

**THE IMPACT OF DEMOCRATIC RULE ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:
AN ASSESSMENT OF KOGI EAST SENATORIAL DISTRICT, 1999-2012**

BY

**OJUH, Ainoko Fidelis
(MSC/SOC-SCI/42369/2012-2013)**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES,
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA, IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER DEGREE IN**

POLITICAL SCIENCE

**DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES,
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,

ZARIA NIGERIA

FEBRUARY, 2017

Declaration

I hereby declare that this dissertation titled “**The Impact of Democratic Rule on Socio-Economic Development: An Assessment of Kogi East Senatorial District, 1999-2012**” has been carried out by me in the Department of Political Science and International Studies. The information derived from the literature has been duly acknowledged in the text and a list of references provided. No part of this thesis was previously presented for another degree at this or any other Institution, to the best of my knowledge.

Name of Student

Signature

Date

Certification

This dissertation entitled “**The Impact of Democratic Rule on Socio-Economic Development: An Assessment of Kogi East Senatorial District, 1999-2012**” by Ojuh, Ainoko Fidelis, meets the regulations governing the award of the degree of Master of Science of the Ahmadu Bello University, and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

Dr. Audu Jacob
Chairman, Supervisory Committee

Date

Dr. Yakubu A. Yusufu
Member, Supervisory Committee

Date

Dr. Aliyu Yahaya
Head of Department

Date

Prof. Kabiru Bala
Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies.

Date

Dedication

This research is dedicated to the loving memory of Late Ojo-Agefu Theresa Ojuh-Okolo whose inspiration and childhood care continually lingers in me; and to Olorunfemi Omojarabi (Marshal), my dear classmate and friend. Continue to rest in peace!

Acknowledgement

I wish to express my profound and eternal gratitude to the Almighty God for His grace, love, and protection and for the success of this research. Very importantly, my sincere and unalloyed gratitude goes to my team of supervisors for their masterly and professional guidance to make my research a huge success. I remain eternally grateful to you, Dr. Audu Jacob and Dr. Yusufu Yakubu.

I am most importantly grateful to my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Y. Ojuh for giving me the opportunity to live as a human, for their unending love, care, prayers and financial support. You allowed God to use you to give me life and you never stopped there. I will always love and thank you. I am also very grateful to my siblings, Mr. Festus Ojuh, Sr. Helen Ojuh, Mr Julius Ojuh, Mr. Martin Ojuh, Mrs. Mercy Ojuh-Ahiaba and Mrs. Anthonia Ojuh-Edogbo for their love, care, prayers and support. I love you all.

My profound gratitude also goes to my external examiner, Professor Aisha Abdul-Ismail, my internal (external) examiner, YK Gandu, PhD, my internal examiner/discussant, Dr. David O. Moveh and all the distinguished lecturers in the department, particularly those that guided me during my class work. I am particularly indebted to Dr. Aliyu Yahaya for his benevolence in helping me with a very important material that aided my research. I also thank all the non-academic staff of the department who in one way or the other helped to facilitate the completion of my programme.

I am particularly grateful to all those whose support saw me through in this journey: Fr. Theophilus Ejeh, Fr. Emmanuel Abuh, Fr. Bruno Ezedinma, Sr. Regina Achor, Miss Mary Dike, Fr. Peter Okolo and Mrs. Mary Ojuh. Also, very importantly, I remain eternally grateful to Mr.

and Mrs. Joseph Ojuh-Haruna and family, for taking me in as their own during this period of my studies. Only God will reward and bless you all for your support. I thank also, Mr. Abel Haruna, Mr. Innocent Alfa, Mr. Theophilus Omale, Judith Ajago, Racheal Attah and Jessica Oguche who helped in administering and retrieving my questionnaires.

My gratitude also goes to a very special friend, Miss Elizabeth Obianuju Osuagwu who always showed me care and moral support. You have always been there. I equally thank Solomon and Fidelis – Omale respectively for their kind support.

I thank my very special friend and brother, Maichiki Paul Manasseh, whose brotherly love and friendship made life easy and worthwhile for me during this period at ABU. I will never forget you, brother from another mother. To my very wonderful roommates, brothers and friends, Israel Ocheje Haruna and Onuche Angel Daikwo, I say a special than you. I also thank my uncle, Dr. Ezekiel Haruna for his encouragement.

To my friends, Jerry Usman, Usman Hezekiah, Mercy Arifayose, Abdulnasir James and Jim Ekene, I say a very big thank you.

Abstract

This study is an assessment of the Impact of Democratic Rule on Socio-Economic Development in Kogi East Senatorial District, from 1999 to 2012. This is predicated upon the assumption that democratic rule advance or foster socio-economic development and also, based on the belief that Nigeria, having returned to democratic rule in 1999, opened a new chapter to write a new history in developmental issues, it becomes empirical to assess the effects of democratic rule on socio-economic development using a case study. Invariably, Nigeria has faced developmental challenges for many years after her independence going through series of political instability and change of government over the years and the return to democratic rule in 1999 presented an epoch good enough for academic study. However, the case study, Kogi East Senatorial District becomes imperative for academic research because Kogi State being one of the poorest states of the nation has faced its own developmental challenges that makes it very important to understudy in order to identify the effects of democratic rule at the grassroots. However, the period under study is very significant because, immediately after the return to democratic rule in 1999, Kogi State witnessed a change in administration in 2003 and the subsequent administration was greeted with series of legal battles challenging the credibility of the election that brought it into power. Also, the period witnessed an intense political thuggery and thus, it is imperative to examine if socio-economic development could thrive under such heightened political situation. The study used three survey instruments (questionnaires, In-depth and Focus Group Discussion) to collect the primary data and the secondary data using documentary method. The data was quantitatively and qualitatively presented and analyzed through triangulation method. The Modernization Theory was adopted to analyze the phenomena of democratic rule, good governance and their effects on socio-economic development. The adoption of this theory is informed by the fact that the wave of democratic transition in Africa and many developing countries anchored the desire for development in line with the actualization of the dividends of democratic rule which is dependent on the manner of governance found at all levels in Nigeria. The study found out that, though not commensurate to the desires of the people, Kogi East Senatorial District has recorded some socio-economic development in areas such as growth in education, employment and social amenities, between 1999 to 2012. The study also found out that living standard of people has improved. Corruption, imposition of leaders, bad, visionless and unresponsive leadership/governance are chief among the challenges identified to be hindering the growth of democratic rule in the region. In view of this, the study recommends that leadership and governance be taken as key areas of priority to be tackled for the growth of democracy in order to advance socio-economic development. Corruption, which is at the core of the challenges hindering the growth of democratic governance in fostering socio-economic development must be sincerely and adequately tackled as urgent as possible.

List of Abbreviations/Acronyms

APP – All People’s Party

CMML – Christian Mission in Many Lands

DTAT – Data Transcription and Analysis Technique

FCT – Federal Capital Territory

FGD – Focus Group Discussion

FRSC – Federal Road Service Commission

ICDA – Igala Cultural and Development Association

ICT – Information Communication Technology

IDI – In-Depth Interview

INEC – Independent National Electoral Commission

LGA – Local Government Area

MDG – Millennium Development Goals

NA – Native Authority

NAPEP – National Poverty Eradication Programme

NBS – National Bureau of Statistics

PDP – People’s Democratic Party

QDI – Quality of Democracy Index

QIM – Qua-Iboe Mission

SPSS – Statistical Package for Social Sciences

SURE-P – Subsidy Re-Investment Programme

UNCDP – United Nations Committee for Development Policy

UNDP – United Nations Development Programme

UN-ESCAP – United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and Pacific

UN-OHRLS – United Nations Office of the High Representatives of the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States

YAD4KOGI – Youth Advancement and Development for Kogi

Table of Content

Title Page -----	i
Declaration -----	ii
Certification-----	iii
Dedication -----	iv
Acknowledgement -----	v
Abstract -----	vii
List of Abbreviation/Acronyms -----	viii
Table of Content -----	ix
List of Tables -----	x
CHAPTER ONE: GENERAL INTRODUCTION -----	1
1.1 Background to the Study-----	4
1.2 Statement of Research Problem -----	5
1.3 Research Questions-----	6
1.4 Objectives of the Study -----	6
1.5 Research Propositions -----	7
1.6 Significance/Justification of the Study -----	7
1.7 Scope and Limitation of the Study -----	8
1.8 Chapter Organization -----	9
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK -----	10
2.1 Introduction -----	10
2.2 Literature Review -----	10
2.2.1 The Concept of Democracy -----	10
2.2.1.1 Types of Democracy -----	19
2.2.1.2 Features of Indirect Democracy -----	20
2.2.3 Democratic Rule -----	23

2.2.4 Democratic Rule and the African Experience -----	26
2.2.5 Liberal Democracy and the Relationship between Democracy and Development: The Argument So Far -----	31
2.2.6 Yardsticks to Measuring Democracy in Fostering Development -----	39
2.3 The Concept of Good Governance -----	46
2.4 The Concept of Development -----	54
2.4.1 Strategies for Development -----	61
2.4.2 Alternative Strategies for Transformative Development -----	63
2.5 The Effects of the Nexus between Democratic Rule and Good Governance on Socio-Economic Development-----	65
2.6 Theoretical Framework -----	73
2.7 Conclusion -----	81
 CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY-----	82
3.0 Research Methodology -----	82
3.1 Introduction -----	82
3.2 Study Area -----	82
3.3 Types and Sources of Data -----	82
3.4 Instrument of Data Collection -----	84
3.5 Population Sampling and Sampling Techniques -----	85
3.6 Population and Sample -----	87
3.7 Data Transcription and Analysis Technique (DTAT) -----	89
3.8 Hiring of Research Assistant -----	91
3.9 SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN KOGI EAST SENATORIAL DISTRICT BEFORE 1999 -----	91
 CHAPTER FOUR	
4.0 ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTS OF DEMOCRATIC RULE ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN KOGI EAST SENATORIAL DISTRICT, 1999-2012 -----	97

4.1 Introduction -----	97
4.2 DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS -----	99
4.2.1 The extent to which Democratic rule has impacted on socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District Between 1999 to 2012 -----	102
4.2.2 Challenges hindering socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District under the democratic rule between 1999 to 2012 -----	122
4.2.3 Ways to tackle such challenges hindering democratic rule in fostering socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District -----	128
4.4 Summary of Findings -----	132
 CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS -----	134
5.0 SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS -----	134
5.1 Introduction -----	134
5.2 Summary -----	134
5.3 Conclusion -----	134
5.4 Recommendations -----	137
References -----	138
Appendix “A”: Questionnaire -----	146
Appendix “B”: Interviewees -----	149
Appendix “C”: Names of People Interviewed -----	151
Appendix “D” Focus Group Discussion Guide -----	152
Appendix “E” List of FGD Respondents -----	154
Appendix “F” Healthcare Facilities in Kogi East Senatorial District before and after 1999 ---	156
Appendix “G” List of Roads and Housing Projects/Programmes in Kogi East Senatorial District after 1999 -----	159

List of Tables

Table 3.5.1 Showing Wards according to the Selected Local Governments -----	86
Table 3.61 Distribution of the Total Population and Sample Size according to the Wards of the Local Governments -----	89
Table 3.9.1 Relative Poverty Headcount from 1980-2006 -----	96
Table 4.1 Biodata of Respondents -----	99
Table 4.2 Have you enjoyed dividends of democracy between 1999-2012? -----	102
Table 4.3 The nature of the dividends of democracy enjoyed -----	104
Table 4.4 On the reasons that democratic rule has fostered socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District since 1999-2012 -----	107
Table 4.5 Whether respondent's friend or relative has been employed since 1999- 2012 -----	109
Table 4.5.1 NBS 2010 Report showing rising unemployment in Kogi State -----	110
Table 4.6 Was there healthcare delivery, roads, water supply and food supply, 1999-2012?--	111
Table 4.7 Did people in your area own more cars between 1999-2012 -----	113
Table 4.8 Has there been reduction in poverty, inequality and unemployment, 1999-2012 ----	114
Table 4.9 If yes, how? -----	116
Table 4.10 Any new industry in your area between 1999-2012? -----	118
Table 4.11 Any other dividends of democracy enjoyed between 1999-2012? -----	119
Table 4.12 Has there been any problem in your area since 1999-2012? -----	122
Table 4.13 Is corruption the major problem that has hindered democracy, 1999-2012 -----	122
Table 4.14 Any other problem that has hindered democracy in your area? -----	124
Table 4.15 If yes, mention. -----	125
Table 4.16 Can the problems facing democratic rule in fostering socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District be tackled? -----	127
Table 4.17 How can democracy perform better to enhance development in your area? -----	128

CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Democracy, democratic rule and development are being increasingly used in development literature to mean series of complementary unification of concepts closely tied to good governance. Democracy is one of the universal and indivisible core values and principles which according to the United Nations World Summit Outcome Document (2001) is “based on the freely expressed will of people and closely linked to the rule of law and exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms”. Democracy therefore, backed by good governance, feeds into economic and social policies that are responsive to people’s needs. Its basic features therefore includes political tolerance, citizens participation, equality, respect for rule of law, social and economic freedom, human rights, multi-party system, culture of accepting election results, among others.

However, the meaning or definition of good governance is relative as what is ‘good’ for one person may be bad for the other (Adagba, 2009: 377). However, a more general conceptualization of good governance can be seen through a broader perspective to include the following eight characteristics: participation, consensus orientation, accountability, transparency, responsiveness, efficiency and effectiveness, equality and inclusiveness and, the rule of law (UN ESCAP, 1999).

Development can simply be seen as economic growth, increase in quality of life of a given population and anything that adds value to the improvement in human life and society as a

whole. This view gives a general and wider look at the term 'development' because of its multifaceted outlook.

The three concepts (democracy, good governance and development) have been accorded intellectual attention in development literature at various levels over the years. Whether in practice or on paper, these concepts when respectively used and applied tend to flow into one another as they appear to be the indicators of internationally and locally accepted civilized sources of administrative and governmental apparatuses to bring government closer to the people.

The recent Nigerian history, that is, from 1999 till date sees the popularisation of these concepts as they hinge on the pragmatic identification of politics to cut across the inadequacies of governance and democracy in order to precede socio-economic development. This period has also seen the expression of high hopes by the masses especially with the feeling that the democratic dispensation would address issues of poverty, poor health care, unemployment, inequality, lack of social amenities and improve the general living conditions of the people. Many also believe that the democratic dispensation would meet the yearnings of the people especially as regards fostering of economic freedom, increase in earnings, improved market structure, respect for human rights, respect for rule of law, press freedom and greater economic prospects.

Moreso, UNDP Human Development Reports (2014) identifies key areas of human development every government or system must ensure are adequately tackled. These include long and healthy life, knowledge, decent standard of living, promoting equality and social justice, human security and rights, environmental sustainability and participation in political and community life. It thus recommends that government must directly enhance human capabilities and create conditions for

human development. No doubting, these are the key areas every democratic dispensation or government must address.

However, despite the abundance of huge human and natural resources, history indicates that Nigeria, irrespective of the many social and economic policies propagated over the years by different successive administrations, have been faced with many social, economic and political development issues, ranging from acute youth unemployment, poor health prospects, insecurity, heightened crime rate, poor infrastructural development, abject poverty among the masses, widespread of malnourishment, to mention but a few (Ogundiya, 2010). Both students of development and government have the responsibility of identifying the causes of these multifarious development challenges in Nigeria. Noteworthy, therefore is the fact that democracy, democratic rule and good governance are absolutely imperative for social and economic progress. The question therefore remains whether the yearnings of the people have been met over the years, especially during the period under study.

Over the years, many arguments have been put forward to ascertain the actuality of the effects of democratic rule and good governance on socio-economic development. Some scholars (Ake, 2000; 1996; Toyo, 1994; Ogundiya, 2010), have engaged some academic rigour to hold the point that democracy, possibly backed by good governance enhances development and vice versa. Many of these discourses occur probably as a result of the perception and conceptualization of democracy.

Ake (2000:7) is of the opinion that:

The trivializing of democracy often occurred under cover of clarifying or operationalizing a supposedly complex and confusing concept. But that was only a blind because there is nothing complex or confusing about the concept of democracy. For political concept, 'democracy' is uncharacteristically precise. It

means popular power, or in a famous American version, government of the people, for the people, by the people.

Nevertheless, democracy can adequately be established to be a theory that sets some basic principles for good governance. These principles cut across justice, equality, freedom, liberty, accountability, etc, and, effective democratic forms of government rely on public accountability and transparency (Oluwole, 2003;Ogundiya, 2010), all of which are the ingredients of good governance.

However, the United States Ambassador, Thomas Pickering, declared before the United Nations in October 1991 that, "the bottom line of good governance is democracy itself" (cited in Ogundiya, 2010). Consequently, many scholars who share this view have associated the state of development in Africa, including Nigeria, to the absence of democratic rule and prolonged military hegemony (Ake, 1996). Therefore, it has become necessary to study whether the presence of democratic rule or governance has been able to solve developmental questions in Nigeria. Whether this is characterised by the nature of African and Nigerian elites or not, the situation has led many scholars to doubt the existence of democracy in Nigeria. For instance, Eskor Toyo (1994), critically opined that Nigeria had never experienced democracy. His argument is summed in the fact that, instead of the return to civil rule, Nigerians kept talking about return to democracy, falling into the presumption that democracy has once existed in Nigeria (cited in Ogundiya, 2010).

Whether the arguments put forward on the right definition of democracy and its possible effect on socio-economic development are genuine, the simple fact remains that, judging from the view of Ake, that is, seeing democracy as popular power, one can dare to state that such popular power should uncharacteristically be anchored by good governance in order to enhance socio-economic development. This definitely is the case for Nigeria in general and Kogi East

Senatorial District in particular. For instance, there cannot be socio-economic development if democratic governance is mixed with bad leadership which is a prototype of bad governance.

However, it is worthy of note that in any political institution, the system of government and governance are germane to social and human development and, democratic rule, backed by good governance has been given much credence towards this extent. It is therefore imperative to critically evaluate the extent to which this practice has been observed in Nigeria. Unlike in advanced societies where these practices, to a large extent are strictly adhered to, the situation with Nigeria appears to be different. This is a problem that has created doubts over the credibility of our democracy and its sustenance in the nearest future.

1.2 Statement of Research Problem

Owing to the assumption that democracy promotes development, it has become imperative to conduct an empirical study to ascertain whether the return to democratic rule in Nigeria in 1999 has enhanced socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District. This study, therefore, sets out to examine the extent to which democratic rule has promoted socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District between 1999 to 2012, especially in the areas of poverty, poor health, unemployment, inequality and general living conditions.

The period under study is important because, just after the return to democratic rule in 1999, the state witnessed in 2003, a change of administration from one political party to another (APP to PDP) after four years. The new administration from 2003 witnessed several legal battles regarding the credibility of the election that brought it into power and the subsequent one, a situation that later saw the administration spanning through nine (9) years. Also, the period witnessed an intense era of political thuggery which brought about a heightened political tension

in the state. Thus, it is necessary to investigate whether socio-economic development could thrive under such situation.

However, the choice of this topic is predicated on the fact that the researcher hails from this region and his good knowledge of the area makes it worthwhile for an academic investigation. However, with the informal expectations and yearnings from the people of this region on the dividends of democracy, having produced the three Executive Governors that have ruled the state since the return to democratic rule in 1999, this research becomes also imperative to assess the complementary role of Democratic Rule on Socio-economic Development, bearing in mind that, a region does not produce a governor to develop its area only.

1.3 Research Questions

This study attempts to provide answers to the following research questions:

- i. To what extent has democratic rule promoted socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District between 1999 and 2012?
- ii. What are the challenges hindering socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District 1999 to 2012?
- iii. How can such challenges be tackled to foster or promote socio-economic development Kogi East Senatorial District?

1.4 Aim and Objectives of the Study

The aim of this study is to assess the extent to which democratic rule has promoted socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District between 1999 and 2012. However, the specific objectives of this study are:

- i. To examine the extent to which democratic rule has enhanced socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District between 1999 and 2012.
- ii. To study the challenges hindering socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District since the return to democratic rule from 1999 to 2012.
- iii. To identify ways through which democratic rule can foster socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District.

1.5 Research Propositions

This study was guided by the following research propositions:

- i. Democratic rule has not adequately necessitated socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District since 1999 to 2012
- ii. Bad governance has limited socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District between 1999 to 2012
- iii. Good governance can foster socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District.

1.6Significance of the Study

The significance of this study centres very significantly on the fact that existing literature on the complementary effects of democracy on development have all been anchored on the macro level and none has so far, been particularised to the micro level of which this study is set to unravel. Thus, this study is most significant as it basically looks at the effects of democratic rule, backed by good governance on socio-economic development at a micro level, with specific regards to

Kogi East Senatorial District. The knowledge gathered therefore would help broaden the understanding of the effects of democratic rule at a micro level.

1.7 Scope and Limitations of the Study

The scope of this study is the examination of the Impact of Democratic Rule on Socio-Economic Development in Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999 to 2012. The period encompass the three administrations of late Prince Abubakar Audu of the then All People's Party (1999-2003) and Alhaji Ibrahim Idris of the People's Democratic Party (2003-2012).

The period under study is important because, just after the return to democratic rule in 1999, the state witnessed in 2003, a change of administration from one political party to another (APP to PDP) after four years. The new administration from 2003 witnessed several legal battles regarding the credibility of the election that brought it into power and the subsequent one, a situation that later saw the administration spanning through nine (9) years.

The study could not have been without some limitations. It is pertinent to note that the field work covered a period of two months and about 10 days that is, from February 8 to April 14, 2015. It is very important to note that this period happened to be the intense campaign season for the 2015 general elections and one of the major challenges the researcher faced was the unfortunate apathy of those to be interviewed to honour the researcher's requests. This consequently limited the researcher to interview only six people.

Also, there was apathy on the side of respondents to attend to the questionnaires as many, because of the campaign period demanded for some financial benefits before attending to the questionnaires. But with persistence and clarification on the importance of the survey from the researcher and the research assistants, they were able to convince them.

However, the limitations cannot be complete without mentioning the difficulty faced in the area of mobility and financial constraints. Moving round twelve (12) wards was not easy for the researcher and his assistants and this posed a serious challenge towards the accomplishment of this study but because of the importance of the study, much effort was made to actualize the target for the study.

1.8 Chapter Organization

This research is made up of five chapters. Chapter one covers the general introduction which culminates the detailed description on how the research was conducted. Chapter two consist of the review of relevant literature related to the subject under study. The bulk of literature was therefore thematically and systematically done and a theoretical framework was adopted to enhance the analysis herein.

Chapter three of this study encompass the research methodology. The methodology gives the details of how the data used in this study were derived and analyzed. However, a historical overview of the socio-economic activities in Kogi East Senatorial District was given to enhance the understanding from the field result.

The bulk of work in chapter four consists of data analysis which was done with descriptive quantitative and qualitative analysis. Also, chapter four states the summary of findings from the analysis advanced in the study. Chapter five is the final chapter of the study and it consists of summary, conclusion and recommendations from the study. However, the later part of the chapter gives a detailed list of references and list of various appendixes used herein.

CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

The central argument or proposition of this research is to investigate the level of socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District and this is advanced in line with the belief that democratic rule, backed by good governance form the harbinger to the actualization of socio-economic development in the research focus area from a general scope to the narrowness of the case study. The review in this chapter therefore, covers a bulk of literature on these variables. A systematic thematic review thus is advanced. It therefore covers themes on the three major variables in this study, that is, the concept of democracy, the concept of good governance and the concept of development. Further sub-themes to cover other aspects of the complementary relationships between democracy and good governance on development, features of indirect democracy reflected on good governance and the feasibility of democracy through the continuous democratization in Africa/Nigeria are equally advanced. However, the research creates a theoretical framework for analysis and effort is thus made to operationalize the most suitable theory that best describe the phenomena of democracy, good governance and development.

2.2 Literature Review

2.2.1 The Concept of Democracy

The concept of democracy has an age-long intellectual discussion and it has been in use (especially in the Western political thought) since ancient times. Etymologically derived from the Greek words “demos”, meaning, “the people” and “cracy”, which stands for “rule” or

“government”, democracy, therefore literally means “the rule of the people”. As a system of government, democracy has been one of the most popular concepts discussed in contemporary literature and discourses. Very closely, Abraham Lincoln’s definition of democracy as “the government of the people, by the people and for the people” portrays its literal meaning (Gaub, 2007: 421). In a nutshell therefore, Gaub(2007) opines that democracy as a form of government envisages that ultimate authority of government is vested in the common people in order for public policy-making to conform to the general will of the people, thereby serving their interests.

However, many proponents of democracy, especially in the likes of John Austin (1790-1859), James Bryce (1838-1922), A. V. Dicey (1856-1943) chiefly treated the concept as a form of government. Lowell, for instance views democracy as “only an experiment in government”. This view sees democracy as a practice in continuous change. That is, as an experiment, democracy is expected to keep improving. This is basically common of democracies in developing states, where the practice could be stated as *primitive*.

Historically, democracy emerged from the Athenian city state (polis). According to Ober, (1989), the Athenian democracy was based on a set of abstract principles: moderation was desirable, the law should exist separate from and superior to social and political processes; the organs of government should be distinct in their powers; and, in general, all forms and forums of public decision and action should be defined by clear boundaries and restrictions. From this view, democratic practice saw the reflection of government principles strictly replicated in laws and institutions of government. Worthy of note here is the fact that, these abstract principles were codified in the constitution according to which the people were governed. It culminated a practical politics in which the governance of the people was based on the body of rules

(constitution) to which people were directly part of. Thus, from the inception, democracy has been a people's form of government.

The classical notion of democracy, according to Plato and Aristotle saw democracy as having the features of equal participation by all *freemen* in the common affairs of the *polis*, arriving at public decisions in an atmosphere of free discussion and general respect for law and for the established procedures of the community (Gaubu, 2007: 420). This was not, however, seen as the ideal rule or democracy but the essence was its inclusion of every member of the society and the respect for rights and freedom of the people expressed by the virtue of their participation. Hence, from this perspective, the future of democracy was dependent on the advancement or development of human wisdom towards societal governance.

Other classical views notable to mention are those of Dicey and Bryce respectively. Dicey, in his famous work "Law and Opinion in England" (1905) treated democracy as a form of government under which majority opinion determines legislation (Gaubu, 2007). Opinion in this sense is seen from the will of the people, hence, according to Dicey, it would be unwise in a democracy to enforce law not approved by the people. Laws of a land must therefore be sanctioned by the will (opinion) of the people before it can be considered as law unless in a tyranny.

James Bryce, in his monumental works, "The American Commonwealth" (1893) and "Modern Democracies" (1921) defined the term as "the rule of the people expressing their sovereign will through the votes". He ultimately limited democracy to the rule of the majority. Hence, he justified it as having the chief functions of government as: the protection from internal and external enemies, the securing of justice, efficient administration of common affairs, and the bestowal of aid to individual citizens in their several occupations. The last is a welfarist kind of

democracy, but however, history shows that these functions may be carried out by other forms of government.

That notwithstanding, Gauba (2007: 423) opine that democracy seen from the perspective of Bryce, that is, as “rule by the people” sees the exercise of authority in two ways: (a) the people determining the ends towards which their government shall aim, and (b) watch over those into whose hands the people place the central power of administration.

