected that the members of these community associations within these local governments would have participated in some development activities in their communities.

The study adopted a simple random sampling technique to determine the sample size for this study. The simple random technique was used to select one community development association with longest period of existence from each community in the six local government areas in Anambra and Kaduna States. In addition, the researcher adopted this technique because the oldest community development association would have participated greatly in the development activities in its community.

The reliability and validity of the questionnaire were established along the constructs; community culture, citizen participation and community development before the instrument was administered. From the copies distributed, responses rate was 85% amounting to 811

from the two states. The descriptive statistics was use to establish pattern, and characteristics of the respondents, hierarchical regression analysis was employed to test the hypothesis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 4.1: Characteristics of the Respondents

Variables	Categories	Anambra State Frequency (208) AND Percentage (100%)	Kaduna State Frequency (603) AND Percentage (100%)
Gender	Male	161(77.4%)	474(78.6%)
	Female	47(22.6%)	129(21.4%)
Age	20-29	36(17.3%)	103(17.1%)
	30-39	48(23.1%)	131(21.7%)
	40-49	47(22.6%)	209(34.7%)
	50-59	38(18.8%)	103(17.1%)
	60 and above	39(18.3%)	77(12.8%)
Educational Qualification	Religion studies	-	103(17.1%)
	Sch. Cert.	40(19.2%)	103(17.1%)
	WAEC/Grade II	61(29.3%)	137(22.7%)
	OND/NCE	51(24.5%)	131(21.7%)
	HND/Degree	48(23.1%)	129(21.4%)
	PG Education	8(3.8%)	-
Occupation Distribution	Farmer	74(35.6%)	240(39.8%)
	Trader/Artisan	125(60.1%)	103(17.1%)
	Public/Civil ser.	9(4.3%)	260(43.1%)
	Unemployed	-	-

The results in Table 4.1 reveal that majority of the respondents from both Anambra and Kaduna States were males with 77.4% and 78.6% respectively, while 22.6% and 21.4% were females. In Anambra, the statistical results indicated that 17.3%, 23.1%, 22.6%, 18.8%, and 18.3% of the respondents were between the age brackets of 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, and above 60 respectively. In Kaduna, findings equally indicated that 17.1%, 21.7%, 34.7%, 17.1% and 12.8% of the respondents were within the age groups of 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, and above 60 respectively.

More also, the questionnaire required the respondents to indicate their educational qualification. As a result, 19.2%, 29.3%, 24.5%, 23.1% and 3.8% of the respondents in Anambra respectively indicated that they qualified in the areas of Primary school leaving certificate, WAEC/Grade II, OND/NCE, HND/Degree, and postgraduate education. Similarly, 17.1%, 17.1%, 22.7%, 21.7%, and 21.4% of the respondents in Kaduna also respectively acclaimed that they are qualified in the areas of religion studies, primary leaving school certificate, WAEC/Grade II, OND/NCE, and HND/Degree. From the dimensions of occupational distribution, the respondents were also required to indicate areas in the categories of farmer, trader, artisan, public/civil servant and unemployed. Hence, while 35.6%, 60.1% and 4.3% of the respondents in Anambra respectively indicated that they are farmer, trader, artisan, and

public/civil servant, 39.8%, 17.1%, and 43.1% respondents in Kaduna also respectively indicated that they are farmer, trader, artisan, and public/civil servant.

Table 2. Hierarchical Regression Result for Moderating Effect of Culture on Citizen Participation and Community Development in Anambra State

