

Facebook groups and youths' facilitation of self-help rural development programmes in Rivers State, Nigeria

Clement Afamefuna Asadu¹ and Jones Gilbert Ayuwo²

Abstract

This study sought to evaluate the utilization of Facebook group discussion in the facilitation of rural development of Rivers State. The study was motivated by the fact that many youths in Rivers State are on social network, but they appeared not to be exploring it to solve socio-political problems of the people. Three research questions were posed to guide the study. Using the mixed research methods of the survey and content analysis, a multistage sampling technique was employed to select 384 respondents from the population. Data were collected using questionnaire and code sheet. The collected data were subsequently presented using simple percentages and frequency tables, and four-point Likert scale. The study found out that Rivers State youths use Facebook group to share messages or information that bordered on road renovation, environmental protection and increase in political consciousness. It equally found out that members of the community who live outside the community are always motivated to participate in sharing and execution of rural development programmes. Based on the findings, the study recommended that development agents and government should develop Facebook groups dedicated to different aspects of socio-economic and political development of the state.

Keywords: Facebook group, youth, rural development, self-help

Introduction

No society can be considered developed if the rural areas are still largely backward and deprived. It therefore, follows that for a society or state to be developed, rural areas should be the focal point. Yadav (2006: 85) supports this

¹ University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria, Department of Linguistics and Communication Studies

Email: afamefuna.asadu@uniport.edu.ng

² University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria, Department of Linguistics and Communication Studies

Email: jones.ayuwo@uniport.edu.ng

assertion, observing that “unless the living conditions of the majority of the rural poor who live below the subsistence level are improved, there cannot be development in its true sense”. In Nigeria, development was structured along two lines by the colonial masters – urban and rural. Colonial masters lived and administered from upgraded areas with many amenities necessary for good life, the other areas remained underdeveloped.

This system was inherited by Nigerians who took over the mantle of leadership from the colonialists. The whole development initiative in Nigeria since then has been championed by government officials who see development only as the concentration of infrastructure such as hospitals, good roads, bridges, high-rise buildings, access to the media, good schools, among others in the urban areas. This lopsided development has left the rural areas very impoverished, abandoned and neglected. Rural areas, according to the National Population Commission (2006), have over 60 per cent of the Nigerian population which equally provides a very high percentage of the food and workforce needed in the urban areas. Most youths are leaving the rural areas for the urban areas. Youths have been recognised as the propelling force in most self-help development projects.

Today, Facebook group, as one of the social media platforms, has reconnected and reunited youths in the urban and rural areas as though they were in one place. This sense of oneness has increased the involvement of the youths in the community self-help development programmes and by extension has increased the social capital value of youths in all societies. Youths have used social media to come together to solve problems that affect them and that of the entire community. For instance, the popular Arab Spring which was aimed at changing authoritarian regimes in the Arab world is an example of a self-help development intervention. The protest was organised and executed through the social media. Similarly in Opi, Nsukka Local Government Area of Enugu State, youths opened a social media platform blog (www.onyeopi.com) to combat raping of elderly women in the community. More so, such site had long been opened by youths of Ndokwa West in Delta State to discuss mainly socio-political challenges faced by the area.

This type of people-initiated development is called self-help. Cheshire (2006) notes that self-help development presupposes that: “since entire groups or localities were experiencing a disadvantage, community solutions to the problem should be applied” (p. 59). Besides, in recent decades the responsibility for initiating regeneration programmes has been placed firmly in the hands of rural communities with the rationale being that local people are best placed to know

their own problems and consequently, to develop their own solutions. Developing their own solutions involves “grassroots programmes of consciousness raising and collective action which helps the people in the identification and prioritization of their needs and resources” (Cheshire, 2016: 59).

Rivers State is one of the six States in the South-South geo-political zone of Nigeria created in 1967 by General Yakubu Gowon military administration. It is about the highest oil producing State in Nigeria yet there are high levels of poverty, neglect and poor presence of government in the rural areas. Youth unemployment is equally high. A youth here refers to a young person who is independent and can take full responsibility for all his/her actions or inactions. In other words a youth is independent. The age of a youth differs from country to country and context to context. For the purpose of this study, youth is made up of male and female from the age of 15 to 44 years.

