FEDPUKA JOURNAL OF SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND CONTEMPORARY STUDIES VOL 1 ISSUE 3, 2025

AN EVALUATION OF FACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR POOR REGIONAL PLANNING IN RURAL COMMUNITIES IN RIVERS STATE

MONDAY ABEL
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING
PORT HARCOURT POLYTECHNIC, RIVERS STATE

Abstract

Regional planning in rural communities of Rivers State, Nigeria, faces significant challenges that impede sustainable development and quality of life improvements. This study evaluates the primary factors contributing to poor regional planning outcomes in these communities through a comprehensive analysis of institutional, socio-economic, and environmental determinants. The research employed a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative surveys with qualitative interviews across selected rural communities in Rivers State. Findings reveal that inadequate funding mechanisms, weak institutional capacity, poor stakeholder engagement, and environmental degradation constitute the most significant barriers to effective regional planning. The study recommends strengthened institutional frameworks, enhanced community participation, improved funding strategies, and integrated environmental management approaches to address these challenges and promote sustainable rural development in Rivers State.

Keywords: ***Regional Planning, Rural Communities, Rivers State, Sustainable Development, Institutional Capacity***

1. Introduction

Regional planning represents a critical component of sustainable development, particularly in rural communities where strategic spatial organization can significantly impact economic growth, social equity, and environmental sustainability (Albrechts, 2004; Healey, 2007). In Nigeria, the importance of effective regional planning has been increasingly recognized as essential for addressing the diverse challenges facing rural communities, including poverty, infrastructure deficits, and environmental degradation (Agbola & Agunbiade, 2009; Olujimi, 2016).

Rivers State, located in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria, presents a unique case study for examining regional planning challenges in rural contexts. The state's economy is predominantly oil-dependent, with significant implications for rural development patterns and planning priorities (Idemudia, 2012; Obi, 2014). Despite substantial oil revenues, many rural communities in Rivers State continue to experience inadequate infrastructure, limited access to basic services, and environmental challenges related to oil exploration activities (Amnesty International, 2017; Ordinioha & Brisibe, 2013).

The theoretical foundation for understanding regional planning effectiveness draws from multiple disciplines, including urban and regional planning theory, development studies, and public administration (Friedmann, 2005; Taylor, 1998). Collaborative planning theory, as articulated by Healey (1997, 2006), emphasizes the importance of inclusive stakeholder

engagement and institutional capacity in achieving successful planning outcomes. Similarly, the sustainable development paradigm provides a framework for evaluating planning effectiveness across economic, social, and environmental dimensions (Brundtland Commission, 1987; UN-Habitat, 2016).

Previous research on regional planning in Nigeria has identified numerous challenges, including weak institutional frameworks, inadequate funding, poor coordination among government agencies, and limited community participation (Agbola & Agunbiade, 2009; Mabogunje, 2007; Olujimi, 2016). However, limited empirical research has specifically examined these factors within the context of Rivers State's rural communities, despite the state's unique socio-economic and environmental characteristics.

International experiences in rural regional planning provide valuable insights for addressing these challenges. Successful rural planning initiatives in countries such as Ireland, South Korea, and Brazil have demonstrated the importance of integrated approaches that combine top-down policy frameworks with bottom-up community engagement (OECD, 2006; Park, 2009; Silva, 2018). These experiences highlight the critical role of institutional capacity, adequate funding mechanisms, and environmental sustainability in achieving effective rural development outcomes.

2. Statement of the Problem

Rural communities in Rivers State face persistent challenges in regional planning that have hindered sustainable development and improved quality of life for residents. Despite Nigeria's constitutional framework that mandates effective planning at all levels of government (Constitution of Nigeria, 1999), rural areas in Rivers State continue to experience inadequate infrastructure development, poor service delivery, and limited economic opportunities (Akpan, 2014; Nwilo & Badejo, 2006).

The Niger Delta region, where Rivers State is located, has been characterized by environmental degradation, social unrest, and inadequate development planning (Amnesty International, 2017; Obi, 2014). Oil exploration activities have resulted in significant environmental challenges, including water pollution, land degradation, and loss of agricultural productivity, which have not been adequately addressed through comprehensive regional planning initiatives (Idemudia, 2012; Ordinioha & Brisibe, 2013).

Furthermore, weak institutional capacity at local government levels has been identified as a significant barrier to effective planning implementation in Rivers State (Akpan, 2014; Olujimi, 2016). Local government areas, which are constitutionally responsible for rural development, often lack the technical expertise, financial resources, and administrative capacity necessary for effective regional planning (Agbola & Agunbiade, 2009; Mabogunje, 2007).

