FROM PARTICIPATION TO PROSPERITY: EXAMINING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND SUSTAINANABLE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTH-WEST, NIGERIA

Omowunmi Joshua Olusegun[1] & Oyelekan Azeez. Akanni[2]
Department of Public Administration, Federal Polytechnic, Ilaro[1]; Department of General Studies, Federal Polytechnic, Ilaro[2]

Abstract
This study investigates the impact of community involvement strategies on sustainable economic development in South-west Nigeria, with a focus on Ogun State. Using a quantitative, cross-sectional survey design, the study adopted an infinite population comprising adult residents, community leaders, and individuals directly involved in development projects across three Local Government Areas: Abeokuta South, Yewa South, and Sagamu, using Yamane to obtained sample population of the study. Data were collected from 294 respondents using a structured questionnaire based on a five-point Likert scale. Reliability testing produced a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.793, while factor analysis revealed a principal component explaining 73.58% of the variance, confirming strong construct validity. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and multiple linear regression were used for data analysis. Regression analysis demonstrated that community involvement ($\beta = 0.280$, $p < 0.05$) and participation in decision-making ($\beta = 0.340$, $p < 0.05$) significantly enhance sustainable economic development, collectively explaining 42.6% of the variance. However, impact assessment ($\beta = 0.058$, $p = 0.265$) was not a statistically significant predictor, suggesting current practices are underutilized. The findings support participatory development theory, highlighting the role of grassroots engagement and shared governance in achieving sustainable growth. The study contributes theoretically by contextualizing participatory models within Nigeria's socio-cultural realities and practically by recommending the institutionalization of inclusive governance frameworks and continuous community capacity building to promote resilient, inclusive, and sustainable economic development in Southwest Nigeria.

Keywords: Community involvement, community participation, community impact assessment, decision making, sustainable economic development

Introduction

The growing concern over persistent poverty, unemployment, infrastructural deficits, environmental degradation, and weak community participation in development initiatives has intensified debates on the sustainability of economic development efforts, particularly in developing countries. From the researchers' perspective, this situation raises fundamental questions about whether existing development strategies are sufficiently inclusive to generate meaningful and lasting socioeconomic transformation. Despite numerous government policies and development programmes, many communities in Southwest Nigeria continue to experience limited socioeconomic progress due to inadequate inclusion of local stakeholders in planning, implementation, and decision-making processes. This reality has increasingly drawn scholarly attention to the limitations of top-down development approaches that often overlook grassroots participation, local knowledge systems, and community ownership. Consequently, there is growing consensus among researchers and development practitioners on the need for community-driven and participatory development strategies as viable pathways to inclusive growth, social cohesion, accountability, and long-term sustainability.

Sustainable economic development has gained increasing global attention due to the growing need to balance economic growth, social inclusion, and environmental sustainability within development planning frameworks (United Nations, 2023; Sachs, Schmidt-Traub, Mazzucato, Messner, Nakicenovic, & Rockström, 2019). Contemporary development discourse emphasizes that economic advancement alone is insufficient without inclusive participation, environmental protection, and institutional sustainability (World Bank, 2022). Consequently, sustainable development has emerged as a multidimensional concept aimed at improving living standards while preserving resources and opportunities for future generations (Barbier & Burgess, 2020).

Sustainable development emphasizes meeting present economic needs without compromising the welfare of future generations, while ensuring balanced growth across social and ecological dimensions (Barbier & Burgess, 2020; United Nations, 2023). Recent studies argued that sustainable economic development is strongly influenced by participatory governance, community engagement, and inclusive institutional frameworks that promote local ownership of development initiatives (Mensah, 2019; Leal Filho, Azul, Brandli, Özuyar, & Wall, 2021). In developing economies, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa, grassroots participation has been identified by scholars as a critical driver of sustainable infrastructure delivery, poverty reduction, social cohesion, and local economic resilience (Adebayo, & Butcher, 2023; Okafor, Adebisi, & Oluwatobi, 2022).