This work is aimed at examining how the Facebook group has been employed by the youths in Rivers State to initiate and champion development programmes in rural areas considering the fact that social media has facilitated social-economic changes in other climes. Specifically, this study focuses on three broad questions in the analysis. First, to what extent do youths in Rivers State utilize the Facebook group to share rural development messages? Second, what specific rural development programmes do youths in Rivers State facilitate through Facebook group discussions? Finally, to what extent do messages shared through the Facebook group mobilizes youths in Rivers State to engage in rural development?

The concept of rural development

Defining a rural area has lacked precision. Schucksmith and Brown (2016) observe that the pastoral and modernist schools of thought have affected the meaning of rurality. While the pastoral school sees “rural areas as repositories of cultural values or even national identities the modernists see rural areas as essentially backward and requiring transformation and development so that their residents can enjoy the tangible benefits of the modern world” (Schucksmith and Brown, 2016: 2). One thing that has been agreed by the two groups is that rural means a place that appears natural, local and lacking the necessities of life such that exist in urban areas –good roads, quality education, good housing and adequate health facilities. Rural dwellers depend on natural resources for survival. Rural areas can better be understood when compared with the urban

Journal of Sociology and Development, Vol. 2, No. 1

areas. Brown and Schafft (2011) see rural areas as “spatially delimited or separated natural environments. A rural area is also thought of as a geographically and socially isolated area from centres of power and influence” (Brown and Schafft, 2011: 5). In addition, “rural areas are homogeneous, have closer relationship, and social order is typically maintained through informal control” (Brown and Schafft, 2011: 7).

The development of the rural areas has been seen as the fulcrum of the national or societal development. In support of this view, Mahatma Gandhi had written long back in 1936 in Harijan saying, “I have believed and repeated times without number that India is to be found not in its few cities, but in its 700,000 villages...I would say that if the village perishes, India will perish too” (Singh, 2009). Gandhi favoured village-based decentralized development where the masses cause employment through cottage industries leading to self-sufficiency. He believed in rural development as the desideratum for societal or national development. The term rural development has undergone several shifts in meaning and practice. The modernization approach which involves an increase in income, westernization, diffusion and attempts by powerful, urban-based elites to extract resources from rural communities and places was earlier adopted to define and execute rural development programmes (Gasteyer and Herman, 2013; Green and Zinda, 2013; Mefalopulos, 2008). Today, the participatory approach has been adopted. This approach is the direct opposite of modernization approach. It believes that the change or development in the rural area involves the empowerment of the rural people for the realization of their human values. It is the participatory approach that has birthed self-help rural development.

Self-help rural development is referred to as grassroots development by Gasteyer and Herman (2013). They note that “grassroots development is a process of intentional social change that privileges local organising, visioning and decision making” (Gasteyer and Herman, 2013: 56). The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO, 2013) describes self-help or grassroots rural development as rural transformation which harnesses the productivity and entrepreneurial potential of rural communities by transition of informal economic activities into the formal sector (UNIDO, 2013: 1). Rural transformation looks beyond agriculture. The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD, 2016) notes that rural transformation does not happen in isolation, but as part of a broader process of structural transformation shaped by the interlinkages between agriculture, the rural non-farm economy, manufacturing and services among others (IFAD, 2016: 18). IFAD (2016) goes

further to remark that rural transformation alters the structure of landholdings, the technologies in use, the capabilities of rural women and men, and the distribution and dynamics of the population and labour force. The foregoing shows that modern rural development or transformation encourages women and youth to take part in activities that can help in pushing poverty back. In other words, rural transformation aims to arrest the rural-urban drift which was caused by the underdevelopment of rural areas and connect it to the urban areas. This will lead to building a new countryside and the development of township and village enterprises (TVEs) (Long, Zou, Pykett and Li, 2011).

Supporting this, Bhose (2003) observes that “rural development is the process of continuous progress, unyoking the people from the stages of dependency towards self-reliance, assuring equitable distribution of opportunities and resources” (Bhose, 2013: 56). Similarly, Anaeto and Solo-Anaeto (2010) submit that rural development is “a planned process of change designed to alleviate poverty, increase productivity and improve the conditions of the rural areas” (Anaeto and Solo-Anaeto, 2010: 2). They add that rural development involves “a planned process of using a form of action or communication intended to transform the environment, institutions and attitudes of rural people to alleviate poverty and improve their way of life” (Anaeto and Solo-Anaeto, 2010: 2).