Participation and Community Development in Makassar State									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R ² Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig.F Change
1	0.351 ^a	0.123	0.119	4.18565	0.123	28.989	1	206	0.000
2	0.378 ^b	0.143	0.135	4.14886	0.020	4.669	1	205	0.032
3	0381 ^c	0.145	0.132	4.15379	0.002	0.514	1	204	0.474
ANOVA ^a									
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.			
1	Regression	507.872	1	507.872	28.989	0.000 ^b			
	Residual	3609.047	206	17.520					
	Total	4116.918	207						
2	Regression	588.248	2	294.124	17.087	0.000 ^c			
	Residual	3528.670	205	17.213					
	Total	4116.918	207						
3	Regression	597.115	3	199.038	11.536	0.000 ^d			
	Residual	3519.804	204	17.254					
	Total	4116.918	207						
a. Dependent Variable: Community Development									
b. Predictors: (Constant), Citizen Participation, culture									
c. Predictors: (Constant), Citizen Participation, Citizenp*culture									
Coefficients									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.			
		B	Std. Error	Beta					
1	(Constant)	74.304	0.885		84.000	0.000			
	CitizenParticipation	0.067	0.012	0.351	5.384	0.000			
2	(Constant)	69.663	2.320		30.031	0.000			
	Citizen Participation	0.071	0.012	0.374	5.712	0.000			
	Culture	0.097	0.045	0.142	2.161	0.032			
3	(Constant)	55.495	19.900		2.789	0.006			
	Citizen Participation	0.242	0.238	1.272	1.015	0.312			
	Culture	0.399	0.424	0.585	0.940	0.348			
	Citizen participation*culture	-0.004	0.005	-0.935	-0.717	0.474			
Dependent Variable: Community Development									

Table 2 presented summary results of hierarchical multiple regression analysis of the moderating effect of community culture on the relationship between citizen participation and community development in Anambra State. In the model 1, citizen participation was

regressed on community development. The result yielded the coefficient of $F(1,206)=28.989$ ($p<0.05$) and the regression coefficient of $R^2 = 0.123$ which explained 12.3% of the variance in community development that can be accounted by a rise in citizen participation. The results also indicated that the model was statistically significant ($p<0.05$), meaning that citizen participation has a significant positive effect on community development. In model 2, the moderating variable which is community culture, was tested with citizen participation and community development. The results of model 2 show that citizen participation and community culture explained 14.3% of the variation in community development ($R^2 = 0.143$). Under changed statistics, the results reveal that the R^2 change increased by 2.0% from 0.123 to 0.143 ($R^2 = 0.020$). In addition the value of the F-ratio, which represents the ratio of the improvement in prediction that results from fitting the model, is 17.087, $p<0.05$. This shows that citizen participation and community culture had a significant positive effect on community development.

In model 3, when community culture was interacted with citizen participation (community culture*citizen participation) on the relationship with community development in Anambra State, a change occurred ($R^2 = 0.145$). However, this value was not statistically significant at $p>0.05$ (p -value = 0.474). This means that the interaction variable accounted for no change in community development in Anambra State. Therefore, culture has no moderating effect on the relationship between citizen participation and community development (F change = 0.514, 474). Based on these results, hypothesis, which states that culture has no moderating effect on the relationship between citizen participation and community development in Anambra State was not rejected.

Table 3. Hierarchical Regression Results for Moderating Effect of Community Culture on Citizen Participation and Community Development in Kaduna State

Citizen Participation and Community Development in Kaduna State									
Mode 1	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R ² Change	F Change	df 1	df2	Sig.F Change
1	0.209 ^a	0.044	0.042	3.96220	0.044	27.479	1	601	0.000
2	0.585 ^b	0.342	0.340	3.28904	0.298	272.187	1	600	0.000
3	0.587 ^c	0.344	0.341	3.28720	0.002	1.673	1	599	0.196
ANOVA ^a									
Model		Sum of Squares		df	Mean Square		F		Sig.
1	Regression	431.396		1	431.396		27.479		0.000 ^b
	Residual	9435.124		601	15.699				
	Total	9866.521		602					
2	Regression	3375.852		2	1687.926		156.033		0.000 ^c
	Residual	6490.668		600	10.818				
	Total	9866.521		602					
3	Regression	3393.930		3	1131.310		104.696		0.000 ^d
	Residual	6472.590		599	10.806				
	Total	9866.521		602					
a. Dependent Variable: Community Development									
b. Predictors: (Constant), Citizen Participation, culture									

c. Predictors: (Constant), Citizen Participation, Citizenp*culture						
Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	75.001	0.889		84.375	0.000
	Citizen Participation	0.054	0.010	0.209	5.242	0.000
2	(Constant)	53.411	1.502		35.551	0.000
	Citizen Participation	0.051	0.009	0.197	5.952	0.000
	Culture	0.448	0.027	0.546	16.498	0.000
3	(Constant)	94.316	31.660		2.979	0.003
	Citizen Participation	-0.421	0.365	-1.639	-1.154	0.249
	Culture	-0.372	0.634	-0.454	-0.586	0.558
	Citizen participation*culture	0.009	0.007	2.110	1.293	0.196
Dependent Variable: Community Development						

