

Participation and Grassroots Development in Nigeria: A Study of Emohua Local Government Area, Rivers State, 2015-2023

Onuoha, Peter Chuks

Department of Political science
Rivers State University
charichuks@gmail.com
08038929131

Okore, Michael Okiemute

Department of Political Science
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education
okoremichael@yahoo.com
08132030307

DOI: 10.56201/ijgem.vol.11.no5.2025.pg22.34

Abstract

This paper investigated participation and grassroots development in Nigeria with emphasis on Emohua Local Government Area. In order to enhance the participation of people at the grassroots level in the development process, the institution of local government was established in Nigeria. However, despite the existence of local government institution, numerous development problems such as lack of portable water, poor drainage system and lack of accessible road among others still ravage many rural areas in Nigeria and Emohua Local Government Area in particular. The existence of these problems is traceable to corruption, godfatherism and poor leadership among others that characterised local government system in Nigeria. People at the grassroots are not consulted before the initiation and execution of development projects and this has led to the failure of most of those projects. The elite theory propounded by Robert Michels, Gaetano Mosca and Vilfredo Pareto was adopted as the theoretical framework. Primary and secondary sources of data were adopted; primary source involved the use of interview while secondary source involve the collection of data from textbooks, journals and seminar papers among others. The study found that the major impediment to participation at the grassroots is corruption, godfatherism and poor leadership etc. The study therefore recommends that the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) and the Independent Corrupt Practice & Other Related Offences Commission (ICPC) should be alive to its responsibility so as to address the problem of corruption especially at the grassroots level in Nigeria

Key word: Local Government, Grassroots, Participation and Administrators

Introduction

The term participation has become ubiquitous in recent times; different people in different circumstances use the term to mean different things. The following implies participation as acknowledged by Singh based on people's experience; attending meetings, call to discuss matters concerning the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of natural resources

management; contributing money, labour, or both to activities /projects of common interest to the group/ community; seeking new knowledge and information and sharing it with other members of the group/community as well as within the project authority concerned; following the rules and regulations set by the group/community/organisation in consultation with the local people; and serving on the joint management committees constituted by the project authority for natural resources management (Singh, 1992). Egenti (2001) identified some of the objectives and functions of participation which include making local wishes known, generating development ideas, providing local knowledge, and testing proposals for feasibility and improving them.

Participation finds expression within the broader concept of decentralisation. What then is decentralisation? Aaron (2012) noted that decentralisation as a concept has attracted a variety of interpretations from scholars and practitioners. He therefore conceived decentralisation as “the transfer of authority and responsibility for public functions from the central government to subordinate or quasi-independent government organisation and or the private sector” (Aaron, 2012, p. 8). Decentralisation is of three kinds as noted by Aaron (2012), they are deconcentration, delegation and devolution. By deconcentration, we imply “the transfer of non-decisional authority in policy, financial and administrative matters from the central government to sub-ordinate lower level units or sub units who are accountable to the central government” (Aaron, 2012, p. 9). By delegation, we imply “the transfer of responsibility for decision making and administration of carefully specified tasks from the centre to semi-autonomous organisation not directly controlled by the centre but ultimately accountable to it” (Aaron, 2012, p. 10). By devolution, we imply “the transfer of authority for decision making, finance and management from the centre to substantially autonomous, representative and lower level units of government possessing corporate status” (Aaron, 2012, p. 10).

No matter the type or form decentralisation assume, one central element in decentralisation is participation. In other words, the hallmark behind decentralisation is to enhance the participation of people especially those at the grassroots in the decision making process. This is paramount owing to the fact that a greater number of people in Nigeria are found to live at the grassroots. Again, most rural areas in Nigeria are confronted with numerous challenges such as lack of portable water, poor drainage system, inadequate healthcare system, poor/lack of electricity and general underdevelopment etc. Onabanjo (2004) noted that a vast majority of Nigerians are still living devoid of both basic and social amenities at the grassroots. He concluded that meaningful development can only take place when the people are well mobilised for community action (Onabanjo, 2004). Abiona (2009) attributed the numerous challenges confronting the grassroots in Nigeria to lack of participation of the people at the grassroots in the development process. A situation he described as top bottom approach of decision making. According to him, the elite often dominate the decision making process and rarely consult nor carry the people along in the initiation and execution of projects and programmes (Abiona, 2009). This has made development to elude the grassroots in Nigeria owing to the fact that the people are not carried along in the process to ascertain their needs and aspirations. This appears to be the situation in Nigeria and Emohua Local Government Area in particular.

