Constraints to Selected Social Institutions Implementing Rural Development Activities in Rivers State, Nigeria

Nimame, I. P. & Elenwa, C.O.

Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, Rivers State University,
Port Harcourt, Nigeria

Abstract

Social Institution is a tool organized by human society to guide and carry out the activities needed for satisfaction of human needs especially in the development of the rural areas. Studies have been carried out on the activities of social institutions. However, there are factors militating against the execution of these activities. Therefore this study with the aim to ascertain the constraints to selected social institutions implementing rural development activities in Rivers State, Nigeria. Multi-stage sampling procedure was used to select 430 respondents and data were gotten from the respondents using structured questionnaire. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyse data. From findings, good proportions (55.2%) of the respondents were male while females were few with 44.8%. The mean age was 45years, majority (48.9%) were married, 48,.9% had tertiary education, the mean household size was 5 persons, 48.5% were self-employed and 57.0% earned a monthly income of ₦50,000 and above. The major sources of financial support for the social institution are from personal savings and the least is from social organizations and association. The grand mean for religious, education and family institutions were 2.61, 2.39 and 2.53 respectively indicating that the overall challenges experienced by the selected social institutions are statistically significant with religious and family and significant with education. The study concludes that social institutions through personal funding, external support and fund raising/pledges have contributed immensely in rural development activities for sustainable human development in the study area. Therefore, recommends that government in all facets should strengthen the capacity of local authorities to effectively manage resources and provide essential services.

Keywords: Constraints, Selected Social Institutions, Implementing, Rural Development

Introduction

Rural development involves the process of improving the quality of life and economic well-being of people living in relatively isolated and sparsely populated areas (Mosely, 2003). These peoples' major occupation is farming, which they see as a means of sustaining their entire family. They are characterized by high level of illiteracy, abject poverty, unemployment and lack of basic infrastructural facilities (Otto, 2008). Esema (2010) as cited in Bassey (2011), affirmed that rural communities are usually characterized by poor health, lack of basic nutrition, inadequate housing

and voicelessness. They are socially discriminated and stigmatized due to their poor living condition and have no channels through which to voice their concerns. Rural development is part of general development that embraces a large segment of those in great need in the rural sector. Rural development as a starting point of development, aims at finding ways to improve lives with the participation of rural people themselves, so as to meet the required needs of rural communities (Pellissery, 2012). Ogidefa (2010) sees rural development as creating and widening opportunities for rural people to realize their full potential through education and share in decisions and actions which affect their lives. He further asserted that rural development involves efforts to increase rural output and create employment opportunities and root out fundamental cases of poverty, diseases and ignorance.

Over time, Nigeria has experienced economic hardship due to poverty, corruption and poor leadership, hence the need for social institutions to help in decision making, definition of roles, setting of law in order to meet up with man's social need. Social institutions are the first jointed efforts by people towards self and rural development. Abegunde (2009) opined that through local decision making; locally based economic ventures have shown strong community commitment. He further stated that, rural development involves the initiators, supporters and beneficiaries. However, rural development in Nigeria has been a worrisome issue over the years past due to its inability to provide the necessary basic amenities needed by the rural people despite the few policies and programmes that government have initiated and implemented. The efforts included institutionalization of the local governments to serve as agents for enhancing, grass roots development, the establishment of the directorate of food, roads and rural infrastructure (DFFRI) to enhance infrastructural development in the rural areas, the establishment of River Basin and Rural Development Authorities; the establishment of Rural Water Scheme, the establishment of rural electrification scheme, the establishment of Better Life for Rural Women programme, the establishment of National Directorate of Employment (NDE), the establishment of Millennium Development Project through rural infrastructure, micro finance banking to enhance availability of financial services to the rural poor, low income earners and the rural dwellers (Ajadi, 2010). Despite the development strategies and efforts put in place in the past, Nigeria has been more of urban based or focused, resulting in relative neglect of the rural areas (Abah, 2010). Rural development which is geared towards the improvement of the living standard of the rural people through the provision of basic amenities seem to have failed due to relative neglect of agricultural policies by successive governments, ineffective implementation of agricultural policies, projects and programmes, poor commitment of the political representatives towards enhancing the development of agriculture in the rural constituencies, deplorable road network and absence of all year round access road for the transportation of farm produces. Also, development policies record failure due to corruption and embezzlement of fund, adoption of top-bottom model and absence of reliable data base, therefore the need for social institution intervention.

