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ABSTRACT

This study investigated the “Influence of Traditional Rulers in Resource Mobilization towards Community Development Projects in Rivers State. It examines how traditional rulers organize, mobilize and utilize material and human resources for community development projects, for an improved society. To achieve this objectives, four research questions and four null hypotheses were developed. A descriptive survey research design was used in the study; a sample of 133 respondents were purposively drawn from a population of 133 as sample size from the three senatorial district to respond to questionnaire, title Influence of traditional rulers in resource mobilization towards community development project in Rivers State (ITRRMTCDP). This is because the population is small. The instrument was subjected to face and content validity by two experts. The mean was used as statistical tool to answer the research questions, while the one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. In the course of the study, related literature on resource mobilization, community development and roles of traditional rulers in resource mobilization for community development projects were reviewed. The mission and activities of traditional rulers in Rivers State were reviewed, based on the theories of collective action, social development and structural functionalism. The following findings were made among others: that traditional rulers embarked on community development projects in Rivers State, mobilize resources through fund raising programmes, mobilize CBOs for effective implementation of community development programmes negotiate for portions of land for community development projects to be cited and organize community participation/human resources for community development activities: the following recommendations were made: that there is much to gain from traditional ruler’s community development intervention in Rivers State, if the constraint factors affecting them from achieving results are eliminated. That finding of this study on resource mobilization through fundraising reviews that if more financial support are given to the traditional rulers, they will embark on sustainable community development projects in their communities. The following recommendations were made that: Traditional rulers should be given proper constitutional recognition in the community development process as they are the custodians of the land upon which the projects will be established. Therefore, their opinions, views and aspiration should be respected.
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INTRODUCTION

Traditional Rulers in Rivers State remain important for the implementation of development projects within their areas of jurisdiction. Traditional institutions provides forum for the planning and implementation of community development projects which were aimed at providing basic amenities and assistance to the needy members of the traditional community.
Their core-functions include mobilization of their community resources for developmental purposes. This includes the provision of infrastructure to enhance standard of living within the community. Sometimes, traditional rulers initiate development projects and secure the support of both internal and external development agents for the execution of these projects.

Traditional rulers in conjunction with their community people carry the whole community along to accomplish development projects that will be of benefit to the entire community. As the custodian of the culture and traditions of the land, they are looked upon, in most cases, for decision bordering on the general welfare of the people. There is virtually nothing that could be done in the land without the approval of the traditional ruling council. They may not initiate development projects and programmes but must be consulted by governmental and non-governmental agencies, CBOs willing to carry out development projects, and programmes in the land. In this way, traditional rulers influence development projects in Rivers State. This influence can be negative or positive, depending on the disposition of the rulers at any given time. It is a known fact that self-sustained rural community development is vital to the economy like Nigeria, Rivers State in particular. Unless the ways and means of massively accelerating development in the rural areas where over 80% of Nigeria’s population reside (Guidian Newspaper, 2008) our national goal of self sufficiency and control over resources may continue to elude us.

Interestingly, the resources already exist, but what is missing is the master of the practical wisdom and technology to mobilize them for our overall benefit. The main argument here in favour of community based development is that communities are deemed to have a better knowledge of the prevailing local conditions such as who is poor and deserves micro-environment, and a better ability to enforce rules, monitor behavior, and verify actions related to interventions (Plafteau and, Gaspart, (2003).

There are quite a number of traditional stools in Rivers State as established by the tradition and custom of the people following the Rivers State Traditional Rulers Amendment Law No.4 of 2012, 2014 and 2015 respectively. The traditional stools in Rivers State are classified into three major segment (ie) First Class, Second Class and Third Class. It consists of 133 traditional stools, most of them are occupied while some are vacant. There are as well other local/ traditional rulers who are not recognized but are also in-charge of their respective communities (Bazier, 2017). Traditional rulers are no longer just the custodian of the people’s customs and traditions but are bestowed with the assignment as Chief Security Officers of their respective communities. They promote, maintain peace and unity in their areas and of course, seen as instruments of peace. As a matter of fact, our communities need more hands to aid the State Governors in the fight against crime and insecurity, hence the need to establish more traditional stools; It is on this basis that several calls have been made towards given the traditional institution of this country a constitutional backing; Recently, a frontline traditional ruler in Bayelsa State, King Okpoitari Diongoli, stressed the need for the Federal Government to strengthen the traditional institutions through the instrument of the Nigerian constitution.