Bryce (1921) enumerated six outstanding evils of the classical democracy: (i) The power of many interests to pervert administration or legislation; (ii) The tendency of actual politics to become a trade entered for the gain and not for service; (iii) Extravagance; (iv) The failure to evaluate properly the skilled man, and to abuse the doctrine of equality; (v) Party politics; and (vi) The tendency of politicians to play over votes. These defects, notwithstanding, do not suffice to deny the importance and effectiveness of democracy. They form the few shortcomings of every concept and cannot be overemphasized.

Notwithstanding the fact that democracy is an old concept, the recent discussions and conceptualization have seen it used in diverse manifestations. Chiefly among them is the liberal democracy, which today has outstandingly distinguished itself from other forms of democracy. Broadly speaking, liberal democracy can be seen in two principles and characteristics, that is, its procedure and institutional arrangements. Gauba (2007), for instance categorizes these principles/characteristics into: government by consent; public accountability; majority rule; recognition of minority rights; and constitutional government. These are inherent of modern democracy which is seen spreading its wings across the globe.

Democracy has been under a rigour of contending ideological viewpoints over the years. Many scholarly opinions thus, have conceived the concept differently. Accordingly, Audu (2010) views democracy as standing on the assumption that the government is not an end in itself but a means for the realization of the greatest good of the greatest number. This assumption is established on the fact that government which sets out to rule must not be in the special interest of any one group or alliance of groups, but in the common interest of all. Though political parties and individuals contest and win elections, their ascendance in government must therefore be in the general interest of the people but not the people that voted them into office.

However, from the earlier type of democracy, that is, the Athenian model, the concept has evolved a continuous systematic change and it has been viewed in many dimensions. To reckon this, Ogundiya (2010) posits that, “democracy has become the most fashionable form of governance in the world”. To this end, the issue is not to desire the appropriate political system but how every society can become democratic. In the same view, Audu (2010) holds that, “democracy is today considered as the most desirable form of government and man’s best idea on earth for governance”. Viewed from the perspective of the Athenian model of democracy, Audu(2010) explains that the people were originally viewed to mean “the poor, disadvantaged, or the many”, whose will must be conformed in the abstract principles of governance stated above.

However, the concept has generated great debate and contest among scholars, as it has been viewed in many diverse ways. Linz and Stephan (1996) view democracy to meet three conditions: competition among individuals and organized groups (political parties), political participation in the selection of leaders and civil and political liberties. According to this view, democracy is seen as a popular manner in which the people with the use of their liberty freely

choose those to govern them through the exercise of selection/election. It entails an active participation and exercise of freedom and determination on the manner to select those who represent their will in government. It can be therefore deduced as electoral democracy.

In this line too, Schumpeter (1976) and Weber (1970) view democracy to primarily be a means of selecting political regime in condition of a modern bureaucratic society and the role of the people are reduced to voters with little or no influence over decision-making (cited in DDP Research Unit, 2008). To these scholars, the role of the people in decision-making has been reduced minimally to the exercise of franchise. Thus, by way of contributing to decision-making, the will of the people is manifested through voting.

Satori (1962) refers to democracy as the “power of the people”, where power resides with the people. Conceptualised this way, democracy is said to be a direct form, where people govern themselves; or an indirect/representative form where the emergence of a government is done through the expression of the will of the people to derive its legitimacy. The important factor here is a democratic system which has its root in the general will of the people.

Ake (2000) argues that democracy simply connotes popular power and further states that liberal democracy repudiates popular power. This argument is uncharacteristically precise. He further added that liberal democracy is not really a political morality in the sense that classical democracy was to the Athenians but a political convenience, the political correlate of the market, or the political condition for operationalizing the law of value and maximizing its efficiency and sustainability. Furthermore, Ake (2000), argues that there appears to be a confusion of the concept in regard to the emergence of liberal democracy. This he states, is not a causal result of confusion but a deliberate political choice arising from a careful appraisal of substantive interests. To this end, what is seen is the rejection of the true democratic doctrines and practice

and rather replaced with definitional refinements anchored by the ruling elite (liberal democrats or the bourgeoisie). Thus, democracy is not delegated authority or representative governance but a popular expression of power by the people through voting.

However, according to Dahl (1982: 11), democracy “is viewed as a system of elected representative government operated under the rule of law, where the most significant groups in the population participate in the political process and have access to effective representation in the practice of making governmental decision, that is, allocation of scarce resources” (cited in Ayatse, Onaga and Ogoh, 2013). This conceptualization recognises a particular number of people who must participate in the election of the representative government which invariably means the qualified adult of a society. Hence, their contribution to the allocation of scarce resources in the society is done through the universal adult suffrage.

Przeworski (2004), creating a dichotomy between democracy and dictatorship states that the prototype of democratic politics underlies the analysis of Schumpeter’s (1942) focus on filling governmental offices by elections. Thus, democracy is seen as a political regime in which rulers are elected through free and fair elections. Also, democracy can be operationally conceived as a regime in which incumbents lose elections and leave office if they do. This type of democracy is chiefly seen as electoralist or Schumpeterian, for its basic feature is the dominance of electoral practice and respect for votes. In this regard, if an incumbent who respects the doctrine of democracy loses election, he is bound to leave office, as the case against dictatorship.

However, Ayatse, Onaga and Ogoh, (2013) states the basic characteristics of democracy to include the existence of the mechanism for political and economic choice, balanced political structure and stable political system where periodic elections are held in which people renew their mandate of those they love and accept or terminate those they are dissatisfied with through

the succession of a new government. The conceptualization equally has a dominating electoralist characteristic and the respect for the generality of the will of the majority through the exercise of voting. By doing so, they either terminate a mandate given for representation or renew it as the case may be.

Ayoade (1998: 11) sees democracy as:

The form of government in which every citizen in a state has political investments of political participation and trust. This system of government is owned by the people which it governs. It is this ownership that makes it tenable and acceptable to the people... it is marked by the continuous dialogue and interaction between those who govern and the ruled (cited in Ayatse, Onaga and Ogoh, 2013).

This definition shows the collectivity of the interests of the people in entrusting power to the government, represented by a certain number of individuals with the legitimate authority to pilot the affairs of government. It is done in a participatory form central to the trust bestowed on the elected officials to represent the will of the people. Democracy, in a nutshell, therefore is the “system of government that is rooted in the notion that ultimate authority in governance rightly belongs to the people, and that everyone is entitled to an equitable participation and share in human rights, where equitable social and economic gains are the right of everyone in the society” (Ayatse, Onaga and Ogoh, 2013).

Nnoli (2003: 143), argues that democracy emphasises freedom of the individuals in various aspects of political life, equality among citizens, justice in the relations between the people and the government, and the participation of the people in choosing those in government. This definition is multifaceted and all inclusive as it cuts across human rights, freedom, equality and even the right to participate in governance.

However, Schumpeter (1959: 258; 1967: 153) holds that democracy entails “institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions, which realizes the common good by making the people decide issues through the election of individuals, who are to assemble in order to carry out its will”. Schumpeter (1950) sees the other side of democracy as the centrality of competition to the emergence of political leadership (cited in Omotola, 2006). These respective definitions presuppose democracy as basically emphasizing on the right to elect political leaders and a way of ensuring that the people participate in the selection of their leaders through competitive free and fair elections.

According to Dahl (2003: 37), an ideal democracy is conterminous with “a political system that might be designed for members of an association who were willing to treat one another, for political purposes, as political equals”. Such system requires certain criteria for effective functioning as in the following: fundamental human rights of citizens, democratic political institutions to boost citizens’ participation in electing representatives, to freedom of expression, inquiry, discussion, and many more (Omotola, 2006).

Meanwhile, it is important to bear in mind that democracy has certain tenets which underpin its practice and these, according to Dahl (1991) have been rendered in seven ways thus:

- i. Control over government decisions about policy is constitutionally vested in elected officials.
- ii. Elected officials are chosen in frequent and fairly conducted elections in which coercion is comparatively uncommon.
- iii. Practically, all adults have the right to vote in the election of officials.
- iv. Practically, all adults have the rights to run for elective offices in the government.

- v. Citizens have a right to express themselves on political matters without the danger of severe punishment.
- vi. Citizens have the rights to seek out alternative sources of information that are protected by law.
- vii. Citizens have a right to form relatively independent associations or organizations, including independent political parties and interest groups (cited in Olufemi, 2009).

For these tenets to be put in practice is the fact that there must be a preliminary facilitating factor to predispose a people to readily embrace, imbibe or at best be willing to adapt to the values of democratic practices. This is generally known as ‘political culture’, as propagated by Almond and Verba (1963), cited in (Olufemi 2009). This is equally important for the fact that countries, Nigeria inclusive, that have accepted to practice democracy must start from the scratch.

2.2.1.1Types of Democracy

Democracies fall into two basic categories, i.e. direct/participatory and indirect/representative democracy.

DIRECT DEMOCRACY- This is seen in a situation where citizens, without the intermediary of elected or appointed officials, can participate in making public decisions. Direct democracy thus reduces the distinction between government and the governed and between the state and civil society; it is a system of popular self-government. Its most common manifestation in the modern era is the use of referenda (U.S. Department of State, *Democracy in Brief*, cited in EU Guide for Peer Educators, 2011).

Direct democracy is most clearly practicable with relatively small numbers of people in a community organization, tribal council, or the local unit of a labour union, for example, where

members can meet in a single room to discuss issues and arrive at decisions by consensus or majority vote.

INDIRECT DEMOCRACY- Today, unlike in the past, the most common form of democracy, whether for a town of 50,000 or a nation of 50 million people, is representative democracy, in which the citizens elect officials to make political decisions, formulate laws, and administer programmes for the public good. This type of democracy is limited and indirect. It is limited in the sense that popular participation in government is infrequent and brief, being restricted to the act of voting every few years. It is indirect in that the public do not exercise power themselves; they merely elect those who will rule on their behalf. This form of rule is democratic only insofar as representation establishes a reliable and effective link between the government and the governed (EU Guide for Peer Educators, 2011).

2.2.1.2 Features of Indirect Democracy

There are salient features/characteristics of democracy common in every democratic nation all over. These features are:

- **CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:** This means that citizens are part and parcel of what happens in their society or country. The citizens are part of the decision-making process on matters that affect them. Communication is a two-way consultative process, i.e. bottom-up as well as top-bottom before any decision is reached. This happens through voting during elections or referendum.
- **EQUALITY:** This means equality before the law, equality of opportunity in the realization of individual capacities without regard to one's race, gender, ethnic background, religion or whatsoever.

- **POLITICAL TOLERANCE:** This means the ruling class is mindful and respectful of the interests of the minority. While there may be differences between the people by way of race, religion, descent and culture they rise above such differences and give room for discussion, debate and accommodation of different viewpoints.
- **ACCOUNTABILITY:** This is when elected leaders or public officials have to answer to the common citizens regarding their actions, decisions or indecisions during the time they are or were occupants of the public offices. Those found to be performing to the required standards are rewarded by their continued stay in office while those found to be lacking in one way or another are punished.
- **TRANSPARENCY:** To be transparent means that leaders allow for public scrutiny of what they do while in public office. The citizens are allowed to attend public meetings and are free to obtain information on what happens in public offices, who makes what decisions and why. Transparency is a step towards accountability.
- **REGULAR, FREE AND FAIR ELECTIONS:** Regular elections ensure that the citizens are not stuck with bad leadership but that they have the opportunity to throw out incompetent leaders through free and fair elections. Free and fair elections give the citizens a chance to elect a leader of their choice as opposed to rigging elections that return often unwanted leaders to power. Elections are the main avenue for all citizens to exercise power by choosing their leaders and giving their vote to the candidate whom they think will represent them best.
- **ECONOMIC FREEDOM:** Economically handicapped citizens are the ones prone to all types of abuses as they lack the economic base to meet the basic necessities of life. As a result they are the ones often bribed with the smallest of gifts during elections, the consequences of which are often adverse, such as returning corrupt and morally bankrupt

leaders to power. Economic independence creates the foundation on which the citizens become vibrant and thus able to call their leaders to account for their actions or inaction. In democracies, economic pluralism needs to go hand in hand with political and social pluralism, i.e. the freedom to choose/select one's political leaders and the freedom to belong to one's social/cultural associations, respectively.

- **CONTROL OF THE ABUSE OF POWER:** Any government without checks and balances on its powers is likely to abuse those powers. The most common form of abuse of power is corruption by government officials. Control of abuse of power can be achieved through a number of ways, i.e. by way of *separation of powers* of the three arms of government – the legislature, executive and the Judiciary – and by ensuring the independence of the three. Another way is by creation of institutions such as the government ombudsman which watches over the performance of government officials in relation to the agreed standards and ethics.
- **BILL OF RIGHTS:** This imposes controls on government powers in a bid to protect the citizens from abuse by heavy-handed leaders. As such, the bill of rights seeks to protect the rights and freedoms of the citizens by way of ensuring that this protection is enshrined in the constitution of a given country.
- **A CULTURE OF ACCEPTING THE RESULTS OF ELECTIONS:** Once free and fair elections are held and a winner clearly emerges, the loser of the elections should without resistance evacuate office and hand over the instruments of power to the winner. However, it is also important that once voted into power, the leaders should rule for the benefit of all citizens regardless of the fact that some did not vote for them.
- **HUMAN RIGHTS:** Unlike dictatorships, democracies strive to protect the rights and freedoms of their citizens from abuse. These rights include the right to life, the right to

own property, the freedom of expression, the freedom to associate, and the freedom to assemble, among others.

- **MULTI-PARTY SYSTEM:** A multiparty system is a set-up where there are more than two political parties contesting for power. The reasons for having multiple parties in a democracy are: to widen the pool for choice of the best candidate for political office; to offer alternative views to the government of the day as a result of the existence of an opposition; and to enable the opposition to act as a check on those in political office. One-party systems lead to a lack of alternatives for the citizens and concentration of powers and have often led to dictatorships.
- **NEUTRALITY OF STATE INSTITUTIONS:** State institutions such as the police and the army should be neutral and not take sides or be politically partisan.
- **RULE OF LAW:** This implies that no one is above the law and requires that all citizens observe the law and are held accountable if they break it. The due process of law requires that the law should be equally, fairly and consistently enforced. The rule of law ensures law and order and the protection of citizens as they enjoy their rights (the EU Guide for Peer Educators, 2011).

Sen, (1990); Oluwale, (2003); Ogundiya, (2010); all believe that these features of indirect democracy are common and related to good governance. They believe that all these features are ingredients of good governance and any effective democratic rule rely on them to foster socio-economic development in every society.

2.2.3Democratic Rule

Robert Dahl (1956), in his popular work, “*APreface to Democratic Theory*”, developed two concepts that are very important to the understanding of democracy and democratic rule,

namely ‘Contestation’, which entails competition and pluralism; and, secondly, ‘mass participation’ which gives the concept a majoritarian system of governance. According to these concepts, democratic rule carries its chief characteristics of freedom for participation in the competitive electoral process in order for citizens to elect their representatives and this could be pluralistic in nature as well, because it gives many competent people, the chance to vie for any such representative positions through the contest of elections. It however, on the other hand allows for mass participation where in any given state or society, many political associations, alliances, all in the form of political parties and even the generality of the masses partake in the governing of the state through an electoral process that allows for all to participate.

Diamond (1997) sees democratic rule as the most common and somewhat legitimate in the whole world but believes that it is shallow, illiberal and poorly institutionalized outside the Western societies. Accordingly, because of the level of poverty and inequality in the Third World countries, the true meaning and dividends of the practice makes it weak. This suffices to say that, democratic rule in Europe and America has greatly been entrenched in the systems in such a way that it has reduced poverty and limited the level of inequality in those societies. Because it has been fully established over the long period of practice, it has successfully blended into the society unlike the emerging democracies of Africa, Asia, perhaps, the Third World.

The foregoing reveals that democratic rule is not purely African and however, may not have blended well yet, into the African societies, of which Nigeria is inclusive. However, Nwauwa (2013) tends to differ in opinion as he believes that to what extent a society “democratizes” is incontestably dependent on its socio-cultural milieu, whether it is African, European, American, Asian, or even Islamic societies. His position is that, seeing democracy as European is erroneous and thus in his words,

While the term *democracy*, now a Western buzzword for representative government, might have been borrowed from the Greeks, democratic thought and values have never been exclusively Greek or Euro-American preserve. Indeed, the desire for representation, inclusion, and participation in public affairs, essential elements of democracy, are universal to all humans; the difference rests in the methods of attaining these goals (Nwauwa, 2013: 4).

The presumption has been that democratic values and practices are alien to the African continent, with the West posturing as their cultural bearers and defenders. His argument is also predicated on the premise that, the features of democratic rule, world all over, is the same and that whether it is characterized European or African does not matter so far the practice and standard acceptable everywhere is the same. Hence, it poses the question whether democratic rule in Africa is seen alongside that found in the Western societies.

According to Oyediran and Nweke (2014: 54):

The universal acceptance of democracy as the best system of governance is incontestable. This is premised on the participatory opportunity democracy affords the citizenry in the selection and election of their leaders and representatives. It guaranteed some recipe for good governance and the fundamental human rights of all law abiding citizens.

These opportunities are commonly identified with democracy everywhere it is genuinely practiced and it raises a curtain on the practice of democracy in Africa, whether its true meanings and principles are adhered to. Does the reality, therefore, of democratic rule in Africa and Europe or America suffice to be the same? This poses a critical gap in the conceptualization of democratic rule in Africa and Europe, both in theory and practice.

Bertin (2009) believes that Europe has much better democratic regimes in Europe than in many other countries and other countries could be positively influenced in matter of democracy by European initiatives in advancing socio-economic development. The developed societies in Europe suggests that democratic rule has attained a very significant maturity in those countries and thus, it become necessary for African countries to key into such systems based on their comparative advantages to better the practice in Africa.

Even though elections are not solely free and fair in every society, the examples shown in many developed countries in Europe and America suggests that democratic rule in Africa continues to experience a continuous development and over the years it could metamorphose to even be better than those of the Western countries.

In Western countries also, there are high regards for human rights, rule of law, accountability, government responsiveness, transparency, and many other characteristics accompanying democratic rule. These features continue to find their way into African societies and it is believed that with time, the maturing democracies in Africa, especially in Nigeria will attain that height.

2.2.4 Democratic Rule and the African Experience

The foregoing shows the fact that democracy is primarily not an African originated system or practice. This has given rise to a rigour of intellectually masterminded discourses to ascertain the feasibility of democracy in Africa and Nigeria in particular. This democratization in Africa hence becomes necessarily inevitable for academic investigation. This is because, existing literature and experiences in many African countries, Nigeria inclusive, show that the democracy in Africa is yet to attain its true meaning, especially as it has not appropriately met the yearnings of the masses. The continuous entrenchment of democratic rule in Africa is therefore necessary for investigation. Thus, it is inevitable to assume that democratization can help Africa and Nigeria achieve the much desired development or better still, if democratic rule has the institutional capacity to drive the desired socio-economic development needed in Nigeria. Hence, it is necessary to discuss the terrain of the inherent meaning of democratization in Africa.

Democratization is a process of entrenching democracy in a country (Steve, 2002). Seen from this perspective, it can be summarised that democracy in Africa and Nigeria is still in a process

of transition. However, according to Yusuf (1992), the notion of democratic transition implies a passage from a non-democratic to a democratic situation. Hence, the essence is a question posed in the long term because the establishment of a democratic rule or system, however defined, would constitute a veritable transition only if it becomes a fairly permanent feature of political life. For this to be made manifest, it must encompass constitutional rule and operation of a multi-party system but also a more profound socio-political transformation that will allow freely elected rulers and the majority of the civil population to impose their supremacy over the ruling oligarchies.

Democratization according to Ake (2000: 51) is the demand for economic and political incorporation interface and constitutes a rudimentary democracy movement. Ake (2000) argues that the process in Africa is of the fact that democracy is seen to enhance economic and political growth in the continent and the need and agitations therefore becomes inevitable. Overtly, this argument tries to ascertain the feasibility or compatibility of democratic practice in Africa and many arguments have therefore been advanced.

Evidentially, Ake (1996:3) states that, “although political independence brought some change to the composition of the state managers, the character of the state remained much as it was in the colonial era”. This means that, post-colonial situation in Africa and in Nigeria in particular was a mere transfer of colonial legacies to trusted and selected Africans; another form of colonial continuity which definitely hampers the growth of Africa. Thus, Ake (1996:3) argues further that,

With few exceptions, the gaining of independence was not a matter of the nationalists’ marshalling forces to defeat colonial regimes. More often than not, it was a matter of the colonizers’ accepting the inevitable and orchestrating a handover of government to their chosen African successors, successors who could be trusted to share their values...

To establish this view, democratization is seen as a continuing struggle for the independent development of the Nigerian state and its citizens, founded in the struggle against foreign colonial conquest and occupation since the early 1900s (Bello, 2012). From inception, Africans have repudiated the colonial dominance and subjugation and consequent upon this was the underdevelopment of Africa. The aftermath now is the influence of the colonial powers on the various governments across Africa.

Ogundiya (2010) and Owolabi, (2001) sees democratization project as the age of civilization that every society should strive to attain rather than a political option among many others. To these scholars, in all societies of the world today, the issue is not which political system is appropriate but rather when will society become democratized or fully democratic. This view spells the inevitability of democratic rule to the socio-economic development of Africa and Nigeria in particular, welcoming it into the comity of nations.

History has shown that the long dominance of colonialism in Africa and its later dictatorial governments has greatly contributed to the underdevelopment of the continent. Many therefore argue for democratization as the possible solution to development issues in Africa. According to Ibrahim (1994), “the incursion of the military into African political life has further worsened the problems generated by authoritarianism. The military has impacted on society its anti-social and anti-political values”. It thus suffice to state that military regimes in Africa and Nigeria have greatly affected the exercise of human rights, popular people’s opinion in governance and participation has been denied a greater number of the citizens.

By the mid-1960s, most of the independent governments in Africa were properly elected by the eve of independence, and later imposed an unmasked, unpainted, unscrupulous and cynical

dictatorships masquerading as one-party democracy. This imposition of one-party system in most cases went side by side with the personalization of state power and the privatization of public wealth by the African leaders (Okoye, 1981, cited in Yusuf, 1992: 7). The long term authoritarian regimes that greeted Africa called for democratization, for the “object of authoritarianism has been to exclude the people from the government and resources it controls” (Ibrahim, 1994). Virtually all the ruling oligarchies in Africa represented only a small fragment of their societies and a large number of the people was excluded from participating in the political process. This led to a great crusade and movements for democratization across various countries of Africa.

According to Ake (2000: 127-128), the democratization campaign across Africa was not a single homogenous one with coherent doctrine and agenda. It was a loose coalition of groups with variations from one country to another. They include:

- Political elites who have been denied access to power.
- Social groups which have been excluded from power and often from the mere prerogatives of citizenship by religious, national, regional or ethnic discrimination.
- Business people who deplore prevailing governance practices, especially corruption, lack of transparency and rule of law.
- Elements of civil society such as students, teachers, lawyers’ groups, trade union groups, women’ rights advocates and minority groups.
- Workers and peasants, sometimes in mass organisations and sometimes not.
- The international community, especially the industrialized Western countries, development agencies and the international financial institutions, especially the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

Ake further argues that “the sociology of the democracy movement in Africa shows that two distinct and ultimately incompatible democracies are incubating in the same movement”. He calls one the “minimalist liberal democracy” which has its focus on multi-party elections. To him, this movement is controlled by those in leadership and so far, the democratization of Africa seems to be moving in this direction (Ake (2000: 128).

The other movement is anchored by the masses and peasants and human rights activists and this movement according to Ake (2000) is marked differently. He calls this a “social democracy with emphasis on concrete rights and concrete equality”. This type of democracy is geared towards uplifting and empowering ordinary people and it invariably suits the basic tenets of the African socialist movements where for a long period of military and dictatorial regimes they have been adversely large pauperisation of the masses. It definitely will give rise to development in Africa.

Stemming from the foregoing, the principal objective is to establish the need for democratization vis-à-vis development in Africa and Nigeria in particular, with emphasis on Kogi East Senatorial District. However, scholars have variegated opinions on democratization but all seem to share similar tenets. According to Omotola (2007), the end of the Cold War and the subsequent emergence of New World Order no doubt produced significant impacts on the world system. This was seen in the outstanding global resurgence of democratization, which according to Huntington (1991) has brought about the ‘third wave’ of democratization. Scholars all over the world and Africa in particular have called for the entrenchment of democratic practice in the continent and as have been advanced from the foregoing, the movements have been moving towards one direction.

Osaghae (1999: 5) defines democratization as “the process of establishing, strengthening, or extending the principles, mechanism, and institutions that define a democratic regime”. To

elaborate this definition, two points could be inferred: one, that democratization is relative, incremental and phased; two, that democratization is variegated in nature, calling for caution not to analyse it as a blanket process. To buttress this, Omotola (2007) states that the validity of this exposition, particularly in the African context, Nigeria inclusive, can hardly be contested. This is because democratization is a term that has been used retroactively, after certain thresholds have been crossed (see Schatzber, 1997: 215-221).

Summarily, Omotola (2007: 268) holds that:

Democratization may very well be a real harbinger of development. This would however depend on its time-spell as well as the depth of the democratization itself. It has also been stressed that democratization could also engender development aspectorally giving the fact that development is multidimensional. In the long run however, the developed aspect could induce development in other aspects.

It can be deduced from the Omotola (2007) that democratic could can no doubt be a harbinger to development in many aspects. Since it sees development as multifaceted and that development in one aspect could trigger development in other aspects, it is necessary to bear in mind that with a well-established democratic rule, geared towards enhancing socio-economic development, other developmental aspects could spring up. With socio-economic development domestically, the nation could witness a rise in her economic policies across Africa. However, socio-economic development could however, trigger sustenance of democracy as each works complementarily.

2.2.5 Liberal Democracy and the Relationship between Democracy and Development: The Arguments So Far

Democracy is one concept that has generated several arguments among scholars. These arguments cut across different strands and the type of democracy subjected to such academic investigation. Some of these opinions state the facts that democracy is a harbinger to achieve and

sustain economic development and others differ and move in contrast to that. This necessitated Dworkin (2005: 130-131) to state that:

We all have the concept of democracy; we can talk about it meaningfully. But we have different conceptions of it. And if we do not get clear on what conception we are invoking, there is going to be confusion rather than actual conversation (cited in Palmer, 2008: 443).

Democracy, therefore, cannot be conceptualized within the confines of a singular understanding. Over the years, the concept has metamorphosed into global issues tied to several aspects of governance and with the popularization of the concept alongside different standpoints and the generic opinions attached to it, it becomes vital for greater academic investigation. Central to this arguments is the fact that liberal democracy, which in the contemporary world has gained more prominence in both theory and practice, is seen more dominating in several discourses on the subject matter of democracy.

The quest to experiment liberal democracy began during the early 1960s when it became necessary for political institutions to explore different types of systems of government. Movements towards such structures are seen in Eastern Europe as well as many parts of the Third World (Bollen, 1993). This trend has in the recent time been renewed in the measuring and monitoring of liberal democracy of which the U.S. Department of State publishes annual reports on international human rights, including democratic rights, to assist Congress on foreign assistance decisions.