Facebook group as a rural development forum

Facebook exists in two main forms –as a page and as a group. A Facebook page is usually added to a person’s profile. It is typically used by artistes or people with a large fan-base. The Facebook page is for public figures, celebrities and other people you would like to hear from (<https://web.facebook.com>). Every comment made by the person and response to the comment appears on the timeline. One sends and receives messages from a public figure by clicking on “like” on the public figure’s page.

Facebook group is specialized. It is for like-minds or people who share interests. It carries the profile of the group or community. It could be a closed or open (public) group with an administrator. Vahl (2015) observes that one of the biggest reasons to join Facebook groups is the visibility and networking they offer. Generally speaking, a Facebook group is one of the social media platforms where people who are separated by distance but united by interest converge to share ideas, video clips, photographs or information among others. Kraynak and Belicove (2010) note that “Facebook is a free online social

network site where friends, families, colleagues and acquaintances can mingle, get to know one another better and expand their social circles” (Belicove, 2010: 3).

Facebook has transformed how information is shared. Kirkpatrick (2010) is of the view that this social media site makes communication more efficient, cultivate familiarity among people and enhance intimacy. He adds, “Facebook is bringing the whole world together. It has become an overarching common cultural experience for people worldwide, especially young people” (Kirkpatrick, 2010: 15).

A Facebook group is a good medium to mobilize support for or against any cause. Kirkpatrick (2010) observes that “people were using it back then to protest whatever was important...even if they were just upset about a minor issue with school” (Kirkpatrick, 2010: 6). Golden (2009) writes that Facebook causes three things in society. First, it causes deep integration. It binds members of the society together irrespective of geographic location, tribe and tongue. Second, it causes mass distribution of messages. The message on Facebook, like any other network media, spreads beyond one person to almost the whole people on the network. Third, it creates new opportunities. Facebook has become a place where an individual can stumble on information that is capable of transforming the person’s life in a sustainable way.

Mobile phone and Facebook in rural areas

Internet communication can arguably be seen to have penetrated and reformed all forms of communication. In the past, internet services were mainly seen at cybercafés in the urban centres. But the discovery of Global System Mobile (GSM) or mobile phone has transformed communication and levels of interactions mainly in the rural areas. Because of the commercial drive of the operators, telecommunication masts are scattered in both urban and rural areas for greater market share.

Further improvement on mobile phone technology took it from simply voice services and text messaging to diverse range of applications. Smart wireless phone now operates the way computer does. In other words, it can be used to also browse the Internet, download video, audio and access information services. Most of the internet activities which were not available in rural areas due to lack of cybercafés or electricity are now done with the phone. Khali, Dagier and Qiang (2009) note that “mobile phones increase productive uses of online applications and services making it possible to improve process, introduce new

Journal of Sociology and Development, Vol. 2, No. 1

business models, drive innovation, and extend business links” (Khali, Dagier and Qiang, 2009: 5).

Mobile phone in other words has also extended social network to the rural areas. Many young people in rural areas are now connected with family and friends who are in faraway places. The ubiquity of mobile phone in rural areas has increased the information sharing capacity of rural people and as such has blurred the line between the urban and rural members of a community. Williams and Kwofie (2014) stress that African families are close units although today, these units are scattered they still communicate and support each other. This communication and support is coming from the mobile phone. The generation of mobile phones in rural areas has actually given the people, irrespective of location and distance, the opportunity to contribute their knowledge, ideas and opinion in what happens in their community.

Youths group discussion and civic engagement

Kim and Ball-Rokeach (2006) sought to find out how communication infrastructure of neighbourhood storytelling network can cause a community to engage in a collective action for common purpose (civic engagement). Civic engagement is akin to citizen participation in community efforts which helps individuals in identity formation, teamwork, building and maintaining organizations, socialization, community building, and democracy and civic society. The study found that neighbourhood storytelling network encourages people to talk about their neighbourhood thereby making individual residents more likely to become community members and have a stronger sense that they can solve various neighbourhood problems and to be more willing to participate in civic action. To explore the importance of youth groups in rural development, Iwuchukwu, Ogbonna and Agboti (2015) found out that Afikpo youths belonged to different groups and organisations and their major roles included town hall building, school development and market building among others.