Administrators in Emohua Local Government Area especially between 2015-2023 do not engage the people in the area neither do they consult the people to ascertain their needs and aspirations. Most of the projects executed by administrators in Emohua Local Government Area do not reflect

the yearnings of the people. Because the people were not consulted, local administrators find it difficult to factor in the projects that reflect the interest of the people.

The objectives of the study are to; examine the relevance of participation to grassroots development in Nigeria; examine the factors that impede development in Emohua Local Government Area.

In addition to this introduction, this paper is structure into four sections; section one; methodology and theoretical framework, section two; literature review, section three results and discussion and the last section focuses on conclusion and recommendations.

SECTION ONE

Methodology

The research design adopted for the study is the descriptive survey design. According to Iwariemie-Jaja (2014), it involves checking and fact-checking enquiries. Still within the descriptive framework, the survey method is employed because the study is largely dependent on the use of interview. Primary and secondary source of data were utilised for this study. Primary source involve the use of interview while secondary source involve the use of textbooks, journals and conference paper among others

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework adopted for this study is the elite theory propounded by Robert Michel, Gaetano Mosca and Vilfredo Pareto. In the view of Michel (1915), the ultimate fate of all organisation is to be run by a small minority or plural elites. In the view of Mosca (1939) human societies is divided into two major classes of people namely, the ruler and the ruled. The ruling class is a minority group who monopolised power and enjoys the advantages that accrues from it. The ruled class (masses), on the other hand constitute the majority group but are directed and left in the hands of subsistence by the ruling class. Mosca (1939) went further to assert that, power is always in the hands of an organised minority who has the authority and power over the majority by virtue of certain characteristics such as consensus on the basis of forms, cohesiveness and consciousness. A situation described as the iron law of oligarchy.

According to Perry and Perry (2003), elitism is a theory which upholds that wealth, power, influence and prestige are held by a small number of individuals or groups who have achieved a higher degree of excellence in there endeavours. Elite theorist maintained that the consensus that supposedly exists in the society is in reality, established by the elites who are able to manipulate the masses through the mass-media. The theory also asserts the existence of multitude interest groups whose interactions do not result in the diffusion of power. Here, society consists of few who have power (elite) and the many that do not (masses). The elite's holds key positions in the society such as those in the economy, military, politics, religion, education among other professions. The elite differ from the masses because they derived their value from their upper socio-economic class origin. Members share a common lifestyle and identify with others of the same background.

Relating the elite theory in understanding participation and grassroots development in Nigeria and Emohua Local Government Area in particular, it becomes imperative to state that the elite rarely carry the masses along especially in the business of development. They feel they are more knowledgeable than the masses and do not require the input of the masses in the initiation and

execution of development policies. The masses are rarely consulted to determine their needs and interest. This has led to the failure of projects and programmes in Nigeria and Emohua Local Government Area in particular.

SECTION II

Concept of Participation

In the context of organisational development, Anyanwu (1992, p. 112) refers to participation as “an active practice whereby recipients stimulate the direction and execution of development projects rather than just receiving a share of the project benefits”. Thus, it can be said that citizen participation in organisational development programmes entails the involvement of the people or their representatives in the formulation and development of proposals, planning of programmes and its implementation. Citizen participation in development programme is therefore an obvious strategy for programme accomplishment, as it is a tool for mobilising new and extra resources within the organisation (Anyanwu, 1992). The principle of citizen participation implies, therefore, that community members have to source the essential and needed stimulus for programme’s success. Paul (2011) observed that citizen participation is largely used to achieve effectiveness, efficiency and cost sharing. A consideration of these definitions of citizen participation and the extent to which project implementation has incorporated participation into project strategy are indications of the insignificant practical application of the concept in project design and execution. Osuji (2012, p. 67) perceives community participation in relation to development as “the involvement of members of communities in all stages of decision making relating to development programmes in their areas”. What this means in effect is that development programmes and projects should not be forced on the people who are supposed to be the receivers of development energies. According to him, “beneficiary populations should not be made passive recipients of services; rather they should take part in all activities concerned with the development of their areas” (Osuji, 2012, p. 68).