The absence of comprehensive, empirically-based studies examining the specific factors contributing to poor regional planning in Rivers State's rural communities represents a significant knowledge gap. While general studies on Nigerian planning challenges exist (Agbola & Agunbiade, 2009; Olujimi, 2016), there is limited research that specifically addresses the

unique contextual factors affecting rural planning effectiveness in Rivers State. This research gap hinders the development of targeted interventions and policy recommendations for improving regional planning outcomes in these communities.

3. Research Objectives

The primary objectives of this study are:

1. To identify and analyze the key institutional factors that contribute to poor regional planning in rural communities of Rivers State.
2. To examine the socio-economic factors that influence regional planning effectiveness in rural areas of Rivers State.
3. To assess the environmental factors that impact regional planning processes and outcomes in Rivers State's rural communities.

4. Research Questions

Based on the stated objectives, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the primary institutional factors that contribute to poor regional planning outcomes in rural communities of Rivers State?
2. How do socio-economic factors influence the effectiveness of regional planning in rural areas of Rivers State?
3. What environmental factors impact regional planning processes and outcomes in Rivers State's rural communities?

5. Literature Review

5.1 Theoretical Framework

Regional planning theory has evolved significantly over the past several decades, moving from technocratic, top-down approaches to more collaborative, participatory models (Healey, 2006; Allmendinger, 2009). The communicative planning theory, developed by Habermas (1984) and later adapted by planning scholars such as Healey (1997), emphasizes the importance of inclusive dialogue and stakeholder engagement in planning processes.

The sustainable development paradigm has also significantly influenced regional planning theory and practice (Brundtland Commission, 1987; Wheeler, 2004). This approach emphasizes the need to balance economic growth, social equity, and environmental protection in planning decisions (Campbell, 1996; Berke & Conroy, 2000).

5.2 Factors Affecting Regional Planning Effectiveness

5.2.1 Institutional Factors

Institutional capacity represents a critical determinant of regional planning effectiveness (North, 1990; March & Olsen, 1989). Research has consistently demonstrated that weak institutional frameworks, inadequate technical capacity, and poor coordination among government agencies significantly impede planning outcomes (Agbola & Agunbiade, 2009; Healey, 2007).

In the Nigerian context, studies have identified several institutional challenges affecting regional planning effectiveness. These include weak legal frameworks, inadequate funding mechanisms, poor coordination between different levels of government, and limited technical capacity at local levels (Mabogunje, 2007; Olujimi, 2016).

5.2.2 Socio-Economic Factors

Socio-economic factors play a crucial role in determining regional planning effectiveness, particularly in rural contexts (Friedmann, 2005; Sen, 1999). Poverty, limited education levels, and weak economic structures can significantly constrain community participation in planning processes and limit the implementation of planning initiatives (Chambers, 1997; Mohan & Stokke, 2000).

Research in Nigeria has demonstrated that socio-economic challenges, including high poverty rates, limited access to education, and weak local economies, significantly impact regional planning effectiveness in rural areas (Agbola & Agunbiade, 2009; Olujimi, 2016).

5.2.3 Environmental Factors

Environmental considerations have become increasingly important in regional planning, particularly in areas affected by resource extraction activities (O'Riordan, 1988; Rees, 1995). Climate change, environmental degradation, and natural resource depletion can significantly impact planning processes and outcomes (Wheeler, 2004; Wilson & Piper, 2010).

In the Niger Delta region, environmental challenges related to oil exploration have been extensively documented (Amnesty International, 2017; Obi, 2014). These challenges include water pollution, land degradation, gas flaring, and oil spills, which have significant implications for regional planning effectiveness (Idemudia, 2012; Ordinioha & Brisibe, 2013).

6. Methodology

6.1 Research Design

This study employed a mixed-methods research design, combining quantitative surveys with qualitative interviews to provide a comprehensive understanding of factors affecting regional planning in rural Rivers State communities. The mixed-methods approach was selected to enable triangulation of findings and provide both breadth and depth of analysis (Creswell, 2014; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010).

6.2 Study Area

The study was conducted in six rural communities across three Local Government Areas (LGAs) in Rivers State: Ogba/Egbema/Ndoni, Omuma, and Etche. These LGAs were selected based on their rural characteristics, diverse economic activities, and varying levels of development to ensure representativeness of rural experiences across the state.