On their own, Farnham, David-Keyes and Tugwell (2013) sought to explore the relationship between internet technology experiences, civic efficacy, community identification and civic engagement in their everyday lives. The study found that contrary to prevailing stereotypes of digital youth, most of them rely on email and text messaging in their local communities about civic issues. Those who use social network had higher levels of civic engagement. These studies have confirmed that sustainable rural development programmes are championed by a group or an organisation in the community. This group simply

uses a wide and cheap communication platform such as Facebook group to mobilize support from members of the community within and outside.

Theoretical framework

This study is anchored on participatory development communication approach. The groundwork for this approach to development was laid by Nora Cruz Queberal in 1973 in a paper titled “Development Communication in the Agricultural Context”. The theory posits development decisions, plan and execution cannot be done without integrating the beneficiaries. It recognizes people as the drivers of their own development. Communication for Development Roundtable Report (CDR Report, 2005) sees participatory communication for development as “a horizontal, two-way process that is about people coming together to identify problems, agree on visions for desirable futures and empower the poorest. It is about the co-creation and sharing of knowledge. It respects the local context, value and culture” (CDR Report, 2005: 6). To involve the people in the development intervention requires sharing development information not only through the available means of communication, but the ones that can conveniently reach the people at a cheaper rate and offers them the right of reply. Interaction is central to participatory communication.

Similarly, Mefalopulos (2008) submits that participatory communication “involves the use of dialogic methods and tools to promote change” (Mefalopulos, 2008: 7). He goes on to say that the approach is rooted in the people’s cultural realities. That is, development has to come from the people and within their environment; it cannot be transported or copied. McAnany (2012) notes that “participatory communication for development sees the people as the engines of sustainable change in their lives and their environments” (Mefalopulos, 2008: 87). In the views of Servaes (2008) this approach involves “sharing knowledge aimed at reaching consensus for action that takes into account the interests, needs and capacities of all concerned” (Servaes, 2008: 15).

For this reason, participatory communication approach to development recognizes any medium of communication that allows free and pluralistic information systems. The use of new information technology should be for problem solving and not an end to itself. Facebook provides a platform for participatory communication for development. It enables people to gather, irrespective of their physical locations, as though they are face-to-face to discuss and share information about their community. The Facebook group platform

empowers community members to report issues of concern and make their voices heard. By so doing they improve their sense of identity and increase their participation in the community and the possibilities of empowerment for social change. Self-help projects are often initiated and pursued through information exchange among people who initially had an offline relationship, but may have been separated by distance. The end result of participatory communication is to bring about empowerment, commitment to action and equality in development decision making.

Methodology

The survey method and content analysis of Facebook group posts from August 2016 to October 2016 were employed. The population of this study comprised all the youths (aged between 15-44 years) in Rivers State which according to the National Population Commission Census (2006), was 2,588,682 and was projected to 3,241,865 in 2015 using 2.5% exponential growth rate. Using Meyer's sample size determination template, a sample size of 384 was arrived at. To ensure that every youth in the State was represented in the study, a multi-stage cluster sampling technique was adopted. The state was divided into the three senatorial zones from where three local government areas were purposively selected. The reason for using the purposive sampling technique was to eliminate any chance of selecting a local government that was not rural. Quota sampling technique was employed to allocate 42 respondents to each local government with the exception of Degema and Gokana which had 44 respondents each because they had larger populations.

From each local government area, three wards were selected using simple random sampling technique. Subsequently, relying on the register/roll call of the general community youth association in the selected wards, a systematic random sampling technique of interval of six members was used to select 14 respondents from each ward. For content analysis, using simple random sampling technique, one Facebook group was selected from each of the three senatorial zones of the State. For clarity, Ikwerremeka news represented Rivers East senatorial district; Advocacy for the actualization of Ogoni freedom represented Rivers South-east senatorial district and Kalabari youth federation represented Rivers West senatorial district.

Content categories

To group messages shared (posted), the contents or themes of the three groups’ posts between August 1 and October 31st were analysed and classified as shown below:

Table 1: Themes of discussion

| Themes | Description |
|---|---|
| Name of Facebook group | They are the Facebook groups studied –Ikwerremeka news, Advocacy for the actualization of Ogoni freedom and Kalabari youth federation |
| Awareness raising | Posts on: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Notice of meetings of any community group 2. Government official’s visit to the community or 3. Any other announcement |
| Raising community consciousness to support community programmes | Messages on: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Encouraging people to embrace education, 2. Use of native tongues, 3. Support for clean environment struggle 4. Stop and report of criminal activities |
| Call on government | Posts that border on road rehabilitation |
| Raising of political consciousness | Messages on politics |
| Skill acquisition/training | Posts that encourage people to learn a handwork |
| Others | These are messages that do not concern the community. They include things like advertisements, comedy skits, marriages and online businesses |

Source: Developed for this research.