Concept of Development

There is no consensus among scholars about the precise definition of development; this is not strange owing to the fact that in the field of social sciences, there is hardly a universal conception of concept. Scholars often define or conceive concepts on the basis of their understanding of such phenomenon. However, according to MacLean and Macmillan (2009), they agree that the phenomenon of development is all encompassing. This implies that development covers a vast area such as political development, economic development, socio-cultural development, human development, scientific development, technical development and educational development among others. According to them, development is defined as “the fulfillment of all necessary conditions for the realisation of the potential of human personality” (MacLean & Macmillan 2009, p.148-149). This definition sees development as providing for the basic needs and the basic necessities of man. These basic needs will include among other things shelter, food, education, health, security among others. When these basic needs are available, then it becomes easier to realize the potential of the human personality. Development involves the improvement of certain social indicators such as life expectancy and living standards ((MacLean & Macmillan 2009).

Seers (1969) in his submission on the meaning of development averred that the purpose of development is to reduce poverty, inequality and unemployment. According to him, he noted that

to determine the development status of any State, three important questions must be asked and answered. These questions are: What has been happening to poverty? What has been happening to unemployment? What has been happening to inequality? He argued that if all of these three problems have deteriorated over the period under consideration, then it has been a period of development for the State concerned, but if one or two of these problem has been growing worse especially if all three have, then the situation cannot be said to be development even if per capita income had doubled over the period under consideration.

Grassroots Development

Development represents positive change. It is the process by which livelihoods are improved as communities and individuals are endowed to lead happy, healthy and prosperous lives. The term “grassroots development” is used to describe the process by which underprivileged people organise themselves to advance the social, cultural and economic well-being of their families, communities and societies (UNDP, 1999). This concept is based on the principle that the key to sustainable democracies, equitable societies and prosperous economies is a people-oriented strategy that stresses participation, organisational development and networking (UNDP, 1999). Historically, international development has been characterised by top down processes, where contemporary business models have been applied to the art of development. International agencies enter foreign communities aiming to advance the lives of vulnerable and disadvantaged people (Maureen, 2005). This is based upon the premise that objectively beneficial technical processes exist that may assist any community. This is absolutely true. These processes have been outlined by the United Nations in both the Millennium and Sustainable Development Goal frameworks (UNDP, 1999).

Babajide (2006) averred that at the local level however, ongoing community development requires a very different approach. Rather than merely providing infrastructure, healthcare clinics or emergency relief, truly sustainable programmes at the local level must be a reflection of the community’s real needs and values. If not, it cannot succeed. However objectively beneficial a resource may be, if nobody uses it, it is worthless. This is the cornerstone of neo-liberal development philosophy (Babajide, 2006). In rejecting the notion of indisputable ‘best practice’, neo-liberal development embraces community needs, values and knowledge in solving local problems. Grassroots development involve community members working together to improve their collective livelihoods. It is bottom-up and locally accountable, acknowledging that the process of development is just as vital as the results. By focusing principally upon capacity building, grassroots development stimulates inclusiveness and resilience. It offers a space for communities to discourse local issues, find common ground and balance competing interests (Sarumi, 2003).

SECTION III

The Relevance of Participation to Grassroots Development in Nigeria

Community participation empowers communities and enables them to initiate and control their own development; it creates consciousness among patrons on how funds are being used in bringing in infrastructural development project in various communities. Anderson (2011) noted that an energetic community member is better than a passive community member, because when members partake in grassroots development in their communities, it is directed towards achieving common

objective, and with community participation, formulated policies are been more credibly grounded in community preferences. There can never be effective grassroots development projects without community participation (Dokubo et al., 2017). Burkey (2011, p.98) ascertained that “community participation is a prerequisite for genuine development. According to him, grassroots development cannot be possible unless it is assisted by the community members using their own mechanism in taking major decision in the execution projects”. Grassroots development is projects that have positive impact on the lives of the people. Such projects include; provision of pipe born water, provision of drainage system, provision of adequate healthcare system, good road networks and good electricity etc.