6.3 Sample Size and Sampling Technique

A multi-stage sampling technique was employed to select study participants. The total sample size consisted of 384 household respondents, 24 key informants, and 18 focus group discussion participants. The sample size for the quantitative component was determined using Yamane's (1967) formula with a 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error.

6.4 Data Collection Methods

Primary data were collected through structured questionnaires, in-depth interviews, and focus group discussions. Secondary data were obtained from government documents, academic publications, and reports from relevant organizations. Data collection was conducted over a six-month period from January to June 2023.

6.5 Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analysed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 28.0, employing descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and multiple regression analysis. Qualitative data were analysed using thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2006) framework.

7. Results

7.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The study involved 384 household respondents across the six selected rural communities. The demographic profile reveals a diverse population with varying educational backgrounds, occupational patterns, and community involvement levels.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	218	56.8
	Female	166	43.2
Age Group	18-30 years	89	23.2
	31-45 years	156	40.6
	46-60 years	102	26.6

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
	Above 60 years	37	9.6
Education Level	No formal education	45	11.7
	Primary education	98	25.5
	Secondary education	167	43.5
	Tertiary education	74	19.3
Primary Occupation	Farming	142	37.0
	Fishing	78	20.3
	Trading	89	23.2
	Civil Service	52	13.5
	Others	23	6.0

7.2 Institutional Factors Affecting Regional Planning

Analysis of institutional factors reveals significant challenges in planning capacity, coordination, and implementation across the studied communities.

Table 2: Assessment of Institutional Factors

Institutional Factor	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Mean Score
Local government planning capacity	34.6%	41.1%	18.2%	5.2%	0.9%	1.97
Inter-agency coordination	29.2%	38.5%	22.4%	7.8%	2.1%	2.15
Community participation mechanisms	31.8%	35.4%	20.8%	9.6%	2.4%	2.15
Legal framework adequacy	42.2%	33.6%	16.7%	5.7%	1.8%	1.91
Technical expertise availability	38.8%	36.7%	17.2%	5.5%	1.8%	1.94
Planning implementation capacity	36.2%	39.8%	16.9%	5.5%	1.6%	1.96

The results indicate consistently poor ratings across all institutional factors, with mean scores ranging from 1.91 to 2.15 on a 5-point scale. Legal framework adequacy received the lowest rating (mean = 1.91), while inter-agency coordination and community participation mechanisms both scored 2.15.

7.3 Socio-Economic Factors Affecting Regional Planning

Socio-economic analysis reveals significant challenges related to poverty, education, and economic capacity that impact planning effectiveness.

Table 3: Socio-Economic Factor Analysis

Socio-Economic Factor	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean Score
Adequate income for development contribution	45.3%	32.8%	12.2%	7.3%	2.4%	1.89
Community economic capacity	41.7%	35.9%	15.1%	5.7%	1.6%	1.90
Educational levels support planning	28.6%	31.0%	23.7%	13.0%	3.7%	2.32
Access to information and communication	39.1%	33.6%	18.2%	7.0%	2.1%	1.99
Women's participation in planning	35.2%	30.5%	21.1%	10.4%	2.8%	2.15
Youth engagement in development	32.3%	29.7%	24.2%	11.2%	2.6%	2.22

Socio-economic factors show generally poor ratings, with adequate income for development contribution receiving the lowest score (mean = 1.89). Educational levels supporting planning received a relatively higher rating (mean = 2.32), though still below the midpoint of the scale.

7.4 Environmental Factors Affecting Regional Planning

Environmental factors analysis reveals significant challenges related to pollution, resource degradation, and climate-related impacts.

Table 4: Environmental Factor Assessment

Environmental Factor	Very High Impact	High Impact	Moderate Impact	Low Impact	No Impact	Mean Score
Water pollution from oil activities	52.3%	28.9%	12.5%	4.7%	1.6%	4.26
Land degradation	41.4%	34.6%	16.7%	5.7%	1.6%	4.09

Environmental Factor	Very High Impact	High Impact	Moderate Impact	Low Impact	No Impact	Mean Score
Air pollution and gas flaring	48.2%	29.2%	15.1%	5.5%	2.0%	4.16
Flooding and erosion	38.5%	31.8%	20.8%	7.3%	1.6%	3.98
Loss of agricultural productivity	44.5%	32.0%	16.4%	5.5%	1.6%	4.12
Inadequate waste management	46.9%	30.7%	15.6%	5.2%	1.6%	4.16

Environmental factors show consistently high impact ratings, with water pollution from oil activities receiving the highest score (mean = 4.26). All environmental factors scored above 3.98, indicating significant negative impacts on regional planning efforts.