Results

Three hundred and eighty four (384) copies of the questionnaire were administered on the respondents by hand and all were returned. However, only

267 were found useable as they belonged to Facebook groups while 117 did not belong to any Facebook group. For this reason, the 267 represents 100% of the respondents used for the analysis.

Table 2: Amount of time spent on Facebook

| Nature of response | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|
| 3 hours and above | 57 | 21.3 |
| 1.30 mins -3 hour | 133 | 49.8 |
| 30 mins-1.30 mins | 68 | 25.5 |
| 1 min-30 mins | 09 | 3.4 |
| Total | 267 | 100 |

Table 2 shows that 57 (21.3%) respondents spent above three hours on Facebook each time they are connected. A total of 133 (49.8%) respondents spent between 1.30 minutes and three hours each time they are connected. The number of respondents that spent between 30 minutes and 1.30 minutes was 68 (25.5%) while nine (3.4%) respondents were always connected for between one minute and 30 minutes.

Table 3: Frequency of community information sharing on Facebook group

| Frequency | No. of respondents | Percentage |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Daily | 93 | 34.8 |
| Once in 3 days | 51 | 19.1 |
| Once a week | 107 | 40.1 |
| Fortnightly | 13 | 4.9 |
| Don't share information | 3 | 1.1 |
| Total | 267 | 100 |

The table shows that a total of 93(34.8%) respondents share information (photographs) everyday through Facebook group. The number of respondents that shared information once in three days was 51(19.1%). The table equally shows that 107(40.1%) respondents shared information on through Facebook group once in a week. A total of 13 (4.9%) respondents shared information fortnightly while 3 (1.1%) respondents did not share any message.

On content analysis, units of analysis of the discussion themes were texts, videos and pictures on the timelines of the three selected Facebook groups. It was found out that *Ikwerremeka news* had 5,179 members with 477 posts; *Advocacy for the actualization of Ogoni freedom* had 2,518 members with 72 posts on issues that directly or indirectly border on their community while *Kalabari youths federation* had 835 members with 47 posts about the community within the period under study. This brought the total posts from the three zones to 596.

Table 4³: Mobilization for school renovation

| Nature of response | SA | A | D | SD | TOTAL | N | WMS | DECISION |
|--|----|----|----|----|-------|-----|-----|----------|
| Youths in your community use Facebook group to initiate and mobilize for renovation of schools | 73 | 98 | 53 | 43 | 735 | 267 | 2.7 | Accepted |

The table shows a positive mean score of 2.7 which is accepted. The question indicates that 171(64.0%) agreed that youths use Facebook group to initiate and mobilize for the renovation of schools in Rivers State while 96 (36.0%) did not agree that youths used Facebook group to initiate and mobilize for the renovation of schools.

³ For this table and the others below, a four-point Likert Scale was used: SA = Strongly Agree, A=Agree, Disagree and Strongly Disagree, while ‘N’ is the population and WMS= Weighted Mean Score. The decision rule is that any score above 2.5 is accepted as positive while the score below 2.5 is rejected.

Table 5: Mobilization for environmental protection

| Nature of response | SA | A | D | SD | TOTAL | N | WM | DECISION |
|--|-----------|------------|---------------|----------|-------|---------|-----|----------|
| Facebook group is used to mobilize for environmental protection/sanitation | 43 172 | 109 327 | 65 13 0 | 50 50 | 679 | 26 7 | 2.5 | Accepted |

The table shows that 152 (56.9%) respondents agreed that they used Facebook to promote environmental protection and sanitation while a total of 115 (43.1%) said they did not use Facebook group to promote environmental protection and sanitation.