Bollen (1980; 1986; 1990) defines liberal democracy as the extent to which a political system allows political liberties and democratic rule. In his view, political liberties exist to such an extent that the people of a country have the freedom to express a variety of political opinions in any media and the freedom to form or participate in any political group of their choice. In that

regard, therefore, democratic rule culminate the enhancement of political rights which exists in order for the national government to be accountable to the general population, and each individual is thus entitled to equal participation in the government directly or through representatives.

However, some definitions of liberal democracy emphasize the democratic rule component. Schumpeter (1950: 269) states that democracy “is that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which the individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for people’s vote”. Similarly, Moore (1966: 414); Lipset (1981: 27); and Huntington (1984: 195) concentrate also on the democratic rule dimension. They viewed liberal democracy or democracy as the struggle for people’s vote through periodic elections, such expressed through the freedom to select or elect those deemed as representatives of the general populace.

However, Lenski (1966: 319) identifies universal adult suffrage as an aspect of democratic rule, and the freedom of organized political opposition, a reflection of political liberties, as basic to democracy. Moreso, Therborn (1977: 4) lists popular representation, universal and equal suffrage, and freedoms of speech, assembly, organization and the press as crucial variables of democracy. These are basic and fundamental to liberal democracy.

Notwithstanding, Casanova (1970) and Dahl (1971) cited in Bollen (1993: 6-7) provide two other examples of definitions of democracy that include “participation and competition”. However, like liberal democracy, these terms have connotations. These connotations show restrictions on franchise or political participation as part of the democratic rule dimension. In other words, according to Coppedge and Reinicke (1990: 51-52), when it comes to measurement, the extent of the franchise, the prime barometer of inclusiveness is less useful because a

universal franchise is widespread, even in dictatorships or ‘people’s democracies’ where the elections are rigged or little choice is offered (cited in Bollen, 1990: 1209).

Another connotation of the foregoing conceptualization of democracy is participation in relation to voter turnout (Bollen, 1993). In a situation where there is restriction on voter turnout, especially as the case of dictatorship or political systems in which the people cannot freely express their wish during elections, it is believed that franchise is faced with some level of limitations; meanwhile, voter turnout is indirectly reflective of democratic rule. Nevertheless, it cannot be authoritatively understood or stated that higher voter turnout directly resonates liberal democracy. Inasmuch as high voter turnout is a desired symbol of legitimation in most political systems, it reflects a lot more than just the degree of liberal democracy (Bollen, 1993). For instance, in the former ‘people’s democracies’ of Eastern Europe where voter turnout figures were seen on the highest point, political liberties were largely absent, even though elections allowed for little choice. There are indicators that political liberties inherent in liberal democracy must as a means of fundamental right be enjoyed by all and sundry. The foregoing shows the intrinsic resemblances of the conceptualization of democracy as related to liberal democracy.

Having stated some conceptualization or definitions of democracy and liberal democracy, it is important to examine the relationship between democracy and development as rightly put forth in the foregoing arguments for and against the two concepts, earlier discussed in this study as complementarily tied to each other, especially as used in contemporary development literature,

According to Adejumo (1999:34; 2000: 2)

The last two decades of the 20th century witnessed renewed hope about the birth of democracy in Africa. The process was actively supported by all segments of society - labour, students, market women, rural dwellers, and the lumpen elements, who saw in it the prospects of reversing the trend of political despair and disillusionment that hitherto

characterised political life in Africa. The democratic aspiration of the African people is not only confined to the arena of political democracy (of elections, and granting of civil and political rights), but involves the demand for economic empowerment, better living standards, and adequate social welfare. Indeed, for the majority of the people, democracy is meaningful only when it delivers socio-economic goods. In other words, political democracy must be linked to socio-economic development.

The author is apt to create the needs and linkage between the two concepts (democracy and development) even though he has not exhaustively done so. His view shows the yearnings of many Africans and African states who express the desire and clamour for to the institutionalization of democratic governance believed to trigger development in Africa. Even though it is not saliently reflected in the Africa of today, that democratic rule has enhanced socio-economic development, the argument cannot be overemphasized.

As seen in the extant literature on democracy and development, there is an enormous amount of literature covering the relationship between democracy and development. It is therefore important to examine some of the dominant approaches and seminal works on the relationship between these two concepts which could be adjudged elusive bedfellows.

As rightly noted by Adejumobi (2000), the debate on the relationship between democracy and development has witnessed some twists and turns driven by the currents of global political changes. In his words:

In the 1960s and 1970s before the current democratic upsurge, the focus of debate on the connection between democracy and development was on how the latter constitutes a prerequisite for and enhances the former. That is, under what mode of economic system and stage of economic development is democracy consummated? Conversely, under what form of economic system is democracy not likely to take root and grow? The economy was treated as an independent variable and the polity, dependent. The attempt was to explain why democracy exists in some countries and not in others (Adejumobi, 2000: 3).

The views and questions raised above comes as corollary to the democratization debate about the relationship between democracy and development. This view is important as regards

modernization and the quest to institutionalize liberal democracy in many countries across the globe. However, it is pertinent to note that the argument does not end here.

At the heart of this debate, two dominant intellectual paradigms in the social sciences, the modernisation and the Marxist theories, share a common ground on the interface between democracy and development, even though they view it from different standpoints. The modernisation theory contends that democracy corresponds with the industrial phase of capitalist development (Lipset, 1960; Eisenstadt, 1966; Apter, 1965).

It is believed that capitalist development engenders features like structural differentiation, secularism, bureaucratisation, urbanisation, and individualism, all of which engenders a new logic of power and “ethics of governance”, of liberal democratic politics (Adejumobi 2000: 3). The social structure which industrial capitalism pushes into reality reinforces democratic values. Therefore, the fact that the middle class in an industrial capitalist society thrives is seen to be crucial to the growth and protection of a liberal democratic order. In this regard, “liberal democracy is viewed as an outcome, and not a cause of economic development” (Adejumobi 2000: 3).

On the other hand, the argument of the Marxist and neo-Marxist emphasises the centrality of the economy to the mode of politics.

Accordingly, Adejumobi (2000: 3-4) empathizes the argument of the Marxist and Neo-Marxist school when he notes that:

The economy was considered as the sub-structure of society, which determines the superstructure that includes the polity. As such, liberal democracy was conceived as the limited form of democracy possible under industrial capitalism. “Backward” and agrarian societies do not have the prerequisites for democratic practices.

Conversely, it is pertinent to note that the priority of the Neo-Marxist paradigm focuses on the issues of economic underdevelopment and dependency seen as the prime political agenda for

Third World countries to resolve. Hence, “democracy was considered a secondary priority for Third world countries, since in any case it could hardly evolve in those contexts. The concern was to be with the issue of economic development, after which democracy may logically follow” Adejumobi (2000:4). This culminated the wave of the intellectual rigour that greeted the 1960s and 1970s during which many African leaders were seen to eulogise development as ‘dictatorship of development’ instead of ‘democratisation of development’ (Adekanye 1978: 29-40, cited in Adejumobi, 2000: 4). Consequently, development was regarded as political cliché over and above which no other thing suffices.

However, the 1980s witnessed a new tide of global democratic change resonated in most parts of the world, with the emphasis of academic discourses on the relationship between democracy and development focussed on the object and purposes of democracy. Accordingly, therefore, N’yongo, (1988); Mkandawire (1988); Mkandawire (1991) all cited in Adejumobi (2000); and Ake (1996) construed democracy as a means to an end or an end in itself. To buttress the argument, Leftwich (1996) further opined that the debate on the relationship between democracy and development based on the foregoing argument, especially that which supports democracy as a harbinger to development culminate the conceptualization of what he calls “the developmentalist efficacy of democracy” (Leftwich 1996: 4).

The debate on the relationship between democracy and development gained considerable prominence in mainstream academic and policy circles with the view that democracy was more likely to emerge in countries with high(er) levels of socio-economic development (Lipset 1959; Almond and Verba 1963; Moore 1966). Building on Lipset’s seminal analysis (1959), which lays more emphasis at one point that economic wealth is ‘an initial condition for democracy’ (p. 62), it became a common understanding that this correlation was interpreted as implying that

development was a precondition for democracy. This modernisation approach to democratisation has seen the emergence of democracy as “a consequence of the transformation of class structure, the emergence of bourgeoisie, economic development, increasing urbanisation, the prior development of democratic values, and other cultural and religious factors” (Alina 2007: 4-5).

Accordingly, a comprehensive understanding of the debate on the relationship between democracy and development, according to Alina (2007) depends on how ‘development’ is defined. To view it from the perspective of Sen (1999b) and to adopt a definition of development as ‘freedom’, a broad definition seen to incorporate not only “economic indicators but also freedoms like human and political rights, social opportunities, transparency guarantees and protective security, then by definition democracy must lead to development” (cited in Alina 2007: 3).

Nevertheless, recent debates on a rights-based approach to development also focus on participation, accountability, and other elements that are very similar to those values underlying substantive forms of democracy as guidelines by the UNDP (2000). However, such an approach could pose conceptual and definitional problems because there is enormous value in understanding development in such a holistic way. Therefore, Alina (2007: 3-4) notes that:

Defining development in terms of many of the attributes inherent to democracy (including rights and accountability) makes it more difficult analytically to make a distinction between the two terms and to be able to (or at least attempt to) disentangle the nature of the relationship between them. For this reason, it may be useful to adopt a somewhat narrower definition of development.

However, from our review on development done below, we shall see some basic scholarly definitions of the term but according Stiglitz (2003), development is understood as a transformation of society that goes beyond economic growth alone to include social dimensions like literacy, distribution of income, life expectancy, etc. The variables in his definition were also captured in the UNDP’s human development index. In addition, Leftwich (2005) opines that

development must include some dimension of the (re)distribution of wealth as well. The thrust of the matter can be seen in the argument that democracy has some inbuilt mechanisms and connotes the creation of conducive environment to economic development. Where the above variables, freedom, literacy, distribution of income, etc. are found, economic development becomes more veritably imminent. This in summary translates to good governance.

Thus, Grossman and Noh (1990) believes that the thrust of the argument centres on the fact that democracy ensures accountability of rulers to the ruled with result that rulers are motivated to allocate resources efficiently and productively in order to be allowed to stay in power (cited in Ake (2000: 78). When rulers are accountable to the people, as seen more in democracies, there is a higher expectation of the degree of development to be witnessed and in such societies, rule of law, freedom, income distribution, responsiveness and other ingredients of democratic practice are highly respected.

Judging from the foregoing, therefore, the striking linkage or relationship between democracy and development are not far-fetched. Inasmuch as scholars view the two concepts from different perspectives, the fact remains that the concepts are closely related, especially in their usage in governance and development literature. While democracy is used as independent variable in some cases, development too, is used independently in other cases depending on the argument and the subject under review.

2.2.6 Yardsticks to Measuring Democracy in Fostering Development

The argument on the relationship between democracy and development has for long lingered in governance and development literature and may not in the near future vacate the front burner. This is because the two concepts have generated a lot of scholarly debates as they both appear to be complementarily used at separate periods. Godson Dinneya in the preface of his work, “Political Economy of Democratization in Nigeria (2006)” notes that:

The democracy-development relationship and its imperative of incorporating political institutional variables in the analysis of national growth and development raise the issues of conceptualization and measurement of the institutional variables. While orthodox economic indicators are quantifiable and therefore easy to measure, political institutional variables present some difficulty. How, for instance, is democracy measured; what institutions provide the frameworks for sustainable national democratic development; and do existing measures of democracy provide a basis for universal application? (xiv)

The questions raised by Godson Dinneya bears the central argument on the infeasibility thesis on democracy in Africa that Ake (1999); Peterson (1994), and others have argued in recent time. Justifiably so, the implicit measurement of institutional variables and conceptualization of democracy may not be accurately present because of the uneven dynamism of national historic experiences in Africa and many developing countries of the third World. Notable to further pose the measurement challenge of democracy is the fact that the “zero performance on the orthodox democracy scales has given empirical credence and further impetus to the theory of the infeasibility of democracy in African countries that are transiting” (Dinneya (2006: xv). There is no doubt that these arguments are valid but it further raises a question whether it is all-in-all. Whether in Africa or elsewhere, some other arguments and studies have shown evidences of development and yardsticks for measuring and conceptualizing democracy as it translates to development.

No doubting the fact that the infeasibility theoretical foundations have some strong points, other school of thought championed by scholars like Sklar (1982, 1986); Ake (1999), Peterson (1994); and others, cited in Dinneya (2006), have spontaneously challenged the infeasibility thesis, arguing that their validity from the infeasibility theory treats democracy as a product only and that it does assume only a binary value. What this means is central to the fact that democracy should be viewed not as an outcome but a cause of economic development.

Available academic evidence shows that there has never been a unified method, mode or established measures for measuring democracy, especially as it pertains the fostering of development in its general term. What this means is that, no globally acceptable yardsticks for measuring democracy in regards to developmental growth has been so far established, even though the foregoing arguments and scholarly conceptualization of the concept point to some basic items which could be used as major indices to measure democracy. These items would summarily be discussed and elaborated along the line. However, let us observe some of these measures taken by different scholars in measuring the impacts of democracy on development.

Lipset (1959) is foremost to have identified the positive relationship between democracy and development by establishing the relationship between national wealth and political development which emanated his idea of measurement. He constructed measures for the variables in order to identify how each variable varied from the other. Hence, he identified economic affluence as the independent variable as measures to political development. His classification of democratic systems using indices of national wealth of the Latin American countries by categorising them into; democracies/unstable dictatorships, and stable dictatorships gave a general foundation to the measurement of democracy across the globe. Some basic indices identified are socio-economic, cultural and political conditions that strengthen or weaken democracies through the development of statistical models that predict the future of democracy by prescribing policies that should generally enhance democratization (Dinneya, 2006: 26).

Philip Cutright (1963) is known to have made the earliest attempt to assign numeric values to the measurement of the degree of democracy by constructing “Index of National political Development” for 77 countries to test the principal hypothesis that political institutions are interdependent with educational systems, economic development, communications systems,

urbanization, and labour force distribution (Dinneya 2006: 27). This index was majorly based on two indicators: (a) freedom of elections and respect for their results, and (b) the existence and size of opposition representation in legislature. The index assigned one point to a country for every year it was ruled by an executive that emerged through free elections, one point, also every year in which more than one party was represented in the legislature and one point every year in which the minority party held more than 30% of the legislative seats.

As the measurement argument continued, Olsen (1968) while reviewing Cutright's index of national democratic development accused the latter of perpetuating a Western democratic concept of political modernization by focusing only on the Western parliamentary system. Olsen's conception of political growth led to the multidimensional process of political development by identifying the following four dimensions: the degree of democracy/autocracy, centralization/decentralization, stability/instability and effectiveness/ineffectiveness. These dimensions further emanated five indices which are: (a) executive functioning, (b) legislative functioning, (c) power diversification, (d) party organization, and (e) citizen influence. Olsen (1968) further based each of the indices on three empirical variables. Executive functioning was based on: functional effectiveness of the governmental bureaucracy, interest aggregation by the executive and degree of governmental stability.

He measured legislative functionality by the effectiveness of the legislature, interest aggregation of the legislature and extent of civilian control of politics. Power diversification was tied to constitutionality of the government, number of autonomous governmental branches and non-restrictive recruitment of the political leaders. The index further looked at such variables like the number of political parties, interest aggregation by the political parties and stability of political parties in order to assess the effectiveness of party organization. The citizen influence was

further graded on the basis of electoral representation in politics, freedom of groups opposition and freedom of the press (cited in Dinneya 2006; 27-28).

The measurement instruments and dimensions of democracy, as earlier stated has been seen differential opinions as have been discussed so far. However, one of the longest lists of characteristics of a democratic system is contained in the Africa Demos' (1993) *Quality of Democracy Index* (QDI) for the assessment of democracy in Africa. The QDI adopted twelve indicators in its analysis on African political systems and classified them into five different categories thus: (a) democratic, (b) authoritarian, (c) directed democracy (d) contested sovereignty, and (e) regimes in transition. However, the fine-tuned QDI (1995) sub-classified the regimes in transition into strong, moderate, and ambiguous according to their commitment to democracy.

The empirical application of the classification done by the Demos is questionable despite the fact that it appears to have theoretically captured appropriate nomenclatures for current African political systems. According to Dinneya (2006: 32), "it might be virtually impossible to gather data in Africa on the numerous indicators. It is not surprising that, to date, no empirical test of the democratization based on these indicators had been carried out". This means that, despite the enormous good will and acceptance, democracy cannot be actually empirically measured in transitional African countries. The amount of data required for this herculean of task has over the years proved difficult to access.

As the argument progressed, Jackman (1974) in an analysis of the impact of democratic performance on social equality constructed an 'Index of Democratic Performance' designed to meet the criteria of democracy as classified by Dahl (19971) and Downs (1957), cited in Dinneya (2006: 32). Jackman (1974) based his index on three indicators, that is: electoral participation,

political competition and access to information. His resuscitation of Dahl's procedural philosophy received a boost in Vanhanen's (1997) application of evolutionary theory to measure democracy (cited in Dinneya 2006).

Vanhanen (1997) proposed his 'evolutionary theory of democratization' with two basic hypothesis, having drawn his foundation from the Dawinian theory of evolution by natural selection. According to the first category, the concentration as well as the distribution of political power depends on the degree of resource distribution. The argument was that variations of political systems from 'the rule of the few' (autocracy) to 'the rule of the many' (democracy) followed from the distribution of resources that accord power to their holders. He opined that in the societies where relevant power resources were concentrated to the few, political power was also concentrated, leading to autocracy, while in societies with wider distribution of resources, political power was more decentralized, leading to democracy.

However, his second hypothesis was that, democratization takes place under conditions in which power resources have become so widely distributed that no group is any longer able to suppress its competitors or maintain its hegemony. Hence, Vanhanenian theory shows that, only two indicators, the level of competition and the extent of participation, were empirically relevant in the struggle for power resources and therefore for measurement of the degree of democracy.

The measurement of democracy as it relates to development cannot be overemphasized. The foregoing arguments have shown that there has not been a consensus among scholars and the argument will continue to linger in the front burner. However, measuring democratization in transitional political economies has added to the arguments on the measurement of democracy. Accordingly, Dinneya (2006: 45) notes that every transition polity goes through four main dimensions: electoral and selectoral processes, management of citizens' natural rights, the intermediate output from the management of natural rights and the actual and expected rights and

freedoms. It is pertinent to note too, that every transition polity goes through these processes irrespective of whether the dominant regimes represent a civil-military diarchy, a military-personal dictatorship or a democratic-civilian regime. Thus, four measurable dimensions of democratization, according to Dinneya (2006: 45) can be identified as power change, quality of governance, political environment and democratic dividend.

According to the power change dimension, the criteria for ranking indicators are elections and selections. Elections include federal, regional, state and local government electoral processes (including plebiscites), whether organized by a military or civilian regime. On the other hand, the quality of governance dimension borders more significantly on various variables anchored on governance according to the three arms thus: the Executive Quality, Legislative Quality and Judicial Quality (Dinneya 2006). The synergy desired from these various institutions must be legally balanced by the law in order to ensure the independence of each arm without any inkling on the others.

In another dimension, that is, political environment, Dinneya (2006) emphasised that the preferred political environment for democratic developments is one that is both potentially and actually stable, and which enables the expression of political views that not only enhance democratization but also those that attack undemocratic institutions and actions within framework of democratic laws. However, ‘democratic dividend’ which forms the last dimension is defined according to Dinneya (2006: 55) as:

The end product of citizens’ investible natural rights and is captured by two variables: the actual level of liberty enjoyed by citizens and the expectation of future liberties, referred to here as democratic hope.

He emphasise that in countries where the actual levels of freedom are low, as in Nigeria, democratic hope becomes very crucial and that without such hopes, those who fight to resist undemocratic institutions would simply give up.

In synergising the ongoing debates on the measurement of democracy, especially as it relates to development, it is pertinent to note that some basic indices have appeared to have correlated in virtually all the models and measures identified so far. These measures also correlate our earlier conceptualization of liberal democracy which at other times was conceived in line with democratic governance. Dinneya (2006) opine that there is a lack of consensus among scholars on the operational indicators of democratization. Hence, however one would see it, rule of law, credible periodic elections, responsible and responsive government, free press/viable media systems, etc., form the umbrella with which democratic rule can foster development. This borders on good governance which comes against the backdrop of the argument for dictatorial/authoritarian regimes. These indicators have not flourished well under such regimes and hence they appear to be more realistically present under democratic regimes.

2.3 The Concept of Good Governance

According to Omotola (2007), the concept of good governance is problematic. For one, it is value-loaded and therefore subjective. Its inherent meaning may largely be a function of the intents and purposes of the analyst and what is good to one person may not be good to the other. However, Ozigbo (2000) is of the opinion that before one discusses the concept of good governance, it is very significant to examine the context of the term ‘governance’. For him, “governance denotes how people are ruled and how the affairs of the state are administered and regulated”. Governance therefore means how the politics of a country is carried out. In like manner, the World Bank Report of 1989 defined governance as the exercise of political power to manage a nation’s affairs. It is on this note that Ansah (2007, cited in Adagba, 2009: 378) defines governance as “encompassing a state’s institutional and structural arrangements, decision-

making processes and implementation capacity, and the relationship between government officials and the public”. This definition is inclusive of the people and in other words, public authority is expected to play a vital role in creating conducive and enabling environment to enhance development.

However, Kanfmann, et al. (2000) conceived governance as tradition and institution that determine how authority is exercised in a particular country. This includes:

- i. The process by which governments are selected, held accountable, monitored and replaced.
- ii. The capacity of government to manage resources efficiently and formulate, implement and enforce sound policies and regulations; and
- iii. The respect of citizens and the state for the institutions that govern economic and social interactions among them.

This definition is both a process and a practice to which the end goal is to inclusively administer the government in a more people-oriented manner, which is the essence of good governance.

Shalendra (2007) notes that the term good governance encompasses all aspects of the way a country is governed. Moreover, good governance has many characteristics, ranging from participatory, consensus oriented, equity, transparency, efficiency, etc. Good governance therefore is a multifaceted concept and different scholars have conceptualised it differently. The fundamental issue, therefore, is not the differences in their various conceptualisation but whether they all render similar indices to measure good governance or however, if their conceptualisations coherently summarise the concept; or better still, to see the respective

perspective in which they see the concept, that is, if it has a causal or inherent effect on development. A better knowledge of good governance is therefore very significant.

According to Sen (1990) the ingredients of good governance include freedom, accountability, participation and accountability (in Adagba, 2009). The view of Sen (1990) here, places greater emphasis on accountability and however, without strict adherence to these ingredients, the attainment of good governance becomes a mere illusion. Similarly, Adagba explains further that these ingredients include the “conduct of an inclusive system of management wherein all the critical stakeholders are allowed to have a say in the government decision-making process”. This condition is therefore inevitable if good governance must take its cause.

However, the African Development Bank views good governance as one that embodies and promotes effective states, mobilised civil societies and productive private sector. This view gives a definition of good governance in a government that is all encompassing, involving the private sector and the generality of the people in the day-to-day running of the government. This makes government’s decision-making process all-encompassing. In the same vein, Adagba (2009: 378) argues that, “good governance is the process through which a state’s affairs are managed effectively in the area of public accountability, financial accountability, administrative and political accountability, responsiveness and transparency, all of which must show in the interest of the governed and the rulers”. In this way, good governance cannot be achieved in a vacuum. It must exist within the framework of an orderly defined system and the people whose duties it is to rule must strictly follow these principles.

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP 1996) sees good governance as a “commitment and the capacity to effectively address the allocation and management of resources to respond to collective problems” (cited in Ogundiya 2010: 203). This definition basically

focuses on the management and administrative responsibilities of those in administrative offices. They must show commitment to governance in the interest of the collectivity of the governed and the entire system.

However, the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and Pacific (2005) establishes eight characteristics of good governance that it must be participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive and follows the rule of law. Participation in this sense means, both men and women are key cornerstone of governance and must participate either directly or through intermediate institutions or representatives; consensus must encompass the interests of several actors in the society; not only government institutions, but the civil societies and private sector must be accountable to institutional stakeholders and the entire public. Transparency means decisions taken and their enforcement are done in a manner that follows rules and regulations; responsiveness requires institutions and processes to try and serve all stakeholders within a reasonable timeframe; governance must produce results that meet the needs of society while making the best use of resources at their disposal if it must retain the quality of effectiveness and efficiency; equity and inclusiveness suffice that all groups, but particularly the most vulnerable, have opportunities to improve or maintain their well-being; and rule of law entails fair legal framework that are enforced impartially.

These characteristics of good governance stated above ensures the minimization of corruption, the representation of minority views and respect for the voices of the most vulnerable in the society. It is in this purview, therefore, that the Nigeria's Vision 2020 document views good governance to mean "accountability in all ramifications" (in Ogundiya, 2010: 204).

However, good governance, according to Landell-Mill and Seragelden and Simbine (2000: 17) is closely linked to the extent to which a government is perceived and accepted as legitimate, committed to improving the public welfare and responsive to the needs of its citizens, competent to assure law and order and deliver public services, able to create an enabling policy environment for productive activities; and equitable in its conduct (cited in Omotola 2007: 253). In as much as this conceptualisation gives constitutional responsibilities on those vested with the act of governance, it equally lays a moral responsibility on them too. The security of life, safe environment, and genuine commitment must be seen in governance if the ideal of good governance must be attained.

Nevertheless, Ajene (2003: 58) states the following as the basic principles, characteristics and fundamentals of good governance:

- i. The promotion of the best wishes of the majority represented in the actual policies and programmes of constituted authority which best serve and promote those wishes.
- ii. The accommodation and tolerance of the yearnings and aspirations of the majority and discordant groups.
- iii. The principles of consultation whereby the wishes of the majority are not simply assumed but a policy strategy which involves consultation with the spectrum of society for the purpose of obtaining consensus over policy at all times is pursued.
- iv. The strict adherence to the rule of law at all levels of society. The adherence to the practice of accountability and transparency by leadership and others in political authority.

These stated features and fundamentals of good governance encompass a holistic precedence for the actualization of good governance. These therefore must be adhered to in order to achieve the desired goals.

Ayatse, Onaga and Ogoh, (2013: 66), argue that:

It must be noted that good governance is all not about a mode of polity, or a procedural arrangement, but a holistic and consequential variable that is measurable in terms of real effects in lives of the people. It is not about forms of governance, but the result of governance. It is not the process or course of a political rule, but its effects; it is about effective and productive governance.

This argument gives the actual essence of good governance and creates a clarification against the misunderstanding that the regime type (as against authoritarianism) contributes mainly to bad governance or vice versa. The argument has been tensely contended among scholars. For instance, Jega (2002: 29) hold that:

The impact of authoritarian rule on transition to democracy and the quest for good governance in the ‘on-going wave of democratization’, on the African continent are profound for all countries, which have experience military rule. But they are especially so for Nigeria, which has about three decades... been continuous, and during which militarism has been deeply entrenched and militarization has taken its toll. Indeed, they make good governance exceedingly difficult, and arbitrariness and authoritarianism a prevailing tendency.

Jega’s view establishes the fact that military regimes (especially those of Nigeria) are examples of bad governance as against good governance which in turn reduces development in many aspects. However, Ayatse, Onaga and Ogoh, (2013:66) opposes this view, stating that

The urge to align good governance with democracy and development is therefore to caricature it. This is because some of the East Asian countries that have recorded remarkable growth did so within the context of authoritarian rule, the contention is that what is important is not so much the form of government, but its impact.