Table 3 illustrated summary results of hierarchical multiple regression analysis of the moderating effect of community culture on the relationship between citizen participation and community development in Kaduna State. In model 1, citizen participation was regressed on community development. The results yielded the coefficient of $F(1,601) = 27.479$ ($p < 0.05$) and the regression coefficient of $R^2 = 0.044$ ($p < 0.05$) which denoted that the model was statistically significant and explained that 4.4% of the variance in community development could be accounted for by a rise in citizen participation.

In model 2, the moderating variable which is community culture, was tested with citizen participation and community development. The results of model 2 show that citizen participation and community culture explained 34.2% of the variation in community development ($R^2 = 0.342$). Under changed statistics, the results reveal that the R^2 change increased by 28.8% from 0.044 to 0.342 ($R^2 = 0.342$). In addition the value of the F-ratio, which represents the ratio of the improvement in prediction that results from fitting the model, is 17.087, $p < 0.05$. This shows that citizen participation and community culture had a significant positive effect on community development.

In model 3, when community culture was interacted with citizen participation (community culture*citizen participation) on the relationship with community development in Kaduna State, a change occurred ($R^2 = 0.344$). However, this value was not statistically significant at $p > 0.05$ (p -value = 0.196). This means that the interaction variable accounted for no change in community development in Kaduna State. Therefore, culture has no moderating effect on the relationship between citizen participation and community development (F change = 1.672, 0.196): $F(3,599) = 104.696$, $p > 0.05$. Based on these results, the hypothesis which states that culture has no moderating effect on the relationship between citizen participation and community development in Kaduna State was not rejected.

Discussion

The objective of this study was required to explore the moderating effect of culture on the relationship between citizen participation and community development in Anambra and Kaduna States. The study revealed that culture had no significant moderating effect on the relationship between citizen participation and community development in Anambra and Kaduna States, Nigeria. Some studies carried out by Loeurt (2016); Tjarve and Zemite (2016) revealed that culture has a prominent role to play in the issues of citizen participation and development of communities. However, this study revealed that community culture plays no significant role when used to moderate citizen participation in the development of communities in these States. This revelation is an addition to knowledge, because it is very easy to make an assumption that community culture plays a crucial role in the issues of citizen participation and community development. This study has scientifically proved that community culture cannot be considered to be a significant variable that can strengthen the relationship between citizen participation and community development. This means that what citizens need is mainly enlightenment and cooperation between them and the agencies that are responsible for allocation of resources for proper repositioning of the development of communities in Anambra State, Nigeria.

Again, other dimensions of culture like Organisational culture and National culture have been widely used as moderating variables in many studies (Dang, 2018). However, community culture has not been used except in this study. This is another feat this study has achieved in the addition of knowledge to the existing one. Dang (2018) carried out a case study for the purpose of determining the level of effect that culture has on public participation. The study revealed that while a hierarchical way of life is mainly found in China and Italy, the Dutch people are more individualist and egalitarian. As a result, the author explained that public participation is difficult to implement in both China and Italy base on their hierarchical driven culture that promotes top-down inter-institutional relations and policy design. However, the individualist and egalitarian culture of the Dutch promotes environmental public participation and collective decision making process.

Conclusion

In alignment with the findings of this study, this research concluded that culture has no moderating effect on the relationship between citizen participation and community development. This means that the strengthening and motivating power that the citizens need in order to participate actively in development issues is not predicated on community culture. This further explains that there are other variables that are not within the purview of this study that are responsible. Therefore, citizen enlightenment and public advocacy can be explored in order to ascertain whether they can successfully moderate the participation of citizens in community issues.

