2026 Volume: 02 Issue: 08 www.ijrpa.com ISSN 2456-9995 Research Article

International Journal Research Publication Analysis

Page: 01-19

COMMUNITY RESISTANCE AND RESOURCE MOBILISATION CHALLENGES IN COMMUNITY-DRIVEN DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES IN EBONYI STATE, NIGERIA

Ngozi Chijioke*[1] & Dr. Yves-Mary V. Obi[2]

[1]General Studies Department, Federal College of Agriculture, Ishiagu, Ebonyi State.

[2]Department of Public Administration, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam Campus, Anambra State, Nigeria

Article Received: 11 July 2026
Article Revised: 31 July 2026
Published on: 20 August 2026

***Corresponding Author: Ngozi Chijioke**
General Studies Department, Federal College of Agriculture, Ishiagu, Ebonyi State.

DOI: https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijrpa.2186

ABSTRACT

This study examined community resistance to development projects and the challenges traditional leaders face in mobilising financial and material resources for Community-Driven Development (CDD) initiatives in Ebonyi State, Nigeria, between 2015 and 2023. The study responded to concerns that CDD projects may be delayed or weakened when communities resist interventions or when local institutions lack adequate resources. A descriptive survey design was adopted. The population of the selected six Local Government Areas was 1,192,105, and the Taro Yamane formula produced a sample size of 400. Four hundred questionnaires were distributed, while 396 valid copies were returned, representing a 99% response rate. Data were collected through a five-point Likert questionnaire and analysed using frequencies, percentages and simple linear regression. The results showed that 40.5% of respondents strongly agreed and 36.5% agreed that community resistance affects CDD implementation, while 21.6% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Regression analysis produced an extremely strong relationship between community resistance and the measured CDD outcome ($R = .999$; $R^2 = .998$; $B = .953$; $t = 206.21$; $p < .001$; $F = 42,519.51$). The results on resource mobilisation showed that 43.9% strongly agreed and 38.4% agreed that traditional leaders face financial, institutional and coordination constraints. Regression analysis showed $R = .8045$, $R^2 = .6473$ and $B = .8947$, but $p = .1007$. Thus, the community-resistance model was statistically significant, while the resource-mobilisation model was not significant at $\alpha =$

.05. The study concludes that community attitudes are central to CDD outcomes and resource constraints remain major practical challenges.

INTRODUCTION

Community-Driven Development (CDD) emerged from dissatisfaction with development approaches in which decisions were predominantly made by central authorities with limited participation by the people expected to benefit. The CDD model places greater emphasis on local knowledge, community decision-making, ownership and collective responsibility. The World Bank (2009) explains that CDD transfers elements of control over planning decisions and investment funds to local groups, while Elekwa and Eme (2013) emphasise community responsibility for identifying needs and organising interventions. The model therefore assumes that development outcomes improve when people participate meaningfully in decisions affecting their communities. The success of CDD, however, depends on more than project design. Community acceptance is particularly important because local people are expected to contribute ideas, labour, funds, land, monitoring and maintenance. Where a project is regarded as externally imposed, poorly communicated or inconsistent with community priorities, resistance may emerge. Such resistance can delay implementation, reduce participation, increase conflict and weaken sustainability. Salleh (2016) found that inadequate community involvement hindered sustainable infrastructure development in the Niger Delta, while Ukah (2017) stressed awareness and mobilisation as conditions for ownership and long-term project success. Barron et al. (2024) similarly argue that effective CDD depends on programme design and local context.

Traditional leaders are important in this environment because they possess cultural legitimacy, local knowledge and established communication networks. They may mobilise community members, mediate disputes, provide access to land, organise contributions and link local communities to government agencies and development partners. Umezulike and Mbara (2021) associate traditional leadership with community mobilisation and conflict management, while Honig (2019) describes traditional leaders as intermediaries between communities and the state. In Ebonyi State, traditional leaders and town unions have historically contributed to local development, particularly in infrastructure and community projects. Otu et al. (2024) found that town unions contributed to rural road development in Ndiabor Ishieke, while Ezeali et al. (2018) reported positive community-driven development outcomes through the Ebonyi State Community and Social Development Agency.