Moreover, from an analytical standpoint, the growing complexity of socioeconomic challenges such as unemployment, environmental degradation, rural poverty, and weak institutional coordination has reinforced the importance of community-centered development approaches United Nations Development Programmes (UNDP, 2022). Scholars have therefore stressed that integrating local communities into planning, implementation, monitoring, and decision-making processes enhances accountability, project sustainability, and developmental outcomes (Chigbu, 2021; Leal Filho et al., 2021). This perspective aligns with participatory development theory, which advocates shared governance and collaborative decision-making as essential mechanisms for achieving long-term sustainable economic development.

Several scholars have examined the nexus between community participation and sustainable development, emphasizing its relevance to inclusive governance and long-term economic transformation. Mensah (2019) conceptualized sustainable development as a participatory-driven process that requires institutional inclusiveness and stakeholder engagement. Similarly, Sachs et al. (2019) and Leal Filho et al. (2021) argued that sustainable development outcomes are strengthened when governance systems integrate multiple stakeholders in decision-making processes, thereby improving accountability and institutional responsiveness. In developing regions such as South-west Nigeria, local communities remain key actors in the implementation of development initiatives due to their access to indigenous knowledge, social capital, and locally embedded governance structures (Akinyemi & Adejumo, 2022; Adeyeye, Akinwale, & Ilori, 2021). Empirical evidence suggests that participatory development approaches strengthen institutional accountability, improve project sustainability, and enhance economic resilience (Mansuri & Rao, 2019; Mensah, 2019).

Despite this potential, the integration of community involvement into sustainable development frameworks in Southwest Nigeria remains inconsistent and poorly institutionalized. From a critical research standpoint, existing studies often focus narrowly on either the economic performance of communities (Olawumi & Adetunji, 2022) or environmental sustainability outcomes (Ajibade, 2021), thereby neglecting the interactive role of community agency in simultaneously advancing economic, social, and environmental objectives. This creates a critical concern for researchers in understanding how community engagement strategies can be effectively operationalized to address power asymmetries, resource constraints, and institutional barriers while still achieving long-term sustainability goals.

However, the integration of community participation into sustainable development frameworks across Nigeria remains uneven and often poorly institutionalized (Akinola & Adeyemi, 2021; Olawumi & Adetunji, 2022). Existing studies frequently examine either environmental sustainability or economic performance separately, with limited attention to how community agency simultaneously influences social, economic, and environmental outcomes (Ajibade, 2021; Adeyeye et al., 2021). Furthermore, several limitations persist in the literature. First many studies fail to account for regional socio-economic and political differences, leading to generalized conclusions that overlook context-specific realities (Ojomo & Oyewobi, 2019). Second, marginalized populations such as youth and women remain underrepresented in development research (Akinola & Adeyemi, 2021). Third, the majority of studies rely on cross-sectional designs rather than longitudinal approaches capable of examining long-term development trajectories (Olayide & Ogunbameru, 2021). Finally, theoretical frameworks are often applied inconsistently, limiting the development of integrated models for sustainable community engagement (Olayiwola, Ojo, & Akinwale, 2020).

Theoretically, much of the African sustainable development discourse has emphasized the “triple bottom line” (Elkington, 1999), yet empirical validation of its adaptation to community-led initiatives in Southwest Nigeria remains limited. Practically, although national policy frameworks advocate community participation, mechanisms for translating these intentions into measurable, sustained outcomes remain underdeveloped (National Planning Commission, 2021). These concerns underscore, from a scholarly viewpoint, the need for more context-specific and empirically grounded investigations.

Community involvement strategy refers to a systematic and deliberate approach aimed at engaging local stakeholders in the design, planning, implementation, and evaluation of development initiatives within their communities (Arnstein, 1969; Pretty, 1995). At its core, it seeks to empower community members to shape their development agenda, leveraging indigenous knowledge, skills, and locally available resources to address shared challenges. Arnstein, (1969) seminal “Ladder of Citizen Participation” conceptualizes community involvement as a continuum from tokenism, where participation is symbolic, to genuine citizen power, characterized by shared decision-making authority. Community involvement strategies refer to structured approaches designed to engage citizens in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of development initiatives within their communities (Mansuri & Rao, 2019; Cornwall, 2020). Participatory governance mechanisms such as citizen forums, participatory budgeting, and community-driven development programs are increasingly recognized as effective tools for strengthening accountability and improving development outcomes (World Bank, 2020).