Social organizations are establishments, foundations, societies or the like that are devoted to the promotion of a particular cause or programme especially of a public, educational or charitable character (Ekong, 2010). Ekong (2010) further defined social organization as organized systems of social relationships embodying certain common values and procedures and meeting certain basic societal needs. Social institutions such as family, education (schools), religious (churches),

economy (markets, banks etc) among others emerged as instruments to create and sustain a society among natural enemies by articulating certain rules of conduct and their enforcement instruments so that people can co-exist peacefully and resolve their conflicts by peaceful means (Aldashev & Zamanone, 2012). On the other hand, social institutions, according to Aysan (2005) have redistributive role to play in the economy by carrying out some developmental programmes such as construction of roads, pipe borne water, giving indigenes scholarships, among others. They make sure that resources are properly allocated and ensure that the poor or those with fewer economic resources are protected. They also encourage trust by providing policies and justice systems which adhere to a common set of laws. However, these developmental efforts have been faced with some challenges such as insecurity, vandalization of established projects, communal conflicts, among others.

It is against the foregoing that attention of this study was drawn to the investigation on the constraints to social institutions implementing rural development activities in Rivers state,
The specific objectives of the study were to;
i.   describe the socio-economic characteristics of members of social institutions in the study area;
ii.   determine sources of support to social institutions; and
iii.   identify the challenges faced by social institutions in carrying out rural development activities in the study area.
       The following hypotheses were tested to achieve the stated objectives of the study.
$H0_1$: The socio-economic characteristics of members of social institutions have no significant affect with their rural development activities in the study area.
$H0_2$: There is no significant difference in the challenges of religious institution (church), family institution and educational institution (school) in rural development activities in the study area.

Methodology
The study was carried out in Rivers State which is one of the thirty-six (36) states that make up Nigeria. Rivers state is situated at the southern part of Nigeria comprising the Niger River Delta on the Gulf of Guinea and has Port-Harcourt as its capital. It is one of the states that make up the Niger Delta region in the South- South geopolitical zone of Nigeria and it is bounded by the states of Anambra and Imo on the North, Abia and Akwa Ibom on the east and Bayelsa and Delta on the West. Rivers state contains mangrove swamp, tropical rain forest and many rivers which makes water serve as the principal means of transportation (Pop 2006) The geographical area of the state is amphibious in nature, comprising both riverine and upland areas all netted in a web of rivers. The state has three senatorial districts namely Rivers West, Rivers South and Rivers East. The people speak different languages ranging from Ikwerre, Okrika. Ogoni, Kalabari, among others.
The study adopted the survey research design; the population of the study consists of all heads of households, heads of churches, heads of schools in the registered selected social institutions such as family, churches and schools in Rivers State. For the educational institution, there are fifty (50) registered government primary and secondary schools in the selected communities in Rivers state, with a population of eighteen thousand (18,000) people, as at 1999 (Retrieved Population Census, 1999). Total number of registered Anglican, Methodist and Catholic churches in the study area is

forty-nine (49) with a population of twelve thousand six hundred (12,600) people (Anglican Consultative Council, 2020) while the total population of families in the selected communities in Rivers State is Seven Thousand Eight Hundred and Ninety (7,890) (PHC Priority Tables ,2006)