References

- Adah, B., & Abasilim, U. (2015). Development and Its Challenges in Nigeria: A Theoretical Discourse. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. 6(6), 275-281.
- Ajekwe C. (2017). Effect of Culture on Entrepreneurship in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 6(2), 1-6.
- Akanle O. (2012). The Ligaments of Culture and Development in Nigeria. *International Journal of Applied Sociology*, 2(3), 16-21. DOI: 10.5923/j.ijas.20120203.02
- Akinsorotan, A. & Olujide, M. (2007). Community Development Associations' Contributions in Self Help Projects in Lagos State of Nigeria. *Journal of Central European Agriculture*, 7(4), 609-618.
- Amos N., Ajike, E., Akinlabi, B. & Kabuoh, M. (2014). The Influence of Nigerian Culture on Leadership and its Implication on the Sustainable Development of the Nation. *International Policy Brief Series - Education & Science Journal*, 4 (1), 115-135.
- Andy S. Blanke & Norman Walzer (2013) Measuring community development: what have we learned?, *Journal of Community Development*, 44(5), 534-550. DOI: 10.1080/15575330.2013.852595
- Armstrong E. (2013). *The Role of Active Participation and Citizen Engagement in Good Governance*. New York: Division for Public Administration and Development Management.
- Buchenrieder G., Dufhues T., Theesfeld I., & Nuchanata M. (2017). Politics & International Relations: Participatory local governance and cultural practices in Thailand. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 1, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2017.1338331>
- Che C. (2018). Re-Inventing Community Development: Utilizing Relational Networking and Cultural Assets for Infrastructure Provision. *Societies*, 8(84), 1-12. doi:10.3390/soc8030084
- Culture Action Europe (2018). The Value and Values of Culture. European Union: European Cultural Foundation. www.cultureactioneurope.org
- Dang W. (2018). How Culture Shapes Environmental Public Participation: Case Studies of China, the Netherlands, and Italy. *Journal of Chinese Governance*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23812346.2018.1443758>
- Dobson (2010). *Community Development Framework*. Australia: Greater Shepparton City Council.
- Elekwa N. & Eme O. (2013). Community Driven Development in the Local Government System: A New Strategy. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 3(1), 1-15.
- Freire F., & Lima, D. (2018). The 1960s Modernization Theory Updated: The Role of the Evaluative State in Today's Brazilian Education. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 6(10): 2373-2378.
- Fox, O. and Stoett, P. (2016). Citizen participation in the UN Sustainable Development Goals Consultation Process: Toward Global Democratic Governance? *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations*, 22(4). 555–74. <http://journals.riener.com/doi/abs/10.5555/1075-2846.22.4.555>
- Fitzgerald C., McCarthy S., Carton F., Connor Y. Lynch L. & Adam F. (2016). Citizen participation in decision-making: can one make a difference? *Journal of Decision System*, 25(1), 248-260
- Idang G. (2015). African Culture and Values. *University of South Africa*, 16(2), 97–111.

- Loeurt T. (2016). Community Participation in Education. A Case Study in the Four Remote Primary Schools in Samlot District, Battambang Province, Cambodia. *A thesis submitted to Victoria University of Wellington in partial fulfilment of requirements for the degree of Master of Development Studies.*
- Mangla A. (2014). Mobilizing Culture for Public Action: Community Participation and Child Rights in Rural Uttar Pradesh Working Paper 14-100
- Obasi I., & Lekorwe M. (2014). Citizen Engagement in Public Policy Making Process in Africa: The Case of Botswana. *Public Policy and Administration Research*, 3(4), 1-11.
- Onyenemezu C. (2014). The Imperative of Citizen's Participation in Community Development. *Academic Research International*, 5(1), 209-215.
- Quick K., & Bryson J. (2016). *Public Participation*. Forthcoming 2016 in Handbook in Theories of Governance, edited by Jacob Torbing and Chris Ansell, Edward Elgar Press.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282733927_Theories_of_public_participation_in_governance [accessed Nov 03 2019].
- Tjarve, B. & Zemite I. (2016). The Role of Cultural Activities in Community Development. *Acta Universitatis Agriculturae et Silviculturae Mendelianae Brunensis*, 64(6), 2151-2160.
- Vadeveloo T., & Singaravelloo K (2013). Local Government and Community Development. *International Journal of Business, Economics and Law*, 2(2).54-5