However, the development that is envisaged is not merely a handout of benefits to people in need, but a process of empowerment where rural communities can acquire mastery over their own destiny through the realization that they, individually and collectively can do something to improve their circumstances. This is refocusing strategy from waiting on government, oil companies or other organizations/donors to solving their own problems themselves.

Community development according to Ajayi (1995) is a social process by which human beings can become more competent to live with and gain some control over local conditions and the changing world. Sustainable community development cannot take place through force or order, but is most likely to happen when all actors participate and share their ideas, visions and responsibilities equally and democratically in steering and implementing their community or village development projects (Ajayi & Otuya, 2006).

According to Orapin (1996), one approach in creating sustainable rural development is through giving main actors (traditional rulers) as well as villagers living in the community, an equal opportunity to think and plan their own future. This underpins the need for effective leadership structure and making strategic plans at the local community levels in order to harness the efforts of the rural resource mobilization
towards their own development. Usually, community development programs aim at creating awareness of rural possibilities, providing information on resources, inputs and infrastructures, deploying technical assistance, skills acquisition and development, increasing literacy levels, improving productivity and productive system, adapting appropriate technology in agriculture, sensitizing potential volunteers and donors among other things. Ideally, most community development programmes in developing nations focus on people’s felt needs and basic amenities such as the provision of good roads, electricity, health clinics, markets, school building and farm settlements among others. These goals can only be achieved through the combined and collective efforts of all those who share the conviction that rural community development must be accorded a high priority in our drive for poverty alleviation and national self-sufficiency.

Furthermore, the traditional rulers mobilizes available community resources which involve getting the members of a community together to act with concerted effort to ensure self-reliance and programme sustainability. Ijah (2013) in Dokubo (2015) sees community resource mobilization as a means of wiping up sentiments for positive action to be taken to achieve felt needs. She also described it as a process through which group of people assembles material and non material resources and places them under collective control for singular purpose of pursuing and achieving group interest through collective action. She further observed that mobilization “involves creation of awareness and raising the consciousness to the masses to turn around their mental and psychological facilities for attitudinal changes towards improvement of their welfare”. Community mobilization empowers members by providing adequate information, relevant education, technical support and decision-possibility so as to enable them share in the opportunities and responsibilities for action in the interest of the community. When the people are filled with zeal and enthusiasm to sustain the tempo of community development, the result is that they are motivated to increase participation, making for effective time-bound of accelerated operations. The aim is to enlist high level of commitment and make the community feel and believe that a particular project belongs to the community.

To help bring a rural community to action, it is necessary for individuals and groups to provide good leadership. When good leadership is provided, the people participate voluntarily in the accomplishment of stated objectives. The approach to rural community development is always through traditional rulers who not only act as pioneers of projects but also help in influencing and motivating their people to action. For any rural community development to be successful, influential traditional rulers must be involved otherwise they might undermine the progress of such programme. Therefore, any agency or organization coming up with a development programme for the community must initially clear with these influential traditional rulers through a process otherwise referred to as “legitimization”. It is saddening to recall that rural community development was neglected by successive governments since colonial rule in Nigeria. For instance, while the colonial government concentrated their development projects such as roads, schools, hospitals, and pipe-borne water around the major cities and built network of roads to areas where they exploit natural resources, the rural areas were completely left out. The post-independence governments are not equally left out in the practice of rural neglect as only communities whose sons and daughters were in government benefited from development projects otherwise referred to as “national cake”. Even where good development programmes were designed for rural areas, they most of the time failed because there were no scientific and empirical studies of the target rural communities which should guide their implementation. Since 1980s, Nigeria and many African countries have experienced a rising wave of revolts and restiveness by some rural communities. Governments have not been able to tackle these crises because there were no reliable baseline studies on the problems of such rural people (Orwigho and Ifie, 2004). It is estimated that Nigeria has over 25 million farm families who are supposed to be reached by extension workers. Currently, the extension worker farm family ratio is 1.250. This means that 100,000 extension workers have to be at work in the rural communities. Unfortunately, Nigeria cannot boast of one tenth of this number currently. It therefore falls on the rural communities to free themselves from the shackles of under development with or without government supports.