Rivers State has three senatorial districts namely Rivers West (Ogba, /Egbema, Ndoni, Ahoada-East, Ahoada -West, Abua/ Odual, Degema, Akuku-Toru, Asari toru and Bonny), Rivers South (Port-Harcourt, Obio /Akpor, Emohua, Ikwere, Etche, Omuma, Okrika, and Ogu Bolo) and Rivers East (Opobo/ Nkoro, Andoni, Oyigbo, Tai, Eleme, Gokana and Khana.) Multistage sampling procedure was employed. First, four (4) Local Government Areas from each Senatorial District were randomly selected to make a total of twelve (12) Local Government Areas. Secondly, simple random sampling procedure was used to select two (2) communities with the presence of selected social institutions from each of the selected Local Government Areas to give a total of twenty-four (24) communities. Purposive sampling procedure was finally used to select key officials, like heads of schools, heads of churches, heads of households from the total population of people in registered government schools, Population of people in registered orthodox churches and number of household respectively from the selected communities due to their relevance to the study. A total of four hundred and eighty (480) respondents representing 80% of the total population served as the sample size. Primary data source was used, such as structured questionnaire, observation and personal interviews. The study adopted the use of descriptive and inferential statistical tools to present and analyze the data from the field work. A four-point rating scale with options strongly agreed (4), agreed (3), strongly disagreed (2) and disagreed (1) was used to get the mean score of 2.50. Variables that are less than 2.50 indicated rejection of the variable while $\geq$2.50 indicated acceptance of the variable and analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyse the hypothesis at 0.05 significant level.

Results and Discussion
Social-Economic Characteristics of Members of Selected Social Institutions
The result presented in Table 1 revealed that a good proportion (55.2%) of the respondents were male while females were few with 44.8%. This result is an indication that the female members of social institution in rural development were few as a result of limitations shaped by the dictates of local patriarchy and religious beliefs. This result is in line with the findings of Duflo (2012) who observed that traditional gender roles, limited access to education and resources, cultural norms that prioritize men's involvement and lack of support of women's leadership and contribution to underrepresentation of women in social institution in rural development. From the result, 54.8% of the respondents in Rivers State were within the ages of 40-49 years with the mean age of 45years. This implies that the members of social institutions in rural development are middle aged, active, vibrant, builders, innovators, creators and tomorrow's leaders who were still in their productive stage. According to Smith *et al*. (2014), middle aged people often have more experience and knowledge about rural communities and development strategies; they might have spent time living and working in rural areas giving them the opportunities of getting acquainted with rural activities. Furthermore, from the result, a majority (48.9%) of the respondents was married, 31.1% of the respondents were single, 9.4% were widowed while 10.6% were separated. This result revealed a high proportion of married people in the selected social institutions which reflects on high level of responsibility and ability to carry out potential impacts in development interventions

(Albert et al., 2014). The result in Table 1 indicated that a small percentage (10.6%) of the members of selected social institutions in rural development in the study area had primary education, while 17.5% had non-formal education, 23.0% had secondary education and 48,.9% had tertiary education respectively. The implication of this is that a greater proportion of the members of selected social institution had one form of education or the other. This result falls in line with the findings of Elenwa and Ile (2014) who ascertained that a proportion of the respondents had one form of education or the other which will embrace their yarn and willingness to participate in rural development programmes that will give them a better living condition. The academic level attained by a farmer not only increases their farm productivity but also enhances their ability to understand and evaluate new production technologies (Emodi & Elenwa, 2016). Table 1 disclosed that a good number (64.5%) of the respondents had a household size of 1-5 persons and the mean household size was 5 persons. This result is in line with the findings of Elenwa and Ile (2014) who appreciate a moderate household size as a plus to community engagement; such as co-operatives, self-help groups and community based organizations, diversification of activities like small scale business, handicrafts and service oriented enterprises, inclusive decision, multi-generational participations and volunteering and community spirit. However in Nigeria an household size of five (5) is relatively high due to economic issues and unemployment experienced across the nation especially in the rural communities but large families from the study enhance collaboration in rural development activities through increase labour force. Majority (48.5%) of the members were self-employed while 26.0% of the members were civil servant, 13.3% were company workers and 12.2% were farmers respectively. This result shows that members in the selected social institutions in the study area were more engaged in the formal sector of the economy rather than farming which is the informal and main occupation of those in the rural areas. This is in consonance with Webster et al.(2011) who attributes this result to economic interdependence, access to resources, through credit training, technology and market linkages. A measurable proportion (57.0%) of the members earned a monthly income of ₦50,000 and above, 22.7% earned N40,000- ₦50,000, 18.8% earned ₦30,000- ₦40,000 while 1.5% earned ₦20,000- ₦30,000. This implies that the members of selected social institutions in the study area had an average income indicating that some members may not be financially stable to their contributions and support to rural development activities. This can hinder or restrict the ability of members of selected social institutions to contribute time, energy and financial resources to the community project and initiatives (Smith et al., 2014). Finally, 34.8% of the members had rural development agent visits once in a year while 24.8% had never had visit of rural development agents, 22.7% had visits once in 6 months, 9.4% had visits once in a month and 8.3% had visits once in 2 weeks. This result confirms the findings of David et al. (2014) who observed that infrequent visit of agricultural extension agents can limit the support and guidance provided to social institutions their progress and effective in rural development activities.