7.5 Correlation Analysis

Correlation analysis was conducted to examine relationships between different factor categories and overall planning effectiveness.

Table 5: Correlation Matrix

Variables	1	2	3	4
1. Institutional Factors	1.000			
2. Socio-Economic Factors	0.624**	1.000		
3. Environmental Factors	-0.589**	-0.512**	1.000	
4. Planning Effectiveness	0.743**	0.681**	-0.698**	1.000

**Note: ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

The correlation analysis reveals strong positive relationships between institutional factors and planning effectiveness (r = 0.743), and between socio-economic factors and planning effectiveness (r = 0.681). Environmental factors show a strong negative correlation with planning effectiveness (r = -0.698), indicating that environmental challenges significantly impede planning outcomes.

7.6 Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the relative contribution of each factor category to planning effectiveness.

Table 6: Multiple Regression Analysis Results

Variables	Beta	t-value	Sig.	VIF
Institutional Factors	0.412	8.764	0.000	2.147
Socio-Economic Factors	0.298	6.421	0.000	1.892
Environmental Factors	-0.325	-7.298	0.000	1.743

$R^2 = 0.721$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.718$, $F = 325.467$, Sig. = 0.000

The regression model explains 72.1% of the variance in planning effectiveness ($R^2 = 0.721$). All three factor categories are significant predictors of planning effectiveness. Institutional factors have the strongest positive influence ($\beta = 0.412$), followed by socio-economic factors ($\beta = 0.298$). Environmental factors have a significant negative influence ($\beta = -0.325$).

8. Discussion of Results

8.1 Institutional Factors and Planning Effectiveness

The findings reveal that institutional factors represent the most significant determinant of regional planning effectiveness in Rivers State's rural communities. The consistently poor ratings across all institutional indicators (Table 2) align with previous research highlighting institutional weaknesses in Nigerian planning systems (Agbola & Agunbiade, 2009; Mabogunje, 2007).

The particularly low rating for legal framework adequacy (mean = 1.91) reflects broader challenges in Nigeria's planning legislation, which has been criticized for being outdated and inadequately enforced (Olujimi, 2016). This finding is consistent with Healey's (2007) emphasis on the importance of robust institutional frameworks for effective planning outcomes.

Poor inter-agency coordination (mean = 2.15) represents a critical challenge that has been documented across various Nigerian contexts (Agbola & Agunbiade, 2009). The fragmented nature of planning responsibilities across different government levels and agencies creates significant barriers to comprehensive regional planning, as noted by March and Olsen (1989) in their institutional analysis framework.

Limited community participation mechanisms (mean = 2.15) contradict the principles of collaborative planning theory (Healey, 1997) and represent a significant barrier to sustainable development outcomes. This finding supports Chambers' (1997) argument that effective rural development requires meaningful community engagement and participation.

8.2 Socio-Economic Factors and Development Constraints

The socio-economic analysis reveals significant constraints that limit planning effectiveness in rural Rivers State communities. The particularly low ratings for adequate income for development contribution (mean = 1.89) and community economic capacity (mean = 1.90) highlight the poverty-related barriers to effective planning implementation.

These findings align with Sen's (1999) capability approach, which emphasizes the importance of economic empowerment for sustainable development. The limited economic capacity of rural communities constrains their ability to contribute to and benefit from regional planning initiatives, creating a cycle of underdevelopment.

The relatively higher rating for educational levels supporting planning (mean = 2.32), while still below average, suggests some potential for capacity building in these communities. This finding supports Freire's (1970) emphasis on education as a tool for development and empowerment.

Gender and youth participation constraints (means = 2.15 and 2.22 respectively) reflect broader social exclusion patterns that limit the effectiveness of planning processes. These findings are consistent with Mohan and Stokke's (2000) analysis of participation barriers in development contexts.

8.3 Environmental Factors and Sustainable Development

The environmental analysis reveals severe challenges that significantly impact regional planning effectiveness. The high impact ratings across all environmental factors (Table 4) demonstrate the severity of environmental degradation in Rivers State's rural communities.

Water pollution from oil activities received the highest impact rating (mean = 4.26), reflecting the well-documented environmental consequences of oil exploration in the Niger Delta region (Amnesty International, 2017; Obi, 2014). This finding supports previous research by Idemudia (2012) and Ordinioha and Brisibe (2013) documenting the environmental impacts of oil activities on rural communities.

