Developing the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria through Community Development Committees (CDCs): A Critical Assessment

Agba, A. M. Ogaboh (PhD)[1]; Ikoh, Moses U. (PhD)[2] ; Ushie, E. M.[3]

[1&3]*Lecturers, Department of Sociology, University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria.*
[2] *Lecturer Department of Sociology, University of Jos, Nigeria.*
Dr.Agba, A.M. Ogaboh, email:ogabohagbagroup@yahoo.com +2348072727272 (Corresponding Author)

Abstract

Democratization and political pluralism is reviewing emphasis on community development through community Development Committees CDCs. It is one strategy adopted by the Niger Delta Development commission (NDDC) in its quest to fast – track development in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria (NDRN). The theoretical lenses of Social Capitalist theory and Asset-Based perspective support this initiative. But analysis of empirical studies in the NDRN on community development reveals some short-comings that ranged from poor leadership, poor project sustainability, and risk of capture to abuse of community development objectives. We argued that without deliberate training they could change leadership practice at the community level and encourage active/effective participation by community members, the on-going advocacy and community-driven development would suffer similar fate.

Key Words: Community Development Committee, Community Development.

Introduction

For almost a decade now, Nigerians have witnessed an unprecedented public interest and supports for good governance and leadership.   This is largely the result of the work of civil societies and renewed support from International organizations, which have encouraged democratization and political pluralism. The consequence of political pluralism and decentralization is seen in the high-level declaration of support for grass-root development as witnessed in the proliferation of empowerment strategies. Recently, the Niger Delta Development Commission (NDDC) had to mount workshops for community leaders in all the nine states of the region with the sole objective of sensitizing them to form Community Development Committees (CDCs) for the purpose of developing their communities. Since then rhetoric commitments to CDCs have continued to flourish with very little attention being paid to problems that resulted in the demise of the ones formed under fanfares in the 1970s as well as problems that could cripple the developmental dreams of existing ones.

For many scholars, development through CDCs is premised on the idea that every community member would want to participate because the kinship and lineage relationship within a community evoke a spirit of togetherness (Charles, 2005, Corwall, 2006) as well as that of homogeneity and harmony (Gaventa & Valderrama, 1999). For others, participation in Community Development Committees for the purpose of development has implications for equity, representation and voice (Montgouery, Stren, Cohen and Reed, 2003), and is thus a realization of the long-awaited paradigm shift in

social development thinking: from direct empowerment of the people, to participation of the people in decision making toward their empowerment.

In contemporary development discourses, CDCs is advocated as a basic development strategy for attracting development to the community (Robert, 2002, Suk-Young, 1999; Cornwall, 2006). Unfortunately, development requires more than mere group formation. In the NDRN, CDCs have been used in the past to create disharmony and stifle development. However, the realization that CDCs can provoke development benefits beyond the immediate domain, and could generate macro-level implication inform the need for a critical assessment of CDCs in the Niger Delta region a view to repositioning them for effective community development. Other than this, CDCs can be used to hold policy implementer to account. This could have a positive implication for democracy and decentralization of governance.

In this paper, we discuss the concept of community development within the context of Community Development Committees. We equally assess the problems confronting CDCs in the Niger Delta Region and by so doing provides warning signals to emerging ones. We argue that community development requires more than group formation. Leadership training, advocacy and conflict resolution skills are necessary. Beside basic management skills in budgetary and planning procedure by CDCs leaders, effective participation by community members could enhance transparency and refashion people sense of their right. Ability to hold community leaders accountable could translate to holding government accountable and could become very significant in the emerging right-based approach to development.

We begin the paper with conceptual clarifications and review, followed with the theory of social capital and asset-based perspective. Next, we examined the CDCs and its developmental outcome in the Niger Delta Region. Thereafter, we outline suggestion for the repositioning of CDCs for effective participation by community members for community development.