Over the past two decades, development policy has increasingly shifted from centralized planning toward participatory models that empower communities as co-creators of development outcomes rather than passive beneficiaries (United Nations, 2015; Sachs et al., 2019). In African contexts, participatory development has been associated with increased project sustainability, enhanced trust in institutions, and improved local economic outcomes (Akinola & Adeyemi, 2021; Mensah, 2019).

Sustainable economic development integrates environmental protection, social equity, and economic growth in order to promote long-term prosperity (Barbier & Burgess, 2020; United Nations, 2023). Core components include economic diversification, social inclusion, environmental stewardship, and participatory governance (Mensah, 2019). Empirical studies demonstrate that community participation strengthens project ownership, improves monitoring mechanisms, and facilitates the integration of local knowledge into development planning (Mansuri & Rao, 2019; Adeyeye et al., 2021). However, challenges such as elite capture, weak institutional frameworks, and limited funding often undermine the effectiveness of participatory governance mechanisms in developing countries (Cornwall, 2020; Akinola & Adeyemi, 2021).

Meaningful community involvement is operationalized through mechanisms such as participatory budgeting, citizen forums, collaborative planning processes, and inclusive needs assessments (Chambers, 1997). These approaches, when applied effectively, can foster social capital**,** build local ownership, and promote transparent governance. However, literature also highlights risks of elite capture and consultation fatigue where engagement processes are dominated by local elites or overused without tangible benefits (Cooke & Kothari, 2001; Cornwall, 2008). The last three decades have seen a global policy shift from top-down development planning to participatory, inclusive models that position communities as partners rather than passive beneficiaries (United Nations, 2015; Sachs, 2015). In contexts like Southwest Nigeria, where cultural norms and traditional governance remain influential, effective community engagement is pivotal for aligning development projects with local needs and ensuring sustainability (Akinmoladun & Adejumo, 2020).

Scholars argue that community involvement enhances project ownership, strengthens institutional trust, and improves long-term outcomes (Uphoff, 1992; Mansuri & Rao, 2013). Yet, other studies caution that participation is not inherently transformative, particularly in settings with entrenched power hierarchies, low literacy levels, or inadequate institutional frameworks (Cleaver, 1999; Ojomo & Oyewobi, 2017). This divergence underscores a key debate: whether participation should be pursued primarily as a means to improve efficiency and outcomes, or as an intrinsic democratic right (Hickey & Mohan, 2004). The study identifies several strategies for embedding community engagement in economic development. Participatory decision-making ensures local needs shape development priorities (Mansuri & Rao, 2013). Capacity building equips individuals with skills to participate meaningfully (Pretty, 1995). Support for local enterprises stimulates grassroots economic growth (Olufemi & Adefalu, 2017). Cultural preservation integrates heritage into development, enhancing both identity and tourism opportunities (UNESCO, 2021). While these strategies are widely endorsed, implementation in Nigeria is often hampered by limited funding**,** institutional fragmentation**,** and weak accountability mechanisms (Akinola & Adeyemi, 2019).

Sustainable economic development seeks to balance economic resilience**,** social inclusion**,** and environmental protection (WCED, 1987; Elkington, 1999). Core principles include: Environmental sustainability, minimizing ecological degradation and optimizing resource use (United Nations, 2015). Social equity, ensuring benefits are broadly shared, especially among vulnerable groups (Sachs, 2015). Economic diversification and resilience, reducing dependency on single sectors (Diamantis, 2012). Participatory governance, embedding transparency and accountability in decision-making (United Nations, 2015). The study emphasizes that these dimensions are interdependent, yet in practice, development programs often prioritize economic growth over social or environmental goals, leading to contradictions in sustainability discourse (Redclift, 2005). The synergy between community involvement and sustainable economic development in Southwest Nigeria lies in mutual reinforcement. Community involvement enhances project relevance and sustainability (Pretty, 1995), while sustainable economic growth generates the resources and incentives that sustain participation (Sachs, 2015). However, studies also show that without institutional safeguards against elite capture, benefits may bypass marginalized groups (Cleaver, 1999; Akinola & Adeyemi, 2019). The debate here revolves around context-specificity: should participation models in Nigeria adopt globally recognized frameworks or be entirely localized? While global models offer tested principles, local adaptations are essential to address Nigeria's socio-cultural realities (Ojomo & Oyewobi, 2017).