Despite this potential, traditional leaders face serious resource constraints. Financial resources are required to mobilise people, provide counterpart contributions, support project monitoring and sustain community facilities. Material resources such as equipment, building materials, transportation and technical inputs are equally important. Tonwe and Osemwota (2013) identify inadequate budgetary support as a constraint on traditional institutions, while Igbokwe-Ibeto and Ogbuagu (2021) note that material and financial limitations weaken traditional leaders' ability to perform community functions. Ugochukwu (2016) similarly identifies lack of funds, weak leadership and inadequate mobilisation strategies as challenges to community development.

The Ebonyi State context is particularly significant because the 2015–2023 period coincided with major infrastructural and economic development under Governor Dave Umahi. The period created numerous opportunities for community projects but also required coordination among traditional institutions, communities and formal government structures. The source study identifies gaps in research on how community resistance and resource mobilisation challenges affect CDD outcomes in Ebonyi State. This article addresses those gaps by focusing on two issues: the effect of community resistance on the success and sustainability of CDD initiatives and the challenges faced by traditional leaders in mobilising financial and material resources. The study consequently treats resistance and resource mobilisation as governance issues rather than merely operational problems. This perspective places emphasis on the relationships among community members, traditional institutions and formal public authorities. In practical terms, a project that has adequate funding may still fail if beneficiaries do not accept it, while a highly supported project may remain incomplete when funds and materials are unavailable. Examining both conditions together therefore provides a fuller explanation of CDD performance in the study area.

Objectives

1. To ascertain the effect of community resistance to development projects on the success and sustainability of Community-Driven Development initiatives in Ebonyi State.
2. To assess the challenges faced by traditional leaders in mobilizing financial and material resources for Community-Driven Development projects in Ebonyi State between 2015 and 2023.

Hypotheses

1. H_0: Community resistance to development projects does not affect the success and sustainability of Community-Driven Development initiatives in Ebonyi State.
2. H_0: Traditional leaders do not face challenges in mobilizing financial and material resources for Community-Driven Development projects in Ebonyi State between 2015 and 2023.

Literature Review

Concept of Community Resistance

Community resistance refers to opposition, reluctance or unwillingness among community members to accept, participate in or support development interventions. In CDD, resistance can arise from inadequate consultation, distrust, fear of adverse effects, disagreements over project location or benefits, political differences, previous experiences of failed projects and perceptions that decisions were imposed from outside. The questionnaire used in the source study measured resistance through delays in project initiation, obstruction of implementation, opposition caused by lack of consultation, reduced likelihood of project completion and difficulty faced by traditional leaders in overcoming resistance.

Participatory development literature indicates that resistance is closely connected to the quality of participation. The source document's Participatory Development Theory emphasises dialogue, empowerment, shared decision-making and ownership. When communities are not involved in identifying needs and designing projects, the social basis for acceptance may be weak. Boadu and Ile (2024) show that indigenous evaluation approaches based on participation and relational feedback can improve inclusivity and sustainability. Ara et al. (2024) similarly found that top-down bureaucratic decision-making, nepotism and weak inclusive decentralisation can limit meaningful community participation.

Concept of Resource Mobilisation

Resource mobilisation involves identifying, generating, coordinating and applying financial, material, human and other resources required for development. Traditional leaders may mobilise community labour, land, donations, local contributions, external assistance and support from government or development partners. Shillah (2016) describes community mobilisation as a process through which traditional leaders mobilise material and non-material resources, including labour, finance and expertise. Ugochukwu (2016) identifies financial assistance and manual labour as major forms of community participation but also

reports inadequate funds and weak mobilisation strategies as important challenges. Resource mobilisation in CDD is important because projects require resources throughout their life cycle. Funding is needed for construction, procurement, supervision and maintenance. Material shortages can delay implementation and reduce quality. Weak coordination between traditional institutions and government agencies may also prevent access to external support. Abdullahi and Mahmud (2023) identify inadequate funding, weak organisational structures and lack of committed leadership as resource mobilisation challenges. Ezeali et al. (2018) also emphasise the importance of funding, transparency and participation for CDD programmes in Ebonyi State.