Conceptual Clarification
Community/Community Development Committee

The term, community, has many interpretations. In the social science, community generally refers to a group that has some sense of shared identity and belonging, often within a geographic and political context, where they satisfy many of their needs (Schaefer, 2004). Communities have common values, tradition interests, institutions and experiences. They also have social networks and systems within and beyond boundaries such as mutual help, traditional and social safety nets, which build support and cooperation. In this sense, community evokes the ideal of a homogeneous social group with shared interest. Members worked together harmoniously for the common good of all (Cornwall, 2006).

In development literature, community refers to an administratively defined locale (tribal areas or neighbourhood) or a common interest group (a community of weavers, fishermen or tailor). In this sense, what is labeled as a community is often an endogenous construct defined by the parameter of a project, facilitator or by the nature of administrators or identify boundaries rather than by an organized form (Mansuri & Rao, 2004).

Generally, communities vary substantially in the degree to which their members feel connected and share a common identity. We may have urban community and within it are other communities. In this manner, even rural communities do have other smaller communities within them. Since communities are complex and dynamic, Community Development Committees are often tailored to a given situation. Conditions both within and outside the community such as existing socio political and economic problem that demand public support, attention and knowledge about development issues, affect a community readiness to act.

Community Development Committees (CDCs) as a developmental strategy has a long history. The objective could be summed up in two words: "community" and "development". The beauty of CDCs resides in its simplicity. Members are drawn from the community and or similar trade. It encourages participation by community members and the response to communal needs. Community Development committee starts with the people. It helps community members to identity their needs and work together in finding answers. It brings about self-reliant as community members become armed with knowledge (Minkler, 2005; Narayan, 2002).

The "Pedagogy of the oppressed" propounded by Freire (1970) had argued that the oppressed needed to unite to find a way to improve their own destinies. These ideas resulted in the first waves of community development committees with cooperative movements emerging as strategy for self-reliance. The failure of large-scale, government – initiated development programme equally awakened interest in the local management of resources and decisions (Chambers, 1983). Formation of CDCs and participation of community members was expected to lead to better designed inputs, and more equitable distributed project benefits with less corruption and other rent-seeking activity (Mansuri & Rao, 2004). According to the World Employment Conference (WEC), participation of community people in making decision, which affect them through organizations of their choice, is a basic need fulfillment (Cornwall, 2006). The world conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (WCARRD) equally called for the involvement of rural people at the grassroots in the conceptualization and design of policies as well as programmes, and in creating administrative and social as well as economic institutions that could implement and evaluate then (Oakley, 1995).

The Theory of Social Capital

When networks and local associations become structures that support collective action, enforce norms, generate expectations of reciprocity, and or foster feelings of mutual trust, they constitute a social capital. Since the theory places emphasis on the more durable features of networks and assigns prominent roles to associations and institutions, it could be invoked in the discussions of community participation in development.

Social capital theory has a close link with concepts of "embeddedness" which views social networks more as a property of groups and communities than of individuals (Meagher, 2005). Within close-knit groups, relationship of kinships, friendship and ethnicity can form dense networks of solidarity, cooperation and communal sanction that enhance development (Waldinger, 1995). This is because strong ties based on deep bonds of kinship and community can create trusts that enforce cooperative norms (Coleman, 2000).

Another feature of the social capital theory is the "bridging and bonding" approach, which emphasizes the importance of both "strong" and "weak ties, and the ability of social networks to contest social and institutional boundaries rather than to maintain normative closure (Putman, 2000). While "strong ties" provide significant regulating advantages, "weak ties" help in bridging social cleavages and provide access to new resources and information (Woolcock & Narayan, 2000). The ability of individual to build "bonds" within their own group and bridges to other groups is deeply tied to the belief that the quality and quantity of group activity are key sources of community strength and its ability to work for its own betterment (Meagher, 2005). In these way social networks allows individuals or marginalized groups to circumvent institutional constraints and structures of exclusion, and reduces transaction costs by filling the gaps in formal institutional arrangement, particularly in contexts of underdevelopment or institutional collapse (Stightz, 2000).