This study draws on four theoretical lenses. Social Capital Theory – highlights trust, reciprocity, and networks as drivers of collective action (Putnam, 2000; Oyelaran-Oyeyinka & Adeyemi, 2003). Institutional Theory – emphasizes how governance structures and rules influence participation outcomes (North, 1990; Olayide & Ogunbameru, 2018). Political Ecology – examines how environmental decisions are shaped by power relations and resource conflicts (Blaikie & Brookfield, 1987; Fisher, 1997). Developmental State Theory – underscores the state strategic role in guiding economic transformation (Evans, 1995). While these frameworks provide analytical depth, a persistent gap is the lack of integrated models combining socio-cultural, institutional, and ecological perspectives in the Nigerian context.

Empirical studies in Nigeria (Olayide & Ogunbameru, 2018; Akinola & Adeyemi, 2019; Olufemi & Adefalu, 2017) confirm that community participation can enhance sustainability outcomes through improved ownership, social cohesion, and local knowledge integration. However, challenges persist: Power imbalances marginalizing women and youth (Akinola & Adeyemi, 2019). Short-term project funding undermining long-term engagement (Olayiwola et al., 2020). Fragmented institutional frameworks limiting scalability (Oladokun & Obi, 2018). Limited longitudinal studies tracking sustained impacts (Olayide & Ogunbameru, 2021). These studies also present contradictory findings—while some highlight the positive role of strong social networks (Oyelaran-Oyeyinka & Adeyemi, 2003), others warn that tightly knit groups may exclude outsiders or entrench inequalities (Cleaver, 1999). This study demonstrates a consensus on the potential of community involvement to advance sustainable economic development in Nigeria, yet significant gaps remain: Contextualization gap – Overgeneralization of findings without accounting for the socio-cultural and political uniqueness of Southwest Nigeria. Inclusivity gap – Insufficient focus on marginalized voices in participation processes. Methodological gap – Predominance of cross-sectional studies, with limited longitudinal analysis. Theoretical integration gap – Weak application of multi-theoretical frameworks linking community participation with sustainability outcomes. This study addresses these gaps by adopting a mixed-method, context-specific, and theoretically integrated approach to examine how community involvement strategies influence sustainable economic development in Southwest Nigeria. It contributes to theory by proposing an adapted model of community participation for developing economies and to practice by providing actionable policy recommendations for inclusive, locally grounded development planning.

This study therefore seeks to solve the problems by providing empirical evidence for localized, culturally grounded approaches to community participation in sustainable economic development in Southwest Nigeria, with particular attention to how community involvement strategies translate into measurable development outcomes.

Purpose of the Study

The main objective of the study was to examine the impact of community involvement strategies on sustainable economic development outcomes in Southwest Nigeria. The specific objectives were to:

1. examine the effect of community involvement on sustainable economic development in Southwest Nigeria.
2. determine the impact of community participation in decision-making on sustainable economic development in Southwest Nigeria.
3. establish the effect of community impact assessment on sustainable economic development in Southwest Nigeria.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study;

1. What is the current extent and nature of community involvement in sustainable economic development initiatives in Southwest Nigeria?
2. What effective impact does community participation has on sustainable development in Southwest Nigeria?
3. What effect does community impact assessment has on sustainable economic outcomes in Southwest Nigeria?

Methods

The influence of community involvement strategies on long-term economic growth in Southwest Nigeria was investigated in this study utilizing a quantitative, cross-sectional survey method. The cross-sectional design provided a one-time assessment of the current situation, making it appropriate for identifying significant correlations relevant to community development and policy formulation, whereas the quantitative approach allowed for empirical testing of proposed relationships between quantifiable constructs (Creswell & Creswell (2018); Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill (2019). Ogun State was chosen for the study due to its active community development processes, mix of rural and semi-urban regions, and socioeconomic diversity. Adult residents with relevant experience or direct involvement in development projects, as well as community leaders, comprised the target population. Convenience sample was employed for accessibility, whilst purposive sampling was used to ensure the involvement of informed respondents. Three Local Government Areas (LGAs) were purposefully selected to demonstrate disparities in governance, development engagement, and sociocultural composition: Abeokuta South, Yewa South, and Sagamu.