Empirical Literature

Ezeali, Uwadi and Nwaowu (2018) examined the activities of the Ebonyi State Community and Social Development Agency using 400 respondents. They found that the community-driven approach helped provide local services and infrastructure but required greater funding, transparency and participation. The study is relevant because it demonstrates that the effectiveness of community development in Ebonyi is partly dependent on institutional and resource conditions.

Salleh (2016) investigated CDD and sustainable infrastructure in the Niger Delta using 300 respondents. The study found that inadequate community involvement in project design and implementation weakened project sustainability. This supports the present study's focus on resistance and community acceptance.

Ugochukwu (2016) studied mobilisation strategies for community development in Igbo-Etiti Local Government Area of Enugu State using a descriptive survey of 370 community-based organisation leaders. Financial assistance and manual labour were identified as major forms of participation, while lack of funds, poor leadership, weak mobilisation strategies and embezzlement were reported as challenges. The study recommended involving people throughout the development process and strengthening community organisations.

Bappi, Singh and Dahiru (2017) examined community development under the Gombe State Agency for Community and Social Development Project. Their findings showed progress in micro-project delivery and improved infrastructure services but identified the need for awareness, sensitisation, inclusion and stronger maintenance. The study demonstrates that project success depends on continuing community engagement beyond construction.

Fritzen (2007) examined the risk of elite capture in CDD projects in Indonesia. The study found that elite capture can occur but can be reduced through accountability mechanisms. Its relevance to the present study lies in the need for transparent decision-making and mechanisms that ensure local participation rather than allowing powerful actors to dominate project choices.

Barron et al. (2024) reviewed conditions for effective CDD and concluded that programme design and local context affect cohesion, inclusion and resilience. Their work reinforces the argument that community response is not peripheral but central to project performance.

Otu et al. (2024) examined town unions and rural development in Ndiabor Ishieke Development Union, Ebonyi State, using 320 respondents. The study found that town unions contributed to rural road development and recommended periodic government subventions and support for rural economic activities. This evidence highlights both the capacity of local institutions and their need for external support.

Agbam and Elenwa (2021) examined traditional leadership activities in Omuma Local Government Area and found positive contributions to human and infrastructural development. Their study suggests that traditional leaders can mobilise local people, but the quality of leadership affects outcomes.

Adoo, Bem and Tasie (2025) examined traditional rulers and community development in Benue North-West and reported the importance of traditional leadership in mobilising community resources for sanitation and other local initiatives. Emmanuel (2025) further showed that traditional rulers can support reconciliation and resource-sharing in post-conflict communities. These studies reinforce the importance of trust and social networks in mobilising collective action.

Literature Gap

The reviewed studies demonstrate that community participation, resource mobilisation and traditional leadership are important to development outcomes. However, few studies simultaneously examine community resistance and resource mobilisation challenges in relation to CDD initiatives in Ebonyi State during the 2015–2023 period. The source document also identifies limited research on the specific interaction between traditional

leaders, community attitudes and formal government structures in Ebonyi. The present study therefore contributes context-specific empirical evidence.

Theoretical Framework: Participatory Development Theory

Participatory Development Theory, associated in the source document with Paulo Freire around 1970, provides the theoretical foundation. The theory holds that development should involve the people affected by development decisions. Participation allows communities to express needs, contribute ideas, make decisions and take part in implementation. Empowerment gives communities greater capacity to manage development processes, while dialogue creates communication between leaders and community members. Accountability and transparency build trust, and sustainability requires communities to maintain projects beyond external intervention. The theory directly explains community resistance because exclusion or poor communication can undermine ownership. It also explains resource mobilisation because meaningful participation can encourage communities to contribute labour, funds and materials while connecting them to external resources. Traditional leaders can act as facilitators of this process, but they must operate through inclusive and transparent mechanisms. Thus, the theory provides a coherent framework for examining both community resistance and resource mobilisation challenges.

RESEARCH METHOD

The study used a descriptive survey design and was conducted in Ebonyi State, South-East Nigeria. The study focused on six LGAs selected from Ebonyi North, Ebonyi Central and Ebonyi South: Abakaliki, Izzi, Ezza North, Ikwo, Afikpo North and Ivo. The population of the selected LGAs was 1,192,105 based on the 2025 projected population figures reported in the source document.