Within the perspective of CDCs, the impact of social capital can draw considerable attention. When individual community members establish a new social network tie (by forming a committee) or chose to strengthen existing one, they contribute to a mass of social capital. Here social capital takes the form of participation in community Development Committees. Network closure occurs when members come to know each other. Moreover, such personal links enhance contribution toward community development.

Notwithstanding, social capital theory has its own weaknesses. Community members attempting to constitute a committee may be confronted with the problem of insufficient solidarity among themselves, which could produce a failure of trust. Equally economic strengths of social networks may be disrupted by the inability of some CDCs to form weak ties across social cleavages, leading to the formation of close parochial network. Instead of promoting development, close community networks have been found to be associated with fragmentation and communal violence (Meagher, 2005).

Asset based perspective communities have a range of assets that can contribute to development. An asset–based approach holds that each community can boast of a unique combination of assets–individuals, families, local associations, organization and institutions. Asset–based community development is internally focused and relationship driven. It acknowledges traditions of organizing and planning (Kretzmann & Mcknight, 1993).

The key to community planning and management revolves around the capacity to analyze development related problems, understand the views of differing groups in the community, solve problems, create action plans, access and coordinate information, leverage resources and monitor and evaluate progress (Estrella & Gaventa, 2006). These require a leadership structure that embodies diverse interests, equity, group facilitation, conflict resolution, and participatory learning method (Alinsky, 1989) Effective collaboration would involve advocacy, negotiation, and nurturing partnership towards a common goal. When such capacities and assets are lucking in the community, skill building could help to transfer knowledge to the community (Kretzmann & Mcknight, 1993).

Community Development committee and Development outcomes in the Niger Delta Region

The Niger Delta Region of Nigeria (NDRN) consists of nine states of the federation that span the south and the fringes of the south-west and South-East geo-political zones of the country. These states are Rivers, Bayelsa, Edo, Delta, Akwa Ibom, Cross River, Ondo, Imo and Abia. They are the states where crude oil, Nigeria's main source of revenue earning is produced. The long developmental neglect of the area by the government and the multi-national oil companies recently resulted in militancy by the Youths. In order to make amend and fast-tracked development government responded by creating the Ministry of Niger Delta in addition to the Niger Delta Development Commission (NDDC). The later was earlier established but starved of fund to implement some of its laudable intervention programme by government (Ahebe, 2009).

According to NDDC, formation of CDCs would help to fast track development and empower the people out of the dilemma of poverty in the midst of abundant wealth, in the NDRN. In seminars and workshops held for community leaders in the region, the formula is summarized: gather your community members together, for the purpose of forming a committee; elect committee leaders, register your committee if possible; discuss the needs of the community, and put them in a scale of preference; write to a funding organization, if you like the NDDC to partner with you in solving or implementing your plans. Besides attracting development, the CDCs would serve as sources of inputs for NDDC on how well to tackle development at the grass-root level/community level. Within this context CDCs is seen not only as a way of ensuring effectiveness and efficiency in the delivery of development to the communities in the NDRN, but also as sources of bottom-up information.

The urge for CDCs involvement in development delivery is not new. What the recent NDDC's invitation to community leaders has done is to renew the advocacy, which started in the 1970s, under a new nomenclature. As expected, it has generated argument for and against and some are being reasserted to spur enthusiasm. It resembles what Cornwall (2006:69) calls "looking back to more forward". Indeed, that itself is history. It could help to provide a picture of continuity and changes in community development programme. In the 1970s, three distinct arguments influenced community development through participatory approach: efficiency and effectiveness, self-determination; and mutual learning (Cornwall, 2006). It influenced communal efforts that resulted in many development projects like community schools (primary and secondary), markets, rural electrification, boreholes, building and furnishing of community halls that change the face of rural communities. In the urban areas, many projects and programmes had emerged ranging from these to which people contributed their time and labour, like vigilance group to consultative exercises informed by decision taken elsewhere, like month-end sanitation. During the 1980s and 1990s, the concept of "community participation" earlier coined in 1970s received a new dress code in "community empowerment". From "do it by yourself", to "do it for yourself", the 1980-style participation in community development changed to community – driven development (CDD) where communities are given opportunities to bid for funding and support to design, manage and execute their own projects.