This view holds that, whether authoritarian or civil rule or whatsoever the nomenclature, the identity that is necessarily important is good governance. He cited the case of Singapore in particular but does that suffice the case in Africa and Nigeria? The argument is that, what is needed is not democracy but a good government that provides economic well-being, political stability, social order, communal harmony, efficient and honest administration (Huntington, 1997: 11-12). In the same direction, Ayatse, Onaga and Ogoh, (2013) holds that Western political values of liberal democracy embody views that are subversive of the cultural values of the Asian society. Bujra and Molutsi (2000) contend that “while western style of liberal democracy is based on the exclusive concern for individualism, competition and accumulation, values devoid of social welfare, whereas deep concern social affection and collectivism that promote social well-being are the core values in Africa”. To put this argument to rest, Huntington (1997) states that yet, while authoritarian rule may provide good governance for a decade, or even a generation, it cannot provide-and throughout history never has provided good government over a sustained period of time. It lacks the institutions for self-reforms; public debate, a free press, protest movements, opposition political parties, and competitive elections.

What then is a government when it cannot accommodate opposition and allow press freedom? While authoritarian regimes may promote productive governance, it lacks sustainability, orderly process of political organization and procedure. The worst democratic government therefore is better than the best military government in these aspects. For instance, considering the Nigerian experience since the return to democratic rule in 1999, the country has experience great respect for rule of law, freedom of speech and expression, human rights, growth in several other areas like ICT, improvement in general living condition, etc.

According to Jega (2002: 29), “good, responsive, responsible and accountable governance is in need everywhere, in order to harness and develop national resources, as well as, meet the basic needs of the people”. His view replicates the standards of responsiveness, accountability and responsibility of a good government. However, the absence of good governance leads to corruption and all sorts of moral albatross in any society and these retards economic growth and development. Accordingly, Elliot, (1997: 175-176) opines:

When it is pervasive and uncontrolled, corruption thwarts economic development and underlines political legitimacy. Less pervasive variants result in wasted resources, increased inequity in resource distribution, less political competition and greater distrust of government. Creating and exploiting opportunities for bribery at high levels of government; also increases the cost of government, distorts the allocation of government spending, and may dangerously lower the quality of infrastructure.

To establish this view, Okoosi-Simbine (2006) holds that the high level of pervasiveness is what the international organization, Transparency International, seems to have measured using its own indicators and measurement guide, causing it to rate Nigeria as the third most corrupt in the world. This however, goes to show the level of bad governance in the country.

Far from corruption, however, Kasonde (2009: 391) holds that:

The term good governance describes government performance in relation to internationally established norms (or best practices), including freedom to organize political parties, holding public rallies, holding regular free and fair elections, upholding media freedom, respect for rule of law, etc. In a nutshell, the notion of good governance refers to the smooth running of democratic institutions in any given country. Among other things, the vibrancy of the civil society and interest groups constitute a *conditio sine qua non* of good governance.

No doubting, the experiences of the developmental states of East Asia (Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan) offer evidence that efficacious state capacity and good governance can be achieved in authoritarian systems. However, authoritarian regimes that are purportedly said to practice good governance and are development-oriented are no exception rather than the rule, as they are

seen in the denial of many aspects of good governance, ranging from abuse of human rights, press freedom, general participation, among others. A government that is anchored on the world standards of good governance should reflect these indices.

2.4 The Concept of Development

The meaning of development has been under intense intellectual rigour of investigation for a long period of time now. This is because the concept generates much controversy on the actuality of its meaning. However, according to Seers (1969: 1-2), “the challenges of any period depend on the tasks that face those living in it... Social problems and political upheavals have emerged in countries at all stages of development”. These problems range from poverty, unemployment, widespread of malnourishment, poor health prospects, etc. and they hamper, at every stage, what many see as economic growth or development. Seers believe that *development* has, however, been treated chiefly as a normative concept and inevitably understood as almost synonymous with *improvement*. This is tied to the fact that the actual meaning of the concept generates much controversy.

That notwithstanding, development may be considered as a process that involves the progress of people in society, since people live within some form of social framework consisting of socio-economic and political structures, and not in isolation (Burkey, 1996: 38; and Ayatse, Onaga and Ogoh, (2013). It then means that development is multidimensional and comprehensively a transformation of the society.

Unlike democracy and good governance, the concept of development has a loose meaning and rather subjective in meaning which is why scholars express different opinions and explanations. Onyekpe (2004: 133) sees development as a generic term which encompasses the transformation

of the economy, state and society through the achievement of greater capacity to deal with the challenges of:

- i. Production and its expansion
- ii. Political administration and governance and
- iii. Organizing the civil society as a community of people.

This conceptualization see development as almost progress of society and it directs its focus on the path of improving society and its structures with regards to growth. It however, means that, development can be seen as economic growth (production and expansion) and improvement of political and social structures of every society.

However, Todaro and Smith (2003) is of the opinion that, “development is a multidimensional process involving the reorganization and reorientation of the entire economic and social systems. In addition to improvement in income and output, it typically involves radical changes in institutional, social and administrative structures as well as in popular attitudes, customs and beliefs”. This conceptualization holistically covers virtually every aspect of human endeavour and it portrays a common feature that borders on growth and improvement.

Development has been a complicating factor because it is multidimensional as well as value loaded. However, it has been viewed from political, economic and social dimensions and these various aspects are well reflected in the extant literature on the concept (Lane and Ersson, 1997, cited in Omotola, 2007). Development is therefore a concept with ambiguity. It is not one-sided but it must contribute to the growth and improvement of society and its inhabitants both politically, economically or otherwise. In this same way, Adedeji cited in (Agbayoko, 2010) argue that development is all about improvement of man and his environment. Such

improvement is multifarious and imminent to the growth of man, economically, socially and even politically.

In regards to Adedeji's conceptualization, Ibi-Ajayi (2003) identifies some goals of development, particularly in Africa as follows:

- i. To increase the availability and widen the distribution of basic life sustaining goods such as food, shelter, health and security.
- ii. To raise the levels or standards of living in addition to higher incomes, the provision of more jobs, better education and greater attention to cultural and human values all of which will serve not only to enhance material well-being but also to generate greater individual and national esteem.
- iii. To expand the economic and social choices available to individuals and nations by freeing them from servitude and dependence not only in relation to other people but also the forces of ignorance and human security (cited in Ayatse, Onaga and Ogoh, 2013).

The foregoing shows that development attempts to solve the problems of poverty, unemployment, malnutrition, disease, illiteracy, indecent shelter, and insecurity, either of life or of the society. Thus, Ayatse, Onaga and Ogoh, (2013) holds that the hallmark of development is to as much as possible, reduce those obstacles that inhibits attaining higher standard of living so as to maximize the potentials of the people to enable them live high quality life. Summarily, the views expressed so far on the concept of development tend to focus more on socio-economic development and this is seen basically in the aspect of improving standard of living, poverty and malnutrition reduction, creation of employment opportunities, etc. However, the all-encompassing conceptualization of the concept of development is that given by Dudley Seers.

Seers (1969: 5) posit that:

The questions to ask about a country's development are therefore: What has been happening to poverty? What has been happening to unemployment? What has been happening to inequality? If all three of these have declined from high levels, then beyond doubt that has been a period of development for the country concerned. If one or two of these central problems have been growing worse, especially if all three have, it would be strange to call the result 'development', even if per capita income doubled. This applies of course to the future too. A 'plan' which conveys no targets for reducing poverty, unemployment and inequality can hardly be considered a 'development plan'.

This conceptualization recognizes three main aspects (poverty, unemployment and inequality) that need improvement in human life and society and it states less, the importance of per capita income if these aspects are not improved or in the process of improvement. However, these areas of human life culminate the aspect of socio-economic development which is central to this study. They include the areas of industrialization, unemployment and poverty in which democracy and good governance are expected to facilitate or not being able to facilitate.

The literature on socio-economic development over the years has been dominated by two strands of thought:

- i. The 'stages of economic growth' in which the process of 1960s;
- ii. The 'structural-internationalist' models of the late 1960s and early 1970s.

This presupposition, as shown by Todaro (1977), explains the thinking of the 1950s and early 1960s to show the emphasis on the concept of stages of economic growth in which the process of development was viewed with the perception as a series of successive stages through which all countries must pass. It was basically an economic theory of development in which the right quantity and mixture of saving, investment and foreign aid were all that necessarily mattered to the economic growth of the Third World nations which was tailored along the path of economic

historicity of the developed countries. Consequently, according to Todaro, “development thus became synonymous with economic growth” (Todaro, 1977: 50). Development must therefore be seen as the process of boosting the progress of the economy and society at large in enabling and facilitating the growth and better condition of the people. Viewed from the aspect also, Paul P. Streeten, Chairman of Editorial Advisory Board, World Development states:

Development must be redefined as an attack on the chief evils of the world today; malnutrition, disease, illiteracy, slums, unemployment and inequality. Measured in terms of aggregate growth rates, development has been a great success. But measured in terms of jobs, justice and the elimination of poverty, it has been a failure or only a partial success (cited in Todaro, 1977: 71).

The view above sees development chiefly as reflecting on the basic indices need to comprehend economic development. It all borders on the improvement from the aspect of job creation, poverty reduction and justice enhancement to balance inequality in the society.

However, economic development is a relative concept, in that scholars have tried to establish what actually defines the concept. According to Maclin (1997: 134), economic development is the mobilizing efforts to cope and adapt to political and economic changes in the environment. This include some formal and informal arrangements of bolstering and guiding the formal capacity to act. The end goal of this conception is the improvement of human life, building capacity to enhance standard of living of the large number of the people and creation of employment to reduce poverty.

Murray (2008) sees socio-economic development as the struggle to strengthen economic base and increase in job opportunities for the teeming population. To this end, there is effort (struggle) to create capacity, enabling environment and adequate opportunities to reduce unemployment and improve the living standard of the large number of people living in a geographical entity. The basic ingredient here is the capacity to absorb the unemployed and the creation of viable

structural capacity to enhance the living condition of the masses. This in turn will reduce inequality in the society and enhance justice.

Todaro (1977: 2) sees socio-economic development from the living conditions of people. In his view, more than two-thirds of the world population “are much less fortunate”; “their health is poor”, many cannot read or write, “they are unemployed, and their prospects for a better life are bleak or uncertain at best”. This view sees economic development as that aspect of development that basically deals with the improvement of the living condition of the people in order to foster creation of job opportunities, reduce poverty and reduce inequality for the larger number of the world population. To buttress this conception, the Santiago Declaration of Third World Economists (1973) states that, “the Third World, with 70 percent of the world population, subsists on only 20 percent of the world income- and even this meagre income is so maldistributed internally as to leave the bulk of its population in abject poverty”. Economic development seen as the improvement of the living condition of people therefore takes a very vital position in the multidimensional concept of development. If the questions raised by Seers on poverty, unemployment and inequality are sacrosanct to development, then economic development must be established as the foremost and most important aspect of development, in that, the larger population of the people fall short in this aspect of societal needs.

However, according to Bruce and Southworth (1968: 789),

Economic development presents a number of dilemmas; many of these show most sharply in relation to agriculture.... The most obvious dilemma arises from the urgency of development. The object is industrialization; it would be convenient if a developing nation could focus its efforts solely on this aim. But as we have seen, this is not possible.... In fact, the process of structural transformation can be frustrated either because nonfarm employment opportunities are not expanding rapidly enough in relation to the growth of total population and labour force or because agricultural productivity is not rising sufficiently to provide food for a growing nonfarm population.

This view establishes the fact that, given the nature of African society as agrarian, the more need for development should be concerted on agriculture and industrialisation. However, the authors do not dispute the fact that more attention given industrialisation does not invariably correlate the obvious fact that, industrialisation does not represent the other aspects of the economy and society that equally need improvement. Hence, even though industrialisation will boost creation of job opportunities and reduce poverty in return, there is need to accomplish development as multidimensional as the concept suffice.

The foregoing, therefore, shows a corresponding and correlating conception of the term ‘development’ to border more (but not entirely) on economic development in Africa, Nigeria inclusive and particularly, Kogi East Senatorial District. Consequently, we can establish that, the earlier operational definition of the concept “as the areas of inequality, unemployment and poverty” that need to be improved is sacrosanct. In other words, this research views development in specific areas of industrialization, inequality, unemployment and poverty, especially in Kogi East Senatorial District.

Summarily, therefore, development according to the United Nations Intellectual History Project (2009) is seen along the quality of life of people by having to access education and healthcare, employment opportunities, availability of clean air and safe drinking water, the threat of crime, and so on. Thus, economic growth by way of increasing a nation’s total wealth, enhances its potential for reducing poverty and solving other social problems like unemployment and inequality.

2.4.1 Strategies for Development

The forgoing shows that development is multifaceted and its true and single meaning has posed great challenge to many scholars, as the concept has a manifold conceptualization. According to Shanmugaratnam (2001), a lot of activities today in the world in general and the condition of being of millions of people in the so-called developing countries in particular make us wonder what this development really is. In his view, “the term ‘development’ implies improvement or positive qualitative change. In discussions on social change, it is often used to mean greater human freedoms and well-being. But in reality, the development process is uneven and conflict-ridden, with mixed consequences,...” (Shanmugaratnam, 2001: 263).

The meaning of development in this study therefore is seen in our earlier definition to mean “the areas of inequality, unemployment and poverty which democracy and good governance seek to address in Kogi East Senatorial District. In other words, this research views development in specific areas of industrialization, unemployment and poverty.”

As to the strategies for development, the study shall basically focus on the United Nations Development Strategy Beyond 2015. This gives a configurative roadmap for development across diverse spheres of societies in the world.

Poverty eradication is the central purpose of development that began new consensus across the world in the 21st century and it has been supported by an unprecedented political commitment to international cooperation. It was a harbinger on which the 2000 United Nations General Assembly adopted the Millennium Declaration, which outlined three central objectives of the global community for the 21st century: development and the eradication of poverty; peace and security; and democracy and human rights. According to the UN General Assembly (2000, para. 11), world leaders pledged to “spare no effort to free our fellow men, women and children from

the abject and dehumanizing conditions of extreme poverty” and the Declaration was a visionary document which reiterated the shared values of solidarity, equality, dignity and respect for nature as the driving motivation of world leaders.

This form the centrality of the key issues of the outlined strategies for development seen in regards to the Millennium Development Goals.

The consensus on ending human poverty as the central objective of international development was a major achievement of the global community. Central to this strategy is the necessity to define ‘progress’, and it is important therefore to closely consider the contribution by Amartya Sen. Sen understands development as the expansion of people’s freedoms, where freedoms are defined in a multidimensional way to include economic, social, cultural and political freedoms, among others. Three more important considerations are therefore added to this framework to include first, that the expansion of freedoms must be sustainable and, above all, it must meet the challenge of climate change; second, that disparities in achievements across nations, groups, between genders and individuals should be reduced (in other words, reducing inequality, as it is broadly interpreted, should be central); and third, that security from downside risks is centrally included, as embodied in the concept of human security (UNCDP, 2012 17).

However, participation and empowerment combine to form a critical requirement for pre and post-2015 development, giving people the capacity to control their own lives, and ensuring that groups are not marginalized from political processes. To achieve a truly participatory agenda, as well as its implementation, requires real democratic institutions, not simply the trappings of democracy. It also requires policies of education, dissemination of information, and institutional organization to facilitate the empowerment of weaker groups (UNCDP, 2012).

However, universality is needed. For development to be truly incorporated into the global interest, “the new international development agenda must apply to the whole world, not just to developing countries, as in practice since 2000. People all around the world continue to suffer from poverty and insecurity; therefore, all countries should be committed to making development progress, both individually and collectively”.

2.4.2 Alternative Strategies for Transformative Development

THE NATIONAL LEVEL

As principles and goals are identified, alternative development strategies applicable to countries in differing circumstances are needed in order to expand people’s freedoms in a sustainable way.

Macro and distributive policies- It is noteworthy that while the current MDG framework emphasizes the importance of economic growth and employment generation to poverty reduction, it is silent about how growth can be promoted in a sustained and equitable way, and vague about the policies needed to achieve the Goals. Thus, according to the Washington Consensus, the implicit macro model of the MDG framework, has led to greater global economic integration but also to slow growth, rising instability and persisting inequalities. Hence:

There is a need therefore to design a new unified ‘pro-poor, pro-growth, and pro-environment’ paradigm. This new paradigm would specify those policies needed to achieve a broader set of goals (social, economic and environmental, with security) while dealing with the four intertwined crises currently afflicting the developing countries and the world economy (food, finance, inequality and environmental). The appropriate policy set is likely to differ according to country conditions (UNCDP, 2012: 22-23).

Social policies- Social policy should be conceived as a key instrument that works in tandem with economic policy to ensure equitable and socially sustainable development. In considering the international development paradigm of pre and post-2015, options to enhance the efficiency of social policy should be carefully considered and implemented. According to the UNCDP (2012, 32), “country experiences show that active and efficient Government participation and a well-

conceived strategy are necessary for providing, regulating and supervising the delivery of social services, for promoting improved welfare for all, and for protecting the progress achieved”. These experiences also give some indication of the main characteristics of successful social interventions in development crisis-ridden areas.

Nonetheless, it is recognized that the success of alternative development strategies depends largely on the internal effort of the countries themselves. There is, however, an important enabling role to be played by the international environment by providing stable international economic growth and appropriate support in the areas of finance, trade, international labour movements, technology and the environment. These could be achieved summarily in coherence, coordination and governance of the international environment.

However, there is no denial that the attainment of development through the stated strategies does not have short comings. These include but are not limited to the following:

- i. Changes in demographic dynamics resulting from declining fertility and increased longevity have led to a profound transformation of the age structure of populations, with varying trends across countries.
- ii. Growth has been accompanied by persistent inequalities at the global and national levels.
- iii. Rising pressures from environmental phenomena. Continuation of the previous patterns of economic growth will further exacerbate the pressures exerted on the world’s resources and the natural environment, approaching limits where livelihoods are no longer sustainable.
- iv. The instabilities in global markets have presented a severe challenge for all countries in all continents. The simultaneous occurrence of crises in global finance along with food and fuel prices is no coincidence.
- v. The inadequacies of governance in responding to the voices of people have become increasingly apparent with popular manifestations demanding fair, participatory and democratic approaches.

- vi. Today the global aid architecture is more complex and fragmented than before; the low level of coordination among actors is compromising aid effectiveness. With the new actors, the development cooperation system has also increased the range of its available instruments (UNCDP, 2012: 13-16).

2.5 The Effects of the Nexus between Democratic Rule and Good Governance on Socio-Economic Development

The clarifying eloquence on the linkage between democracy and good governance has been subjected to scholarly contention among scholars around the world. The argument advanced here is to establish the correlating relationship between democracy and good governance and their subsequent effects on development.

However, the raging debate among scholars, analysts and practitioners centre very significantly on the form of political regime that best enhance good governance and serves as a harbinger to development (Ayatse, Onaga and Ogoh, 2013). The cleavages on these viewpoints notwithstanding, have been tied to the fact that each of these concepts cannot solely stand alone and isolate the others. Thus, they appear to be viewed as elusive but complementary bedfellows.

According to Omotola (2007) and World Bank, (1992), the quest to understand the nexus between these concepts have produced divergent views. Liberal scholars hold that democracy and development are inextricably linked, with emphasis on good governance as the intervening variable between them. This cannot be overemphasized, especially with the clear recognition of the centrality of good governance on the entire process.

However, Ayatse, Onaga and Ogoh, (2013) are of the interfering opinion that “modern democratic government offers the best prospects of good governance but... democratic governance is not synonymous with good governance and a guarantee for development.

Therefore, the mere existence of democracy does not translate into good governance and development”. This view may appear contradictory in the sense that, it presupposes that democracy offers the best prospects for good governance and thus tries to deny their synonymous linkage but the emphasis here is that, though the concepts are complementary, they are not primarily synonymous. Thus, as viewed from the liberal disposition, good governance is expected to be encompassing and interlinked with the object of liberal democracy. There are seen as mutually yoked elements in which the latter is a precondition for the realization of the former and subsequently development.

Accordingly, Omotola (2007); Nwabueze, (1993:94); Adedeji (1997:7); and Mazrui, (2002: 23-46) hold that:

Conceptually, these concepts are closely interconnected and interwoven. If democratization is about establishing consolidated democracy; the conditions for such attainment are implicitly embedded in good governance. Besides, both democratization and development share certain basic virtues such as popular participation, capacity expansion as well as freedom. Evidently too, these constitute part of the intrinsic values of good governance (cited in Omotola, 2007: 256).

According to this conceptualization, democratic rule and development can be seen as sharing common attributes such as popular empowerment, participation and freedom which in turn are central to good governance.

Existing empirical study however, shows that these variables, democracy, good governance and development are intrinsically linked but for the purpose of this research, both democracy and good governance are operationally used as independent variables, except that good governance is established as an intervening variable. Thus, democracy and good governance are seen as precondition for development. Zack-Williams (2001: 213-223) for instance, held that “no democracy, no development”, following his incisive reflections on the African experience (cited

in Omotola, 2006: 34). Thus, according to Zack-Williams, the essential weapon of democracy that makes it requisite for economic development is that it empowers “the general population to control decision-making” (p. 214). This however, must be achieved with the practice of good governance, thus, democracy and good governance are two concepts that have been interchangeably used in extant literature and this study.

According to Ogundiya (2010), democracy is amenable to moral and ethical justifications or judgments, and on this note, good governance forms the philosophical foundation upon which democracy and democratic theories are built. Therefore, according to Parekh, (1993), for democracy to attain the goal of development, it must be built on legitimacy. In his words, “democracy specifies who constitutes the legitimate government and wields the authority inherent in the state (the elected representatives), how they acquire authority (free and fair elections, choice between parties) and how they are to exercise it (in broad harmony with public good)”, cited in Ogundiya (2010: 204). The sole aim here is the realization of the public good which intrinsically relates to development in its fullness. However, it must be based on a government that sees and is ready to address the needs of the people.

Good governance however, is not a luxury; it must be worked for as a precondition for development. Adejumobi (2004), referring to World Bank (1992) believes that good governance is central to creating and sustaining an environment, which fosters a strong and equitable development and is an essential component to sound economic policies.

However, governance in this sense is suggested from the Platonian metaphor, the “ship of state”. Accordingly, Maclin, (1997) sees governance therefore as “keeping a straight course or smooth operation, in this case, for the long-term good of urban society as a whole”. Viewed relatively too, it can be said to connote political governance which is understood to be a democratically

organized system of long-term guidance or steering that relies considerably on informal arrangements that, as several researchers have noted (Swanstrom, 1985; Elkin, 1987; Kantor and David, 1988; Stone, 1989; De Leon, 1992), surround and compliment the formal institutions of governmental authority (cited in Maclin 1997: 134). However, these arrangements include locally elected officials, business and financial leaders, and the institutional capacities they control, to ideally advance economic development.

According to Bruce and Southworth (1967: 303-306):

Economic growth and development are today the goal of nations all over the earth, those long industrialized as well as those called underdeveloped. The countries that industrialized earliest did so by a largely spontaneous process of private exploitation of science and technology and development of trade. Governments provided certain essential services and aided certain private endeavours, but that did not formulate and impose comprehensive, central economic plans.

Democracy and good governance must therefore be practiced complementarily to ensure that a long term goal of development be achieved but not only the immediate and short term development. Government must ensure that the feasibility of long term developmental goal be fashioned in line with a realisable range of development projected for the longevity of its subsequent dividends. Also, viewed in this regard, Omotola (2006), states that democracy “does no harm to economic development. Rather, it is considered to be an indispensable element for development to take firm root”. Compromised with certain aspect of good governance such as equality, rule of law, egalitarianism, social justice and the rest, the realisation of development becomes viable.

According to Maclin (1997), economic growth must be achieved through an enhanced capacity by government and that notwithstanding, it is believed occasionally that unexpected outcomes must occur as a result. However, these arrangements serve to enhance the long term welfare of

citizens, to meet their common needs, and to further distributive justice, not necessarily because this is the will of the majority (because in some instances, it may not be), but because this is a moral obligation of government in furthering the basic tenets of democracy.

According to Eyinla (2000: 22), good governance means accountability, security of human rights and civil liberties, devolution of powers and respect for local autonomy, which all constitute a challenge to democratic regimes (in Omotola, 2007). This creates the relationship between democracy and good governance and explained further, it suffice that, for a good democratic practice, good governance must be a front runner. It must define the continuity, legitimacy, essence and sincerity of democracy.

Shalendra, (2007), broadly sees governance to encompass all aspect of the way a country is governance to enhance development. Accordingly, he recalls Dahl (2005) stating that:

Not only are political institutions necessary for economic development more likely to exist and function effectively under democratic rule, but also the adaptive efficiencies are best sustained in democracies because institution building to promote good governance and economic development is conterminous with democracy.

This view is anchored on the fact that democracy is durably strong and correlated with economic development. Thus, democracy can be said to have embedded advantages that support economic development. It enhances general participation, grants civil rights and creates enabling atmosphere for capacity enrichment. According to Robert Dahl, cited in Shalendra (2007: 37), “governmental responsiveness to citizens’ demands is built into periodically held electoral contests guaranteed by judicially protected individual rights”. Thus, it is not enough to practice democracy but it must be backed by the intervening variable of good governance to advance development being the sole target.

However, having established the relationship between these triple variables, the task of how these subjects correlate the reality in Nigeria is significantly inevitable. Omotola (2007) notes that the return to civil rule in Nigeria in 1999 and the aftermath experience has been “a tortuous adventure, characterised by moments of hope raised and hope dashed”. The return to democratic government that marked the processes that ushered the country into the Fourth Republic have been regrettably daunting. Accordingly, Jega (2002) opine that good governance has been exceedingly elusive in Nigeria. He notes that, “at every level of governance, what is decent and good is overtaken by what is crude and ugly”. This has hampered the realisation of the chief goal of democracy and good governance, development.

Ayatse, Onaga and Ogoh, (2013:61) observes that:

Liberal democracy, good governance and development are in crisis particularly among the Third World Countries and some developed economies. The level of apathy, self-alienation, cynicism in public discourse and about political leaders, decreasing involvement of people in social and political participation and declining confidence in government as well as the rule of law in these economies show that democracy, good governance and development are not doing too well in these societies.

The central issue and most common challenge facing these countries is the lack of legitimacy of government and political systems. Democratic elections are meant to bring elected representatives to power with the consent of the people but what is obtainable in Africa, and Nigeria and Kogi East Senatorial District in particular is ‘selection’ not election. The will of the people do not count, as desperate politicians continually manoeuvre their ways into government and rendering useless, or more or less, unrealistic, the goals of democracy. Relatively true, Bako (2002) notes that, “the truth of the matter is that Nigeria has been embroiled in more time-wasting, expensive, flamboyant and highly militarized state-guided and exclusive transitions than in real sustainable democratization”. Observably too, Nwabueze (1993: 94) emphasises that

popular participation embraces development, in which case there exist a society where the members are independent of each other, none being subservient to another. In this case also, there is guarantee of equal rights, rule of law, and the democratic process is made open to be all-inclusive thereby ensuring the realization of development.