Imhabekhai (2009) noted that the success or failure of any grassroots development project in the community to a large extent depends on what happens at the planning stage. Most grassroots projects fail because of lack of project planning or poor implementations of excellent project plan. Onyeozu (2007) stated that, planning implies a purposeful attempt to determine in advance the most effective and judicious use of time, finance, and resources so as to achieve desired results and avoid unwanted effects. One of the attending issues of grassroots development project in the community is the absence of community participation at the planning stage of the project. For this reason, Dokubo (2015) argued that community members with extensive indigenous knowledge of their natural social, economic and historical context can contribute valuable ideas on available resource, potentials, solution and challenges, and make locally viable suggestions regarding the project design. Imhabekhai (2009) admitted the fact that, planning of infrastructural development must involve all the stakeholders in a particular project. In other words the adult, men, women, youth, and their leaders or accredited representatives must be involved in the planning process.

It is widely argued (Imhabekhai, 2009) that increased community participation in grassroots development project produces many important benefits. According to Dokubo (2015), community participating in the policies process, collaborating with others and reaching consensus to bring about positive social, economic and environmental change yields good result. Dokubo (2015) defined decision-making as a judgment that is made after attentively weighing the options that are available for the success of the set goals. It is a truism that decision-making takes a deliberate effort that is geared toward making informed choice or judgment that can give a desired result. According to Ottih in Dokubo (2015), decision making process in infrastructural development project in the community has four basic phases; problem analysis, developing alternative solutions, analyzing alternative solutions, and making a choice. The nature of decision-making in the grassroots development in the community requires a diligent and conscious effort to arrive at meaningful decisions that will represent every component of the community (World Bank, 2007). Participation in grassroots development project, community members provides so many benefits such as cooperative education, self-reliance, self-direction, self-help, empowerment, environmental management, motivation, mobilization and cost-sharing (World Bank 2007). For sustainable grassroots development project to take place it is imperative that, the generality of the community must be involved in the developmental process. This involvement through participation at various levels does not come by chance and of course the level of involvement of members of the community depends on the level of sensitization through awareness campaigns by the project initiators on the need to see the benefits accruable from the projects. Within the context of Nigeria and Emohua Local Government Area in particular, there is a great disconnect between the people (masses) and grassroots projects. The political elite neither mobilised the people in the

initiation and execution of projects nor do they initiate projects that reflect the needs of the people. For instance, the administration of Chidi Lloyd, a former council chairman in Emohua Local Government Area, initiated some projects in the local government. Some of these projects include; reconstruction and remodelling of the Emohua Legislative Assembly Complex, the construction of an office complex for the Council Healthcare Center to provide offices for medical personnel and staff of commissioned healthcare, the construction of Emohua local government administrative building at the council headquarters in Emohua, the construction of 350 capacity ICT Studio named after Chief Emeka Woke, also situated within the council secretariat complex and the proposed warehouse which is expected to upon completion serve as the local government's multipurpose storage facility, to properly preserve civil and mechanical engineering types of equipment, agricultural types of machinery, building materials and other valuables owned by the local government etc (Kelly, 2023). Why these projects gulped millions of naira in their execution, most of them have no direct bearing on the lives of the ordinary people in the area. Again, the people were not consulted before these projects were initiated. Because they were not consulted, the people failed to own these projects. Again, some of the aforementioned projects have the nature and characteristics of elitism as they were designed to meet the interest of a few people in the society. The health center initiated and executed was meant for employees of the local government area and the local government administrative building which is meant to ensure a conducive environment for staff and elected officials of the council has no direct positive impact on the lives of the ordinary people in the area.