At some point there is no systematic documentation of the performance of either "community participation" or "community empowerment" approach in community development in the Niger Delta Region, but a sparse contextual account exist. In some communities, development is championed by Community – Based Organization (CBOs) and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) with organizational visions that becloud the boundaries of conventional development practice. In others, community members simply responded to the formation of associations and cooperation in order to attract self-help development projects. In either approaches, the enthusiasm with which "community participation" was received in the 1970s has not been sustained. Despite the much talk about "community empowerment", it failed to strengthen the ability of the vulnerable groups to participate in benefit from the socio-political economic resources and to meet their needs (Ferguson, 1997). The problems that blocked the realization of the objective of "community empowerment" are examined under the following themes:

(i)   *Poor Leadership*

Community participation in whatever form was expected to incorporate local knowledge and improve targeting; lower the informational costs of delivering programme and ensure monitoring of programme implementation (Mansuri & Rao, 2004). Such expectation needed responsible set of leadership that could help in identifying and solving problems. Leadership is a process of creating a vision for others and having the power to translate the vision into reality and sustain it (Hellriegel, Slocum & Woodman, 1989). Leadership behaviour becomes motivational to the extent that it provides necessary direction, guidance and supports that could help to clarify path-goal relationships and removes any obstacles, which could hinder attainment of goals (Mullins, 1989).

A majority of the Community Development Committees formed in the 1970s could not survive up to 1980s because of poor leadership. Local inequality in relations of power generated leadership tussles that derailed the objective of the development committees. Where greed permitted programmes benefits from not being captured by non-target groups, community members were not regularly briefed on the outcome of community initiative. Accusation and counter accusation of fund embezzlement resulted in the early dead of these committees. For instance in Iho community of Imo State, where crude oil was first found in Nigeria, Mba (1996) reports of the committee formed by rural farmers under the umbrella of Rural Farmers Association (RFA) to attracts government supports in the provision of farm inputs. The first set of fertilizers that was released to the RFA members through the state Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development did not reach them. Portfolio farmers collaborated with RFA executive to diverted the fertilizers to elsewhere where they were sold. Government effort to support the farmers was thus thwarted by the RFA leadership. The Association had become a smokescreen for corrupt businessmen in leadership clothing.

Another example that illustrates the capture of programme benefits by non-target group in the NDRN is shown by Mvele's (1990) work in Andoni, a riverine area of River State. In order to increase earnings from their main occupation, which is fishing, the Andoni Sea Ferry Association (ASFA) was established. Initially members operated a contribution group to raise money to buy fishing nets, hook, lines, and canoes. Later the

Association attracted the attention of government, which decided to support them with direct funding. Although the fund reached the Association, it did not reach many of the deserving members. To be able to attract government support, the local leadership of ASFA had approached local politicians who promised to use their position to bring them government supports. They succeeded in doing it but at the expense of ASFA, which members supported their political cause through election riggings, but come not realize their dream of participating in ASFA. The local politicians that hijacked the leadership of ASFA would not allow ASFA members to monitor the Association's expenditure and could not hold the officials to account.

When politicians take control to decide who should participate in the empowerment project, participation becomes bound up with politicized questions of exclusion, rights and control (Cornwall, 2006). In their evaluation of the Mbaitoli Town Union (MTU), Chukwuma (1998) found that the five extended families contributed equal number of participants to the union. At the regular meetings, deliberations are open and frank. Members are able to voice out their opinion without fear of contradiction or reprisal. Such openness enhances the opportunities for horizontal and vertical linkages within the community. In contrast to this, Njoku (2003) observed that the Egbema Development Committee in Imo State could not allow genuine discussion by participating members because of power differential. In display of vested interest, local politicians who hijacked the leadership of the committee often polarized the discussion during meetings with pocket of supporters. As a result, when attention is paid to who participate and who benefit from community projects, it become evident that poor leadership encourages exclusion and local   inequality. Elsewhere Ribot (1996) discovered that patterns of 0065 exclusion found in traditional forms of governance are reinforced by the creature of unaccountable local institution that speak on behalf of the community. Schady (2002) equally found that programmes designed to elicit community participation and meet community demands may be no less immune to political manipulation.