The sample size was determined with Taro Yamane's formula:

$n = N / [1 + N(e^2)]$

$n = 1,192,105 / [1 + 1,192,105(0.05^2)]$

$n = 1,192,105 / 2,981.2625 = 399.89 \approx 400.$

The sample was proportionately allocated to Abakaliki (71), Izzi (77), Ezza North (70), Ikwo (73), Afikpo North (51) and Ivo (58). Stratified, purposive and simple random sampling were combined. Four hundred questionnaires were administered and 396 valid copies were returned, producing a 99% response rate. The instrument was a structured five-point Likert

questionnaire covering community resistance, CDD success and sustainability, resource mobilisation challenges and project implementation. Respondents included traditional rulers, town-union leaders, youth and women leaders, community members and relevant stakeholders. Validity was established through expert review. Test-retest reliability was conducted with 30 respondents outside the main sample, producing coefficients of .921, .900 and .975 and an average coefficient of .932.

Frequencies and percentages were used for descriptive analysis. Simple linear regression was applied to test the two hypotheses at $\alpha = .05$. The model was $Y = \beta0 + \beta1X + \varepsilon$. A p-value of .05 or less was treated as statistically significant, while a p-value greater than .05 required non-rejection of the null hypothesis. The analysis was restricted to the third and fourth objectives so that the article could provide focused evidence on community resistance and financial/material resource mobilisation. The selected respondents were drawn from communities directly exposed to local development activities. The study therefore combined descriptive evidence on the prevalence of the problems with regression evidence on their statistical relationships with CDD outcomes. This approach was consistent with the objectives and the hypotheses contained in the source study. The field procedure also incorporated informed consent, confidentiality and voluntary participation, as reported in the source methodology. Respondents who needed clarification were assisted without influencing their answers. These procedures supported the ethical and practical quality of the survey.

Table 1. Population and Sample Allocation.

LGA	Population	Allocated Sample
Abakaliki	210,941	71
Izzi	229,241	77
Ezza North	207,781	70
Ikwo	219,031	73
Afikpo North	152,728	51
Ivo	172,383	58
Total	1,192,105	400

Table 2. Key Study Calculations.

Statistic	Calculation	Result
Taro Yamane	$1{,}192{,}105 / [1 + 1{,}192{,}105(0.05^2)]$	$399.89 \approx 400$
Returned questionnaires	$396 / 400 \times 100$	99%
Reliability average	$(.921 + .900 + .975) / 3$	.932

Table 3. Community Resistance.

Response	Average (%)
Strongly Agree	40.5
Agree	36.5
Undecided	1.4
Disagree	11.1
Strongly Disagree	10.5

Table 4. Simple Regression: Community Resistance → CDD Outcome.

Statistic	Value
R	.999
R Square	.998
Adjusted R Square	.998
Standard Error	.032
F-value	42,519.51
p-value	<.001
B	.953
t	206.21

Table 5. Resource Mobilisation Challenges.

Response	Average (%)
Strongly Agree	43.9
Agree	38.4
Undecided	1.8
Disagree	10.7
Strongly Disagree	6.8

Table 6. Simple Regression: Resource Challenges → Mobilisation Difficulties.

Statistic	Value
R	.8045
R Square	.6473
Standard Error	.0149
F-value	5.5048
p-value	.1007
B	.8947
t	2.3462
95% CI	−.3189 to 2.1084

Table 7. Test–Retest Reliability.

Reliability Test	r	Level
Research Question 1	.921	Very High
Research Question 2	.900	Very High
Research Question 3	.975	Very High
Average	.932	Very High

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis used frequencies and percentages to describe questionnaire responses and simple linear regression to test the hypotheses. Percentage was calculated as: Percentage = (Frequency/396) × 100. The item-level tables retain the exact statements and response distributions reported in the study.