Using Yamane's (1967) computation for large populations with a 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error, 384 respondents were determined to be the minimal sample size. A total of 320 questionnaires were distributed, and 294 valid responses (91.9%) of the total were received. This meets Tabachnick and Fidell's 2019 recommendation for a multiple regression analysis with at least 15 observations per predictor. Primary data was collected using a three-part structured questionnaire: (i) demographic information; (ii) community involvement strategies (decision-making, project execution, monitoring/evaluation); and (iii) indicators of long-term economic development (economic diversification, job creation, infrastructure enhancement). Each question was assessed on a five-point Likert scale, with one representing strongly disagree and five representing strongly agree. Cronbach's Alpha coefficients found from reliability study exceeded the benchmark of 0.70. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation confirmed construct validity when factor loadings were more than 0.60 and KMO values above 0.70. Content validity was ensured through expert review by academics and practitioners. Multiple linear regression was used to assess the effects of community participation on sustainable economic growth while accounting for multicollinearity, while the following regression assumptions were validated: homoscedasticity, normality, error independence, and linearity.

Results

Table 1: Factor Analysis (Total Variance Explained)

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.625	16.406	16.406	2.625	16.406	16.406
2	2.004	12.526	28.932	2.004	12.526	28.932
3	1.904	11.897	40.829	1.904	11.897	40.829
4	1.590	9.940	50.769	1.590	9.940	50.769
5	1.403	8.771	59.540	1.403	8.771	59.540
6	1.206	7.536	67.076	1.206	7.536	67.076
7	1.041	6.505	73.581	1.041	6.505	73.581

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Researchers Computation, (2026).

Table 2: Reliability: (Reliability Statistics)

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.793	16

Researchers Computation, (2026).

Table 3: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.675[a]	.426	.418	1.95763

a. Predictors: (Constant), Impact Assessment, Community Participation in Decision Making, Community Involvement

Researchers Computation, (2026).

Table 4: ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	323.808	3	107.936	28.165	.000[b]
	Residual	1111.376	290	3.832		
	Total	1435.184	293			

a. Dependent Variable: Sustainable Economic Development

b. Predictors: (Constant), Impact Assessment, Community Participation in Decision Making, Community Involvemen

Researchers Computation, (2026).

Table 5: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.929	1.132		4.355	.000
	Community Involvement	.218	.041	.280	5.335	.000
	Community Participation in Decision Making	.293	.045	.340	6.484	.000
	Impact Assessment	.063	.056	.058	1.118	.265

a. **Dependent Variable: Sustainable Economic Development**

Researchers Computation, (2026).

Summary of Regression Results

Research Objectives (ROs)	Research Questions (RQs)	Hypotheses (H_0)	Key Finding	Result	Interpretation & Implication
RO1: To examine the relationship between community involvement and sustainable economic development.	**RQ1:** To what extent does community involvement influence sustainable economic development in Southwest Nigeria?	**H_{01}:** There is a significant positive relationship between community involvement and sustainable economic development.	$\beta = 0.280$, $p < 0.05$	Supported	Strong community involvement significantly enhances sustainable economic development, confirming participatory development theory. Policymakers should

					promote active grassroots engagement.
RO2: To assess the impact of community participation in decision-making on sustainable economic development.	**RQ2:** How does community participation in decision-making affect sustainable economic development?	**H_{02}:** There is a significant positive relationship between community participation in decision-making and sustainable economic development.	$\beta = 0.340$, $p < 0.05$	Supported	Decision-making participation has a stronger predictive effect than general involvement, highlighting the need for inclusive governance structures.
RO3: To determine the extent to which community impact assessment influences sustainable economic development.	**RQ3:** What is the effect of community impact assessment on sustainable economic development?	**H_{03}:** There is a significant positive relationship between community impact assessment and sustainable economic development.	$\beta = 0.058$, $p = 0.265$	Not Supported	Although positive, the relationship is not statistically significant, suggesting that current impact assessment practices are underutilized or poorly integrated into development planning.
RO4: To evaluate the combined predictive power of community involvement strategies on sustainable economic development.	**RQ4:** How well do community involvement strategies collectively predict sustainable economic development?		$R^2 = 0.426$; Adjusted $R^2 = 0.418$; $F = 28.165$, $p < 0.0005$		The combined model explains 42.6% of the variance in sustainable economic development, demonstrating moderate predictive strength and justifying integrated community-based approaches.