Table 1:   Socio-economic characteristics of members of social institutions on rural development in the study area

Variables	Characteristics	Frequency (n=430)	Percentage	Mean
Sex	Male	282	55.2	
	Female	2148	44.8	
Age (Yrs)	20-29	2	2.7	

	30-39	56	17.7		
	40-49	260	54.8		
	50-59	182		24.8	45yrs
Marital Status	Married	261	48.9		
	Single	103	31.1		
	Widowed	31	9.4		
	Separated/Divorced	35	10.6		
Educational level	Non-formal Education	58	17.5		
	Primary education	35	10.6		
	Secondary education	76	23.6		
	Tertiary	261	48.9		
Household size	1-5	213	64.5		
	6-10	151	15.5		
	10 and above	66		20.0	5
Occupation	Farming	40	12.2		
	Self employed	160	48.5		
	Civil Servant	106	26.0		
	Company Worker	44	13.3		
Monthly Income (N)	20,000-30,000	5	1.5		
	30,000-40,000	62	18.8		
	40,000-50,000	75	22.7		
	Above 50,000	288		57.0	₦30, 780
Rural Development Agent's Visit	Once in two (2) weeks	27	8.3		
	Once in a month	31	9.4		
	Once in six (6) months	75	22.7		
	Once in 9 year	115	34.8		
	Never	182	24.8		

Source: Field Survey (2023)

Sources of Support to activities of Social Institutions on rural Development

The information in table 2 showed the sources of support to the activities of religion was high ($\bar{x}$=3.40) but low for education ($\bar{x}$=1.85), and family ($\bar{x}$=2.30) from voluntary donation. From external support, religion had a mean score of ($\bar{x}$=2.84), education ($\bar{x}$=2.55) and family ($\bar{x}$=2.54). Government support for religion had a mean of ($\bar{x}$=1.85) which was low-below the mean score of 2.50, education ($\bar{x}$=3.40) was high and family ($\bar{x}$=2.35) was low-below the mean score of 2.50. From Non-government organization the mean score for religion is ($\bar{x}$=2.38), education ($\bar{x}$=2.30) and family ($\bar{x}$=2.24) all were low-below the mean score of 2.50. Fund raising/pledge, had a mean score for religion ($\bar{x}$=3.42) was high-above the mean of 2.50 but for education ($\bar{x}$=2.38) and family ($\bar{x}$=1.85) was low-below the mean score of 2.50. For social organization/associations the mean score for religion was ($\bar{x}$=1.58), education ($\bar{x}$=2.24) and family ($\bar{x}$=1.58) all were low-below the mean score of 2.50. Leverage e.g. rent as another source of fund was religion ($\bar{x}$=2.24), education ($\bar{x}$=1.58) and family ($\bar{x}$=2.84). For grants, religion had a mean score of ($\bar{x}$=1.58), education ($\bar{x}$=2.55) and family ($\bar{x}$=2.38), sponsorship had religion with a mean score of ($\bar{x}$=1.85), education ($\bar{x}$=2.64) and family ($\bar{x}$=2.24). For personal savings, the means score for religion was (x=2.33),