Table 1: Community Resistance to Development Projects

Table 1 shows that 40.5% strongly agreed and 36.5% agreed on average that community resistance affects CDD implementation and sustainability. The combined positive response was 77.0%, compared with 21.5% negative and 1.4% undecided. Source: Field Survey, 2026.

Table 2: Financial and Material Resource Mobilisation Challenges

Table 2 indicates that 43.9% strongly agreed, 36.9% agreed, 1.8% were undecided, 10.5% disagreed and 6.8% strongly disagreed. Therefore, 80.8% recognized resource-mobilisation constraints or the importance of adequate resources to CDD outcomes. Source: Field Survey, 2026.

Hypothesis One: Community resistance to development projects does not affect the success and sustainability of CDD initiatives in Ebonyi State.

Table 3: Regression Model Summary for Community Resistance

Calculation: $R^2 = 0.999^2 \approx 0.998$ (99.8%). Since $p < .05$, the null hypothesis is rejected according to the stated decision rule.

Table 4: ANOVA for Community Resistance

Table 5: Coefficients for Community Resistance

Hypothesis Two: Traditional leaders do not face challenges in mobilizing financial and material resources for CDD projects in Ebonyi State between 2015 and 2023.

Table 6: Regression Model Summary for Resource Mobilisation Challenges

Calculation: $R^2 = 0.8045^2 = 0.6473$ (64.73%). The positive coefficient indicates an increasing association, but $p = 0.1007 > .05$, so the reported effect is not statistically significant at the 5% level.

Table 7: ANOVA for Resource Mobilisation Challenges

Table 8: Coefficients for Resource Mobilisation Challenges.

Model	**B**	**Std. Error**	**t**	**p**	**95% CI**
Constant	0.4289	1.5468	0.2773	0.7995	-4.4936 to 5.3515
Challenges	0.8947	0.3814	2.3462	0.1007	-0.3189 to 2.1084
Source	**df**	**SS**	**MS**	**F**	**p**
Regression	1	0.0012	0.0012	5.5048	0.1007
Residual	3	0.0007	0.0002		
Total	4	0.0019			
Statistic			**Value**		
Regression equation			Y = 0.4289 + 0.8947X		
R			0.8045		
R^2			0.6473		
Standard Error			0.0149		
F-value			5.5048		
p-value			0.1007		
Model	**B**	**Std. Error**	**Beta**	**t**	**Sig.**
Constant	0.215	0.161		1.335	0.274
Community resistance	0.953	0.005	0.999	206.21	0.000
Source	**SS**	**df**	**MS**	**F**	**Sig.**
Regression	43.56	1	43.56	42,519.51	0.000
Residual	0.003	3	0.001		
Total	43.563	4			
Statistic			**Value**		
R			0.999		
R^2			0.998		
Adjusted R^2			0.998		
Standard Error			0.032		
F-value			42,519.51		
p-value			0.000		

S/N	**Item description**	**SA n (%)**	**A n (%)**	**UN n (%)**	**D n (%)**	**SD n (%)**	**Total**
1	Traditional leaders face significant financial constraints when mobilizing funds for CDD projects.	173 (43.7%)	149 (37.6%)	7 (1.8%)	41 (10.4%)	26 (6.6%)	396
2	Inadequate	161	158	5	44	28	396

Model		B		Std. Error	t	p		95% CI
	government support limits traditional leaders' ability to mobilize resources for CDD initiatives.	(40.7%)	(39.9%)	(1.3%)	(11.1%)	(7.1%)		
3	Lack of access to external donors and development partners hinders effective resource mobilization.	187 (47.2%)	132 (33.3%)	9 (2.3%)	39 (9.8%)	29 (7.3%)		396
4	Community members' low economic capacity affects the availability of local contributions for CDD projects.	169 (42.7%)	152 (38.4%)	6 (1.5%)	47 (11.9%)	22 (5.6%)		396
5	Poor coordination between traditional leaders and formal government institutions creates resource mobilization challenges.	180 (45.5%)	140 (35.4%)	8 (2.0%)	38 (9.6%)	30 (7.6%)		396
6	Resource constraints negatively affect the timely completion of CDD projects.	173 (43.7%)	149 (37.6%)	7 (1.8%)	40 (10.1%)	27 (6.8%)		396
7	Limited financial resources reduce the quality of CDD projects in the community.	161 (40.7%)	158 (39.9%)	6 (1.5%)	44 (11.1%)	27 (6.8%)		396
8	Inadequate material resources hinder the sustainability of CDD initiatives.	187 (47.2%)	132 (33.3%)	9 (2.3%)	38 (9.6%)	30 (7.6%)		396
9	Effective mobilization of resources improves the	169 (42.7%)	152 (38.4%)	7 (1.8%)	47 (11.9%)	21 (5.3%)		396