Discussion of Results

The results from RO1 show that community involvement has a statistically significant positive effect on sustainable economic development ($\beta = 0.280$, $p < 0.05$). This confirms the hypothesis that there is a significant positive relationship between community involvement and sustainable economic development. The result indicates that strong community involvement significantly enhances sustainable economic development, confirming participatory development theory. Policymakers should promote active grassroots engagement. The results from RO2 show that community participation in decision-making has a statistically significant positive effect on sustainable economic development ($\beta = 0.340$, $p < 0.05$). This confirms the hypothesis that there is a significant positive relationship between community participation in decision-making and sustainable economic development. Decision-making participation has a stronger predictive effect than general involvement, highlighting the need for inclusive governance structures.

The results from RO3 show that community impact assessment has a positive but statistically insignificant effect on sustainable economic development ($\beta = 0.058$, $p = 0.265$). This means, the hypothesis that there is a significant positive relationship between community impact assessment and sustainable economic development is not supported. Although positive, the relationship is not statistically significant, suggesting that current impact assessment practices are underutilized or poorly integrated into development planning. The results from RO4 show that community involvement strategies jointly explain 42.6% of the variance in sustainable economic development ($R^2 = 0.426$; Adjusted $R^2 = 0.418$; $F = 28.165$, $p < 0.0005$). This indicates that the model is statistically significant and the hypothesis that community involvement strategies collectively predict sustainable economic development is supported. The combined model explains 42.6% of the variance in sustainable economic development, demonstrating moderate predictive strength and justifying integrated community-based approaches.

The study establishes that community involvement and participation in decision-making significantly enhance sustainable economic development in Southwest Nigeria, while community impact assessment does not show a statistically significant effect. The overall model confirms that community involvement strategies are important determinants of sustainable economic development.

Discussion

RO1: Community Involvement and Sustainable Economic Development

The study examined the influence of community involvement strategies on sustainable economic development in Southwest Nigeria, focusing on community involvement, participation in decision-making, and community impact assessment. The findings provide empirical insights into how participatory governance mechanisms influence local economic sustainability. The results indicate that community involvement has a statistically significant positive effect on sustainable economic development. This reinforces participatory development literature that active engagement of local communities enhances development outcomes through ownership, accountability, and effective utilization of indigenous knowledge. Studies show that development initiatives involving community stakeholders in implementation and monitoring achieve higher sustainability and resilience (Mansuri & Rao, 2019; Cornwall, 2020). Similarly, evidence from developing economies indicates that community participation strengthens institutional trust, collective action, and development effectiveness (Akinola & Adeyemi, 2021; Adeyeye, Akinwale, & Ilori, 2021). In Southwest Nigeria, where traditional governance and community-based organizations are prominent, community involvement mobilizes resources and coordinates development activities.

RO2: Community Participation in Decision-Making and Sustainable Economic Development

The study reveals that community participation in decision-making exerts the strongest positive influence on sustainable economic development. This shows that communities gain greater developmental benefits when actively involved in shaping development priorities rather than only implementation. Participatory governance literature emphasizes that decision-making authority enables alignment of development initiatives with local needs and socio-economic realities (Mensah, 2019). Community participation increases support for programs, resource contribution, and long-term sustainability. This aligns with global frameworks such as those of the United Nations and World Bank, which stress inclusive governance as essential for sustainable development.

RO3: Community Impact Assessment and Sustainable Economic Development The study found that community impact assessment does not have a statistically significant effect on sustainable economic development, despite a positive coefficient. This suggests that impact assessment mechanisms may not be fully institutionalized or effectively integrated into development planning. In developing contexts, impact assessments are often procedural rather than outcome-driven. Weak institutional capacity, limited technical expertise, and inadequate monitoring frameworks reduce their effectiveness (Barbier & Burgess, 2020). As a result, impact assessment practices remain weakly linked to policy feedback and adaptive governance.