In another development, Kofi Annan notes that, “without good governance, without the rule of law, predictable administration, legitimate power, and responsive power, and responsive regulation, no amount of funding, no amount of charity will set us on the path of prosperity” (cited in Adejumobi, 2004:11). To this end, good governance as the central link between democracy and development must be foremost and a front runner in the actualization of development in Africa and Nigeria in particular. It is on this note that Adagba (2009: 386) opines that good governance has eluded Nigeria since independence and the cause of this problem lies in the manners and ways in which the colonial and post-colonial state was designed and operated. However, Nigeria purportedly practicing a democratic system of government has fallen short of certain realities expected to promote the democratic values. These values, public accountability, transparency, good conscience, fiscal discipline, due process, and so on are basic ingredients of good governance and they serve as harbinger to development. Modern democracies show these traits and the situation in Nigeria is different. Adagba, therefore notes that, “Nigeria is at the crossroad of development in her new era of democratic development”. To realise the goals of democracy and good governance therefore, government must ensure the strict adherence to the principles of democracy and good governance, so as to advance improvement in many sectors of the economy, including the reduction of poverty and unemployment.

Ojo, (2002) notes that there have been an upsurge in the threats to security of lives and property in terms of nature, scope and depth in Nigeria. It is no news to state the fact there is an alarming

insecurity in the country. This has many root and the most visible are the rising uncontrollable unemployment among the teeming youths and the insincerity of the political leaders to deliver the true dividends of democracy. By dividends, (Omotola 2007) notes we mean the benefits and positive gestures which are expected of democracy to be delivered to the state and society. Ideally, it should include improvement on the standard of living of the people, popular empowerment, participation, responsiveness, peace and stability, which all serve as precondition for development. The reality shows a wide gap in the actualization of these purported gains of democracy. To rely on the 2002 and 2003 Economic Intelligence United reports therefore, “Nigeria has nothing close to genuine democracy” (cited in Omotola, 2007). What we have instead is a “woeful failure to improve the standards”. Though, government in recent time, seems to be showing some promises in realising these goals, the reality is yet to be seen. Sincerity of governance and commitment must therefore be shown to gain the popular support of the generality of the Nigerian populace. Anything short of this would amount to a caricature of democracy and the realisation of development becomes a mirage.

However, there is a gap between government pronouncements and the reality of the actions. Good governance being the sole link between democracy and development has taken the backstage and thus, it hampers growth. Eliagwu (2002) notes that, “there is a big gap between rhetorics of transparency and accountability on the one hand and demonstrable commitment to values in the actions of the political actors, on the other”. To this end, the ruling class have failed to live up to the expectations and hopes vested in them by the people whom they were elected to represent. What we see instead in the continuous pauperization of the masses and creation of a perpetual inequality and the entrenchment of a wider and stronger gap between the poor and the rich.

Another most talked about issue that hampers development in Nigeria is corruption. You hear people complain about bureaucratic corruption, political corruption and corruption in every facet of the economy and the failure of government to tackle this menace means the denial of the essence of democracy. According to Okoosi-Simbine (2006), “politics is what often drives development, it is important to get politics right and not allow corruption to distort the nation’s political and democratic system”. Umar (2002) also notes that, “corruption is poison to Nigerian democracy not because it ravages the economy and shreds the moral fabric of society, but because it distorts the character of political competition”. There is a growing dissatisfaction from a large number of Nigerians on the deteriorating electoral process which is meant to elect credible and responsible leaders into government. If the process is marred with wanton corrupt practices, rigging and so on, elections which is the basic sacred ingredient of democracy becomes a mirage. Without credible elections, what then is democracy and good governance, and subsequently, how would development be achieved? Therefore, there is a growing fear on the need to curb corruption before it destroys the entire working of government.

Meanwhile, what is needed is the creation of a framework in which democracy and good governance can operate in an orderly manner in order to achieve the set goals and desires on which the state is built upon. Failure of government to actualise this will see the situation of insecurity in the country rise to its toll.

2.6 Theoretical Framework

The adoption of a theoretical framework is very important to every research. This is because it gives viable and operational implications within the framework of analysis which the research set out to unravel. Theories are in themselves the bedrock of research and a suitable theory gives the level to which the empiricism of such study could be weighed. Thus, in analysing the

phenomena of democratic rule, good governance and their effects on socio-economic development, we adopted the Modernization Theory as a framework for analysis in this research. Other theories may explain these phenomena but the modernization theory appears the most suitable and hence the desire to adopt it. However, effort shall be made to justify the adoption of this theory and the link created intermittently.

The modernization theory has many strands and these strands cut across the diverse views of the various modernization theorists who have postulated from their respective perspectives on the subject matter. In this study, we have adopted the views of the two major theorists of modernization whose standpoints is content to our analysis herein. However, these views are further juxtaposed with other scholars who either differ or agree with these theorists on the modernization theory.

It is pertinent to note that the theory is borne out of the mid-century sociological studies on 'modernization' to mean a process of economic development and social change. Modernization theory examines how modernization processes, and economic growth in particular, relate to democratization and democratic consolidation. This view is owed to the ideas of Seymour Martin Lipset and Samuel P. Huntington, both of whom used quantitative data to argue that modernization has a profound and positive effect on democracy.

Samuel Huntington (1971), in the 'Grand Process of Modernization,' understands modernization as a complex, systemic, global, lengthy, phased, homogenizing, irreversible, and progressive process that transforms a society from traditional to modern. As for its relation to democracy, he concludes that democratization is an inevitable part of modernization, resulting from the rationalization/secularization of authority, creation of specialized bureaucratic structures, and eventual participation of citizens in politics. He argues that democratization emerges from social

mobilization and economic development, the driving forces of modernization. In Huntington's words, "Social mobilization involves changes in the aspirations of individuals, groups and societies; economic development involves changes in their capabilities. Modernization requires both" (Huntington 1986, 151).

On the other hand, Seymour Martin Lipset (1959), in his essay "Some Social Requisites of Democracy" puts forth a nuanced exploration of the relationship between democracy and development when he argued that economic development is a prerequisite for maintaining a functional democracy. His argument was basically focused on the high statistical correlation between economic indicators and successful democracies. He thus developed a multi-tiered causal explanation for why modernization is necessary to sustain democracy.

First, he argues that development helps lower classes gain wealth and education, resulting in moderated political views. In other words, because development gives the lower classes something to lose, they are unlikely to resort to extremism that might challenge their improved standing. Moreover, a richer lower class makes the upper classes less wary of democracy, because they no longer view the lower classes as 'subhuman.' Second, he says that modernization enlarges the middle class to such a degree that it dwarfs the upper and lower classes. The result is that the middle class can moderate both extremes and effectively hold power.

Third, greater income lowers the stakes of the election, because in rich countries, governments have little control over the livelihoods of groups, can redistribute wealth without huge opposition, and there is less corruption and nepotism. Finally, greater wealth creates intermediary institutions that can function independently from the state, preventing a monopoly of power for any one party.

Przeworski, et al.'s *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990* agree with Lipset that increased wealth results in an increased likelihood of sustaining democracy, independent of education levels or democratic history. They emphasise that democracies can still thrive in undeveloped countries, but their fate is intertwined with economics, "a higher growth rate equals a higher chance for democratic survival, while conversely, economic crises are closely associated with the demise of democratic regimes" (Przeworski, et al. 2000:115-116). Conversely, therefore, the argument could be interpreted to mean that economic development is more prevalent in democratic systems and it equally suffice to say that inasmuch as development can thrive under non-democratic regimes, its likely hood is more in democratic systems.

However, the argument is that the emergence of democracy is endogenous to the process of economic and social development. It gives a simple, linear progression toward modernization that ultimately culminates in democratisation. In other words, once a non-democratic regime acquires a certain level, or 'threshold', of economic development and social maturation, it will inevitably become a democracy. Deductively, then, according to the modernization approach, the appearance of democracy should be seen as the crowning achievement of a long process of modernization, or as a luxury that affluent countries can (finally) afford. (Alina, 2007:3)

However, the advent of the so-called Third Wave of democratisation that swept across much of the developing world beginning in the 1980s challenged this concept of 'prerequisites' for democracy. Many of the movements towards formal democracy since then have taken place in countries where such transformation would not have been expected based on low levels of economic development and other socio-economic indicators. As has been amply documented, a large number of countries experiencing a transition to democracy during the Third Wave fell in the bottom third of the Human Development Index (Przeworski and Limongi 1997; cited in

Alina, 2007:4). Third Wave transitions also defied cultural arguments positing that democracy is incompatible with certain faiths and religious values. In addition, many authoritarian regimes were able to survive even after reaching a considerably high level of development, so that there does not seem to be a natural progression from authoritarianism to democracy after reaching some kind of developmental 'threshold.

In response to the perceived limitations of modernisation theory, a budding literature has emerged since the 1980s that seeks to understand democratic transitions from a process-oriented approach. This literature emphasises the importance of decisions, ideas and the interaction among strategic domestic political actors in bringing about transitions in 'unlikely places' (Alina 2007:4), while acknowledging the importance of structural factors in shaping actor choices to varying degrees.

Consequently, a broad international consensus has emerged that holds that economic development is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for the emergence of democracy. On the other hand, beyond this general agreement about the fact that there are practically no (structural) preconditions to the emergence of democracy, the nature of the relationship between democracy and development remains a very hotly contested issue.

The core of the argument that democracy helps promote development (more than the other way around) rests on some of the key institutional features of democratic systems – namely its accountability mechanisms and checks and balances provisions. These features play an essential role in limiting the abuse of executive and state power more broadly, and through elections and other processes, they also provide a predictable (in terms of rules, not outcome), transparent, periodic, and reliable system of rewards and punishments. According to Sen (1999a), for

example, it is these institutional characteristics of a (functioning) democracy that explain why famines have never occurred in democratic systems.

However, the wave of ‘democratic optimism’ that accompanied this momentous transformation toward democracy in a vast number of developing countries may itself have placed unusually high expectations about what these newly emerging democratic systems could and should accomplish. Francis Fukuyama (1992) enthusiastically described as ‘the end of history’, while referring in particular to the global triumph of democracy and capitalism around the world. This development culminated the turning point where many of the more traditional assumptions embedded in modernisation theory on its head, a new orthodoxy emerged within the international community (especially among donors) beginning in the 1990s that held that democracy is not an outcome or consequence of development, but rather a necessary ingredient to bring about development (UN-OHRLLS and UNDP 2006; Leftwich 2000).

This is the thinking underpinning much of the ‘good governance’ agenda promoted by the international community (especially multilateral and bilateral donors). According to (Kjaer, 2004), the donor agenda is fundamentally concerned about the rules and practices according to which governments are chosen and state power and authority are exercised. Although democracy as such is not always explicitly spelled out as an element of internationally-supported good governance efforts, there is a clear normative commitment to democratic politics embodied in the good governance agenda. Among other things, good governance emphasizes the importance of transparency and accountability, and it also calls for broadly inclusive and participatory decision-making processes as an essential condition to the effective promotion of development.

The new wave of democratic governance that dwells more on good governance has become the major linkage of the modernization argument to this study. In the main, there are several

advantages to an open, democratic, and participatory process to policy-making from a good governance perspective, even if this implies that decision-making processes are more protracted and less efficient in the short term. However, as vividly opined by scholars like Saez (2005), the advantages can be summarised as follows:

In the first place, (participation) allows for the creation of alliances of various interests in favour of set objectives. Second, it creates a sense of ownership of adopted decisions, even if they oppose certain interests defended by them. Third, it contributes to sustainability of policies over time: it reduces the chances of backlash if participation is solid and decisions taken are considered legitimate in their origin and outcome. Fourth, participation ... fosters ... more informed decisions. Lastly, participation permits society to demand more accountability of those in charge of public policies (cited in Alina, 2007:7).

These advantages continue to form the basis for which scholars place more emphasis on good governance as a major ingredient to achieving the developmental yearnings of democratic rule and this, no doubt, has emerged in an altruistic argument that favours democratic regimes in developing countries of the Third World.

Joseph Halperin et al. (2005) in their book *The Democracy Advantage: How Democracies Promote Prosperity and Peace*, make a strong case for the developmental benefit of participatory and accountable systems of governance over time, as compared to authoritarian regimes, arguing that the better performance of democracies can be attributed to their relatively greater propensity for establishing institutions of shared power, information openness, and adaptability. The authors find that low-income democracies outperform autocracies across a wide range of development indicators. They show, for example, that democracies have experienced more stable and steady growth patterns than autocracies over time.

Also, in *Democracy, Governance, and Economic Performance: Theory and Evidence*, Yi Feng (2003) finds that democracy has a positive impact on economic and social development, though

mostly through indirect channels. The channels the author describes include policy certainty, political stability, the establishment and enforcement of rules that protect property rights, the promotion of education, the ability to promote private capital, and the reduction of inequality. A democratic regime is seen as vital in bringing about these indirect benefits because it is a system that provides for regular government change while inhibiting irregular/erratic/unconstitutional change. Yet, as the discussion on the ‘development first’ school suggests and as many analysts have also shown (Leftwich 2005, Zakaria 2003, Haggard 1990), these indirect benefits are not the exclusive domain of democracies: (some) authoritarian regimes also seem quite capable of providing stability, the rule of law, the protection of property rights, and basic social services. However, even if authoritarian regimes seem capable of giving room to such indirect channels, the fact remains that the experience in Africa and Nigeria in particular shows that the reverse could be the case. Democratic regimes across Africa and many other parts of the world appear to favour more, the guarantee for the performances of the indirect channels that enhance development.

According to Audu (2010:30), democracy varies from situation to situation but in almost all circumstances, citing Ayee (1998), democracy is the guarantee of social justice and government accountability. Social justice and accountability become the major ingredients for the actualization of democratic dividends and earlier noted in this study, the two concepts are closely tied to development and this has been the heart of the argument so far. It thus entails that, the later argument on modernization, that is, of the ‘new wave of democratization’, has become paramount to this study. Good governance forms the basic yardstick to which democratic rule can enhance socio-economic development, of which this study places great emphasis on. While

democracy has been adjudged as a form of government, good governance has become the bedrock on which its (democratic dividends) could be realised.

2.7 Conclusion

This chapter has done a systematic thematic review of existing literature on the three complementary variables (democracy/democratic rule, good governance and development) to form the central argument of the study. The chapter equally adopted the modernization theory as a framework of analysis in the study. However, the foregoing review of literature shows that no work has been particularly done to focus on the micro level and it thus gives this research the primary responsibility to add to the existing body of knowledge. The understanding derived from this study, particularly as it relates to the variables under study forms a greater part of the gap in the existing literature.

CHAPTER THREE:

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter contains the methods of data collection, study area/sample design of this research, the population, sampling procedures and techniques, instruments of data collection, data presentation and analysis to encompass the bulk of research methodology. The study therefore, made use of both primary and secondary methods of data collection. The primary method entails survey research in which the researcher intends to utilise the distribution of questionnaires and carry out in-depth interviews with selected stakeholders in the region.

3.2 Study Area

The study area or location is Kogi East Senatorial District. Kogi East Senatorial District is made up of nine (9) Local Government Areas which include: Ankpa, Bassa, Dekina, Ibaji, Idah, Igalamela/Odolu, Ofu, Olamaboro and Omala. Except for Bassa Local Government Area which is the only local government that has non-Igala indigenes in large populations, the rest are of the same dialect and share similarities and a common heritage. However, Bassa Local Government has many Igala people domiciled there.

3.3 Types and Sources of Data

A. Sources of Data Collection

The research relies on both primary and secondary sources of data.

THE PRIMARY SOURCES: This includes survey questionnaires, in-depth interview schedule and focus group discussion (FGD).

THE SECONDARY SOURCES: This will depend on materials from published and unpublished sources, text books, journals, available conference proceedings/papers, newspapers, maps, reliable internet sources and official documents related to the topic under study.

The reason for the choice of these categories of respondents is predicated on the nature of what they do and their vast knowledge on the issue under study. Again available official reports from the Independent National Electoral Commission were examined for the purpose of complementarity. The justification for these two sources was for the purpose of one complementing the other so as to strengthen the findings of the study.

3.4Instrument of Data Collection

This study employed the use of qualitative data based on the quality of information and not necessarily mass data. As such, in-depth interview and questionnaires were used to elicit information in order to achieve a holistic understanding of the respondents' point of view.

A. IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW

Unstructured questions for in-depth probing of respondents were used and the respondents involved selected stakeholders ranging from party leaders, chiefs and top government functionaries from the area under study. The interviewees were chosen based on their role, knowledge and involvement in politics and local administration of the study area. Their wealth experience of the democratic and socio-economic activities of this region gives a great credibility to the research.

B. QUESTIONNAIRES

This study in addition to in-depth interview sampled opinions through the use of structured and unstructured questionnaires. The Krejcie and Morgan method of determining sample size in administering the questionnaires was used. In that regard the 400 sample was arrived at based on the total number of the study population from the three sampled Local Governments. This was done using the formula: Population Per Ward, divided by Total Population times Sample Size. While for interviews, the respondents were selected based on the roles they play in politics of the area, positions held and their knowledge of the study area.

However, 400 questionnaires were administered to the adult male and female population in the selected local governments and later the wards selected within the local governments.

Consequently, Ankpa Local Government was administered 143 questionnaires, Dekina was administered 181 questionnaires while Idah Local Government was administered 76 questionnaires. Additional data was also collected from the examination of official documents and publications relating to the subject under study.

C: FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION

The study organized for Focus Group Discussions in some communities in the study area. These communities include Ankpa Township, Anyigba and Idah main town. The FGD was conducted to feature Community Development Facilitators/Leaders who are practically involved in the day-to-day development activities in the various communities in the study area. The Community Development Facilitators/Leaders from the three communities were split into two groups from each community. However, each group was represented by six (6) individuals, except for Anyigba where the groups consisted of seven (7) and eight (8) members. The reason for the

selection of these communities was based on the fact that the communities represent the three sampled Local Governments in the region and given their population and the central position they occupy in the region, it makes it worthwhile to conduct the FGD around these communities.

3.5 Population Sampling and Sampling Techniques

A. THE SELECTION

The data for the study was collected from Ankpa, Dekina and Idah Local Governments respectively. In selecting the local governments, a two stage sampling method was adopted. Firstly, the Simple Random Technique was used to select the local governments using a ballot system. Consequently, each local government was written on a sheet of paper, folded and put in the bowl, after which it was shaken and one selected and returned. The process was repeated until the final third local government was selected.

For the selection of the wards, a Systematic Sampling Method was used based on the Registered Voters Record obtained from the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) for the selected local governments. In selecting the wards, the wards were listed according to the local governments as were arranged by INEC and a Systematic Method was used to select the wards at the third interval after the first was selected from the top.

Table 3.5.1 Showing Wards according to the selected Local Governments

ANKPA LGA	DEKINA LGA	IDAH LGA
Ankpa Township	Dekina Town	Igalaogba
Ankpa Suburb I	Iyale	OwoliApa
Ankpa Suburb II	Emewe	Igecheba
Ankpa I	Odu I	Ukwaja
Ankpa II	Odu II	Ogegele
Enjema I	Abocho	Ede
Enjema II	Ogbabede	SabonGari
Enjema III	AdumuEgume	Ega
Enjema IV	Ojikpadala	Ugwoda
Ojoku I	Anyigba	Ichala
Ojoku II	Okura Olafia	
Ojoku III	OganeInigu	

Source: INEC Voter Register for Ankpa, Dekina and Idah LGAs, 2014

B. JUSTIFICATION FOR THE SELECTION OF THE RESPONDENTS

The above chosen categories of respondents are selected for the following reasons:

The first categories of respondents which have to do with in-depth interview are chosen based on the role, knowledge and involvement in politics and local administration of the study area.

The second category of respondents which constitute Community Development Facilitators/Leaders who are practically involved in the day-to-day development activities in the various communities in the study area. These development facilitators are constantly on ground to guide or give advice to government on developmental concerns in their region.

However, the other category constitute the adult population has to do with the administration of questionnaires to represent the view of the generality of adult Kogi Eastern Indigenes on the

level of their knowledge of the dividends of democratic rule particularly as regards socio-economic development in the area. Therefore, the 400 respondents were randomly selected using the simple random sampling by administering questionnaires after every third household on the streets in the selected wards. Household in this sense means the number of people living under the same roof.

The above category of respondents are justified on the grounds that the area of coverage is the Kogi East Senatorial District made up of respondents based generally on the fact that their responses determines their class, status, etc, therefore the study concentrate on qualitative method in order to draw a better conclusion by touching all those involved in the process.

3.6 Population and Sample

The data for this study was collected from Kogi East Senatorial District. The study population consists of the following categories:

CATEGORY A: This covered the in-depth interview schedule in which selected stakeholders ranging from party leaders, traditional rulers and top government functionaries from the area under study were featured.

CATEGORY B: The second category of the respondents in this study centred on the entire adult population from the study area, so much as no particular class was targeted since the variables under study cut across all realms and are all inclusive. Hence, it is believed that respondents' biodata showed the categories of respondents as directly showed herein on the analysis biodatatable.

CATEGORY C: This category constitutes Community Development Facilitators/Leaders who are practically involved in the day-to-day development activities in the various communities in

the study area. The knowledge and involvement in matters of community development and government policy directions that concerns their communities makes them important to this study.

However, supplementary data obtained from interview and additional data were also collected from available materials on the subject matter under study, in the form of other secondary sources and relevant documents.

Table 3.6.1 Distribution of the Total Population and the Sample Size According to the Wards of the Local Government

S/N	No of Wards of the LGA	Total Population Per Ward of the LGA	Sample Size Per Ward of the LGA
	Ankpa LGA		
1	Ankpa Township	17, 463	57
2	Ankpa I	11, 650	38
3	Enjema II	8. 432	27
4	Ojoku I	6, 387	21
	Total	43, 932	143
	Dekina LGA		
5	Dekina Township	10, 466	34
6	Odu I	5, 772	19
7	Ogbabede	9, 572	31
8	Anyigba	29, 803	97
	Total	55, 613	181
	Idah LGA		
9	Igalaogba	7, 350	24
10	Ukwaja	8, 370	27
11	SabonGari	4, 821	16
12	Ichala	2, 922	9
	Total	23, 463	76
	Sum Total	123, 008	400

Source: INEC Voter Register for Ankpa, Dekina and Idah LGAs, 2014

3.7 Data Transcription and Analysis Technique (DTAT)

The essence of DTAT is to transcribe the raw data generated into an instrument for analysis. For in-depth direct interview and the FGD, it is instructive to note that before interviews and discussions were conducted, the respondents or interviewees were contacted and informed about

the research with detailed overview. Meeting was scheduled by prior notice of the respondents with no definite time targeted. Responses from respondents were recorded by a recorder or tape, in some cases on the permission of the respondents (especially for the interviews) which was later transcribed into notes.

The transcription process began with a careful reading of the transcribed note in order to gain overall familiarity with the data from the interviews. The second reading was conducted in order to identify the salient themes in the data in line with research problems and objectives under investigation. The last reading was to establish emerging themes and to place relevant quotes within the different identified themes.

A triangulation method was adopted for the analysis of the data generated. This is informed by the nature of the phenomenon under investigation in which interview and questionnaires were advanced. This method was adopted so that one would complement the other and also to strengthen the research findings. In a nutshell, the data generated from in-depth interview and questionnaires were analysed using triangulation method with all the relevant issues such as research problems, research question and research objectives listed in form of themes and sub-themes. Inferences were later drawn from the documentary records and interviews to explain these issues under investigation for the purpose of validity and reliability.

In addition, in qualitative analysis, the data generated from questionnaire were collated, coded and then edited. Data were re-coded and assigned values based on responses that were gotten. After coding the data on code sheet, information was translated into numerical form and taken to computer using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, 20.0, 2012). This package brought out the frequencies and percentages to determine distribution of variables. Relevant statistical measures were used to analyse the data. The first level of analysis involved the

examination of the frequency distribution of respondents' socio-demographic attributes as it relate to the effects of democratic rule on socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District. This provided an insight into the structure of the study population, followed by the third part of the triangulation. On this note the observation that the researcher made during both in-depth interviews and responses from the questionnaires either on the personality, office or category of respondents was used to substantiate the other information. In addition to observation also, reports or views of scholars regarding a particular theme or sub-theme were used to strengthen the position or argument on whatever basis.

3.8Hiring of Research Assistant

Three research assistants were used to help the researcher in the administration and retrieval of the questionnaires. Some of the research assistants happened to be friends and relatives of the researcher. The table below represents the breakdown of their wards coverage.

3.9SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN KOGI EAST SENATORIAL DISTRICT FROM HISTORICAL POINT (BEFORE 1999)

This section is designed to review the socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District before the return to democratic rule in 1999. By this, an appreciable level of understanding of the extent of socio-economic development in the region before 1999 was created in order to have the indices or yardsticks for the analysis of the aftermath of the return to democratic rule in 1999.

To have a good understanding of the socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District, it is necessary to have a foreknowledge of the area and its people. The major language of the people is Igala but Bassa language is spoken as a minor language (Edoka, Igbokwe and

Adejo, 2014). According to Obayemi (2012), one of the initial problems facing the area was “sketching the history of the Igala state in its early period is that of chronology”. The area is bounded to the north by Benue and Nassarawa states, Anambra state to the south, Enugu state to the east and River Niger to the west. The Igala ethnic group of Kogi state is found within the savannah belt having two distinct seasons: the wet season which begins in April and terminates in October, and the dry season which commences from November to March. Kogi East Senatorial District is largely an agrarian area and the food crops such as yam, cassava, maize, beans, millet, etc. and cash crops such as oil palm, cashew, citrus, sugar cane etc. are grown for local consumption and export.

On a general note, Kogi State is ranked very low among the 36 States in Nigeria making it one of the poorest states in the country. According to the UNDP figures released in 2009, “out of the state’s population of 3.434 million, 70% live in rural areas where the preoccupation is subsistence agriculture” (cited in Omali, 2011). However, Omali (2011: 37) notes that before the return to democratic rule in 1999, Kogi East Senatorial District was in a miserable socio-economic situation. Economic activities were at very low rates, the health condition of the people was poor and poverty largely prevailed in the region. In his words,

A recent economic survey of the state adduced the widespread of underdevelopment to a combination of factors that are social, economic and political. Due to this state of underdevelopment, majority of the inhabitants are unable to feed adequately. They also do not have access to basic indices of development namely, health, qualitative education, good roads, shelter and portable water.

The major reasons responsible for these challenges were lack of social cohesion, predominantly closed society and inadequate capital formation.

Before 1999 and even to some extent now, the standard of living of the people has been very poor. For instance, the buildings (houses) common in this region were traditionally

mud walls with thatched roofs. The region has remained one of the most rural and underdeveloped areas in the North Central (ICDA Memorandum, 2012).

Education is seen by many as key to the growth of a nation and it has been greeted with low standard and performance in Kogi East Senatorial District before the return to democratic rule in 1999. Historically, in 1932, during the colonial era, the Igala Native Authority (NA) opened its first school in Dekina. With time, the number steadily rose to 40 (Omale, 2011). The Catholic Mission dominated the educational scene in Igala/Bassa land (culminating of Kogi East) with her 59 primary schools while other denominations had 40 with the breakdown at QIM 28, CMML 6 and Anglican 6 (Okwoli, 1984:66, cited in Omale, 2011:12). It is worthy of note that the schools were managed in such a way that the proprietors provided the essential books for staff, desks and other equipment. They visited their schools regularly for routine inspection, supervision and appraisal but with time, after the government takeover, all these became a thing of the past (Omale, 2011).