The high ratings for land degradation (mean = 4.09) and loss of agricultural productivity (mean = 4.12) have significant implications for rural livelihoods and development prospects. These findings align with Rees' (1995) ecological footprint concept and highlight the unsustainable nature of current development patterns in the region.

Air pollution and gas flaring impacts (mean = 4.16) represent ongoing environmental justice issues that have been extensively documented by human rights organizations (Amnesty International, 2017). The continued presence of these environmental challenges demonstrates the inadequacy of current regulatory frameworks and planning approaches.

8.4 Integrated Analysis and Planning Implications

The correlation analysis (Table 5) reveals important relationships between factor categories that have significant implications for planning interventions. The strong positive correlation between institutional and socio-economic factors ($r = 0.624$) suggests that these factors are mutually reinforcing and should be addressed through integrated approaches.

The strong negative correlation between environmental factors and planning effectiveness ($r = -0.698$) highlights the critical importance of environmental sustainability for successful rural development. This finding supports the sustainable development paradigm's emphasis on environmental protection as a prerequisite for long-term development success (Brundtland Commission, 1987).

The multiple regression analysis (Table 6) provides important insights into the relative importance of different factor categories. The finding that institutional factors have the strongest influence on planning effectiveness ($\beta = 0.412$) supports the institutional theory emphasis on governance quality as a fundamental determinant of development outcomes (North, 1990).

The significant negative influence of environmental factors ($\beta = -0.325$) demonstrates that environmental degradation actively undermines planning effectiveness, rather than simply being a passive constraint. This finding has important implications for planning approaches in environmentally challenged areas such as the Niger Delta.

9. Conclusion

This study provides comprehensive evidence of the multifaceted challenges facing regional planning in rural Rivers State communities. The research findings demonstrate that institutional weaknesses, socio-economic constraints, and environmental degradation combine to create significant barriers to effective regional planning and sustainable development.

The institutional analysis reveals fundamental weaknesses in planning capacity, legal frameworks, and coordination mechanisms that severely limit planning effectiveness. These institutional challenges are compounded by socio-economic constraints, including poverty, limited education, and weak community economic capacity, which restrict meaningful participation in planning processes.

Environmental factors emerge as particularly severe constraints, with oil-related pollution, land degradation, and loss of agricultural productivity creating significant challenges for sustainable development. The strong negative correlation between environmental factors and planning effectiveness demonstrates that environmental degradation actively undermines planning efforts rather than simply representing a passive constraint.

The integrated analysis reveals important relationships between factor categories, with institutional and socio-economic factors showing strong positive correlations, while environmental factors negatively impact both planning effectiveness and community capacity. These findings highlight the need for comprehensive, integrated approaches to addressing regional planning challenges in Rivers State's rural communities.

The research contributes to the theoretical understanding of regional planning challenges in resource-dependent developing country contexts, while providing empirical evidence for policy makers and development practitioners working in similar environments. The findings support the importance of collaborative planning approaches that address institutional, socio-economic, and environmental factors simultaneously.

10. Recommendations

Based on the research findings, the following recommendations are proposed to improve regional planning effectiveness in rural Rivers State communities:

1. Strengthen institutional capacity at local government levels through comprehensive training programs, technical assistance, and establishment of dedicated planning units with adequate staffing and resources.
2. Develop and implement comprehensive legal reforms to update planning legislation, clarify institutional roles and responsibilities, and establish effective enforcement mechanisms for planning regulations.
3. Establish multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms that bring together government agencies, community organizations, private sector actors, and civil society groups to improve planning coordination and implementation.
4. Create sustainable financing mechanisms for rural development that combine government allocations, community contributions, private sector investment, and international development assistance to support planning implementation.
5. Implement comprehensive community engagement strategies that ensure meaningful participation of all community members, including women, youth, and marginalized groups, in planning processes through capacity building and inclusive consultation mechanisms.
6. Develop integrated environmental management frameworks that address oil-related pollution, promote sustainable resource use, and build community resilience to environmental challenges through ecosystem restoration and alternative livelihood programs.
7. Establish education and capacity building programs that enhance community understanding of planning processes, build local technical capacity, and promote leadership development for sustainable community-driven development.
8. Create monitoring and evaluation systems that track planning implementation progress, measure development outcomes, and provide feedback for continuous improvement of planning approaches and strategies.
9. Promote economic diversification initiatives that reduce dependence on oil-related activities, support agricultural development, and create alternative income opportunities for rural communities through skills development and market access programs.
10. Develop climate adaptation and disaster risk reduction strategies that address flooding, erosion, and other climate-related challenges through infrastructure development, early warning systems, and community preparedness programs.