education (x= 2.84) and family (x=3.40). For funds from programmes and events, religion had means score of (x=2.54) education (x=1.85) and family (x=1.85) too. This result implies that the major sources of financial support for the social institution are from personal savings and the least is from social organizations and association. The result also revealed that external support also helps the selected social institutions to carry out rural development activities in the study area as the mean level of support for all the variables listed was more than 2.50. This result agrees with the findings of Adekoya et al. (2008) who affirmed that financial assistance from external source can provide the necessary funding for infrastructural development. In another vein, Oluwafemi and Yomi (2019) observed that external support in social institutions facilitates networking opportunities allowing isolated social institutions connect with other organizations, share best practices and access additional resources for sustainable rural development efforts. External partners were able to offer technical expertise and training that helped to enhance capacities of some local staff and volunteers in rural development projects in the study area. Personal savings also provides individuals with the means to invest in their communities.

Table 2: Mean distribution of the sources of support to activities of selected social institutions on rural development in the study area

	Religion Total Score	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	Education Total Score	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	Family Total Score	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	Pooled Mean ($\bar{x}$)
Voluntary Donation	1120	3.40	760	2.30	610	1.85	2.52
External Support	944	2.84	834	2.54	840	2.55	2.64
Governmental Support	610	1.85	786	2.38	1120	3.40	2.54
Non-Governmental Organization	786	2.38	740	2.24	760	2.30	2.31
Fund raising/pledge	1125	3.42	610	1.85	786	2.38	2.55
Social Organization/Association	520	1.58	500	1.58	7.40	2.24	1.80
Leverage e.g. Rent	740	2.24	944	2.84	520	1.58	2.22
Grants	520	1.58	786	2.38	840	2.55	2.17
Sponsorship	600	1.85	740	2.24	872	2.64	2.24
Personal Savings	1100	3.33	1120	3.40	944	2.84	3.19
Funds from programmes/ events	834	2.54	610	1.85	610	1.85	2.88
Grand Mean		**2.50**		**2.33**		**2.40**	

≤ 2.50 Accepted
≥ 2.50 Not Accepted
Source: Field Survey, 2023

Challenges encountered by social institution in rural development in the study area

The result in table 3 shows that several factors served as challenges to selected social institutions in rural development. The challenges for family institutions were insecurity (x= 3.40) as the major challenges encountered followed by inadequate funding (x= 3.10), unemployment (x= 3.08),

poverty (x=3.06), natural disaster (flood) (x= 3.02), conflict (x=2.86), lack of values (x=2.85), leadership decision (x=2.52) and caste system (x=2.50). Forever, land problems to carry out development (x=2.40), theft of properties (x=2.30), lack of government support (x= 1.90), exclusion of rural populace from decision making and implementation process (x=1.89), and lack of competent leaders (=1.88) were seen as not challenges by the respondents to rural development. For education the challenges were lack of government support (x=3.20) followed by lack of competent leaders (x= 3.12) and inadequate funding (x=3.12), insecurity (x=3.08), poverty (x=3.02), natural disasters (x=2.96), rural-urban migration (x=2.95), conflict (x= 2.85), leadership decision (x=2.65), theft of properties (x= 2.58), lack of values (x=2.55) and land problems to carry out development (x=2.50), While exclusion of rural populace from decision making and implementation process (x= 2.45) and caste system (x=2.10) were not considered a challenge.
For religious institutions the challenges were insecurity (x=3.10) and inadequate funding, followed by lack of competent leaders (x=3.05), natural disasters and flooding (x=2.96), leadership decision (x=2.92), conflicts (x=2.86), poverty (x=2.71), extension of rural populace from decision making and implementation process (x=2.70), land problems to carry out development (x=2.61), theft of properties(x=2.60). However, rural-urban migration (x=2.40), lack of values (x=2.03), unemployment (x= 1.91), caste system (1.80) and lack of government support (x=1.51) were seen as not a challenge. The grand mean for religious, educational and family institutions were 2.61, 2.39 and 2.53 respectively. This implies that the overall challenges experienced by the selected social institutions are statistically significant with religious and family and insignificant with education, since the grand means are higher than the critical value of 2.50. The challenges are not just random occurrences but are consistently higher across different factors and dimensions being measured.