100
Statement of the Problem

It is an indisputable fact that traditional rulers constitute the major aspect of community leadership, vested with the responsibility of overseeing various traditional community institutions in the state as may be established by the law of the land. This is to ensure eternal peace and security, orderliness and all-round development through organized resource mobilization and utilization for a sustainable community development. Yet, it is obvious and not uncommon to read on national dailies or hear people assert that traditional rulers are much more indifferent over these responsibilities which has made many communities in Rivers State to desert their communities, face and suffer the worst form of underdevelopment and neglect in the hands of well-meaning community members, government and multinationals vis-à-vis the provision of social amenities. As a result, there are cases of violent demonstration, pipe-line vandalization, cult related activities, youth restiveness, land disputes, lack of youth and women empowerment, marginalization cases and kidnapping etc. The high point is the attendant effects on the community. Most traditional rulers actually abstain from using their position as community leaders and custodians of the culture and tradition of the land to influence mobilization of available resources towards community development programmes in their areas of jurisdiction. Some of the traditional rulers are always afraid of losing their land for community development project without adequate compensation, because of that they shy away from given out land for community development project. It is also glaring that because of some past failed community development project, most traditional rulers has developed what we called Wait and See Attitude towards new community project. This is because of fear of failure of subsequent projects which has directly or indirectly affected the pace of development in some communities. However, the interest of the researcher in undertaken this study is that he noticed there was lack of community leadership effort in mobilizing and utilizing available human and material resources in developing communities in Rivers State. This accounted for high rate of crime and underdevelopment in most communities in Rivers State because community leadership in charge of various institutions are lagging behind expectations in resource mobilization towards sustainable community development projects. In fact, different positions have been taken by some researchers as well as community development agents as solutions to people’s active participation in community development project in Rivers State. While some people do not see this as a very serious issue, others see it as one that needs a rethink. Most of the blames on people’s poor participation in community development activities in most communities have been leveled against the Community Development Committee (CDC), leading to removal and replacement of the committee from time to time. Despite the efforts of the governments in introducing different national development programmes in the country, there is no evidence to show that a reasonable percentage of the people in rural communities in Rivers State participate in community development projects. Experiences of the staff, especially those under community development unit in the local government have shown considerable and progressive deterioration of community development projects in many communities which has created a gap for non-involvement of people in development activities. This concern stem from the fact that while there are indications that some of the national development programmes have positively influenced community development in some areas, there are also indications that in some areas like Rivers State active participation does not seem to be noticeable. Could it be that the mobilization strategies adopted by these community government development programmes were inadequate or that a lot of factors militate against the community development projects embarked upon? However, it is possible that if adequate mobilization strategies are employed in the area, the deterioration in people’s participation in community development projects can be reversed, hence the need for this study. It is on this basis that the study will specifically attempt to explore and look at how traditional rulers mobilize various available resources for community development projects in Rivers State.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to investigate the influence of traditional rulers in resource mobilization towards community development projects in Rivers State. Specifically, the study seeks to accomplish the following objectives:
1. Ascertain how traditional rulers mobilized resources through fund raising as a means of resource mobilization towards community development projects in Rivers State.
2. Examine how traditional rulers mobilize community based organizations (COBs) for effective implementation of community development programmes as a means of resource mobilization towards community development projects in Rivers State.
3. Examine how traditional rulers negotiate for portions of land as a means of resource mobilization towards community development projects in Rivers State.
4. Assess how community participation/human resources are organized by traditional rulers as a means of resource mobilization towards community development projects in Rivers State.