In an interview conducted with Hon. (Chief) Bright, Ugochukwu Eleonu a community Chief/leader in Elele Alimini, Emohua Local Government Area on 05-7-2024, he noted

One of the major issues that have raised serious debate among people over the years is the relevance of local government to national development. Again when we look at the enabling act that established local government in Nigeria, local government were assigned certain constitutional functions such as naming of streets, provision of healthcare and other basic infrastructure. However, in Elele Alimini which is my community, we are yet to feel the impact of local government in meeting the needs of my people especially in the area of construction of internal roads, health centers and empowerment of our people. The health center that was initiated by former local government chairman, Hon. Tom Alieze was uncompleted. Even when his successor Hon Chidi Lloyd on assumption of office, sees the project as defected and decided to remove the roof of the building. As at today, the project has been abandoned with all the money invested gone down the drain. What we see at times is the grading of farms roads which are not constructed. Farmers are not supported in terms of loans, fertiliser and provision of farm tools to support farming. The road leading to the community was constructed by the state government which ought to be the responsibility of the local government. We don't have a standard market where goods can be traded so tell me, what has the council officials been doing in the local government. The development we can perhaps talk of is the sharing of monthly allocation (Field Work, 2024).

He went further to assert that

It is only when you have projects that you can talk of consultations. Like I said earlier, the officials of Emohua Local Government are not interested

in addressing the needs of the people. Even the grading of farm roads though important, they are not the utmost desires and needs of the people. Our people desire electricity, pipe borne water, and basic infrastructure etc to improve the living condition of the people in the area (Field Work, 2024).

Similarly, interview conducted with Hon. Obinna, Clement, the immediate past Councilor, ward 10 in Emohua Local Government Area on 08-7-2024. Regarding the issue of consultation with grassroots people, he noted that

As Councilor during my time in office, I usually relate with people of my constituency to determine their needs and challenges. I usually organised town hall meetings with stakeholders to ascertain their needs and want. The drainage that was initiated under my regime was a collective desire of our people due to the challenge of flooding that affected my people. The fertiliser distribution programme initiated under my regime was in response from the yearnings of our people. So because we always consult our people, they tend to own such projects (Field Work, 2024).

The lack of consultation of rural people in project identification and execution has therefore led to the failure of most projects in the local government area

Factors that impede Grassroots Development in Emohua Local Government Area

The Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI) in its strategy of developing the rural areas recognised the centrality of people's participation in their own development. The Decree No. 4 of 6th February, 1986, which set-up the agency stressed the mobilization of rural Community organisations as the centre-piece of the strategy for rural development. Section 5(9) of the Decree in Zoaka et al. (2010, 45) stated thus "the Directorate shall be charged with among other things to identify; involve and support viable local community organisations in the effective mobilisation of the rural population for sustained rural development activities, bearing in mind the need for promoting greater community participation and economic self-reliance of the rural community". Despite the emphasis on participation of rural people in grassroots development, rural people in Emohua Local Government Area are neither consulted nor carried along in the initiation and execution projects by local government officials. The lack of participation of the people in the initiation and execution projects can be attributed to some factors which includes;

i. Godfatherism; the political environment in Nigeria and Emohua Local Government Area in particular is dominated with preponderance of godfathers and god sons. This was demonstrated in the works of Nwogwugwu (2012) and Ogundiwin (2012) in their studies of politics in the South south Nigeria that kingmakers popularly known as 'godfathers' in Nigeria politics have very strong influences on who emerges as President, Governor, Legislators and council official. This is based on the fact that these council chairmen and other operatives selected or appointed by their godfathers to rule over the affairs of the local government could not be given free hand to operate as they must always act the scripts of the godfathers. Hence, Local government officials are typically nominated by political party "kingmakers" who help to finance their election campaigns. Because politicking in the country is quite expensive, federal allocations to local councils have become the means of paying back "kingmakers" or godfathers for supporting their election campaigns (Abutudu, 2011). By implication, the godfathers dictate who to be appointed to the

system or deployed therein because of their connections at the state and federal levels. In effect, delivering the dividend of democracy becomes secondary while satisfying the appetite of the political godfather is primary (Abutudu, 2011). This has grave implication for participation since the local officials were not nominated and sponsored by the people, there is the tendency for the officials not to be responsible to the people but rather to the godfather that sponsored their election. There is therefore a disconnect between the people and the officials and this disconnect is also reflected in the initiation and execution of projects. Projects that reflect the interests and needs of the people in most cases are not implemented but rather those that reflect the interest of a few (elite) are usually executed. This explains why the officials of local government in Emohua Local Government Area will prioritise the construction of administrative building and health center for local government employees among other (projects that has no direct impact on the lives of the people in the area) rather than executing people oriented projects.