Table 3: Means distribution of the challenges encountered by social institution in rural development in the study area

Challenges	Religion		Education		Family	
	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	SD	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	SD	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	SD
Conflict	2.86	0.8	2.85	1.1	2.86	0.8
Rural-urban migration	3.07	1.0	2.95	1.1	2.40	0.8
Insecurity	3.40	1.1	3.08	1.1	3.10	1.1
Poverty	3.06	1.0	3.02	1.1	2.71	1.0
Natural Disasters	3.02	1.1	2.96	1.0	2.96	1.0
Lack of Values	2.85	1.0	2.55	0.9	2.03	0.6
Inadequate funding	3.10	1.1	3.12	1.1	3.10	0.1
Land Problems to carry out development	2.46	1.0	2.50	0.8	2.61	0.7
Leadership Decision	2.52	0.8	2.65	0.7	2.92	1.0
Caste system	2.50	0.9	2.10	0.9	1.80	0.6
Theft of properties	2.30	0.5	2.58	0.9	2.60	0.7
Lack of Competent leaders	1.88	0.7	3.20	1.1	1.51	0.5
Exclusion of Rural Populace from the decision making and	1.81	0.8	2.45	0.7	2.07	1.0

implementation process by some institutions.						
Unemployment	3.08	1.1	2.30	0.8	1.91	0.7
Neglect and Abandonment of project by successive leaders	1.80	8.0	3.71	1.1	2.56	0.7
Grand Mean		**2.61**		**2.39**		**2.55**

≤ 2.50 Accepted
≥ 2.50 Not Accepted
Source: Field Survey, 2023

The socio-economic characteristics of members of selected social institutions have no significant affect with their participation in rural development activities in study area

From the results in Table 4, the semi-log model which have an F-ratio of 48.17 (p<0.05), R^2 of 0.56 and tolerant multicollinearity whose VIF was on the average was 1.29 (a very low value compared with the critical value of 10 suggested by Ghuari et al. (2009). The R^2 of 0.56 implies that 55 percent of the variation in the values of the dependent variables is brought about by the variations of the included explanatory variables of the model. The significant value of the F-ratio indicated that the joint effects of the independent variables included in the model were significant at 5 percent. It was indicated from the regression results that the slope coefficients of respondents in selected social institutions participation in rural development activities (0.872) was significant ($p \leq 0.05$); age (0.916) was significant ($p \leq 0.0303$)(t-cal=-2.166). This means that age of the respondents in selected social institutions plays a significant role in their participation in rural development activities. Also, level education of respondents (-2.181) was negatively significant ($p \leq 0.0001$)(t-cal=-3.916). This means that education encourages respondents in selected social institutions participation in rural development activities. Education often influences household heads adoption rate of technology/skill positively. Albert et al. (2017) observed that households' heads with more years of schooling would be expected to better visualize the benefits of skills, knowing that participating in rural development activities would increase their income. However, it was expected that more educated households' heads would have a higher opportunity cost of labour, hence this variable (education) would be negatively related to participation. The educated ones are aware that participating in rural development projects will increase their income level. The finding is in line with Daniel et al. (2013) who observed that education enhances participation. However, it is contrary to Albert et al. (2013) who did not observe any significant relationship between education and the decision to participate in rural development project. Household size ($p \leq 0.0482$)(t-cal=-1.975) and monthly income ($p \leq 0.0047$)(t-cal=-2.824) were significant ($p \leq 0.05$). This was expected because majority of the households' heads had farming as their main occupation. Therefore the execution of agricultural projects will attract mostly farmers who are already in the occupation and this will increase their income. This means that these variables (age, level of education, monthly income and household size) all influence respondents in selected social institutions participation in rural development activities positively and significantly; more so as the signs of their slope coefficients were positive. Therefore the null hypothesis of the study which held that the socio-economic characteristics of members of social institutions have no significant

affect with their rural development activities in study area was rejected at the respective significant levels. The alternative hypothesis is hereby accepted which states that members of social institutions socio-economic effects their participation in rural development activities in the study.