Table 6: Mobilization of youths for community projects

| Nature of response | SA | A | D | SD | TOTAL | WM | DECISION |
|--|-----------|------------|---------------|----------|------------|-----|----------|
| Facebook group discussion encourages youth participation in politics | 57 228 | 139 417 | 38 76 | 33 33 | 267 754 | 2.8 | Accepted |
| Community members outside the community always participate in the community development programmes | 42 168 | 150 450 | 58 11 6 | 17 17 | 267 751 | 2.8 | Accepted |

The table shows that 196 (73.4%) respondents agreed that Facebook group discussion encourages youth participation in politics while 71 (26.6%) respondents disagreed that Facebook group discussion encouraged youth participation in politics. The table also shows that 192 (71.9%) respondents agreed that community members outside the community used Facebook group to

participate in the discussion and execution of community projects while 75 (28.1%) respondents disagreed that community members outside the community participated in the community projects.

Discussion

This study was to find out how Rivers State youths utilize Facebook group platform in facilitating the development of rural areas. From the data gathered and analysed, it was found out that Rivers State youths use the Facebook group to share messages/information. Table 2 above shows that the respondents spent between one and a half hours, and three hours on Facebook group to post (repost or share) messages (video) aimed at community development. The content analysis shows that the size of each Facebook group affected the frequency of information sharing via the platform. Large ones like *Ikwerremeka news* got an average of six posts daily; *Advocacy for the actualization of Ogoni freedom* got an average of two posts daily while *Kalabari youth federation* got an average of two posts every three days. This shows that rural development messages were regularly shared on Facebook group.

This finding is in line with what Mustaffa, Ibrahim, Wan-Mahmud, Ahmad, Kee and Mahbob (2011) found in their study. The researchers found out that Facebook has emerged as the most pervasive and the most personal of the new media. The study observed that youths were influenced by peer pressure to use Facebook; spending several hours on it. Facebook is the most popular means of sharing messages especially among the youths. Similarly, Tables 4 and 5 above show that 64% of the respondents used Facebook group to discuss and facilitate the renovation of dilapidated schools in Rivers State. Furthermore, 73% of the respondents used Facebook to promote safe environment and sanitation.

The foregoing shows that Facebook group has been used to facilitate some specific development projects such as: an increase in political consciousness, renovation of schools and promotion of safe and clean environment because of oil exploration. Giving credence to this finding, Iwuchukwu, Ogbonna and Agboti (2015) discovered that the major contributions of Afikpo youths to community development included town hall building, school development and market building. Similarly, Umeh and Odom (2011) found out that youths contribute greatly to agricultural and rural development through construction and rehabilitation of rural roads, promotion of cultural heritage and mobilization of labour for community self-help projects.

Finally, it was found out in the study that youths were often mobilized by messages shared or discussed on Facebook group. Table 4. above shows that 64.0% of the respondents agreed that Facebook group discussions made them take part in politics. The table equally shows that 56.2% respondents agreed that community members outside the community participated in the community projects. The finding is in tandem with the position adduced by Williams and Kwofie (2014) that African families are close units although today, these units are scattered they still communicate and support each other. Kirkpatrick (2010) corroborates this in his work that Facebook brings the whole world together.

Conclusion

The place of rural development in the overall national development is significant. In Nigeria, the colonial masters concentrated the necessities of life in the urban areas where they lived and operated from, while neglecting the other areas as rural. Many approaches to develop the rural areas have been tried with varying degrees of success. Initially, it was the modernization approach which encouraged planning of development programmes for rural dwellers by experts in the urban areas. Today, the participatory approach which encourages self-help or grassroots change or development is supported by many countries and United Nations agencies such as The World Bank, International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) among others. This approach has been seen as the most efficacious and more beneficial to the people. Although rural-urban drift has reduced the number of youths physically present in the rural areas, Facebook group has become a forum where a member of a community, irrespective of his/her location, can connect through the mobile phone to the platform and contribute in one way or the other in the discussion of change that needs to occur in the rural setting.

This form of participatory communication for development as this study has demonstrated happens extensively among youths several communities in Rivers State, Nigeria on Facebook group. Specifically, the study found out that the youths have used discussions on Facebook group platforms to facilitate the renovation of dilapidated schools and promote safe environment and sanitation. It was equally found out that the Facebook group has raised the political consciousness of the youths in Rivers State. It is therefore recommended that development agents and government should develop Facebook groups dedicated to different aspects of socio-economic and political development of the state as a

way of monitoring the direction of people's needs in order to be proactive in providing the people with their needs.