(ii)   *Poor Project Sustainability*

For a sustainable community development both social and technical skills acquisition by community members are necessary to turn rhetoric into positive change. Mansuri & Rao (2004) have demonstrated that mere stimulation of participation by forming community development organization would not sustain a technically incline project beyond a few month. Embarking on such project requires more than educating people about their common need or promoting communal values. A good example exist in the NDRN. The defunct Oil and Mineral Producing Area Development Commission (OMPADEC) had responded to the request by the Mbiabet Ikpe community to sink a borehole for the community. Manual labour was provided by the community while OMPADEC provided the technical staff including the pumping machine and the overhead tank. Few mouths after the official commissioning of the projects, the water pump developed fault. The community members contributed money to effect a repair. However, when it was faulted again including a leaking overhead tank, members refused to contribute forward the repairs and returned to the stream that supplied water to the

community. Lack of technical knowledge among the beneficiaries hampered maintenance of the project and ultimately its waste.

Elsewhere, Cleaver (1999) argues that even when institutional support are initially successful in creating the project, they may lack the material resource and technical know- how to sustain the projects. The operation of community infrastructure is often crucially dependent on external agents. The Nkari Health Centre in Akwa Ibom State offers an illustrative example of such community project. Judging by the health need of the community and the many kilometers that separate the community to the nearest health centres, the Nkari Development Committee approached the OMPADEC with a request for a health center. The community donated land, sand and manual labour, while the OMPADEC provided the design and the builders. The State Ministry of Health agreed to post staff as well as supply drugs to the Health Centre after completion. Three months after the completion of the building, no staff was posted to the center. Community leaders began to lobby officials of the ministry to post their staff to the clinic with the promise of free accommodation and cleaning assistance. Unknown to them staff posted to the clinic were also lobbying to State Ministry officials to cancel the posting because of the distance from the nearest urban centre to the community, and for lack of basic amenities like pipe born water and electricity. When eventually few staff were persuaded to open the Health Center, they opted to reside in the nearest community, where electricity existed and travelled to Nkari every morning. In the course of time, the Health Center could not operate full time. The community becomes confronted with lack of what they have.

Though the community had the potential to sustain the Health center more than if it were completely State owned, the substance was limited to infrastructural repairs. For the professional staff, they needed to be subjects of the government ministries. Several studies have shown that unless communities can lobby for continuing support for technical and professional inputs, they lack ability to sustain such projects (Cornnall, 2006; Mansuria Rao, 2004).

(iii)   Risk Capture

While leadership has been observed as the main problem of many community committees, many participatory projects in the NDRN have been appropriated by the community leader with very little attempt to include community members at any stage. In many instances, such exclusion resulted in serious face –off and misunderstanding that destabilized the community further. The Movement for the Survival of Ogoni People (MOSOP) for instance, may qualify more as an NGO that champion advocacy for non-polluted environment, but it has its root in Ogoni land, whose people it campaigned locally and internationally to end the exploitation of Shell Petroleum Corporation. Unfortunately, for MOSOP, other wealthier and highly connected community leaders had dominated decision – making for the community. This weakened the cohesive ability of MOSOP, and attempt to sanction these leaders for violating cooperative behaviour and collective agreement of Ogoni people resulted in the death of nine Ogoni Leaders. The consequences of that weakened MOSOP further especially when its leaders were national judiciary murdered.