Table 4: Result of binary logit of respondents' of selected social institution socioeconomic attributes on participation in rural development activities in the study area

	Coefficient	Std. Error	z	p-value	
const	0.479130	2.93396	0.1633	0.8703	
GENDER	1.06363	0.612557	1.736	0.0825	*
MARITALSTATUS	−0.519453	0.347705	−1.494	0.1352	
AGE	0.916862	0.423363	2.166	0.0303	**
LEVELOFEDUCATION	−2.18136	0.557075	−3.916	<0.0001	***
HOUSEHOLDSIZE	−0.960557	0.486243	−1.975	0.0482	**
OCCUPATION	0.339440	0.346428	0.9798	0.3272	
MONTHLYINCOME	1.38493	0.490421	2.824	0.0047	***

Mean dependent var	0.546392	S.D. dependent var	0.500429	
McFadden R-squared	0.560514	Adjusted R-squared	0.240784	
Log-likelihood	−42.72864	Akaike criterion	101.4573	
Schwarz criterion	122.0550	Hannan-Quinn	109.7860	

Dependent Variable; selected social institution. Alfa level = 0.05 significance.
Source: SPSS 25.0 output based on field survey data 2023, detailed in Appendix 6, and 7

There is no significant difference in the challenges of religious institution (church), family institution and educational institution (school) in rural development activities in the study area

The result of data analysis for the test of significant difference in the challenges faced by the participants of religious institution (church), family institution and educational institution (school) in rural development activities in the study area as shown in table 5 showed that a computed f-value of 0.642 with a corresponding probability value of (p=0.526> 0.05) therefore the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. More so, $F_{calculated} = 3.016 < F_{tabulate} (3.383) = 2.60$, hence, the null hypothesis was rejected therefore it is concluded that there is significant difference in the challenges faced by the participants of religious institution (church), family institution and educational institution (school) in rural development activities in the study area. The challenges for family institutions had insecurity as the major challenges encountered followed by inadequate funding and unemployment. For education the major challenge was lack of government support followed by lack of competent leaders and inadequate funding while for religious institutions the major challenges were insecurity and inadequate funding.

Table 5: Summary of ANOVA Result on the significant difference in the challenges faced by the participants' in activities of religious institution (church), family institution and educational institution (school) in rural development activities in the study area

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Religious	140	464.8	3.320	0.218078
Education	142	470.8	3.315	0.205133
Family	148	483.3	3.265	0.203505

ANOVA: Rural Development Constraints faced by Respondents in Rivers State

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	0.268091	2	0.134046	0.642022	0.526734	3.016848

Conclusion And Recommendations

The study concluded that social institutions through personal funding, external support and fund raising/pledges have contributed immensely in rural development activities for sustainable human development in the study area. However, the implementations of these rural development activities were faced with some challenges such as insecurity, inadequate funding, lack of competent leaders, natural disasters, among others. These challenges were significantly different. Owing to the fact that the selected Social Institutions in rural development face some challenges ranging from inadequate funding, insecurity, lack of competent leaders, lack of government support, unemployment, poverty to rural- urban migration. It is recommended that government in all facets should strengthen the capacity of local authorities to effectively manage resources and provide essential services.

REFERENCES

Abah, N.C. (2000). Development Administration: A Multi–Disciplinary Approach Enugu; John Jacob's classic publishers Limited.