RO4: Combined Predictive Power of Community Involvement Strategies The regression model shows that community involvement strategies explain 42.6% of the variance in sustainable economic development. This indicates that participatory governance variables are important determinants of economic sustainability at the community level. The ANOVA result affirmed the model's reliability in explaining the relationship between community participation and sustainable development outcomes.

These findings support the theoretical argument that inclusive governance structures and social capital networks are critical for sustainable development, especially in developing countries with institutional capacity constraints (Mensah, 2019; Akinola & Adeyemi, 2021). They also align with participatory development theory, which emphasizes community involvement in decision-making and implementation. In Southwest Nigeria, community development associations, traditional institutions, and grassroots organizations facilitate participation and development initiatives.

Conclusion

The study provides empirical evidence that community involvement strategies significantly influence sustainable economic development in Southwest Nigeria. Specifically, community involvement and participation in decision-making were found to be strong predictors of sustainable economic outcomes, while community impact assessment demonstrated limited statistical influence. These findings highlight the importance of participatory governance structures in promoting inclusive and sustainable development. By strengthening community engagement mechanisms and improving institutional frameworks for impact assessment, policymakers can enhance the effectiveness of development initiatives and foster resilient local economies across the region.

Recommendations

In line with the findings of the study for sustainable community development to thrive;

1. Policymakers must institutionalize inclusive governance frameworks that mandate active citizen participation at every stage of planning, implementation, and decision-making.
2. Government agencies and development practitioners should improve the scope, methodology, and enforcement of impact assessments to ensure that social, economic, and environmental considerations are rigorously evaluated before implementation.
3. Community-based development approaches should be mainstreamed into local and national policy frameworks to ensure long-term sustainability and coherence across sectors.
4. Building local capacity should be a continuous priority, equipping community members, leaders, and government officials with the skills and tools for participatory governance, sustainability management, and effective monitoring.

References

Adeyeye, A., Akinwale, Y., & Ilori, M. (2021). Community participation and sustainable development initiatives in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, *23*(2), 45–60.

Adebayo, A. D., & Butcher, J. (2023). Community empowerment in Nigeria's tourism industry: An analysis of stakeholders' perceptions. *Tourism Planning & Development*, *20*(4), 583– 603.

Ajibade, I. (2021). Climate adaptation and community resilience in sub-Saharan Africa. *Climate and Development*, *13*(3), 201–213.

Akinmoladun, O., & Adejumo, O. (2020). Community engagement and development planning in Nigeria: A participatory governance perspective. *African Journal of Governance and Development*, *9*(1), 112–128.

Akinola, S. R., & Adeyemi, O. O. (2019). Community participation and inclusive governance in Nigeria: Challenges and prospects. *Journal of African Development Studies*, *11*(2), 67–82.

Akinola, S. R., & Adeyemi, O. O. (2021). Participatory governance and community development in Nigeria. *African Journal of Public Administration*, *13*(1), 55–72.

Akinyemi, O., & Adejumo, O. (2022). Indigenous knowledge and community development practices in Southwest Nigeria. *Journal of African Social Research*, *14*(1), 88–103.

Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, *35*(4), 216–224.

Barbier, E. B., & Burgess, J. C. (2020). Sustainability and development after COVID-19. *World Development*, *135*, 105082.

Blaikie, P., & Brookfield, H. (1987). *Land degradation and society*. Methuen.

Chambers, R. (1997). *Whose reality counts? Putting the first last*. Intermediate Technology Publications.

Chigbu, U. E. (2021). Visions and pathways for sustainable rural development in Africa. *Local Economy*, *36*(3), 183–196.

Cleaver, F. (1999). Paradoxes of participation: Questioning participatory approaches to development. *Journal of International Development*, *11*(4), 597–612.

Cooke, B., & Kothari, U. (2001). *Participation: The new tyranny?* Zed Books.

Cornwall, A. (2008). Unpacking 'participation': Models, meanings and practices. *Community Development Journal, 43*(3), 269–283.

Cornwall, A. (2020). Participatory governance and development: A global perspective. *World Development, 134*, 105042.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Diamantis, D. (2012). *The concept of sustainable tourism development*. Routledge.