References

Agbola, T., & Agunbiade, E. M. (2009). Urbanization, slum development and security of tenure: The challenges of meeting millennium development goal 7 in metropolitan Lagos, Nigeria. In *Urban population-development-environment dynamics in the developing world* (pp. 77-106). Committee for International Cooperation in National Research in Demography.

Akpan, U. F. (2014). Impact of regional planning on the development of Niger Delta region, Nigeria. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, 3(5), 1061-1079.

Albrechts, L. (2004). Strategic (spatial) planning reexamined. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 31(5), 743-758.

Allmendinger, P. (2009). *Planning theory* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

Amnesty International. (2017). *A criminal enterprise? Shell's involvement in human rights violations in Nigeria in the 1990s*. Amnesty International Publications.

Berke, P. R., & Conroy, M. M. (2000). Are we planning for sustainable development? An evaluation of 30 comprehensive plans. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 66(1), 21-33.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.

Brundtland Commission. (1987). *Our common future: Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development*. Oxford University Press.

Campbell, S. (1996). Green cities, growing cities, just cities?: Urban planning and the contradictions of sustainable development. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 62(3), 296-312.

Chambers, R. (1997). *Whose reality counts? Putting the first last*. Intermediate Technology Publications.

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. (1999). Government Printer.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum International Publishing Group.

Friedmann, J. (2005). *Planning in the public domain: From knowledge to action*. Princeton University Press.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action: Reason and the rationalization of society* (Vol. 1). Beacon Press.

Healey, P. (1997). *Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies*. Macmillan Press.

Healey, P. (2006). *Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

Healey, P. (2007). *Urban complexity and spatial strategies: Towards a relational planning for our times*. Routledge.

Idemudia, U. (2012). The resource curse and the decentralization of oil revenue: The case of Nigeria. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 35, 183-193.

Mabogunje, A. L. (2007). Land reform in Nigeria: Progress, problems and prospects. *Earthscan Land and Food Policy Series*, 1-24.

March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1989). *Rediscovering institutions: The organizational basis of politics*. Free Press.

Mohan, G., & Stokke, K. (2000). Participatory development and empowerment: The dangers of localism. *Third World Quarterly*, 21(2), 247-268.

North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.

Nwilo, P. C., & Badejo, O. T. (2006). Impacts and management of oil spill pollution along the Nigerian coastal areas. *International Oil Spill Conference Proceedings*, 2006(1), 119-124.

Obi, C. (2014). Oil and conflict in Nigeria's Niger Delta region: Between the barrel and the trigger. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, 1(2), 147-153.

OECD. (2006). *The new rural paradigm: Policies and governance*. OECD Publishing.

Olujimi, J. A. B. (2016). Regional planning and development strategies in Nigeria: Issues, challenges and the way forward. *Journal of Geography and Regional Planning*, 9(4), 45-58.

O'Riordan, T. (1988). The politics of sustainability. In R. K. Turner (Ed.), *Sustainable environmental management: Principles and practice* (pp. 29-50). Belhaven Press.

Ordinioha, B., & Brisibe, S. (2013). The human health implications of crude oil spills in the Niger Delta, Nigeria: An interpretation of published studies. *Nigerian Medical Journal*, 54(1), 10-16.

Park, S. O. (2009). Regional innovation systems and balanced development in Korea. In *Innovation networks and learning regions* (pp. 234-256). Regional Studies Association.

Rees, W. E. (1995). Achieving sustainability: Reform or transformation? *Journal of Planning Literature*, 9(4), 343-361.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.

Silva, E. A. (2018). Participatory planning in Brazil: Lessons from the experience of Porto Alegre. In *Participatory governance in developing countries* (pp. 145-168). Springer.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (Eds.). (2010). *SAGE handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Taylor, N. (1998). *Urban planning theory since 1945*. SAGE Publications.

UN-Habitat. (2016). *The new urban agenda*. United Nations Human Settlements Programme.

Wheeler, S. M. (2004). *Planning for sustainability: Creating livable, equitable and ecological communities*. Routledge.

Wilson, E., & Piper, J. (2010). *Spatial planning and climate change*. Routledge.

Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). Harper and Row.