Model		B	Std. Error	t	p		95% CI
	success rate of CDD projects.						
10	Communities with adequate resource mobilization experience better development outcomes.	180 (45.5%)	140 (35.4%)	8 (2.0%)	37 (9.3%)	31 (7.8%)	396
S/N	**Item description**	**SA n (%)**	**A n (%)**	**UN n (%)**	**D n (%)**	**SD n (%)**	**Total**
1	Community resistance delays the initiation of CDD projects led by traditional leaders.	155 (39.1%)	148 (37.4%)	6 (1.5%)	43 (10.9%)	44 (11.1%)	396
2	Resistance from community members hinders the smooth implementation of CDD projects.	162 (40.9%)	142 (35.9%)	5 (1.3%)	46 (11.6%)	41 (10.4%)	396
3	Community members often oppose CDD initiatives due to concerns about project impacts or lack of consultation.	168 (42.4%)	137 (34.6%)	7 (1.8%)	42 (10.6%)	42 (10.6%)	396
4	Strong community resistance reduces the likelihood of CDD project completion.	160 (40.4%)	145 (36.6%)	6 (1.5%)	45 (11.4%)	40 (10.1%)	396
5	Traditional leaders face significant challenges in overcoming community resistance to development projects.	158 (39.9%)	150 (37.9%)	5 (1.3%)	44 (11.1%)	39 (9.8%)	396
6	High levels of community resistance negatively affect the overall success	155 (39.1%)	148 (37.4%)	6 (1.5%)	43 (10.9%)	44 (11.1%)	396

Model	B	Std. Error	t	p	95% CI
	of CDD initiatives led by traditional leaders.				
7	CDD projects with strong community support are more likely to achieve success and sustainability.	162 (40.9%)	142 (35.9%)	5 (1.3%)	46 (11.6%)	41 (10.4%)	396
8	The ability to overcome community resistance is critical to the success of CDD projects.	167 (42.2%)	137 (34.6%)	7 (1.8%)	44 (11.1%)	41 (10.4%)	396
9	Strong participation of community members enhances the long-term sustainability of CDD projects.	160 (40.4%)	145 (36.6%)	5 (1.3%)	44 (11.1%)	42 (11.4%)	396
10	Community resistance can prevent CDD projects from achieving lasting impact in the community.	156 (39.4%)	153 (38.6%)	5 (1.3%)	43 (10.9%)	39 (9.8%)	396

The descriptive results indicate that community resistance is a substantial issue in CDD implementation. The source data show that 40.5% of respondents strongly agreed and 36.5% agreed that resistance affects CDD projects. Only 1.4% were undecided, while 11.1% disagreed and 10.5% strongly disagreed. The combined agreement of 77.0% indicates that most respondents considered community resistance an important factor. The individual questionnaire items similarly show that resistance can delay project initiation, hinder implementation, reduce the likelihood of completion and make it difficult for traditional leaders to maintain community support.

The regression model for community resistance was exceptionally strong. R was .999 and R^2 was .998, meaning that the predictor was associated with 99.8% of the variance in the measured CDD outcome. The coefficient B was .953 with a standard error of .005, while t =

206.21 and $p < .001$. The ANOVA result was $F(1,3) = 42,519.51$, $p < .001$. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected. The result provides strong evidence that community resistance significantly affects the success and sustainability of CDD initiatives.

The direction of the coefficient requires careful interpretation. Because the source instrument measured resistance and CDD outcomes in related sets of statements, the positive coefficient indicates a strong statistical association between the measured resistance construct and the measured outcome. It should not be read simplistically as meaning that resistance improves CDD. The substantive discussion in the source document states that higher resistance undermines project effectiveness and that mitigating resistance is essential. The result is consistent with Participatory Development Theory because projects with stronger dialogue, consultation and ownership are more likely to obtain community support.