Elkington, J. (1999). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Capstone.

Evans, P. (1995). *Embedded autonomy: States and industrial transformation*. Princeton University Press.

Fisher, F. (1997). Citizen participation and the democratization of policy expertise. *Policy Sciences, 26*(3), 165–187.

Hickey, S., & Mohan, G. (2004). *Participation: From tyranny to transformation? Exploring new approaches to participation in development*. Zed Books.

Leal Filho, W., Azul, A. M., Brandli, L., Özuyar, P. G., & Wall, T. (2021). Sustainable development research and practice in Africa: Challenges and opportunities. *Environment, Development and Sustainability, 23*(1), 1–15.

Mansuri, G., & Rao, V. (2013). *Localizing development: Does participation work?* World Bank.

Mansuri, G., & Rao, V. (2019). Community-driven development: Theory and practice. *World Bank Research Observer, 34*(1), 1–26.

Mensah, J. (2019). Sustainable development: Meaning, history, principles, pillars, and implications for human action. *Cogent Social Sciences, 5*(1), 1653531.

National Planning Commission. (2021). *Nigeria national development plan 2021–2025*. Government of Nigeria.

North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.

Ojomo, E., & Oyewobi, L. (2017). Community engagement and infrastructure development in Nigeria. *International Journal of Development Studies, 9*(1), 15–29.

Ojomo, E., & Oyewobi, L. (2019). Regional disparities and development participation in Nigeria. *African Development Review, 31*(2), 250–262.

Okafor, G., Adebisi, Y., & Oluwatobi, S. (2022). Community participation and sustainable rural development in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Sustainable Development, 30*(4), 785–798.

Oladokun, V., & Obi, C. (2018). Institutional frameworks and community development initiatives in Nigeria. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research, 10*(4), 56–68.

Olawumi, T., & Adetunji, O. (2022). Community engagement and economic performance in Nigerian rural communities. *Journal of Development Policy and Practice, 7*(2), 189–204.

Olayide, O. E., & Ogunbameru, B. O. (2018). Institutional participation and rural development outcomes in Nigeria. *African Journal of Rural Development, 3*(2), 123–135.

Olayide, O. E., & Ogunbameru, B. O. (2021). Community participation and agricultural sustainability in Nigeria. *Journal of Rural Studies, 82*, 36–45.

Olayiwola, L., Ojo, A., & Akinwale, Y. (2020). Community development participation in Nigeria: Issues and prospects. *Journal of Community Practice*, *28*(3), 233–248.

Olufemi, A., & Adefalu, L. (2017). Community-based entrepreneurship and rural economic development in Nigeria. *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship Development*, *5*(2), 45–56.

Oyelaran-Oyeyinka, B., & Adeyemi, K. (2003). Learning, local knowledge, and innovation in African industrial clusters. *World Development*, *31*(9), 1603–1619.

Pretty, J. (1995). Participatory learning for sustainable agriculture. *World Development*, *23*(8), 1247–1263.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon & Schuster.

Redclift, M. (2005). Sustainable development (1987–2005): An oxymoron comes of age. *Sustainable Development*, *13*(4), 212–227.

Sachs, J. D. (2015). *The age of sustainable development*. Columbia University Press.

Sachs, J. D., Schmidt-Traub, G., Mazzucato, M., Messner, D., Nakicenovic, N., & Rockström, J. (2019). Six transformations to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. *Nature Sustainability*, *2*(9), 805–814.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research methods for business students* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.

United Nations Development Programmes. (2022). *Human development report 2021/2022: Uncertain times, unsettled lives*. United Nations Development Programme.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2021). *Culture and sustainable development report*. UNESCO.

United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. United Nations.

United Nations. (2023). *The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2023*. United Nations.

Uphoff, N. (1992). *Local institutions and participation for sustainable development*. International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), Gatekeeper Series No. SA31, London.

World Bank. (2020). *World development report 2020: Trading for development in the age of global value chains*. World Bank.

World Bank. (2022). *World development report 2022: Finance for an equitable recovery*. World Bank.

World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future*. World Commission on Environment and Development.

Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). Harper & Row.