In their work in sub-Saharan Africa, Abraham and Platteau (2004) argued that rural African communities are often dominated by dictatorial leaders who can shape the participation process to benefit themselves. In communities where the literacy rate is still very low, elites capture is more pronounced. Apart from being the embodiment of moral and political authority, these elites remain the only ones that can effectively communicate with outsiders.

*(iv)   **Abuse of Community Committee***

Within the community, cultural forces often shape collective action by providing conventions or norms. These conventions and norms help to engender trust and social capital. Such attribute enhances the possibility of collective action in community development. It could reduce the impact of heterogeneity on community members. According to Rao (20003), people who belong to the community abide by the rules of the community as a result of internalizing its norms and convention and the fear of sanction if they violate them. In communities where Community Development Committees are organized around existing structures of authority, such constraining conventions and norms are often used by authority figures to push community members to projects other than those for community development. In her seminar work, Cornwall (2006) observed that where community members lack ability to mobilize information and are too docile to question their leaders' decision, they may as well not be able to demand accountability. Committees' forms with the objective of community development may be used to pursue personal, cultural and political ends of the leaders.

Example of misuse and abuse of community development committees abound in the Nigeria Delta Region. The Ilaeya Youth Development Committee (IYDC) in Ondo State was formed with the objective of youth empowerment. It was a platform for the selection of Ilaeya indigenes for skills acquisition training programmes promised by OMPADEC. It was equally a platform for the selection of poverty alleviation programme beneficiaries and youth employment. Several youth registered as members. In their work, Adebayo, Ojo and Omatseye (2005) examined the relationship between youth membership in IYDC and participation in the Ilaeye-Ogbe Ijaw communal war. They concluded that the leadership of IYDC had brainwashed the youths to participate in the war and that the real cause of the war was not disclosed to them. When the participation variable was interacted with project benefit, the effect was weak. Under Focus Group Discussion (PGD), respondents reported that youths who did not participate in the war benefited more than those who participated in the empowerment projects of IYDC.

According to the Social capital theory inability of community leaders to form weak ties across communal boundaries, lead to formation of closed parochial networks, which rather than promote development, are associated with fragmentation and communal violence. Since social capital is embedded with structures of power, it can be used to facilitate action for the common good of community members, or to perpetuate symbolic or actual violence against others. The rich may have better internal and external network than the poor and may use these networks to reproduce unequal systems of domination (Meagher, 2005).

The NKA Mkparawa of Ikot Offiong (Youth Association of that Offiong) of Western Calabar, share similar fate with IYDC. Formed for the purpose of youth

138

empowerment, the socio-demographic characteristic of members was marked different from that of its leadership. Very few members were literate (have ability to read and write) and majority of them were fishermen, farmers or motorcyclists. The leadership was dominated by political elites who were either serving local government councilors or ex-councilors. Despite the developmental needs that confronted the community, and the objective of the Association designed to accomplish them, the Association could not draw a proposal to attract development. The objectives of the leadership and members were different. For the leaders empowerment and development could only come to the community if they were able to settle an age long feud with its neighbouring community, Oku Iboku. The Association became an effective platform for the execution of the communal war. The consequences, which include internal displacement, permanent disability etc have kept many of the youths with the dream of empowerment yearning for fulfillment.

Transforming Community Development Committees

The Niger Delta Development Commission's commitment to develop the Niger Delta Region has refocused interest in the formation of Community Development committees and is urging community leaders to organize CDCs. Community organizing is important when the solution must be community – driven and community-wide, or when systematic barriers such as lack of resources must be overcome. Despite availability of a unique combination of assets in the community that could be employed for the realization of the objective of community driven development analysis of CDCs outcome reveals performance failures. A result oriented CDCs would require far reaching changes involving capacity building and leadership training that could close the gap between rhetoric and field reality.