References

- Anaeto, S.G. & Solo-Anaeto, M. (2010). *Rural community newspaper: Principles and practice* (2nd edition). Ibadan: Stirling-Horden Pub.
- Bhose, J.S. (2003). *NGOs and rural development: Theory and practice*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.
- Brown, D. L. & Schafft, K. A. (2011). *Rural people and communities in the 21st century: Resilience and transformation*. Cambridge: Polity.
- CDR Report (2005). *Communication for development roundtable report: Focus on sustainable development*. Rome: FAO.
- Cheshire, L. (2006). *Governing rural development: Discourses and practices of self-help in Australia rural policy*. Hampshire: Ashgate Pub. Ltd.
- Farnham, S.D., David Keyes, V.Y. & Tugwell, C. (2013). Modelling youth civic engagement in a new world of networked publics. Proceedings of the seventh International Association of the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (www.aaai.org).
- Gasteyer, S.P. & Herman, C. (2013). Grassroots rural development: Models of development, capacity and leadership. In G.P. Green (Ed.) (2013) *Handbook of rural development*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 56-74.
- Green, G.P. & Zinda, J.A. (2013). Rural development theory. In G.P. Green (Ed.) *Handbook of rural development*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 3-20.
- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) (2016). *Rural development report 2016: Fostering inclusive rural transformation*. Rome: IFAD
- Iwuchukwu J. C., Ogbonna O. I. & Agboti I. O. (2015). Roles of youth's groups in rural community development in Ebonyi State, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development*, 7(2): 41-47.
- Kim, Y-C & Ball-Rokeach, S.J. (2006). Civic engagement from a communication infrastructure perspective. *Communication theory*, 16: 173-197.
- Kirkpatrick, D. (2010). *The Facebook effect: The inside story of the company that is connecting the world*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Kraynak, J. & Belicove, M.E. (2010). *The complete idiot's guide to Facebook*. New York: Penguin Group.

- Long, H., Zou, J., Pykett, J. & Li, Y. (2011). Analysis of rural transformation development in China since the turn of the new millennium. *Applied Geography*, 31(1): 1094-1105.
- Losch, B., Fréguin-Gresh, S. & White, E. T. (2012). *Structural transformation and rural change revisited: Challenges for late developing countries in a globalizing world*. Washington: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank.
- McAnany, E.G. (2012). *Saving the world: A brief history of communication for social change*. Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- Mustaffa, N., Ibrahim, F. Wan-Mahmud, W-A. Ahmad, F. Kee, C.P. & Mahbob, M.H. (2011). Diffusion of innovations: The adoption of Facebook among youths in Malaysia. *The innovation journal: The public sector innovation journal*, 16(3).
- Robinson, J.W. & Green, G.P. (2013). Developing communities. In J.W.Jr. Robinson and G.P. Green (eds.) *Introduction to community development: Theory, practice and service-learning*. California: Sage, pp. 1-10.
- Report of the Ninth United Nations Communication for Development Roundtable (CDR) on “Communication and sustainable development” Rome, September, 2005.
- Schucksmith, M. & Brown, D. L. (2016). Framing rural studies in the global North. In M. Schucksmith and D.L. Brown (eds.) *Routledge international handbook of rural studies*. London: Routledge, pp 1-26.
- Servaes, J. (2008). Introduction. In J. Servaes (Ed.) *Communication for development and social change*. New Delhi: Sage Pub. Pvt. Ltd.
- Singh, K. (2009). The role of social capital in the development of village economy: A study of tribal village in Manipur. In S. Komol (Ed.) *Village development in North-East India*. New Delhi: Concept publication co., pp. 97-118.
- Stacks, D. W. (2011). *Primer of public relations research*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- UNIDO (2013). *Rural transformation: Promoting livelihood security by adding value to local resources*. Vienna: Vienna International Centre. www.unido.org.
- Vahl, A. (2015). How to use Facebook groups to grow your business (www.andreavahl.com).

- Williams, I. & Kwofie, B. (2014). The impact of liberalization on the mobile telephony market in Africa: The cases of Ghana, Nigeria and Kenya. In I. Williams, & K. E. Skouby (Eds.), *The African mobile story*. Aalborg: River Publishers, pp. 17-40.
- Yadav, R.P. (2006). *People's participation: Focus on mobilization of the rural poor*. In United Nations Asian and Pacific Development Institute document. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company