Research Questions
1. How do traditional rulers mobilize resources through fund raising as a means of resource mobilization towards community development projects in Rivers State?
2. How do traditional rulers mobilize community based organizations for effective implementation of community development programmes as a means of resource mobilization towards community development projects in Rivers State?
3. How do traditional rulers negotiate for portions of land towards community development projects in Rivers State?
4. How do traditional rulers organize community participation/human resources as a means of resource mobilization towards community development projects in Rivers State?

Hypotheses
To help guide this study, the following hypotheses are postulated and will be tested at a 0.05 alpha level of significance.

H₀₁: There is no significant difference between the mobilization of resources through fund raising by the traditional rulers and resource mobilization towards community development projects in Rivers State.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference between mobilization of community based organization for effective implementation of community development programmes by traditional rulers and resource mobilization towards community development projects in Rivers State.

H₀₃: There is no significant difference between negotiating for portions of land by the traditional rulers and resource mobilization towards community development projects in Rivers State.

H₀₄: There is no significant difference between the organization of community participation/human resources by the traditional rulers and resource mobilization towards community development projects in Rivers State.

Population Distribution Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senatorial Districts</th>
<th>Population Figure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rivers South East</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers South West</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers South East</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field Survey: Rivers State Ministry of Chieftaincy and Community Affairs
(December, 2017)

METHODOLOGY
The study adopted the descriptive survey design and the sample size of the study consisted of all the recognized and classified traditional rulers comprising of both 1st class, 2nd class and 3rd class traditional rulers across the three senatorial districts in Rivers State. The respondents are one hundred and thirty three (133) and due to the small size of the population, the purposive sampling techniques were used and all the traditional rulers that make up the population were selected. The instrument used for data
collection was a structured questionnaire Titled: Influence of Traditional Rulers in Resources Mobilization Towards Community Development Projects in Rivers State (ITRRMTCDP). It was divided into sections A and B. Section A contains information about the demographic data of the respondents, while Section B consisted of twenty (20) question items which were based on four research questions that guided the study. The instrument was subjected to content and face validity by the Project Supervisor and two other experts in the department of measurement and evaluation in Rivers State University. Their comments were used to upgrade the instrument for data collection on a weighted Likert 4 point scale (4-1) as Strongly Agreed (4), Agreed (3), Disagreed (2), Strongly Disagreed (1). Data collected from the respondents were analyzed using mean and grand mean to answer the questions while one way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were used to testing the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. The researcher administered the questionnaire to the respondents with the help of two trained research assistants. To ensure the reliability of the instrument a pre-test method of reliability testing was used in some selected communities within the 3 senatorial districts in Rivers State. Fifty (50) copies of questionnaire were distributed to each of the senatorial districts that make up the sample for the study. This brings the total number of questionnaire to 150 copies. After which their responses were collected to determine the reliability co-efficient using split-half method with a significant level of $r = 0.05$. And a reliability co-efficient of 0.78 was obtained, which confirms the instrument was reliable to be used for data collection for the study.

RESULTS
The results obtained from the respondents in shown below:

Research Question 1

*How do traditional rulers mobilize resources through fund raising as a means of resource mobilization towards community development projects in Rivers State?*

**Table 4.1: Mean Response on ways of Mobilizing Resources through Fund Raising by Traditional Rulers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>RSW (N=35)</th>
<th>RE (N=48)</th>
<th>RSE (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Different committees are set up to manage various aspects of fund raising programs.</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fundraising programs are organized. Means and methods of fund raising are determined by the committee</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Deliberate plans are made to reduce the volume of defaulters who may fail to redeem their promises.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Publicity is made to contact committee to determine who will be present and level of support.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand mean

Source: Field Survey
Table 4.1 shows the result of responses regarding how traditional rulers mobilize resources through fund raising as a means of resource mobilization towards community development in Rivers State. As shown in the table, this is achieved through setting up committees, organizing fund raising programmes; allowing committees to device method of raising funds; putting steps to handle defaulters and adequate publicity. This is indicated by grand mean responses of 3.30, 3.31 and 3.12 for Rivers south west, Rivers east and Rivers south east senatorial districts respectively.