The resource-mobilisation results also show substantial practical constraints. On average, 43.9% strongly agreed and 38.4% agreed that traditional leaders face financial, government-support, donor-access, community-contribution and coordination challenges. Only 1.8% were undecided, while 10.7% disagreed and 6.8% strongly disagreed. The most prominent issues include financial constraints, inadequate government support, lack of external donors and development partners, low community economic capacity and poor coordination with formal government institutions.

The regression analysis for resource mobilisation produced $R = .8045$ and $R^2 = .6473$, indicating a strong positive association and approximately 64.73% explained variance. $B = .8947$ and $t = 2.3462$, but $p = .1007$. The p-value is above .05, so the null hypothesis is not rejected statistically. Nevertheless, the magnitude of R^2 and the descriptive findings indicate substantial practical resource constraints. This distinction is important for policy because a non-significant test in the available model does not mean that the resource problem is absent. Rather, the evidence indicates a strong observed relationship that does not meet the conventional statistical significance threshold in the source analysis.

The findings agree with Ugochukwu (2016) and Abdullahi and Mahmud (2023), who identified inadequate funds, weak organisation and poor mobilisation structures as barriers to community development. They also support Ezeali et al. (2018), who stressed funding and transparency in Ebonyi CDD programmes.

CONCLUSION

The study examined community resistance and resource mobilisation challenges affecting CDD initiatives in Ebonyi State between 2015 and 2023. The findings establish that community attitudes are central to the implementation and sustainability of local development projects. Most respondents agreed that resistance can delay projects, obstruct implementation and weaken completion and sustainability. The regression model produced an exceptionally strong association ($R = .999$; $R^2 = .998$) and a statistically significant coefficient ($B = .953$; $p < .001$). The null hypothesis was therefore rejected. The study also established that traditional leaders face substantial practical challenges in mobilising financial and material resources. Respondents strongly identified limited funds, inadequate government support, weak donor access, low community contributions and poor coordination as major obstacles. Although the resource-mobilisation regression was strong ($R = .8045$; $R^2 = .6473$; $B = .8947$), its p-value of .1007 exceeded .05, requiring non-rejection of the null hypothesis under the stated decision rule. The statistical result should therefore be distinguished from the descriptive evidence of serious practical constraints.

CDD effectiveness depends on social acceptance and resource availability. Traditional leaders can help bridge communities and formal institutions, but they require inclusive participation mechanisms and stronger financial and institutional partnerships. Participatory Development Theory reinforces the conclusion that consultation, dialogue, empowerment, accountability and shared ownership are necessary for sustainable community development. The evidence suggests that resistance should be addressed before and during project implementation, while resource mobilisation should be strengthened through coordinated government, community and development-partner support.

Recommendations

1. Traditional leaders should undertake early consultation, sensitisation and participatory needs assessment before CDD projects are commenced.
2. Community members should be involved in project identification, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation to reduce resistance and strengthen ownership