Abegunde, A. A (2009). The Role of Community Based Organizations in Economic Development in Nigeria: The case study of Oshogbo, Osun State, Nigeria.int. *NGO J* 4(5)236 -252.

Adekoya A.E, Ojo E.O and Adeyemi G.O. (2008) "International Development Assistance to Agriculture in Nigeria: Implications for Sustainable Rural Development" *Journal of Agriculture and Social Research 8(2)*

Ajadi, B. (2010). Poverty Situation in Nigeria; An overview of Rural Development Institutions, *Kistan Journal of Sciences,* (7), pp.351-356.

Albert, C.O, Nlerum, P. E. & Ozuruoke, S. N. (2013)Activities of Youth Restiveness and Militancy in the Development of Rural Areas in Southern Nigeria .*Journal of Society and Communication*.

Albert, C.O. & Nne-Cosy, J. (2014). Analysis of family planning programmes among rural households in Ogba/Egbema/Ndoni Local Government Area of Rivers State, Nigeria. *Agricultura, Agricultural Practice and Science Journal*, 1-2 (89-90), 158-163.

Albert-Elenwa, C. O. & Ille, C.P. (2017). Rural and Infrastructural Development on Extension Services to Farmers in Ogba Egbema Ndoni Local Government Area, Rivers State.

International Journal of Agriculture and Earth Science Vol.3 No. 2 ISSN 2489-0081 2017 www.jiardpub.org

Aldashev, G. & Zanarom, G. (2017). Endogenous Enforcement Institutions. *Journal of Development Economics.* North-Holland Publishers.

Aysan, A.F. (2005). The Shadowing Role of Redistributive Institutions in the Relationship between Income Inequality and Redistribution. University Library of Munich, Germany.

Bassey, A. (2011). Understanding Rural Development Concepts, Theories and Strategies: Calabar: Kings View Publishing House.

David, K. & Sageo, S. (2018) Graduate Unemployment in Developing Countries: Dimension Determinants and Policy Responses*. Institute of Applied Economics Research (IAER)*

David, J.S, Gershon, F. & Joshi, P.K (2014) Agricultural Extension Reforms in South Asia; status, challenges and policy options. *Annual review of resources economic* 6(1).

Duflo, E. (2012). Women's empowerment and economic development. *Journal of Economic Literature, 50(2), 1051- 1079*

Ekong, E.E (2010). Rural Sociology, Uyo; Dove Educational Publishers.

Elenwa, C.O. & Ile, C. P. (2019). Human capital development in the growth of agricultural entrepreneurship in Ogba Egbema Ndoni Local Government Area of Rivers State, Nigeria. The International Journal of Agriculture, Management and Technology, 3(1), 77-85

Emodi, A. I. & Albert, C.O. (2016). Family farming practices in Taraba State. *Journal of Agricultural Extension,* 20 (2), 76-88.*.*

Ghuari, P.N. and Firth, R. (2009). The formalization of Case Study Research in International business. Der Market: *Journal for Marketing*.

Golden House Daryagan, New Delhi

Mosely, M. J. (2002). Rural Development: Principles and Practice. London. SAGE Publishers.

National Population Census (2006) PHC Priority Tables, Population gov.ng Retrieved

Ogidefa, I. S (2010). Democracy and Good Governance: Nigeria's Dilemma. African Journal

Oluwafemi A.A & Yomi D.O (2019). *External Support and Institutional Performance*. The case of Rural Development Project in Nigeria. *Journal of International Development 31(5)*

Otto,G.(2008).Urbanisation in Nigeria: Implications for Socio –economic development *Journal of Research in National Development* 6(3):3.

Pellissery, S. (2017). Rural Development Encyclopedia of Sustainability 2012, 7:222-225.

Smith, J & Johnson, A. (2014). The impact of Socio-Economic Status on Community Engagement in Rural Development, *A case study*. *Journal of rural studies* (   ), page no.

Webster, R. Blatchford, P. Brown, P. Martin, C. & Russet (2011). The wider pedagogical role of teaching assistance. School leadership and management