Research “Question 2:

*How do the traditional rulers mobilize Community Based Organizations (CBOs) for effective implementation of community development programmes as a means of resource mobilization towards community development projects in Rivers State?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>RSW (N=35)</th>
<th>RE (N=48)</th>
<th>RSE (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Levy on members of the community</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Projects launching</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Donations form organizations</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Government Donation</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Investment on community resources</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand mean</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Table 4.2 shows the result of responses regarding how traditional rulers mobilize community based organizations for effective implementation of community development programmes as a means of resource mobilization towards community development in Rivers State. As shown in the table, methods employed include: capacity building and assessment, support efforts aimed at addressing retrogressive culture practices, training and carrying out seminars, development of policies and guidelines, funding support using project approach. This is evident by grand mean responses of 3.22, 3.28 and 3.22 for Rivers south west, Rivers east and Rivers south east senatorial districts respectively.
**Research “Question 3**

*How do traditional rulers negotiate for portions of land towards community development Projects in Rivers State?*

**Table 4.3: Mean Response on Negotiating for Portions of Land by Traditional Rulers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>RSW (N=35)</th>
<th>RE (N=48)</th>
<th>RE (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Proper consultation of stakeholders in the community is made through effective mechanism. Necessary traditional approaches for land acquisition and settlement is used to liaise with the land owners. A memorandum of understanding between major landlords and project developers is established. Adequate compensation to the land owners before assessing the land. The objectives of such development projects must be made clearer to the land owners before releasing the land.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Table 4.3 shows the result of responses regarding how traditional rulers negotiate for portion of land toward community development projects in Rivers State. As shown in the table, these include consultation with community stakeholders; traditional approaches for liaising with land owners; establishing memorandum of understanding between landlords and developers; discussion of compensation and adequate awareness of project objectives. This is evident by grand mean responses of 3.50, 3.52 and 3.55 for Rivers south west, Rivers east and Rivers south east senatorial districts respectively.
Research Question 4

How do traditional rulers organize community participation/human resources as a means of resource mobilization towards community development projects in Rivers State?

Table 4.4: Mean Response on Organization of Community Participation/Human Resources for Development Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>RSW (N=35)</th>
<th>RE (N=48)</th>
<th>RSE (N=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Secure strong leadership and establish a formal structure</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create a strategic plan for project execution and implementation</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proper consultations is made to integrated all sections of the</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enlightenment campaigns is done on the project objectives</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They give direction for activities</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand mean</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey

Table 4.4 shows the result of responses regarding how traditional rulers organize community participation/human resources towards community development Projects in Rivers State. As shown in the table, these include securing strong leadership; creating action plan for project execution; consulting all community stakeholders consultation with community stakeholders; conducting enlightenment campaigns and providing direction for flow of activities. This is evident by grand mean responses of 3.35, 3.32 and 3.14 for Rivers South West, Rivers East and Rivers South East senatorial districts respectively.

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference in the mean response of traditional rulers from the three senatorial districts regarding how they mobilize resource through fund raising as a means of resource mobilization towards community development in Rivers State.

Table 4.5: ANOVA for Mean Response on ways of Mobilizing Resources through Fund Raising for Development Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-cal</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>F-crit</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.127</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>1.935</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>3.066</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>37.874</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39.001</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data

Table 4.5 shows the result of the one way analysis of variance. The result shows that there was no significant difference in the mean response of traditional rulers from the three senatorial districts of Rivers State regarding how they mobilize resource through fund raising for community development.
This is evident by $F(2,130) = 1.935$, $P > 0.05$. This result means that there is similarity in the ways traditional rulers in Rivers State employ to raise fund for development project.

**Hypothesis 2**

There is no significant difference in the mean response of traditional rulers from the three senatorial districts regarding how they mobilize Community Based Organizations (CBOs) for effective implementation of community development programmes as a means of resource mobilization towards community development projects in Rivers State.