For effective community development, a deliberate process is needed. A process that could engage CDCs leadership on acquisition of leadership skills. Different theorists tend to place different emphasizes on leadership qualities and skills. A leader is approachable, supportive and flexible, and is concerned with the welfare of the followers. Such leadership tends to produce group harmony and cohesion (Blunt & Jones, 1992) and could build bonds and bridges across cleavages not only for cross-fertilization of ideas, but also for peaceful co-existence.

Equally, greater attention needs to be paid to the terms on which people engage in community initiatives. Enlightenment programmes for community member is crucial for informed choice; it would enable free flow of information and enhance community members to ask questions; and in so doing gain sufficient awareness and knowledge about the community projects.

Practices that boarder on capture by non-target group and miss-use of CDCs by community leaders leave very little good example for community members to emulate. The key to community development through CDCs is the extent to which participants/community members have decision-making powers. Such powers would enable them to monitor how the leaders run the affairs of the committee and be able to hold them acceptable. It could generate impressive impact in the country when campaign against corruption starts at the community level and such transparency struggle can promote the principle of democracy and refashion peoples' sense of their rights as citizen.

When people developed the compatibilities to advocate for their entitlements from these who are charged with service provision, they will be able to participate more actively in designing and implementing community development. This will promote project sustainability and empowerment.

Enabling poor community members and the excluded to benefit from the CDCs requires an active recognition of the relations of power involves at community level. This is currently lacking in the NDDC strategies. Attempts to engage or cultivate representative community leaders may selectively or subconsciously ignore or subvert the natural community organization as found elsewhere (Alwisky, 1989). The option remains the sensitization/education of community members. It could help to build confidence and enhances the capabilities to exercise voice. Ability to voice diversity in opinion is important for community development. It could provide checks and balances needed in accountability.

Conclusion

When "community participation" in community development was first coined in the 1970s, social and political participation were seen as separate in development discourses. While social participation had to do with projects, political participation was tied to representation through elections and legislative apparatus. Increased advocacy for democracy and decentralization of governance which greeted the decades of 80s and 90s subjected development to both social and political influences. Social and political participation become fused. It exerted great influence on developmental design, implementations and outcomes. This work examines the outcomes of community development committees' initiatives in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria, against the background of a renewed plan, by the NDDC to encourage the formation of CDCs in the region for the purpose of stimulating development.

We reviewed the performances of some CDCs in the NDRN and outlined causes of performance failure to include poor leadership, poor project sustainability, risk of capture, and abuse of community development committees. The important of laying foundation that could guard against this failure is emphasized in the recommendation. Beyond community development, we argue that effectiveness and efficiency at CDCs level could stimulate transparency and become a boost to the campaign against corruption in the country.

References

Abraham, A. & Platteau, J. (2004). Participatory Development: When culture creeps. In V. Rao & M. Walton (eds). Culture and public action: A cross – Disciplinary Dialogue on Development Policy. Palo Alto, Calif; Standford University Press.

Adebayo, A., Ojo, N. & Omatseye, P. (2005). Youth Violence and Communal Destruction: A focus on Empowerment Programme Failure. *Journal of Development and Social Issues* 3 (3): 15-39.

Ahebe, R. (2009). The Politics of Funding Development in the Niger Delta Regions. *Tell International XIV:* pp. 7, 9-10.

Alinsky, S. (1989). *Rules for Radicals: A Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Radicals.* New York: Vintage Books.

Blunt, P. & Jones M. L (1992). *Managing Organizations in Africa.* New York: Walter de Gruyer

Chambers, R. (1983). *Rural Development: Putting the First Last.* London: Longman.

Charles, J. O. (2005). *Ethnography of African Societies:* Sub-Saharan Region. Lagos: Security Press.

Chukuma, O. (1998). *The 10ᵗʰ Anniversary of Mbaitoli Town Union.* Owerri: Pascal Press.

Cleaver, F (1999). Paradox of Participation: A Critique of Participatory Approaches to Development. *Journal of International Development* 11 (4): 597-612.

Coleman, J. S. (2000). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. In P. Dasgupta and I. Serageldin (eds). *Social Capital: A Multifaceted Perspective.* (pp. 11-39). Washington D.C. World Bank.