ii. Poverty of Leadership and Patronage Politics; Poverty of leadership at the Local Government level remains one of the most daunting challenges influencing the sustainability of development of the grassroots' in developing countries. While we recognize the fact that leadership problem is a national phenomenon in Nigeria, local government administrations have come under serious criticism over the years for poor service delivery and bad governance (Adeyemi, 2012). Political leadership is in deficit at this level of government due to patronage system of politics. According to Adeyemi (2013) most leaders at the local government level have a sit-tight mentality which does not allow for new ideas, fresh initiative and innovation. Such apathy is true to some extent why this study argues that the scenario is occasioned by the quality of political and administrative managers driving the affairs of the council which to some extent is beyond their control as demonstrated in the role of the godfathers. Beyond the poverty of leadership is that of general poverty in the land. Agagu (2014) revealed that poverty level in Nigeria is 70% while this does not exclude the study area; the implication is that political patronage and dominance of political father is strengthened when there is mass poverty and the political elites are only concerned about maintaining the status quo. Because most of these leaders are bereaved of ideas, they lack the capacity to mobilize the people for effective grassroots development.

iii. Corruption: The socio-political environment of LGs in Nigeria is not devoid of general corrupt practices that has been the bane of governance in Nigeria. It was pointed out by Bolatito and Ibrahim (2014) that corruption has been canonically accommodated, entertained, and celebrated within the system. Agba et al (2013) further viewed corruption as the perversion of integrity or state of affair through bribery, favour or moral depravity. It involves the injection of additional but improper transaction aimed at changing the normal course of events and altering judgments and positions of trust. It is also along this line of thought that the former EFCC boss Farida Waziri in Adeyemi (2012) lamented that waste of government resources at the council level had reached monumental proportions and Local Governments in the country could not explain the mismanagement of over N3.313 trillion allocated to them for period of eight years and that LGs have been so far removed from the lives of the people to a point where some Chief Executives of local council no longer reside in the domains they were elected to administer.

The implication is the criminal deprivation of the citizenry in terms basic amenities and a dangerous disconnection and disenchantment of the people with the three tiers of government, while the officials of the council celebrate their ill-gotten wealth. This was further exuberated by the lack of integrity, transparency and accountability at this level of governance. Corruption has

led to the abandonment of numerous projects.

In an interview conducted with Hon. (Chief) Bright, Ugochukwu Eleonu on 08-7-2024. On the issue of corruption and the imposition of candidates, he noted that

You are not far from the reality; corruption is a normal thing in Nigeria. Our council officials rather than utilised our resources for the betterment of our people, they embezzle the funds and use them for their personal gains. Nothing is happening in the local government apart from the payment of monthly salary. The local officials are often impose on us as they are not the choice of our people. Because they are impose on us, they are not accountable to us but rather to the political leaders that handpicked them (Field Work, 2024).

Similar thought was echoed by Hon. Obinna, Clement on 05-7-2024. According to him

We cannot attribute entirely the problem of our people to corruption, imposition and poor leader to the challenges that affect our people. Though, we cannot eliminate corruption and imposition from the system. Primary elections were conducted were I was elected massively by my people, the local government elections that was conducted; I was won massively so we cannot talk about imposition. I am in touch with my people and I understand there challenges which paved way for my emergence (Field Work, 2024).

Findings

- i. The work found that the major impediment to participation at the grassroots is corruption, godfatherism and poor leadership etc
- ii. The study found that officials of Emohua Local Government Area do not consult with the people at the grassroots before the initiation and execution of projects. This lack of consultation has made the people not to participate in such projects.

SECTION IV

Conclusion

The relevance of local government to grassroots development cannot be over emphasised; local government institution was established for the sole purpose of enhancing grassroots development. Why local government has been able to discharge this task effectively in Western industrialized countries, the experience in third world countries and Nigeria in particular is abysmal. The inability of local government to enhance grassroots development can be attributed mainly to lack of participation of the people at the grassroots level. There is a disconnect between council officials and the people at the grassroots. The political elite initiate and execute projects and programmes without consultation with the intended beneficiary. In most cases, the political elites initiate projects that have no direct bearing on the lives of the people and because the people were not consulted, they tend not to own such projects. This has led to the abandonment of numerous project at the grassroots and the end product is underdevelopment that characterised most grassroots in Nigeria and Emohua Local Government Area in particular; poor rural electrification, poor road networks, lack of portable water and lack of good drainage system etc.