**Table 4.6: ANOVA for Mean Response on ways of Mobilizing Community Based Organizations for Effective Implementation of Development Project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$-cal</th>
<th>$P$-value</th>
<th>$F$-crit</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>3.066</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>31.587</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31.692</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data

Table 4.6 shows the result of the one way analysis of variance for ways of mobilizing CBOs for effective community development projects. The result shows that there was no significant difference in the mean response of traditional rulers from the three senatorial districts of Rivers State regarding how they mobilize community based organizations for effective implementation of community development programmes. This is evident by calculated value of $F(2,130) = 0.216$, $P > 0.05$. This result means that there is similarity in the methods traditional rulers in Rivers State employ to mobilize Community Based Organizations (CBOs) for development projects.

**Hypothesis 3**

There is no significant difference in the mean response of traditional rulers from the three senatorial districts regarding how they negotiate for portions of land towards community development projects in Rivers State.

**Table 4.7: ANOVA for Mean Response on how Traditional Rulers Negotiate for Portions of Land for Development Project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$-cal</th>
<th>$P$-value</th>
<th>$F$-crit</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>3.066</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>20.461</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20.518</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data

Table 4.7 shows the result of the one way analysis of variance for negotiating for portions of land. The result shows that there was no significant difference in the mean response of traditional rulers from the three senatorial districts of Rivers State regarding how they negotiate for portions of land for community development. This is evident by calculated value $F(2,130) = 0.180$, $P > 0.05$. This result means that there is similarity in the methods traditional rulers in Rivers State employ to negotiate for portions of land for community development project.
Hypothesis 4
There is no significant difference in the mean response of traditional rulers from the three senatorial districts regarding how they organize community participation/human resources as a means of resource mobilization towards community development projects in Rivers State.

Table 4.8: ANOVA for Mean Response on Organization of Community Participation/Human Resources for Development Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-cal</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>F-crit</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.208</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>2.948</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>3.066</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>26.646</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.854</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data

Table 4.8 shows the result of the one way analysis of variance for organization of community participation/human resources for community development projects. The result shows that there was no significant difference in the mean response of traditional rulers from the three senatorial districts of Rivers State regarding the organization of community participation/human resources for community development projects. This is evident by calculated $F(2,130) = 2.948$, $P > 0.05$. This result means that there is similarity in the methods traditional rulers in Rivers State employ to elicit participation of community people for community development projects.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS
Discussion in this study is done according to findings of the study
Table 4.1 Shows that traditional rulers actually mobilized resources through fund raising for community development projects by setting up committees, organizing fundraising programmes: allowing committees to device method of raising funds: putting steps to handle defaulters and adequate publicity to elicit support. Inhabekhai (2009) in Dokubo (2015) maintained that inadequate funding often leads to slow pace of work and in very acute situations, project abandonment. Ottih (2000) in Dokubo (2015) maintained that money, either in hand (including bank deposits) or in the form of credit is the key to successful community development project and as such great care should be exercised in determining the amount needed to finance the community project. For instance, if too much money is raised, cost will be unnecessarily high, if little is raised, the project may find itself in a tight corner occasioned by shortage of fund.

As shown in table 4.2, methods employed include: capacity building and assessment, support efforts aimed at addressing retrogressive cultural practices, training and carrying out seminars development of policies and guidelines, funding support using project approach. Dokubo (2015) community development projects are by nature different from individual projects. Organizations for community development projects are diverse, depending on the type of the project and the imitation of the projects. They include; capacity building and assessment, support efforts aimed at addressing retrogressive cultural practices, training and carrying out seminars, development of policies and guidelines, funding support using project approach.

Analysis on negotiating for portions of land by traditional rulers for community development projects as shown in table 4.3, indicated that the following measures must be taken, these include consultation with community stakeholders: traditional approaches for liaising with land owners, establishing memorandum of understanding between landlords and project developers: discussion of compensation and adequate awareness of project objectives.

Table 4.4 reveals how traditional rulers organize the participation of members of the community towards community development projects. As shown in the table, these include securing of strong leadership; creating action plan for project execution: consulting all community stakeholders (consultation with
community stakeholders): Conducting enlightenment campaigns and providing direction for flow of activities. According to Ajayi and Oni (1992) organizing is a collection of human beings with a common goal. It involves a process of executive function aimed at ensuring that resources, activities and authorities’ relationship are so coordinated to achieve prescribed goals.