Cornwall, A. (2006) Beneficiary, Consumer, Citizen: Perspective on Participation for Poverty Reduction. *Sidastuden No. 2*

Estrella, M. & Gaventa, B. J. (2006). *Learning from Change: Issues and Experiences in Participatory Monitoring and Evolution.* London: Intermediate Technology.

Ferguson, C. (1997). *Global Social Policy Principle: Human Rights and Social Justice*. London: DFID.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London: Penguin.

Gaventa, J. & Valderrama. C. (1999). Participation, Citizenship and Local Governance. Background Note for Workshop on "Strengthening Participation in Local Governance. *Brighton June, 21-24.*

Hellriegel, D., Slocum, J. W. & Woodman, R. W. (1989). *Organizational Behaviour.* New York: West Publishers.

Kretzmann, J. P. & Mcknight, J. I. (1993). *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A path toward funding and mobilizing a community's asset*. Chicago Acta.

Mansuri, G. & Roa, V. (2004). Community – Based and Community – Driven Development. *A Critical Review. Research Observers* 19 (1); 1-39.

Mba, U. (1996). Rural People and Rural Development in P. Z. Onusie & K. Mande (eds) *Rural Development in Eastern Nigeria.* (pp. 62-95). Owarri: Century Press.

Meagher, K. (2004). Identify Economics: Informal Manufacturing and Social Network in South Eastern Nigeria. Unpublished D. Phil Thesis. University of Oxford.

Minkler, M. (2005). *Community Organizing and Community Building 2ⁿᵈ ed.* San Francisco: Jossy Bass.

Montgomery, M. R., Stren, R., Cohen, B. & Reed, H. E. (2003). *Cities Transformed: Demographic Change and its Implication in the Developing World.* London: Earthscan.

Mullins, L. J. (1989). *Management and Organizational Behaviour (2ⁿᵈ ed)*. London: Pitman.

Mvelle, P. (1990). Fishing for Live in Andoni. In E. Ezeruwa & L. Kandho (eds). *Empowerment Programmes Benefits in the Riverine Areas* (pp. 20-47) Port-Harcourt: Benz Publishers

Narayan, D. (2002). *Empowerment and Poverty Reduction*: A sourcebook.

Njoku, O. (2003). The Failures of Leadership in Community Development. In E. Ezeruwa & L. Kandho (eds). *Empowerment Programme Benefits in Riverine Areas* (pp. 27-52). Port-Harcourt. Benz Publishers.

Oakley, P. (1995). *Peoples Participation in Development Projects INTRAC Occasional Papers Series* T. Oxford: INTRAC.

Putman, R. D. (2000). *Making Democracy Work: Civil Traditional in MODERN ITALY, Princetunm*. N. J. Princeton University Press.

Ribot J. (1996). Participation without Representation: Chief Council and Forestry Law in the West African *Sahel Cultural Survival Quarterly,* 20 (3): 40-44.

Robert, B. (2002). Informal Economy and Family Strategies. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research,* 18, 6-23

Schady, N. R. (2002). *The Positive effect of Macroeconomic Crisis on the Schooling and Employment Decisions of Children in a Middle Income Country.* Washington D. C.: World Bank.

Schaefer, R. R. (2004). Overview. *World Development* 39 (3): 1990-2110.

Stigbitz. J. E. (2000). Formal and Informal Institutions. In P. Dasgupta and I. Serageldin (eds). *Social Capital. A Multifaceted Perspective* (pp. 59-68). Washington DC: World Bank.

Suk-young, A. (1999). Strategies for Community Management. *Society and Governance 3* (2): 130-181).

Waldinges, R. D. (1995). The other-side of Embeddenesss: A case study of the Interplay of Economy and Ethnicity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 18, 55-80

Woodcock, M. J. V & Narayan, D. (2000). Social Capital: Implication for development Theory, research and policy. *World Bank Research Observer,* 15,225-49.