However, it is significant to acknowledge that between 1900 and 1940, there was not a single senior primary school in this region. The implication was that, majority of the brilliant and ambitious sons and daughters from this region could not continue their education in faraway places because they had no financial means to do so. This, according to Omale (2011) explains why the region had few graduates in the 1970s. Notably therefore, between 1958 and 1969, there were 8 post primary institutions in the area: Dekina Government Secondary School and Ochaja Secondary School (1960), Ochaja Teacher's College (1962) and the BassaNge Anglican College, Gboloko(1969); and 4 post-primary schools were owned by the Catholics- Our Lady of Schools

Teachers College, Anyigba (1958), Holy Rosary College, Idah (1962), St. Peter's College, Idah (1963) and St. Charles College, Ankpa (1967).

There was a wide gap in the education in this region in comparison to other parts of Nigeria during this period. Achimugu, (2001: 32) notes that, looking at the connection between education and a people's growth, it is important to say that when the very first post primary school was established by the year 1960, there were already 545 secondary schools in Nigeria, and while the first secondary school in Kogi East was being established in 1960, the Anglican Grammar School, Lagos, had been in operation since 1859, 101 years earlier (cited in Omale, 2011: 13).

According to Omale(2011:22),

“Between 1950s and the 1960s, missionaries provided infrastructures and learning materials for schools. However, over the years, we have witnessed decaying and dilapidated structures. Classes, in some instances are held under trees, and in classrooms with unpaved floors”.

This shows the long abandonment of government attention towards this sector in Kogi East Senatorial District. Notably, Abdullahi (2001: 6) notes that,

Recreational facilities are lacking in most schools, library is really not what we used to know, teaching aids are not there, classrooms are not inviting, windows falling, the ceiling is caving in”.

Onucheyo (2008:26) equally acknowledges that rather than education impacting on sustainable development in Kogi East Senatorial District, its poor and declining nature and quality has been very glaring. He notes that, the education in this region was directed towards “ensuring peaceful environment, promotion of positive image,... influencing natural resources management, promotion of professional development, trade issues and general economic development”, but the reverse has been the case.

Nevertheless, the gap between educational growth in Kogi East Senatorial District and other parts of the country has been notably wide. While elsewhere in the country, especially in the

southern parts, tertiary institutions were established early at the beginning of 20th century, the very first in Kogi East, the Federal Polytechnic, Idah, was not established until 1977, followed by the College of Education, Ankpa, in 1981, and until the return to democratic rule in 1999, no other tertiary institution had been established in the region, with the population fast increasing by the day.

Other pertinent issuesworthy of note are unemployment, poverty and inequality in Kogi East Senatorial District, especially before 1999. These key issues form the major indices identified in Dudley Seers' definition of development adopted earlier in this research and majorly part of the items identified in the operational definition of socio-economic development earlier adopted. To this effect, a general understanding of poverty, unemployment and inequality in Nigeria has grossly been on the rise. Poverty in itself is the most dehumanizing aspect of human life. Kogi East Senatorial District has had its dehumanizing toll over the years. Thus as rightly noted by Omale (2011: 24),

The economic power of our people have been greatly reduced and ... children have dropped out of school either to take care of their parents or become breadwinners for the family. There are cases of households all over our land which are headed by mere children. Abejukolo, Iyale, Anyigba, Egume, Imane and Dekina from our field experience are worst hit. We have more orphans and vulnerable children needing educational support in these communities.

As a result of the prevailing poverty in this region, many children have no access to education because they lack sufficient food and nutrition. To this effect, the table below was adopted from NBS (2010) figures to show an appreciable statistics of poverty across the country over a period of time.

Table 3.9.1 Relative Poverty Headcount From 1980-2006

Year	Poverty incidence (%)	Estimated population in (million)	Population in poverty in(million)
1980	27.2	65	17.1
1985	46.3	75	34.7
1992	42.7	91.5	39.2
1996	65.6	102.3	67.1

Source: National Bureau of Statistics HNLSS 2010

The above figure also indicate that the proportion of the population below poverty line increases significantly from 1980-1996 (NBS 2010). Poverty line according to Aigbokhan (2000, cited in Usman, 2014) is a measure that divides the poor from non-poor. It is used to determine how far away people are from poverty.

Conclusion

The foregoing shows that poverty has been prevalent in Kogi East Senatorial District and this could closely be tied to the level of unemployment and inequality in the region. There is no gain saying the region has not been in deer need of socio-economic development, judging from the discussion so far advanced.

CHAPTER FOUR:

4.0 ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTS OF DEMOCRATIC RULE ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN KOGI EAST SENATORIAL DISTRICT, 1999-2012

4.1 Introduction

This chapter contains the presentation and the analysis of data collected through both secondary and primary sources on the subject under study in the light of which deductions or findings are drawn and verified for and against the propositions posed in chapter one.

The data presentation and analysis encompass both qualitative and quantitative descriptive analysis as the data collected in the field are presented by tabularisation using the frequency and percentage tools of the SPSS package. This entails a method of transferring data from the information gathered to statistical form and then systematic examination conducted on such data for further interpretation and analysis.

Hence, to that effect, the information contained in the data gathered from the questionnaires are coded in a code sheet, thereafter, an onward transfer of information is summarized in a tabular form using the SPSS tool. The tables, too, are sectionalized based on how the information are categorized in the questionnaire. The information contained in the tables are further explained literally in line with the specific objectives of the study beneath the tables for better understanding and clarification.

However, the use of quantitative descriptive analysis advanced in this study is anchored on simple percentage statistics that sums up the mass of information generated from the field work. Appropriate analysis is therefore applied to help discover the relationship between democracy

and good governance and how they both contributed or vice versa to development in Kogi East Senatorial District between 1999 to 2012.

4.2 DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Table 4.1 Biodata of respondents

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Ward				
Ankpa	133	33.2	33.2	33.3
Dekina	134	33.4	33.5	66.8
Idah	133	33.2	33.2	100.0
Total	400	100.0		
Sex				
Male	257	64.3	65.1	65.1
Female	137	34.5	34.7	99.7
Total	395	98.5	100.0	
Missing System	6	1.2		
Total	400	100.0		
Age				
18-29	230	57.5	59.2	59.2
30-39	91	22.8	22.9	80.9
40-49	55	13.8	13.9	94.7
50>	21	5.3	5.3	100.0
Total	397	99.3	100.0	
Missing System	3	.7		
Total	400	100.0		
Marital Status				
Single	234	58.5	59.2	59.2
Married	157	39.3	39.7	99.0
Divorced	2	.5	.5	99.5
Widowed	2	.5	.5	100.0

Total	395	98.8	100.0	
Missing System	5	1.2		
Total	400	100.0		
Educational Level				
Primary	7	1.8	1.8	1.8
Secondary	85	21.3	21.7	23.5
Tertiary	290	72.5	74.2	97.7
Uneducated	9	2.3	2.3	100.0
Total	391	97.8	100.0	
Missing System	9	2.2		
Total	400	100.0		
Religion				
Christianity	269	67.3	68.3	68.3
Islam	120	30.0	30.5	98.7
Pagan	4	1.0	1.0	99.7
None	1	.3	.3	100.0
Total	397	99.3	100.0	
Missing System	3	.7		
Total	400	100.0		
Occupation				
Civil Servant	106	26.5	26.7	26.7
Farming	54	13.5	13.6	40.3
Business	53	13.3	13.4	53.7
Unemployed	112	28.0	28.2	81.9
Student	71	17.8	17.9	99.7
Retired	1	.3	.3	100.0
Total	397	99.3	100.0	
Missing System	3	.7		
Total	400	100.0		
Source: Field Work (2015).				

The table 4.1 above presents a compartmentalized bio-data of respondents across the three LGAs coded as the wards in order to summarize the table and the respective wards in which the survey was conducted sited in this analysis. The table features the ward of respondent, sex, age, educational level, marital status, religious affiliation and occupation respectively. Accordingly, five (5) wards from each of the LGAs, Ankpa, Dekina and Idah were respectively featured in the survey, namely: Ankpa LGA- Ankpa township, Enjema, Ikanekpo, Ogoto and Ukwaja; Dekina LGA- Anyigba, Dekina, Egume, Ojikpadala, Abocho and Odu; and Idah LGA- Ede, Idah Native town, Igecheba, Igalaogba and Sabon-Gari.

The table equally indicates the sexes of the respondents stating 64.3% for male and 34.5% for female. However, as reflected in the table a total of 395 respondents indicated their sexes and 5 did not. Moreso, the table captured the age ranges of respondents totalling 397, suffice to say that 3 failed to indicate their age. In the main, 57.5% of respondents fall between the age 18-29, 22.8% fall between 30-39, 13.8% fall under 40-49 and 5.3% fall between the age 50 and above. Thus it is evident that the youngest age group attended more to the questionnaires.

In another development, as captured in the table above, the marital status of respondents shows that 58.5% are single, 39.3% married, .5% widowed and .5% divorced, totalling 395 respondents. It means that five respondents preferred not to indicate their marital status.

Another vital information captured in the table is the educational level of respondents which states that 1.8% stopped primary school, 21.3% have O Level, 71.5% tertiary and 2.3% uneducated. However, with the total frequency at 391, it shows that 9 respondents chose not to indicate their educational level.

Also captured in the table is the religious affiliation of respondents which indicates that 67.3% Christians featured, 30.0% featured were Muslims, 1.0% pagan and .3% chose none totalling 99.3% overall respondents and .7% did not indicate their religion.

At the bottom of the table is the occupation of respondents under which 26.5% represents civil servants, 13.5% farmers, 13.3% business, 28.0% unemployed and 17.8% students. With the total 397 respondents shown, only 3 preferred not to show their occupation. The International Labour Organization (2010) indicates that 40 per cent of jobless people worldwide are young. This deductively seems to have reflected in the higher number of the unemployed as captured in the table.

4.2.1 The Extent to which Democratic Rule impacted on socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999 to 2012

This section presents the views of respondents on the level of the impacts of democratic rule on socio-economic development. It takes a general look at the impacts from the broad level with a view to understanding the complementary role democratic rule play in advancing socio-economic development. Divergent views are expressed by the respondents and the analysis was made from tables 4.2 to 4.11 below.

Table 4.2 Have you enjoyed dividends of democracy between 1999 and 2012?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	231	57.8	58.6	58.6
No	163	40.8	41.4	100.0
Total	394	98.5	100.0	
Missing System	6	1.5		
Total	400	100.0		

Source: Field Work (2015).

The table above indicates the fact whether the lives of respondents were positively impacted by the return to democratic rule, especially from 1999 to 2012 which is the timeframe of this research. 57.8%, that is, 231 out of the 394 respondents who responded to this question are of the opinion that they have enjoyed more since the return to democratic rule in 1999. This impact ranges from economic to social freedom, peace and tranquillity, security, etc; and it captures the minds of Ayatse, Onaga and Ogoh, (2013), Ayoade (1998: 11) stated in the earlier chapter of this work that the hallmark of development in a democratic rule is to as much as possible, reduce those obstacles that inhibits attaining higher standard of living so as to maximize the potentials of the people to enable them live high quality life.. However, 40.8% of respondents indicated that they have not enjoyed anything since the return to democratic rule and this shows a very close gap between the other group who claimed to have enjoyed one or two things. Deductively, the percentage of this group is large enough not to adjudge the impacts of democratic rule, backed by good governance on the lives of the people to have impacted the people so well. It opens wide the argument of Ake (2000: 136);Saliu and Lipede (2002) that the political elite in Nigeria have not demonstrated enough commitment to the goal of entrenching democracy in the country as they have failed, so far to deliver the dividends of democracy to the people. However, worthy of note is the fact that, the consensus from the FGDs correspond the view that democratic rule promotes socio-economic development (Respondents, FGD, 2015).

Table 4.3 The nature of the dividends of democracy enjoyed

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Growth in employment and education	51	12.8	24.2	24.2
Respect for human rights and general freedom	59	14.8	28.0	52.1
Social amenities/ welfarism	47	11.8	22.3	74.4
General development/ growth	18	4.5	8.5	82.9
Discipline and orderliness	6	1.5	2.8	85.8
Respect for franchise, public opinion and participation	14	3.5	6.6	92.4
Technological growth/ICT	15	3.8	7.1	99.5
Accountability and sincerity of government	1	.3	.5	100.0
Total	211	47.3	100.0	
Missing System	189	47.3		
Total	400	100.0		

Source: Field Work (2015).

From the above table, eight (8) categories of the benefits or dividends of democratic rule have been indicated by 211 respondents out of 400 to have been enjoyed during the period of 1999 to 2012 and 189 respondents displayed apathy to answer this question. Under this categories of the dividends of democracy are the specifications viz: under “growth in employment and education” which recorded 12.8%, we have employment opportunities, improved salary remuneration, improved education, construction of new schools, and entrepreneurship/empowerment representing the cumulative percentage of 12.8% stated above; general freedom and respect for rule of law under which freedom, absence of coups, human rights, not dictatorial and peace and unity to make the total of 14.8%.

Another category which as shown in the table 4.3 above is “Social amenities/ welfarism” recording 11.8. This category has under it, road construction, water supply, improved electricity, transportation, healthcare, food supply, good housing and even NGO support. 47 respondents out of the 211 indicated that they enjoyed either of these items. However, as development and growth seemingly implies same thing especially in this research, some respondents particularly 18 out of the 211 making 4.5% preferred to state that they enjoyed “general development/ growth” as the next category during the return to civil rule that is the period of 1999 to 2012. Under this category, respondents preferably stated growing democracy, economic growth leading to business profits and price reduction in commodities and improved standard of living. Nevertheless, 1.5% of respondents, precisely 6 indicated in the table to have enjoyed “discipline and orderliness” under the democratic era between 1999 to 2012. The items found under this category include less corruption, orderliness, better security of life, discipline and strictness. However, it could be deduced that the reality of brazen corruption, high handedness of leadership on the masses, some level of insecurity in the region and even in Nigeria in general reflected on the low score this category recorded in the table.

Another category is “respect for franchise, public opinion and participation” scoring 3.5%. This category is very vital to democratic practice and good governance. Under this category we have respect for franchise, public opinion participation and responsiveness. These items form the integral part of democratic culture as Ayoade (1998: 11) notes that every citizen in a state has political investments of political participation and trust as it becomes tenable and acceptable to the people and marked by the continuous dialogue and interaction between those who govern and the ruled (cited in Ayatse, Onaga and Ogoh, 2013). However, scoring this low underlines a perception that the democratic practice so far in the state and this region has not met this chiefly characteristic as it has likely denied the people much sense of ownership of the government.

Public opinion, participation and responsiveness are very vital in making democracy a true government of the people.

The table also shows the next category “Technological growth/ICT” scoring 3.8%. Under this category are telecommunication, ICT and access to information. With the advent of democratic governance, Nigeria witnessed the introduction and rise of ICT and based on the information the table 4.3 above, not much has been achieved or enjoyed in Kogi East in that regard having scored just 3.8%. It suffice to say that much is yet to be done in this area of technological advancement. However, the last category, “Accountability and sincerity of government” on the recorded at .3 shows a gross failure of government in being accountable to the people of this region. It is thus glaring from the table that the people do not have positive opinion about the government in terms of accountability and sincerity.

Table 4.4 On the reasons that democratic rule has fostered socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Participatory and all inclusiveness	100	25.0	28.4	28.4
Operational tranquillity, flexibility and transparency	30	7.5	8.5	36.9
Accessibility, responsiveness and nearness to the people	16	4.0	4.5	41.5
Rule of law, freedom and public opinion	92	23.0	26.1	67.6
Better security, orderliness and less corrupt	84	21.0	26.1	91.5
Developmental effectiveness	23	5.8	6.5	98.0
Immediate impacts on the people	6	1.5	1.7	99.7
Social amenities and welfarism	1	.3	.3	100.0
Total	352	88.0	100.0	
Missing System	48	12.0		
Total	400	100.0		

Source: Field Work (2015).

The information captured in the table 4.5 above details the reason for the large preferences of respondents on the choice of the type of government in the preceding table. These reasons are coded in categories as vividly shown in the table above. The first category being “participatory and all-inclusiveness”, scores 25.0%. It is believed that because democracy is people oriented, it allows for participation and inclusive of all. That is why one respondent believes that “democratic rule takes the wishes of the people as parameter for development, therefore, socio-economic development will tailor towards the intention of the masses” (Interview, 2015).

However, the next category, “Operational tranquillity, flexibility and transparency” goes for 7.5%. This set of respondents believes that democracy is flexible to operate, shows less impunity, is transparent, less prone to wars and more civil; and not dictatorial or autocratic.

However, another set of respondents believes that democracy shows more accessibility and responsiveness. The percentage for this category stands at 4.0 at 16 frequency. Because of the large representation in democracy, it is believed people have more access to government and thus the response from government is much easier than in military government. Also, another category, “Rule of law, freedom and public opinion”, scoring 23.0%, hold that under democratic government, there is respect for rule of law, human rights, public opinion and that the government is open to criticisms unlike in military rule.

One preference that remained constant all through the response from respondents was their choice of military government. While the percentage of their reason stands at 21.0% on the category of “better security, orderliness and less corrupt”, it is worthy of note that majority of the reasons accounted for this category and others preferred not to state it and a very few others were scattered round other categories. The significance of this is that, respondents gave reasons that military rule under this category is well coordinated, strict, less corrupt, orderly, has better security, stability, sincere with words, straightforward, and more professional.

A few other reasons were given for the preference of democratic rule “developmental effectiveness” at 5.8%. They believe that democratic rule is more effective, more promising and enhances easy development. However, 1.5% of respondents are of the opinion that democracy has “immediate impacts on the people”, believing that it is better for job creation and improvement of living standard. Lastly on the table was the category of “social

amenities/welfarism” going for .3%. It is quite shocking that out of the 352 respondents, only 1 could identify that democratic rule has immediate impacts on the people.

Table 4.5 Whether respondent’s friend or relative has been employed since 1999-2012?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	282	70.5	70.9	70.9
No	116	29.0	29.1	100.0
Total	398	99.5	100.0	
Missing System	2	.5		
Total	400	100.0		

Source: Field Work (2015).

The information in table 4.6 above shows the employment condition in Kogi East Senatorial District between 1999 to 2012. 398 at 99.5% respondents answered this question and out of which 70.5% at 282 frequency believe that their friends or relatives have been employed between this period. This shows great improvement in employment in the region but this may still not be commensurable to the rising unemployment in the region, Kogi state and Nigeria as a whole.

Descriptively, the responses in the above table shows an aggregated data, in which the sum total of the respondents were brought together from the various Local Governments according which the questionnaires were administered. However, in its disaggregated format, the response from the questionnaires shows that Ankpa LGA recorded 23.3%; Dekina LGA – 26.4% and Idah recorded 21.2%. However, there seem to be differing opinions among the masses and the elite class featured in the interview. While the mass of respondents believe their friends or relatives have gained employment during the research timeframe, the interviewees are of different opinion. For instance, an interviewee believes that:

Democratic rule has not addressed unemployment. I even see people who had jobs before 1999 losing them, even now and those that are in job now are not receiving commensurable salaries. Because, from the three levels of government, I don't see any job creation in Kogi East (Interview, 2015).

Adding to this, another interviewee equally opines that:

Governance means to empower the people in several ways but what we have seen over the years has been different. For example, at the Local Government level, a Chairman will employ people and once he leaves office, his successor will retrench all those employed by the previous administration. It even makes people to lose the taste of democratic governance (Interview, 2015).

In its 2010 publication, the NBS equally notes the rising unemployment in Kogi State shown in the table below:

Table 4.5.1 NBS 2010 Report showing rising unemployment in Kogi State

Year	Unemployment incidence (%)
2002	11.3
2003	12.4
2004	21.3
2005	10.7
2006	12.4
2007	16.5
2009	19.0

However, Current figures from the bureau of statistics put the current general youth unemployment rate at over 25%. The implication is that over 60 million Nigerian youths out of a population of 170 million are unemployed (Alexander, Ezugwu, Titillayo, and Ajiboye, 2012). Kogi State or Kogi East Senatorial District is not exception of this fact. When compared with the age distribution in table 4.1, it shows the danger, in that, respondents between the age 18-29 stands at 57.5% and the number of the unemployed and students, still in the same table shows 28.0% and 17.8% respectively. But the fact remains that from 1999 to 2012, respondents believe

one or two friends or relatives have been employed. This shows some level of growth and development in the region but maybe probably not commensurate to the desired level.

Table 4.6 Was there better healthcare delivery, roads, water and food supply since 1999-2012?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	215	53.8	76.8	76.8
No	181	45.3	23.2	99.7
Total	397	99.3	100.0	
Missing System	4	.2		
Total	400	100.0		

Source: Field Work (2015).

The figures in table 4.8 above show the improvement in living standard of respondents and in the rewards of democratic governance between 1999 and 2012 in Kogi East Senatorial District. Out of the 397 frequency of respondents that attended to this question, 215 at 53.8% agrees that there have been better healthcare delivery, construction of roads, and improved water and food supplies between 1999 and 2012. However, 181 at 45.3% respondents are of the opinion that they have not enjoyed better healthcare delivery, good roads, and water and food supplies during this period. Given the percentage that disagrees, it is notable that more could be done during this democratic dispensation to render a highly more improved healthcare delivery, roads construction and water and food supplies so as to better the perception of the respondents that disagrees.

In his view, an interviewee believes strongly that democratic rule has improved the standard of living of his people and he particularly notes that:

Before 1999, we had moribund medical/educational infrastructure, with the primary health centres and clinics as the only sources for healthcare delivery. Even the primary healthcare centres and clinics available were not well-equipped but now, we have General and Cottage Hospitals in many communities (Interview, 2015).

Agreeing with this, Oyekanmi, Ayanlade, Muyiwa and Jubril (2011) notes that the ratio of population available healthcare facilities in the state generally is least in Kogi East with a ratio of 1 health facility serving 1577 people. This shows a great deficiency in the area of medical/healthcare delivery in the region prior to the return to democratic rule in 1999. However, the views from the FGD were not unanimous on this matter. While some believed healthcare delivery has not really improved in Kogi East Senatorial District because there are a number of hospitals in the region with inadequate personnel, others believed that healthcare delivery has significantly improved in the region, citing instances of construction of new hospitals in their local communities (Respondents, FGD, 2015).

To complement the views expressed in the table above, the information contained in the baseline data presented in Appendix F of this research shows the Spatial Distribution of Population and Health Care Facilities in Kogi East Senatorial District before 1999.

However, the second table in the same ‘Appendix F’ shows the distribution of the Secondary Health Facilities by Local Governments and their specific Bed Completion in Kogi East Senatorial District. As captured in the table, most of the projects were implemented after 1999 in Kogi East Senatorial District. This means that, the democratic dispensation in the state has enhanced better healthcare delivery in the region than what was obtainable before the return to democratic rule in 1999.

In another development, the information contained in the ‘Appendix G’ which is a baseline data of roads and housing projects in Kogi East Senatorial District reflects the Nigeria Economic Atlas Project as published by the Kogi State Ministry of Works and Housing, Lokoja. Though the information did not capture the status of the respective projects (roads construction/rehabilitation), that is, whether completed or ongoing, it is pertinent to note that the

projects were executed after 1999 or during the democratic dispensation of which this research understudied.

However, the other table in the same appendix shows the list of Projects/Programmes Implemented by Kogi State Ministry of Works and Housing from January 2007 and runs beyond the timeframe for this study. It is pertinent to note that the information did not capture the status of the respective projects (roads construction/rehabilitation and housing programmes), whether completed or ongoing. It is however important to note that attempts have been made to construct accessible roads in the senatorial district. The question whether these projects are commensurate to the desires and yearnings of the people, and whether they meet needs of this region becomes a need for further research. However, with the observation from the field, that is, during the administering of the questionnaires, the reality shows that socio-economic development has not adequately effectively been enjoyed in this region.

Table 4.7 Did people in your area own more cars between 1999-2012

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	304	76.0	76.8	76.8
No	91	22.8	23.2	99.7
Total	396	99.0	100.0	
Missing System	4	1.0		
Total	400	100.0		

Source: Field Work (2015).

The table above captures the responses across the region on whether people in the region drove more cars between 1999 and 2012. As shown in the table, 99.0% of respondents attended to this question and 76.0% agrees that people in their area drove more cars between 1999 to 2012. This view was synonymous to that of the consensus view from the FGDs. Meanwhile, 22.8% noted that people in their area have not driven more cars during this period. For a large percentage of

respondents to agree that people drove more cars within this period, it suffice that there was a huge improvement in the purchasing power of people of this region. Democratic rule has definitely fared well in this regard by improving the standard of living of people. In a recent documentary by the Federal Road Safety Corps (FRSC), it was noted that before the return to democratic rule in 1999, precisely in 1998, about 600, 000 cars were registered for the Nigerian roads but as at 2004, it rose to 6, 000 000 registered cars (FRSC Documentary, 2015). This shows a great improvement in the living and earnings of people during the democratic era. An interviewee equally agreed with the respondents on the improvement of the standard of living of the people. He acknowledged that, “the standard of living and commercialization has greatly improved due to the increase in income of the masses. They may not be as adequate as expected but there are signs of development” (Interview, 2015).

Table 4.8Has there been reduction in poverty, inequality and unemployment since 1999-2012?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	174	43.5	43.7	43.7
No	224	56.0	56.3	100.0
Total	398	99.5	100.0	
Missing System	2	.5		
Total	400	100.0		

Source: Field Work (2015).

Table 4.10 addresses the state of poverty, inequality and unemployment in Kogi East Senatorial District between 1999 and 2012. These are the major areas addressed by Seers (1970) and the responses in the table shows there is no reduction in poverty, inequality and unemployment in this region. While 43.5% of respondents argue that there is reduction, 56.0% hold that poverty, inequality and unemployment have not reduced. The consensus view from the FGD is that poverty, inequality and unemployment have not been addressed by democratic rule in Kogi East

Senatorial District. The reason, they believe is that, in the Igala part of Kogi State, the number of unemployed graduates has not significantly reduced (Respondents, FGD, 2015).

This conforms to the records from the NBS statistics showing that about 67% of Nigerians live below the poverty line. The data further reveals that only 50% of the population has access to safe drinking water, while 38% cannot avail themselves of primary health care. It is also estimated that about 70% of Nigerians consume less than 1/3 of the minimum protein and vitamin intake due to low purchasing power (NBS 2010 and Ajegi 2002).The results shows a gross inequality among the well-to-do and the poor in this region.

However, the NBS 2010 statistics on relative poverty in the Sex Geo-political Zones in Nigeria shows the North Central showing figures that represent different poverty measures as thus: Food poor (38.6%); Absolute Poor (59.5%); Relative Poor (67.5%); and Dollar Per Day (59.7%).

However, the NBS (2010) statistics on inequality reveals that Kogi State has a relative decrease in inequality measure at (-15.7%) compared to Lagos (-26.2%); Kwara (-25.9%) and Bauchi (-28.9%). However, it records that states like Yobe (59.3%), Taraba (43%), Delta (31.1%), Ekiti(30.7%) and FCT (26%) had increase in inequality measures.This data complements the response from the field as it shows in a way, that inequality has not significantly reduced in the State, especially as captured in the table above.