Looking at matters with respect to community development however, Yebamiji and Adekola (2008) in Dokubo (2015) stated that organization of community members is a method concerned with the arrangement of relationship between the various individuals and groups in the community in order for that community to function properly or attain its objectives. It maintains that community organization provides structural framework for communication, direction and coordination of people activities and efforts, the reason is to develop public support and participation in social welfare activities by means of direct voluntary financial contributions and moral support. However, Onyeozu (2007) stated that the success of any of these community development programme depend largely on the effective participation of the community members. In order to achieve the effective participation of the community members, sensitization, enlightening and possible conscientization of the community members are essential elements to put in place.

CONCLUSIONS
This work has investigated the influence of Traditional Rulers in resource mobilization towards community development projects in Rivers State. Although data collection was on sampled communities within the three senatorial districts in Rivers State namely: Rivers South East, Rivers South West and Rivers East respectively, it is received that the situation is the same in all Senatorial Districts of Rivers State.

The study concludes with the following that:

1. The traditional rulers mobilizes resources through fundraising by setting up fundraising committee, organizing fundraising programs, allowing committees set to device means and methods of raising funds, putting steps to handle defaulters and adequate publicity are made to determine who participates and level of support.

2. Traditional rulers employed various means and mobilizing community based organizations for effective implementation of community development projects as a means of resource mobilization for community development projects. These include: capacity building and assessment, support efforts aimed at addressing retrogressive cultural practices, training and carrying out seminars development of policies and guidelines, funding support using project approach.

3. Traditional rulers negotiate for portions of land landed properties towards community development projects. This is done through proper consultation of stakeholders in the community through effective mechanism, necessary traditional approaches for land acquisition and settlement is used to liaise with the land owners, a memorandum of understanding between major landlords and project developers is established, adequate compensation is paid to the land owners before assessing the land, the objectives of such development projects must be made clearer to the land owners before releasing the land.

4. Traditional rulers organize community participation/human resources for optimal involvement or participation of community people in such development efforts. This is done by securing strong leadership and establishing a formal structure, create a strategic plan for project execution and implementation, proper consultation is made to integrate all sections of the community members, enlightenment campaigns is done on the project objectives, and also give direction for activities etc.

RECOMMENDATIONS
To ensure that the people of Rivers State benefit from the Development Intervention of Traditional Rulers, the following recommendations are made:
1. Traditional rulers should be given proper constitutional recognition in the community development process as they are the custodians of the land upon which the projects will be established. Therefore, their opinions, views and aspiration should be respected.

2. Community development projects should be designed with the interest of the people (felt need) in mind because it is only when the people are interested in the project they can boldly embrace it and participate fully in its implementation.

3. Effort should be made by traditional rulers and other community leaders and development agencies to replicate projects that have high record of success in other communities, this will help to arouse the people’s enthusiasm and response to the projects in their own community.

4. Wealthy individuals from the community can support the traditional institution to enable traditional rulers embark on huge projects.

5. The entire population or community should be sensitized to respond to self-help development projects of the community.

6. The resources realized for community development projects both money and materials should be utilized in such a way that the people will gain from them.

7. The spirit of honesty, transparency, and accountability should be the watch word of any traditional ruler.

8. Community based organizations and co-operatives should partner with traditional rulers in the execution of project in host communities.

9. The Federal, State and Local Government should by legislation make the traditional rulers be responsible for project development in their various communities etc.

REFERENCES


Interview (2006).The Permanent Secretary Rivers State Ministry of Chieftaincy and Community Development.


Olisa, M.S.O. and Obiukwu, J.I. (1992). Rural Development in Nigeria; Dynamics and strategies, Awka. Publisher: Mekslink (Nig.).


Onyeeozu, A. M. (2007). Understanding Community Development, Port Harcourt, Publisher: Davidstones Ltd.


PDF Community Mobilization and Development. Women and Child Development Department, Government of Orrissa.