REFERENCES

1. Abdullahi, B., & Mahmud, A. (2023). Resource mobilization and effective utilization for actualizing community development projects in Nigeria. Kashere Journal of Education, 4(1), 123–128. https://doi.org/10.4314/kje.v4i1.15
2. Adoo, H. A., Bem, L. M., & Tasie, O. K. (2025). Traditional rulers and community development in Benue North-West Senatorial District, Benue State, Nigeria. ARCN International Journal of Development, 14(2), 30–49. https://arcnjournals.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/2726-4-573-1-1423-1.pdf
3. Agbam, C., & Elenwa, C. O. (2021). Assessment of the traditional leaderships' activities in community development in Omuma Local Government Area of Rivers State, Nigeria. Journal of Public Administration and Social Welfare Research, 6(1), 57–65. https://iiardjournals.org/get/jpaswr/vol.%206%20no.%201%202021/assessment%20of%20the%20traditional.pdf
4. Barron, P., Fernandes, P., Winkler, S., & Woolcock, M. (2024, July 25). A learning agenda for community-driven development. World Bank. https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099072624122014964/pdf/P180989-b49c8450-1cc4-456e-85eb-540d7cc4422e.pdf
5. Bappi, U., Singh, D., & Dahiru, K. (2017). Issues and challenges of community development in Nigeria: An assessment of Gombe State Agency for Community and Social Development Project (GSA-CSDP). AGU International Journal of Research in Social Sciences & Humanities, 5, 408. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373140091
6. Boadu, E. S., & Ile, I. (2024). Community-based development and indigenous evaluation in Africa: Insights from Ghana. Journal of Contemporary African Studies, 43(1), 87–109. https://doi.org/10.1080/02589001.2024.2414023
7. Ezeali, B. O., Uwadi, M. E., & Nwaowu, C. K. (2018). Activities of Ebonyi State Community and Social Development Agency (EB-CSDA) in the development of Ebonyi State, Nigeria (2009–2014). International Journal of Economic Development Research and Investment, 9(2), 61–79. http://icidr.org/ijedri-vol9no2-august2018/Activities-of-Ebonyi-State-Community-and-Social-Development-Agency-EB-CSDA-in-the-Development-of-Ebonyi-State-Nigeria-2009-2014.pdf
8. Fritzen, S. A. (2007). Can the design of community-driven development reduce the risk of elite capture? Evidence from Indonesia. World Development, 35(8), 1351–1367. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2007.05.001

9. Emmanuel, J. (2025). Examining the roles of traditional rulers in peace building in Northeast Nigeria. International Journal of Education, Culture, and Society, 3(2), 474–488. https://doi.org/10.58578/ijecs.v3i2.5427
10. Holmlund, M., & Rao, V. (2021, October 26). Where and when is community-driven development (CDD) effective? World Bank Blogs. https://blogs.worldbank.org/en/impactevaluations/where-and-when-community-driven-development-cdd-effective
11. Honig, L. (2019). Traditional leaders and development in Africa. In The Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics. Oxford University Press. https://oxfordre.com/politics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-821
12. Igbokwe-Ibeto, C. J., & Ogbuagu, N. E. (2021). Traditional institution and its role in curbing insecurity in Nigeria: Issues and prospects. NAJOPS, 7(1), 1–12. https://najops.org.ng/index.php/najops/article/view/5
13. Otu, E. C., Ngene, I. A., Aja, N., Theophilus, B., Ibemgbo, M., & Obiukwu, C. I. (2024). Town unions and rural development in Ebonyi State: A study of Ndiabor Ishieke Development Union. South East Political Science Review, 9(2), 308–329. https://journals.npsa-se.org.ng/index.php/SEPSR/article/view/228/217
14. Salleh, D. (2016). Community driven development approach: Driving force for sustainable infrastructural development in rural communities. Proceedings of the 13th IASTEM International Conference, 23–27. https://www.academia.edu/81210777/Community_driven_development_approach_driving_force_for_sustainable_infrastructural_development_in_rural_communities
15. Tonwe, D. A., & Osemwota, O. (2013). Traditional rulers and local government in Nigeria: A pathway to resolving the challenge. Commonwealth Journal of Local Governance, 13/14, 128–140. https://doi.org/10.5130/cjlg.v0i13/14.3728
16. Ugochukwu, M. K. (2016). Mobilization strategies for effective community development projects in Igbo-Etiti Local Government Area of Enugu State, Nigeria. Journal of Rural Development, 30(4), 94–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/09718923.2010.11892818
17. Ukah, J. A. (2017). Community mobilization awareness: Strategy for rural development in Nigeria. Open Journal of Social Science Research, 3(4), 12–16. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359109043_Community_Mobilization_Awareness_Strategy_for_Rural_Development_in_Nigeria

18. Umezulike, E., & Mbara, K. U. (2021). Assessment of roles of traditional rulers in community conflict management in Imo State. Journal of Continuing and Development Education. https://journalcde.com/index.php/jcde/index
19. World Bank. (2009). Community-driven development: Delivering the results people need (IDA at work). International Development Association. http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/513351468178137269