Table 4.9 If yes, how?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Growth in employment and education	88	22.0	59.9	59.9
Social amenities and welfarism	8	2.0	5.4	65.3
General development/growth	29	7.3	19.7	85.0
Good empowerment policies like Sure-P, Fadama and YAD4	13	3.3	8.8	93.9
Good leadership	6	1.5	4.1	98.0
General Freedom	3	.8	2.0	100.0
Total	147	36.8	100.0	
Missing System	253	63.3		
Total	400	100.0		

Source: Field Work (2015).

Table 4.11 tries to substantiate the results of the respondents that agreed in table 4.10 that poverty, inequality and unemployment have reduced in Kogi East Senatorial District between 1999 and 2012. Accordingly, 43.5% held that the following reasons are responsible for their argument. These reasons are coded in categories as they vary in six categories. 22.0% agree that “Growth in employment and education” helped in reducing poverty, inequality and unemployment in the region. They believe that through the creation of job opportunities, entrepreneurial growth, building of new schools (like the State University), awareness/civilization and empowerment of youths, poverty, inequality and unemployment have reduced. However, 2.0% believes that through the provision of social amenities/welfarism, poverty, inequality and unemployment have reduced. They believe that making it easy for people to access good roads, water and food supply, even the distribution of mosquito nets, government has helped to reduce poverty, inequality and unemployment.

While 7.3% argue that through “general development/growth”, living condition was improved, business profits have been recorded and these have helped the reduction of poverty, inequality and unemployment in Kogi East Senatorial District. However, 3.3% of respondents hold that through “good policies and programs”, government has helped in reducing poverty, inequality and unemployment. The Subsidy Reinvestment Programme (SURE-P), FADAMA and YAD4KOGI, have respectively helped the reduction of poverty and unemployment. The YAD4KOGI in particular was a programme initiated by the Kogi State Government to tackle youth unemployment as it helped in employing over 8, 000 youths through skill acquisition trainings. It means, Youths Advancement and Development for Kogi. This was done through the distribution of Tricycles as a measure of empowerment and training and employment of over 4, 000 youths, beneficiaries consisting of 1, 019 university and polytechnic graduates and 3, 460 secondary school leavers. In the main, these programs came at the later part of 2012 when the present administration came into power. However, it still falls in the timeframe of this research.

Another category that was shown in the table is “good leadership” with 1.5%. Respondents believe that with a relative level of good leadership, the government was able to reduce poverty, inequality and unemployment through its responsiveness and sincerity. Having recorded such low score as 1.5%, it can be said that, if the leadership was good enough, it would have won more credits from respondents across the region. The last item shown on the table 4.11 above is “freedom” scoring .8%. Freedom to the people may cut across acceptance of public opinion, respect for human rights, freedom for the private sector to thrive and exploit many sectors of the economy. Given the fact that a very few respondents with below 1% believe that freedom has helped reduced poverty, inequality and unemployment, it therefore means that the level of

reduction was very minimal as regards the guarantee of freedom in the region between the timeframe of this research.

Table 4.10 Any new industry in your area between 1999-2012?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	124	31.0	32.4	32.4
No	259	64.8	67.6	100.0
Total	383	95.8	100.0	
Missing System	17	4.3		
Total	400	100.0		

Source: Field Work (2015).

An effort was made on the table 4.12 above to ascertain the respondents' view on industrialization in Kogi East Senatorial District between 1999 and 2012. Industrialization increases economic activities in any environment and the consequence of this is furthering of development. Hence, as revealed in the table, a total frequency of 383 respondents attended to this section and 31.0% agrees that they have been a new industry in the area since the return to civil rule. However, a whopping 64.8 disagrees and state that no industry has been established in the region during this period. This means that, less has been done in the aspect of industrialization in this area.

The view of the respondents that industrialization has been poor in Kogi East was further buttressed by the interviewees. For instance, one of the field interviewees states that,

There has not been any remarkable industrialization in Kogi East. If we could remember, before 1999, there was a Sanitary Warehouse at Idah and a Sawmill at Okura that used to engage people, but they have all broken down and up till date have not been rehabilitated. No rehabilitation of the broken ones and they have not come up with any idea to build any. Even the Fertilizer Producing Industry at Anyigba set up during this period is not functioning. Apart from the mini individual bread industries, there are no government industries around Kogi East and it is seriously very sinful and poor on the part of government (Interview, 2015).

This view was equally expressed by another interviewee noting that,

The bane of Nigeria's problems today is the dependence on civil service and public offices. You cannot gain development without industrial development which is lacking. Rather than improving, we are getting worse. Some of us that grew in the early republics, into industrialized societies like Kano, Kaduna textile industries and the rest, though they have diminished over the years. I think, in this part of the country, participation in the centre has not yielded any dividends back home. We are far from being there and the spill over from the Ajaokuta Steel which we thought was going to impact the people of Kogi East has not materialized because we have no political will to carry it on (Interview, 2015).

A further negligence on the part of the government in industrializing this region will plunge Kogi East into more misery and might affect the mentality of the people on democratic gains. It could dash their hopes and render democratic governance useless in this region.

On the other hand, the consensus view from the FGD equally holds that there is absence of a functional industry in the region. This they believe has led to the continuous increase of unemployment issues in the region (Respondents, FGD, 2015).

Table 4.11 Any other dividends of democracy enjoyed between 1999-2012

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Education/Career and economic sustainability	50	12.5	29.2	29.2
Provision of social amenities	51	12.8	29.8	59.1
Grassroots mobilization and all inclusiveness	13	3.3	7.6	66.7
Technological/industrial growth	17	4.3	9.9	76.6
Respect for rule of law and public opinion	31	7.8	18.1	94.7
Security	4	1.0	2.3	97.1
Good Policies	5	1.3	100.0	
Total	171	42.8		
Missing System	229	57.3		
Total	400	100.0		

Source: Field Work (2015).

The table above sought to ascertain the views of the respondents on other dividends of democracy enjoyed through good governance that has not been mentioned so far. Because of the fact that democracy cannot thrive so well all alone without good governance in order to render its dividends, good governance has become indispensable in its actualization. Hence, respondents' views in the table 4.13 above shows that in the summarised categories coded therein, other dividends of democracy that have not been mentioned have been enjoyed between 1999 to 2012 in Kogi East Senatorial District. Out of the 400 questionnaires administered and retrieved, only 171 attended to this question and 50 at 12.5% are of the opinion that they have enjoyed improved "education/career and economic sustainability". To this set of respondents, they hold that democracy has brought about promotion of workers, improved education with awards of scholarships, building of new schools, creation of employment opportunities, entrepreneurial growth through agricultural policies and building of individual confidence through awareness creation.

Meanwhile, 12.8% of respondents hold that they have had improved "provision of social amenities" within this period and this cut across construction of roads, improved power supply and water supply. However, Kogi East Senatorial District yet to catch the urban glimpse, according to 3.3% of respondents has witnessed "grassroots mobilization and all inclusive governance". Through this, many have been made to see the reality of governance making the people at grassroots feel a sense of belonging in the government through awareness, bringing government closer and allowing for more participation. Also, the table was able to reveal that there has been "technological/industrial growth" as 4.3% respondents hold that through the introduction of telecommunication and ICT, and relative improvement of infrastructure,

dividends of democratic governance has been achieved in Kogi East Senatorial District during the time frame of this research.

Further revealed in the table 4.13 above is the view of about 7.8% respondents that more dividends of democracy has been enjoyed in the areas of “respect for rule of law and public opinion” unlike in military or dictatorial regimes. Hence, they have been respect for rule of law, public opinion and human rights in Kogi East Senatorial District between 1999 till 2012. Moreso, 1.0% respondents showed that relative “security” has been enjoyed in the region during this period of return to civil rule as peace has rained in the area. However, 1.3% of respondents that government through “good policies”, precisely agricultural growth has brought dividends of democracy to the area and also sighting policies like NAPEP to have contributed to growth and development of the area. To correlate the views expressed in the table above with that of the FGD, it is pertinent to note that the views that form the consensus from the FGD reflects more on the improvement in the educational sector, with many of the respondents and groups noting that the literacy level in the region has significantly improved. They further believed that government has improved the level of sensitization on electoral matters and that there is growth in political participation in the region (Respondents, FGD, 2015).

4.2.2The challenges hindering socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District under the democratic rule between 1999 to 2012

Under this, we examine the challenges bedevilling democratic rule in Kogi East Senatorial District in fostering socio-economic development. The issues are examined through the views of respondents, thus, their divergent opinions are expressed and the analysed in the tables 4.12 to 4.15 below.

Table 4.12Has there been any problem in your area since 1999-2012?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	249	62.3	67.8	67.8
No	118	29.5	32.2	100.0
Total	367	91.8	100.0	
Missing System	33	8.3		
Total	400	100.0		

Source: Field Work (2015).

Because no society can flourish without conflict or social issues, it was imperative to investigate whether Kogi East Senatorial District within the timeframe of this research have witnessed one or two problems. Hence, table 4.14 above has shown the views of respondents in that regard. While 249 respondents at 62.3% out of the 367 (91.8%) that attempted this question are of the opinion that there has been at least a problem in the area since the return to civil rule until 2012, 118 at 29.5% held that there has not been any problem. Therefore, it can be established, going by the larger percentage who feels that there has been a problem or more, one can state that Kogi East Senatorial District unlike other ideal societies has had its share of conflicts or social issues since the return to democratic governance.

Table 4.13Is corruption the major problem that hindered democracy between 1999-2012

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	347	86.8	94.6	94.6
No	20	5.0	5.4	100.0
Total	367	91.8	100.0	
Missing System	33	8.3		
Total	400	100.0		

Source: Field Work (2015).

With extant literature, whether in the academia and in the media stating that corruption is the bane of the growth of democracy in Nigeria, it became imperative to ascertain whether this is true at the micro level by way of posing the question to respondents in Kogi East Senatorial District. Hence, 91.8% of respondents attempted the question out of which 86.8% agrees that yes, corruption is the bane hindering the growth of democracy in rendering socio-economic development to people in this area. Meanwhile, 5.0% respondents states that corruption might not actually be the problem hindering democracy from flourishing in the area. The figures shown in the table therefore, establishes that corruption is the major challenge that has hindered socio-economic development during the democratic dispensation, that is, from 1999 to 2012.

According to one of the interviewees, “corruption is the major factor of what we are facing today. Corruption and inability to deliver” (Interview, 2015). Expressing the same opinion, another interviewee holds that “the answer is very obvious. I must not mention corruption but we all know it is” (Interview, 2015). Furthermore, another interviewee giving a relatively different opinion opines that,

“The challenges in this region are not really corruption. Corruption can be an ingredient in it but I think the people in leadership have not grasped the realities of governance and where you run government and depend solely on statutory allocation from the centre to develop, without coming up with your own blueprint on how to get about improving the lives of people, the issues become complicated. You talk about corruption in Local Government administration, because that is the pipeline for drainage” (Interview, 2015).

The foregoing shows a trend establishing corruption as the major challenge hindering democratic governance in rendering socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District. Even though his view of the last interviewee does not solely agree with corruption being the major challenge, the other issues raised are relative to corruption.

Table 4.14 Any other problem hindering democracy in your area since 1999-2012?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	266	66.5	72.7	72.7
No	100	25.0	27.3	100.0
Total	366	91.5	100.0	
Missing System	34	8.5		
Total	400	100.0		

Source: Field Work (2015).

The table 4.15 tries to present the views of respondents on whether there were other challenge(s) hindering the growth of democracy and good governance in enhancing development in Kogi East Senatorial District between 1999 to 2012. Having identified corruption as the major problem in the previous table, 266 respondents at 66.5% agree that there were other problems hindering democracy from enhancing development through the practice of good governance. However, 25.0% of the total 91.5% respondents are of the opinion that there was no other problem hindering democracy from flourishing in the region. Reconciling the figures therefore, one can identify that since a high percentage of respondents agrees, it is right to establish that there were other challenges hindering the growth of democracy in Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999 to 2012.

Table 4. 15If yes, mention

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Governance and leadership challenges	67	17.8	27.8	27.8
Social amenities	26	6.5	10.8	38.6
Crime and security challenges	40	10.0	16.6	55.2
Ethno-cultural, religious and political issues	68	17.0	28.2	83.4
Social and legal challenges	9	2.3	3.7	87.1
Employment and career issues	24	6.0	10.0	97.1
Bad government policies	7	1.8	2.9	100.0
Total	247	60.0	100.0	
Missing System	159	39.8		
Total	400	100.0		

Source: Field Work (2015).

An effort was made on the table 4.16 above to ascertain the respondents' view on the common other challenges hindering the growth of democracy and good governance in enhancing development in the region. It is clearly shown that several government/societal issues are responsible for the growth and smooth operationalization of democratic culture in order to advance development and these are identified in categories as shown in the table. These categories have been respectively identified as clusters in themselves having several individual issues under them. A total 241 respondents out of 400 identified these challenges and 16.8% believe that bad and visionless governance/leadership, bad representation, mismanagement/unprofessionalism, poor project monitoring and politicization of all sectors fall under the cluster of "governance and leadership challenges" hindering socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District. This view was corroborated by an interviewee who acknowledged that "the capacity of leadership to develop is very central to the drawbacks in

development in this region” (Interview, 2015). This view was also replicated in the consensus opinion from the FGD. Respondents opined that leadership is seemingly topmost of the issues hindering the growth of democratic governance in the region and the state in general (Respondents, FGD, 2015).

Another cluster spotted in the table is “social amenities” with varying issues like bad or poor water supply, bad roads, poor healthcare and electricity and poor drainage. The table also shows that “crime and security challenges” form the other category having recorded 10.0%. Under this category, armed robbery, insecurity/insurgency, bribery, fraud/embezzlement, vandalization, killings/kidnapping and malpractices are identified as respective hindrances to the growth of democracy in this region.

Moreso, the table further reveals that “ethno-cultural, religious and political issues” form another category of the challenges hindering the growth of democracy and good governance in Kogi East Senatorial District. Hence, scoring 68 frequency at 17.0%, tribalism/nepotism, favouritism, godfatherism, political thuggery, rigging of elections, ethnic violence/hostilities, and religious violence have been identified as serious hindrance to democracy in advancing development through the practice of good governance. However, some “social and legal challenges” was captured on the table as another category of challenges hindering democratic growth. As such, issues like injustice, inequality, impunity, partiality and instability are identified with this category having recorded 2.3% in the table. The FGD view held strongly that the major challenge in the region is not just corruption but political thuggery. The corresponding view from the various FGD groups held that political thuggery almost brought economic activities in the region to a standstill. And that, at a point, people could no longer move around freely without being molested or attacked by thugs (Respondents, FGD, 2015).

Another group of respondents believe that “employment/career and educational issues” are responsible for the slow growth of democracy as it falls short of its developmental responsibility in the region. Recording 6.0%, they believe that poor and inconsistent staff remuneration, underemployment, strike actions and lack of awareness/illiteracy hinders democracy from rendering developmental advancement to the people in this region. Lastly, the table reveals that 1.8% respondents feel that “bad government policies” in the main, have been another cluster of challenge drawing back democratic growth in the region. They hold that poor revenue generation policies and general inconsistent policies have contributed to the slow growth recorded in the region, especially between 1999 to 2012.

4.2.3 Ways to tackle such challenges hindering democratic rule in fostering socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District

This section examines the possible solutions and means the challenges hindering democratic rule can be tackled in order to enhance socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District. Towards this end, respondents have expressed possible suggestions to tackle the already identified challenges and their divergent views expressed in tables 4.16 and 4.17 below.

Table 4.16 Can the problems facing democratic rule in advancing socio-economic development in your area be tackled?

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	339	84.8	92.9	92.9
No	26	6.5	7.1	100.0
Total	365	91.3	100.0	
Missing System	35	8.8		
Total	400	100.0		

Source: Field Work (2015).

As generally noted that “a problem discovered is half-solved”, the table 4.17 reveals that 339 respondents at 84.8% out of 365 that shared their views believe that these identified challenges can be regulated. However, some respondents feel the problems are so endemic that they cannot be regulated. These set of respondents form a very few percentage of 6.5%. With the information captured in the table therefore, it can be adjudged that all hope is not lost for the region, given that a very large percentage believe the challenges can be regulated. The positive attitude demonstrated by these respondents gives hope and belief that the present and future administrations and representatives in this region can redeem and entrench the dividends of democracy in Kogi East Senatorial District.

Table 4.17How can democracy perform better to enhance development in your area?

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Tackle social, ethical and security issues	93	23.3	29.1	29.1
Tackle educational and general awareness issues	11	2.8	3.4	32.5
Industrialize and tackle unemployment	40	10.0	12.5	45.0
Good governance and leadership	95	23.9	29.7	74.7
Institutional and regime change	20	5.0	6.3	80.9
Respect for people's will and human rights	56	14.0	17.5	98.4
Social amenities and dividends of democracy	5	1.3	1.6	100
Total	320	80.0	100.0	
Missing System	80	20.0		
Total	400	100.0		

Source: Field Work (2015).

The table 4.18 above proffers possible solutions to the problems identified in the preceding table, as to how better democracy and good governance should perform in order to advance greater development in Kogi East Senatorial District. The answers given by respondents ameliorates governance challenges to present and the future of democracy and development in this region. The various views of respondents are coded in categories of which the first, recording 23.3% responders suggesting that government should “tackle social, ethical and security issues”. These suggestive views refer to tackling of corruption, avoidance of tribalism, violence, nepotism, imposition of leaders, improvement in security, eliminating godfatherism, mismanagement and kidnapping.

With the 80.0% of respondents that gave views on how better democracy and good governance could better perform to advance development, 2.8% respondents believe that “tackling educational and general awareness issues” be taken into cognisance. According to them, creation of awareness, political education, improvement of educational system, fostering grassroots development by reducing illiteracy and improving communication will help the growth of democracy and consequently enhance greater development.

However, 10.2% respondents, as captured in the table above believes that democratic rule can perform better when government “industrialise and tackle unemployment”. To them, industrialization is key, as it will enhance job creation; and that good and adequate projects be awarded and implemented in the region, entrepreneurship be encouraged among youths, there should be rational political appointments and infrastructural development be advanced. This view is replicated by one of the interviewees in whose words government need to “promote political education, empowerment and create avenues for employment” (Interview, 2015).

The table further reveals that 23.8% respondents believe that “good governance and leadership” is very crucial to the growth of democracy in order to advance development. This, recording the highest percentage is key to development. Hence, respondents believe that good leadership, government nearness to people, visionary and people oriented leadership, fairness, fear of God, political will, right and appropriate government decision, strict adherence to laws, monitoring of projects, youthful leadership, unity and adequate and equal allocation of resources, all falling under this category be advanced. These views by the respondents is reminiscent of another stakeholder from the region who during the interview, in his words believe that,

First of all, we have had the three governors that have ruled the state from this region, but are those people in tune with the realities of this place? Do they have what it takes to develop? What is their relationship with the people prior to becoming governors or administrators of this area that will enhance their ability to develop? It is when you understand the needs of people that you will improve on them. We need to have visionary leaders, leaders with capacity to develop; leaders that are creative and can explore the potentials that exist (Interview, 2015).

However, another category of respondents believe that “institutional/regime change” is the likely good to advance development in this area. About 5.0% respondents, as captured in the table thus believe that change of government, a revert to military rule, divine intervention, removal of present leaders and amendment of the constitution can only enhance development in this area.

Nevertheless, as revealed in the table 4.18 above, 14.0% respondents believe that “respect for people’s will and human rights” can greatly advance growth of democracy and subsequently enhance development. Particularly to this category of respondents, respect for people’s mandate at elections, recall of identified representatives, election of good and credible leaders, respect for public opinion, encouragement of more participation, equal rights and rule of law will no doubt improve democracy and thus advance more development in the area. The last set of respondents in the table represents a small percentage (1.3%), believe that the provision of “social

amenities/dividends of democracy” will foster the entrenchment of democratic governance in the region and increase greater development in the nearest future. They hold that, adequately providing good roads, water, electricity, healthcare, welfare and improving the general standard of living of people will go a further way in enhancing the growth of democracy in the area.

The summary of the consensus opinion from the FGD holds that inasmuch as corruption needs to be urgently tackled to foster socio-economic development in the area under study, politically motivated and electoral violence and, political thuggery remain endemic issues to be tackle (Respondents, FGD, 2015).

4.3 Summary of Findings

From the results of the data presented and analysed above on the subjects studied, the following findings can be drawn:

1. The study has shown that a high percentage of respondents have benefited from democratic rule within the period under study as a higher percentage believes that government has provided social amenities to the people.
2. A great number of people believe and agree that democratic rule, backed by good governance has helped in improving the living standard of people between 1999 to 2012 especially at the grassroots.
3. Despite the promising dividends of democracy, a greater number of people believe that poverty, inequality and unemployment have not really reduced in Kogi East Senatorial District. With this seen in table 4.10, Dudley Seers’ definition of development still remains very sacrosanct especially at the grassroots.

4. Despite the rising unemployment, many are of the opinion that there has been growth in employment and the aspect of industrialization has recorded little socio-economic development.
5. Most people believe that corruption is the major hindrance to socio-economic development as it limits democratic rule from fostering socio-economic development.
6. Most people believe too, that bad governance is another serious challenge hindering democracy from fostering socio-economic development at the grassroots.
7. The most important option to strengthen democracy in fostering socio-economic development is to ensure good governance.
8. Another viable option to make democracy enhance more socio-economic development is to tackle corruption and mismanagement.

CHAPTER FIVE:

5.0 SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter summarises the report of this study and concludes the work with a set of recommendations on the Effects of Democratic Rule on Socio-Economic Development, an Assessment of Kogi East Senatorial District between 1999 to 2012.

5.2 Summary

The crux of this study has been to examine the effects of democratic rule on socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District between 1999 to 2012, covering the three administrations/tenures of Prince Abubakar Audu and Alhaji Ibrahim Idris respectively. The administration of Prince Audu spanned from 1999 to 2003 while that of Ibrahim Idris spanned through 2003 to 2012.

Drawing from the assumption that democratic rule foster socio-economic development, the statement of research problem was set to inquire the extent to which democratic rule has or has not enhanced socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District between 1999 to 2012. To that end the research question, objectives and the assumptions were all set in line for the purpose of that investigation.

The extant literature reviewed in the chapter two of this study centres very significantly on the various variables investigated in this study to include, democratic rule and good governance and their complementary effects on socio-economic development taken into cognisance. Also, the study reviewed and examined literature on the democratization process in Nigeria by

examining and correlating the return to democratic rule in Kogi East Senatorial District in order to show the level of achievements advanced within the timeframe of the study, that is, 1999-2012.

Having used a two stage Sampling Technique (Simple Random and Systematic Sampling Method) respectively to draw up a sizeable population for the field work, the study however, created the understanding on the socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District from historical point of view. This necessitated a good understanding of the area under study, hence it builds on the appreciation of the subsequent results gathered from the field.

Moreover, using In-depth Interview (IDI) and questionnaire administration, and using documentary method of analysis of some of the existing materials or literature relevant to the study, the study has come up with some major findings that democratic rule has so many effects on socio-economic development, even though so much has not been achieved in Kogi East Senatorial District within this period under study.

Also, it was gathered from the study that corruption is the major hindrance among other challenges bordering on leadership and governance as hindrances to democratic rule in fostering socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District.

5.3 Conclusion

The democratic dispensation in Nigeria and even across many countries of Africa and at the international community today has become fundamentally vital to the future of many countries. Both at micro or macro levels, governments have been charged to genuinely abide by the rules of governance that make development an integral part of it especially with democratization going round many countries who willingly accept or are being made to accept the liberal type of democracy.

It is pertinent to note that, there is no doubt that democratic rule promotes socio-economic development. However, this cannot be achieved if democratic rule is not backed by good governance, the two variables which are seen to be complementary as are harbingers to the realization of socio-economic development in every democratic society.

However, given a situation where certain aspects of governance are allowed to go wrong and not address the ideals of the principle of democracy and good governance, the actualization of the so much desired dividends of democracy and democratic rule remains in jeopardy. Corruption, bad, unresponsive and visionless leadership cannot give democratic rule a free hand to foster socio-economic development, especially as has been revealed in Kogi East Senatorial District under the period of study and Nigeria as a whole.

The recent past experience in Nigeria shows that democracy can and would thrive given the fact that the positive attitude from leaders in managing the affairs of government well would enhance trust from the entirety of the masses. In this way, democracy will have its true meaning and realization of its basic characteristics, that is, people-oriented, responsiveness, all-inclusiveness and majoritarian support. Many challenges have therefore been identified to hinder the growth of democracy in Nigeria, particularly in Kogi East Senatorial District and these challenges are closely tied to bad governance and bad leadership.

However, at the core of the actualization of democratic governance is leadership and it must be noted that across the various states of the federation, people continue to clamour for true, sincere, transparent and responsible leaders, who would pilot the affairs of government and drive the cause of socio-economic development to its maximum realization. Leaders and the ruling elite therefore, must be braced with the task of governance and convincingly show the commitment to

governance. Whether, democratic governance is more development oriented or not, its basic tenets and principles must be adhered to, so as to foster the desired socio-economic development.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings revealed by this study, the following recommendations are advanced.

- Leadership and governance should be taken as key areas of priority to drive the growth of democracy in order to advance socio-economic development.
- Corruption should be sincerely and adequately tackled as urgent as possible.
- Government must ensure that people are well politically educated especially from the grassroots.
- Furthermore, government must try as much and as urgent as possible to address the rising unemployment in Kogi East Senatorial District and Nigeria as a whole. Vocational training and skill acquisition programmes must be advanced especially at the grassroots so as to further empower the masses technically and otherwise.
- Good and responsible representation must be encouraged from the grassroots, especially in Kogi East Senatorial District. Representatives politically elected must be held accountable by the people and a better public participation be encouraged in order to carry the people along.