Recommendations

- i. The Economic and Financial Crime Commission (EFFC) and the Independent Corrupt Practice & Other Related Offences Commission (ICPC) should be alive to its responsibility so as to address the problem of corruption especially in Emohua Local Government Area
- ii. Civil society groups should sensitize the masses on the need to hold elected public office holders accountable; this will eradicate corruption and imposition that characterized local government.

References

- Aaron, K.K. (2012). *The nature and state of local government in Nigeria*. Kemula publication
- Abutudu, M. (2011). *The challenges and opportunities for improving the local government system in Nigeria*. Paper prepared for presentation at the third biennial national conference on community development.
- Agagu, A. (2014). *Continuity and change in local government administration and the politics of underdevelopment*. In Agagu, A. & Ola, R. (eds). *Development agenda of Nigeria state*. Fiag Publishers.
- Anderson, L.A. (2011). *The change leader's roadmap: How to navigate your organisation's transfer matron*. Rout ledge
- Babajide, O. O. (2006). *Rural change and the impact of development intervention on Ilaje People in Ondo State, Nigeria*. (Unpublished Ph.D thesis, institute of African Studies)
- Burkey, W.W. (2011). *Organizational change theory and practice*. Sage publishers
- Dokubo, .C et al..(2017). Factors militating against the sustainability of community development projects in Emohua Local Government Areas of Rivers State. *Australian Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, vol. 10
- Dokubo, .C. (2015). *Management and strategies of community development in adult education*. Netmand Prints.
- Egenti, M. N. (2001). *The influence of citizen participation in self – help projects on the welfare of people in Imo state, Nigeria*. (Unpublished Ph.d Thesis, University of Ibadan).
- Imhabekhai, C. I. (2009). *Management of community development programmers and projects. Benin*: UNIBEN Press.
- Maureen, N. E. (2005). *Appraisal of the due Process in the principles, methods and techniques of managing community development projects for development in adult and non-formal education in Nigeria*: papers from the NNCAE annual conference. p16.
- Mclean, I. and McMillian, A. (2009). *Oxford concise dictionary of politics*. Oxford university press
- Mosca, G. (1939): *The ruling class*. McGraw-hill press.
- Onabanjo, F. A. (2004). *Community development: Rural development and planned pocial change*. Felix enterprises.
- Onyeozu, A.M. (2007). *Understanding community development*. David stones publishers.
- Osuji, E. E. (2012). *Community participant: Proceeding of Unicef sponsored workshop*. consultancy services press
- Oyebamu, M.A & Adekola, G. (2008). *Fundamentals of community development in Nigeria*. University of port harcourt press.
- Pareto, V. (1915). *The mind and society: A treatise on general sociology*. NY dover press.
- Perry, I & Perry, O. (2003). *Democratizing candidate selection, party politics*. Ipmann press
- Robert, P. (2015). *Why infrastructure matters. Rotten roads, burn economy brooking*. Education Publishers,
- Sarumi, A. (2003). *Community Development: Historical perspective*. *Nigeria journal of Labour Relations*, vol. 3.
- Ugwu, S. C. (2000). *Issues in local government and urban administration in Nigeria*. Academic Printing Press.

- UNDP. (1999). *Indicators of sustainable development, interim analysis world bank, 2008: community and social development project in Nigeria*. Retrieved June 27, 2024, from <http://www.worldbank.org>
- World Bank (2005). *Exploring partnerships between communities and local government in community driven development: A france work social development*. Oxford University Press.
- World Bank (2007). *World Development Report 2001: Attacking poverty*: Oxford university press.

Appendix

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Questions

1. What do you understand by grassroots development?
2. Do officials of Emohua Local Government Area consult with the people before initiating projects and programmes?
3. Can we attribute the poor performance of Emohua Local Government Area to corruption, imposition and poor leadership etc to local government officials?