REFERENCES

- Adagba, O. (2009), "Ideology and the Challenge of Good Governance and Development in Nigeria", in *Democracy, Leadership and Accountability in Post-Colonial Africa: Challenges and Prospects*. Edoh, T and Wuam T. eds., Aboki Publishers, pp. 373-389.
- Adedeji, A. (1999), *Africa: The Crisis of Development and Challenges of a New Economic Order* Kimshasa: Economic Commission For Africa Document
- Adejumobi, S. (2000), "Between Democracy and Development in Africa: What are the Missing Links?". *A Paper Presented to the World Bank Conference on "Development Thinking in the Next Millennium", Paris 26-28 June 2000.*
- Adejumobi, S. (2004), "Democracy, Good Governance and Constitutionalism in Africa" in Akhaime, S. (ed), *Governance: Nigeria and the World*. Lagos: Centre of Constitutionalism and Democratization.
- Africa Demos (1993), "Democracy and the African Machtstaat". *Africa Demos*, 3, 1:14-19
- Africa Demos (1995), "The Promise of Democracy". *Africa Demos*, vol.3, No. 4, Pg 1-35
- Ajegi, S.O. (2012), "The Affluence of Poverty: A Critical Evaluation of Nigeria Poverty Reduction Programmes". In *Journal of Economic and Social Research* Vol. 3 June, 2002
- Ajene, O. (2003), "Political Parties and Good Governance in Nigeria: A Case Study of Benue State", in *Journal of Political and Administrative Studies*, Makurdi: Aboki Publishers
- Ake, C. (1996), *Democracy and Development in Africa*, Washington DC: The Brookings Institution
- Ake, C. (2000), *Feasibility of Democracy in Africa*, CODESRIA Book Series
- Alexander, H. S., Eziagwu, D. C., Titilayo, A. O. and Ajiboye, D. I. (2012), "Unemployment in the Nigerian Democratic Setting: Challenges and the Way Forward". In *International Journal of Economic Department Research and Instrument*, Vol. 3, No 2
- Alina, R. M. (2007), "Analysing the Relationship between Democracy and Development: Defining Basic Concepts and Assessing Key Linkages". Background note (1) prepared for the Wilton Park Conference on Democracy and Development, 23-25 October 2007
- Apter, D. (1965), *The Politics of Modernisation*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Audu, J. (2010), "Interrogating the Interface between Democracy and Poverty in a Democratic Governance: the Challenge of Democratization", in *NAPSSITE Magazine*, The Political Scientist, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

- Audu, J. (2011), "Public Ethics in Democratic Governance in Nigeria: An Assessment of the Code of Conduct Bureau/Tribunal (CCBT) (1999-2007)". A PhD Dissertation submitted to the Post-Graduate School, Department of Political Science and International Studies, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.
- Ayatse, F. H., Onaga, U. B. and Ogoh, A. O. (2013), "Democracy, Good Governance and Development: Nigeria's Experience", in *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, Vol. 8(5), pp. 61-67
- Ayoade, J. A. A. (ed) (1998), *Democracy: Its Meaning and Values*. Vintage Publishers, Ibadan
- Babatinehin, O., Ayansina, A., Muiyiwa, B. and Jubril, O. Y. (2011), "Geo-Political Pattern of Health Care Facilities in Kogi State, Nigeria". In *The Open Geography Journal*, Vol. 4.
- Bello, S. (2012), "Challenges and Opportunities in Nation-Building and Democratic Governance: Perspectives on Politics in Nigeria", in Bello, S. and Yusuf, M. M.(eds) *Popular Participation and Democratization in Nigeria Under the Fourth Republic*, African Research and Development Agency.
- Bertin, D. (2009), *Reality of Democracy in Western Countries: How Economics may pervert Democracy*. Accessible on: at <http://www.didier-bertin.org/pages/democracy-and-economics/reality-of-democracy-in-western-countries.html#cD5qMICKUBGfyciR.99>
- Bollen, K. (1993), "Liberal Democracy: Validity and method Factors in Cross-National Measures", In *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 37, No. 4, Texas University Press, Austin.
- Bruce, F. J. and Southworth, H. M. (1967), "Agricultural Development: Problems and Issues", in Bruce, F. J. and Southworth, H. M. (1967) (eds), *Agricultural Development and Economic Growth*. Cornnel University Press Ltd., UK
- Bryce, J. (1893), *The American Commonwealth: Vol. 1, With An Introduction by Bary L. McDowell*. Liberty Fund Indianapolis. Accessible on: <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/809>
- Bryce, J. (1921), *Modern Democracies*, Vol. 2. Macmillan New York.
- Bujra, A. and Molutsi, P. (2000), "Preface", in Report of the DPMF/IDEA Workshop on "Democracy, Poverty and Social Exclusion: Is Democracy the Missing Link?" (DPMF: Addis Ababa).
- Burkey, S. (1996), *People first: A guide to Self-Reliance Participatory Rural Development*. London: Zed Hocls Ltd.

- Dah, R. (2002), "Dahl's Philosophy of Democracy, Exhibited In His Essays", *Annual Review of Political Science*. Vol. 6: 99-118 (Volume publication date June 2003); First published online as a Review in Advance on Dec. 6, 2002
- Diamond, L. (1997), "In Search of Consolidation". In Larry Diamond, et al, *Consolidating the Third Wave Democracies: Themes and Perspectives*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press
- Dinneya, G. (2006), *Political Economy of Democratization in Nigeria*. Concept Publishers, Lagos, Nigeria.
- Edoka, M. H., Igbokwe, E. M. and Adejo, P. E. (2014), "Constraints to Farmers' Labour Group Productivity in Eastern Kogi State, Nigeria". In *Journal of Agricultural Extension*, Vol. 18 (2)
- Eisenstadt, S. N. (1966), *Modernisation, Protest and Change*. Prentice Hall, N.J: Englewood and Cliff
- Eliagwu, J. I. (2002), "Democracy, Transparency and Accountability in Nigeria". Newswatch Annual Lecture. In Newswatch, February 18, 2002.
- Elliot, K. A. (1997), "Corruption as an International policy Problem: Overview and Recommendations", in Elliot, K. A. (ed), *Corruption and the Global Economy*, Washington DC: Institute for International Economics.
- Fukuyama, F. (1992) *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press.
- Gauba, O. P. (2007), *An Introduction to political Theory*, Macmillan India Limited
- Haggard, S. (1990) *Pathways from the Periphery: the Politics of Growth in the Newly Industrialising Countries*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Halperin, J., Siegle, T. and Weinstein, M. (2005) *The Democracy Advantage: How Democracies Promote Prosperity and Peace*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Higley, J. (2008), *Elites and Democracy: The 'Futility Thesis' Today*, University of Texas, at Austin.
- Huntington, S. (1968) *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Huntington, S. (1991) *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Huntington, S. (1997), "Democracy for the Long Haul", in Diamond, L. et al (eds) *Consolidating the Third World Democracies: Themes and Perspectives*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press

- Huntington, S. P. (1971), "Modernization Development and Politics," in *From Modernization to Globalization*, eds. T. Roberts and A. Hite. London: Blackwell Publishing, Ltd.
- Huntington, S. P. (1986), "Political Order in Changing Societies," in *From Modernization to Globalization*, eds. Roberts, T. and Hite, A. London: Blackwell Publishing, Ltd.
- Ibrahim, J. (1994), "Democratic Transition in Africa: The Challenges of a New Agenda", CODESRIA Book Series.
- Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A. and Zoido-Lobaton, P. (2000), "Governance matters: From Measurement to Action, Finance and Development", Vol. 37 (2), Washington DC: International Monetary Fund.
- Leftwich, A. (1996), "On the Primacy of Politics in Development" in A. Leftwich (ed.) *Democracy and Development*. (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996).
- Leftwich, A. (2005) 'Democracy and Development: Is There Institutional Incompatibility?'. *Democratization* 12(5)
- Linz, J. (2006), *Robert Michels, Political Sociology, and the Future of Democracy*. New Brunswick NJ, Transaction Publishers.
- Linz, J. J. and Stephan, A. (1996), *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: South Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe*, John Hopkins University Press, London.
- Lipset, S. M. (1959), "Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy". *American Political Science Review* Vol. 53, No. 1, Pg. 69-105.
- Lipset, S. M. (1960), *The Political Man*, London: Heinemann.
- Maclin, S. A. (1997), "Economic Development as Political Governance", in *Administrative Theory and Praxis*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 132-145. Accessible on <http://www.jstor.org/stables.258611208>
- Murray, E. P. (2008), "Economic Development Specialty Tracks: A Survey of MPA Programs", in *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, Vol. 13, No. 3/4, pp. 649-669. Accessible on <http://www.jstor.otg/stable/40215789>
- Nnoli, O. (2003), *Introduction to Politics*. Revised Second Edition, Enugu, PACREP.
- Nwabueze, B. (1993), *Democratization*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.
- Nwauwa, A. O. (2013), Concepts of Democracy and Democratization in Africa Revisited. Paper presented at the Fourth Annual Kent State University Symposium on Democracy. Culled from: http://upress.kent.edu/Nieman/Concepts_of_Democracy.htm

- Obayemi, A. (2012), "States and Peoples of the Niger-Benue Confluence Area". In *Groundwork of Nigerian History*, (ed) Obaro, I., HEBN Publishers Plc.
- Ober, J. (1989), *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens: Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Power of the People*, Princeton University Press.
- Ogundiya, I. S. (2010), "Democracy and Good Governance: Nigeria's Dilemma", in *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, Vol. 4(6), pp. 201-208. Available on <http://www.academicjournals.org/ajpsir>
- Ojo, E. O. (2002), "A review of Ethno-Religious Conflicts in Nigeria: Implications for the Nascent Democracy", *The Polity*, Vol. 5.
- Okoosi-Simbine, A. (2006), "Democracy and Development: Two Heavy Pillars for Nigeria's Greasy Hands of Corruption", in Saliu, H., Amali, E. et al., *Democracy and Development in Nigeria*. Vol. 3., Concept Publications.
- Olufemi, P. A. (2000), "Tenets of Democracy: An Exploration of Attitudinal Comportment Needed for Sustainable Democratic Governance in Nigeria", in Saliu, A. H., Jimoh, I. H., Yusuf, N., and Ojo, E. O. (eds.) *Perspectives on Nation-Building and Development in Nigeria: Politics and Legal Issues*, Concept Publications.
- Oluwole, S. B (2003), "Democracy and Indigenous Governance: The Nigerian Experience", in Oguejiofor, J. O. (ed.): *Philosophy, Democracy and Responsible Governance in Africa*, New Brunswick and London, Transaction Publishers.
- Omale, S. (2011), "Reorienting Education in Igalaland". In Alhasan, A. K. (ed) *Igala Cultural and Development Accosiation: Ancient Landmarks and the Future*, ICDA, Tamaza Publishing Company, Zaria.
- Omali, B. (2011), "Igalaland and the Challenge of Economic Development". In Alhassan, A. K (ed) *Igala Culturaland Development Accosiation: Ancient Landmarks and the Future*, ICDA, Tamaza Publishing Company, Zaria.
- Omotola, S. J. (2006), "No Democracy, No Development or Vice Versa?" in Saliu, H. A., Olorunfemi, J. F. Lateef, U. and Oludoyi, S. B. (eds.), *Democracy and Development in Nigeria*. Concept Publications Limited, Lagos.
- Omotola, S. J. (2007), "Democratization, Good Governance and Development in Africa: The Nigerian Experience", in *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, Vol. 9, No. 4
- Onucheyo, E. (2008), *The Igala Man's Burden*. TW Press and Publishers
- Onyekpe, N. (2004), "Issues in Development Nigeria", in Akhaine S. (ed) *Governance: Nigeria and the World*. Lagos Centre of Constitutionalism and Demilitarization.

- Osaghae, E. E. (1999), "Democratization in Africa: Faltering Prospects, New Hopes", in *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 1.
- Owolabi K. A. (2003), "Can the Past Salvage the Future? Indigenous Democracy and the Quest for Sustainable Democratic Governance in Africa" in Oguejiofor J Obi (Ed.) *Philosophy, Democracy and Responsible Governance in Africa*, New Brunswick and London, Transaction Publishers.
- Oyadiran, P. A. and Nweke, O. I. (2014), "An Appraisal of the Nigerian Democratic Journey between 1999 and 2014". In JORIND 12 (2) 2014. Accessible on: www.transcampus.org/journals; www.ajol.info/journals/jorind
- Palmer, T. G. (2008), "Democracy and the Contest for Liberty", In *Northwestern University Law Review*, Vol. 102, No. 1.; Northwestern University School of Law , USA.
- Parekh, B. (1993), "The Cultural Particularity of Liberal Democracy", in David H. (ed) *Prospects of Democracy: North, South, East, West*. Polity Press
- Przeworski, A. (2004), "Democracy and Economic Development", in Edwards, D. M. and Sisson, R. (eds.), *Political Science and the Public Interest*, Columbus Ohio State University Press.
- Przeworski, A. and Limongi, F. (1997) 'Modernization: Theories and Facts'. *World Politics*
- Przeworski, A., Alvarez, M. E., Cheibub, J. A, and Limongi, F. (2000) *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-being in the World 1950-1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saliu, H. A and Lipede, A. (2002), "Constraints of Democracy in Nigeria", in Saliu, H. A., Jimoh, I. H., Yusuf, N., and Ojo, E. O. (eds.) *Perspectives on Nation-Building and Development in Nigeria: Political and Legal Issues*. Concept Publications.
- Satori, G. (1962), *Democratic Theory*, Wayne State University Press, Detroit.
- Schatzber, M. G. (1997), "Hijacking Change: 'Zaire's Transition' in Comparative Perspective", in Ottaway, M. (ed) *Democracy in Africa: The Hard Road Ahead*, Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1942), *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. London: George Allen and Unwin
- Seers, D. (1969), *The Meaning of Development*. IDS Communication 44, Institute of Development Studies
- Sen, A. (1999a) 'Democracy as a Universal Value'. *Journal of Democracy* 10(3):3-17.

- Shalendra, D. S. (2007), "Democracy, Good Governance and Economic Development", in Taiwan Journal of Democracy, volume 3, No. 1.
- Shanmugaratnum, N. (2001), "On the Meaning of Development: An Exploration of the Capability Approach". In Forum for Development Studies, No. 2.
- Steve, L, and Lucan A. W. (2002), "Elections without Democracy: The Rise of Competitive Authoritarianism", in Journal of Democracy Volume 13.
- The United Nations Development Strategy Beyond 2015: Committee for Development Policy, June 2012
- Todaro, M. P and Smith, S. C. (2003), *Economic Development*, New Delhi, Pearson Education
- Todaro, M. P. (1977), *Economic Development in the Third World: An Introduction to Problems and Policies in a Global Perspective*. Longman Inc., New York.
- Todaro, M. P. And Smith, S. C. (2003), *Economic Development*. New Delhi; Pearson Education
- Umar, Z. M. (2002), "The Problems and Prospects of Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria", in *Democracy and Democratization in Nigeria: 1999-2001*. Mambayya House, The Centre for Democratic Research and Training, Kano.
- UNDP (1996) Report on the Workshop Governance for Sustainable Human Development, MDGD, New York, April.
- UNDP Human Development Reports (2014)
- United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (1999).
- United Nations World Summit Outcome Document (2001)
- UN-OHRLLS and UNDP (2006) *Governance for the Future: Democracy and Development in Least Developed Countries*. New York, NY: United Nations.
- USAID Strategy on Democracy Human Rights and Governance June 2013
- Vanhanen, A. (1997), *Prospects of Democracy: A Study of 172 Countries*. Routledge, London.
- Varma, S. P. (2006), *Modern Political Theory*, New Delhi, Vicaks Publishing House
- World Bank, (1992), *Governance and Development*, Washington D.C.: World Bank.

Yusuf, A. M. (1992), “Democracy in Africa: Problems and Prospects”, Revised edition of Paper Presented at the International political Science Association (IPSA) Conference, Centre for Democratic Studies (CDS), Abuja.

Zakaria, F. (2003) *The Future of Freedom: Illiberal Democracy at Home and Abroad*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company.

APPENDIX

Appendix “A” Questionnaire

Department of Political Science and International Studies
Faculty of Social Sciences
Ahmadu Bello University
Zaria-Nigeria.

Research Questionnaire

SECTION A. Introduction

Ojuh, Ainoko Fidelis (M.Sc./Soc-Sci/42369/2012-2013)

This is to certify that the above named person is a bonafide postgraduate student in this Department. He is conducting a research on the topic, **The Impacts of Democratic rule on Socio-Economic Development: An Assessment of Kogi East Senatorial District, 1999 to 2012**, which forms part of the requirement for the award of M.Sc. in Political Science. Any information gathered from you will strictly be used for academic purpose.

SECTION B. Bio Data

Instruction: Kindly tick (√) or fill the blank space provided as exemplified.

1. Ward of respondent
2. Sex: i. Male () ii. Female ()
3. Age: i. 18-29 () ii. 30-39 () iii. 40-49 () iv. 50 and above ()
4. Marital Status: i.
Single () ii. Married () iii. Widowed () iv. Divorced ()
5. Educational Level: i.
Primary () ii. O' Level () iii. Tertiary () iv. Uneducated ()
6. Religious Affiliation: i.
Christianity () ii. Islam () iii. Pagan () iv. None ()
7. Occupation: i. Civil
Servant () ii. Farming () iii. Business () iv. Unemployed () v.
Student () vi. Retired ()

SECTION C: QUESTIONS

On the extent to which democratic rule has enhanced socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999-2012.

8. Have you enjoyed dividends of democracy between 1999 to 2012? Yes () No ()
9. If yes, what?
.....
10. Why do you think this regime type has fostered socio-economic development more in Kogi East Senatorial District?.....
.....
11. Has any of your people been given employment since 1999 to 2012?
Yes () No ()
12. Has your area gotten better healthcare delivery, roads, water and food supply since 1999 to 2012 than during military era? Yes () No ()
13. Do people in your area own more cars since the return to civil rule, that is, 1999 to 2012?
Yes () No ()
14. Do you think poverty, inequality and unemployment have reduced in your area since 1999 to 2012? Yes () No ()
15. If Yes, how?
.....
16. Has there been any new industry in your area since 1999 to 2012? Yes () No ()
17. What again have you enjoyed that has not been mentioned since 1999 to 2012 and was never there during the military rule?
.....

On the challenges hindering socio-economic development under the democratic rule in Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999-2012.

18. Has there been any problem in your area since the return to civil rule, that is, from 1999 to 2012 that was not there during military rule? Yes () No ()

19. One of the problems hindering development that most people talk about in your area from 1999 to 2012 is corruption. Yes () No ()

20. Is there any other problem or problems that has been hindering development in your area since 1999 to 2012? Yes () No ()

21. If yes, please, mention.
.....

On solutions to the problems of democratic rule in fostering socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District

22. Do you think the problems facing democracy in fostering development in your area can be tackled? Yes () No ()

23. How do you think democracy can perform better to enhance development in your area?

.....
.....

Appendix “B” In-depth-Interview Guides

Department of Political Science and International Studies
Faculty of Social Sciences
Ahmadu Bello University
Zaria-Nigeria.

RESEARCH IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

SECTION A. Introduction

Ojuh, Ainoko Fidelis (M.Sc./Soc-Sci/42369/2012-2013)

This is to certify that the above named person is a bonafide postgraduate student in this department. He is conducting a research on the topic, **The Impacts of Democratic rule on Socio-Economic Development: An Assessment of Kogi East Senatorial District, 1999 to 2012**, which forms part of the requirement for the award of M.Sc. in Political Science. Any information gathered from you will strictly be used for academic purpose.

SECTION B. Bio Data of Interviewee

Name:

Occupation:

Rank:

Sir/Madam,

1. Do you believe that democratic rule can promote socio-economic development?
Yes () No ()
2. How can democratic rule promote socio-economic development?
3. Sir, do you believe democratic rule has brought socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999-2012.
4. Has democratic rule addressed poverty or improved the living standard of people in Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999-2012? Yes () No ()
5. Has democratic rule addressed unemployment in Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999-2012? Yes () No ()
6. In your own opinion, how has democratic rule brought socio-economic development to Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999-2012?

7. How else has democratic rule brought development to Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999-2012 or vice versa?
8. Has democratic rule have brought industrialization to Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999-2012? Yes () No ()
9. How many industries and what are they?
10. Do you believe that one of the challenges hindering democratic rule in fostering socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999-2012 is corruption? Yes () No ()
11. What do you think has been the major challenge(s) hindering democracy and good governance in fostering development in Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999-2012?
12. Do you think the challenges hindering democratic rule from promoting socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District can be tackled?
13. What are the ways democratic rule can be consolidated to enhance development in Kogi East Senatorial District?

Appendix “C” Interviewees

S/N	Names	Rank	Date/Time
1	Chief John S. Odawn	Former Kogi State PDP Chairman,from 1999-2011	06/03/201508:43am-9:07am
2	HRH EtilaAjeka	HRH, Onu of Egume/Chairman, Traditional Council, Okura District, Dekina LGA	07/03/201509:06am-09:44am
3	Hon. Peter Akubo	Dekina LGA APC Chairman	28/07/201509:25am-10:02am
4	IsahAbubakar	APC State Organizing Secretary	28/07/2015 2:15pm-02:33pm
5	Nda Usman Adegbe	Chairman, Dekina LGA/SSA to the Governor of Local Government	03/08/2015 3:30pm-03:46pm
6	Hon. Mrs Eke Iyaji	Former Kogi State Commissioner of Women Affairs and Social Development	11/08/2015 06:15pm-6:33pm

Appendix “D” Focus Group Discussion Guide

Department of Political Science and International Studies
Faculty of Social Sciences
Ahmadu Bello University
Zaria-Nigeria.

FGD QUESTIONS

SECTION A. Introduction

Ojuh, Ainoko Fidelis (M.Sc./Soc-Sci/42369/2012-2013)

This is to certify that the above named person is a bonafide postgraduate student in this department. He is conducting a research on the topic, **The Impacts of Democratic rule on Socio-Economic Development: An Assessment of Kogi East Senatorial District, 1999 to 2012**, which forms part of the requirement for the award of M.Sc. in Political Science. Any information gathered from you will strictly be used for academic purpose.

1. Do you believe that democratic rule can promote socio-economic development?
Yes () No ()
2. How can democratic rule promote socio-economic development?
3. Sir, do you believe democratic rule has brought socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999-2012.
4. Has democratic rule addressed poverty or improved the living standard of people in Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999-2012? Yes () No ()
5. Has democratic rule addressed unemployment in Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999-2012? Yes () No ()
6. In your own opinion, how has democratic rule brought socio-economic development to Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999-2012?
7. How else has democratic rule brought development to Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999-2012 or vice versa?
8. Has democratic rule have brought industrialization to Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999-2012? Yes () No ()
9. How many industries and what are they?

10. Do you believe that one of the challenges hindering democratic rule in fostering socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999-2012 is corruption?
Yes () No ()
11. What do you think has been the major challenge(s) hindering democracy and good governance in fostering development in Kogi East Senatorial District from 1999-2012?
12. Do you think the challenges hindering democratic rule from promoting socio-economic development in Kogi East Senatorial District can be tackled?
13. What are the ways democratic rule can be consolidated to enhance development in Kogi East Senatorial District?

Appendix “E” List of FGD Respondents

Group	Names	Community
A		Ankpa
	Ogohi Atokolo	
	Abubakar Yusuf	
	Augustine Ojonugwa	
	Ogala Everistus	
	Ochala Emah	
	Awulu Ocheni	
B		Ankpa
	Edicha Ogah Hillary	
	Edebo R. Oguche	
	Yunusa Ebiloma	
	Ocheje Enemaduku	
	Ibrahim Danlami	
	Etubi Dansoho	
A		Anyigba
	Sani Shekuru	
	Adams Sunday Ugbede	
	Victor Edicha	
	Onalo Jude	
	Abdulahi Kadili	
	Attai Monday Arome	
	Yisufu Omale	
	Iyaji Etila Ben	
B		Anyigba
	Iyaji Atodo	
	Suleiman Alhassan	
	Akilu Onuh	
	Musa Simeon	
	Atuluku Kamilu	
	Yunusa Ibrahim (Ukpahiu)	
	Jerry Onakpa	
A		Idah
	Unwuchola Omali	
	Ukwumaka Emma	
	Enemali Etubi	
	Jude Enemaduku	
	Ocheje Benjamin	
	Sule Sumaila	
B		Idah
	Ofanwa Peter	

	Alidu Dalhatu	
	Agbo Omika	
	Agwuja Solomon	
	Musa Enechojo	
	Omika Isiaka	

Appendix “F” Healthcare Facilities in Kogi East Senatorial District before and after 1999

Spatial Distribution of Population and Health Care Facilities in Kogi State Before 1999

Senatorial District	LGAs	Population	No. Of Health Facilities		
			Primary	Secondary	Both
Kogi East	Ibaji	85239	39	3	42
	Idah	55959	43	1	44
	Igalamela/Odolu	83494	70	3	73
	Ofu	108095	73	1	74
	Olamaboro	104705	70	8	78
	Ankpa	185458	40	6	46
	Omala	60476	29	1	30
	Dekina	177513	115	9	124
	Bassa	88496	83	8	91
	District Total	949435	562	40	602
	Facility-Population Ratio		1:1689	1:23736	1:1577

Source: *National Population Commission, 1991.

** Federal Ministry of Health, 2000.

**Secondary Health Facilities by LGAs and Number of Completed Beds in Kogi East
Senatorial District**

District	Health Facilities/Location	Local Govt. Area	No of Completed Beds	Date Completed
Kogi East	General Hospital Ankpa	Ankpa	465	Before 1999
	General Hospital Oguma	Bassa	400	Before 1999
	Cottage Hospital Gbokolo	Bassa	125	After 1999
	General Hospital Dekina	Dekina	265	Before 1999
	General Hospital Iyale	Dekina	465	Before 1999
	Diagnostic/Reference Hospital Anyigba	Dekina	465	After 1999
	Cottage Hospital Abocho	Dekina	125	Before
	General Hospital Egume	Dekina	125	After 1999
	Cottage Hospital Emewe-Opada	Dekina	127	After 1999
	Cottage Hospital Odu-Ikaka	Dekina	127	After 1999
	Cottage Hospital Odeke	Ibaji	120	After 1999
	Cottage Hospital Ejule-Ejebe	Ibaji	127	After 1999
	Cottage Hospital Onyedega	Ibaji	150	After 1999
	General Hospital Idah	Idah	465	Before 1999
	General Hospital Odolu	Igalamela/Odolu	125	After 1999
	Comprehensive Health Centre Ajaka	Igalamela/Odolu	175	After 1999
	General Hospital Alloma	Ofu	175	After 1999
	General Hospital Ugwolawo	Ofu	180	After 1999
	Eye Hospital Ogbonicha	Ofu	240	After 1999
	Cottage Hospital Onicha-Igo	Ofu	240	After 1999
	Cottage Hospital Okpo	Olamaboro	100	Before
	Cottage Hospital Ogugu	Olamaboro	100	After 1999
	General Hospital Abejukolo	Omala	125	After 1999
	Cottage Hospital Olla	Omala	150	After 1999
	Cottage Hospital Ogodo	Omala	125	After 1999

Source: *HMIS Unit, Dept. of Health Planning, Research and Statistics, Kogi State Ministry of Health (C2011)

Appendix “G” List of Roads and Housing Projects/Programmes in Kogi East Senatorial District after 1999

Nigeria Economic Atlas Projects, Ministry of Works and Housing, Lokoja

Project Location	Project Title	Contractor
Kogi East	Ibana-Okpo-Ogugu-Ette Road (26km)– Completion of Abandoned Road Project	Borini Prono and Co. Nig. Ltd.
	Ejule-Alloma-Otukpa Road Rehabilitation (70km) -Repair works	Borini Prono and Salin Co. Nig. Ltd.
	Idah-Ejule-Anyigba junction Road (66km) -Repair Works	Borini Prono and Co. Nig. Ltd.
	Road of Governor’s Lodge Dekina (1.8km) -New Construction	
	Internal Road Network in G. G. W. SS Ogbonicha (23km) – New Construction	Oject Nig. Ltd.
	Ankpa Township Road –Recently Connected	Borini Prono and Co. Nig. Ltd.
	Construction og Ogbabo-Abocho/Ajiolo-Ajaji	Transengineering
	Construction of Umomi-Ochadamu Road (12km)	Astra Nig. Ltd.
	Construction of Idah Township Road	Borini Prono Nig. Ltd.
	Construction of Anyigba Township Roads	Borini Prono Nig. Ltd.

Source: *Kogi State Ministry of Works and Housing, Lokoja, 2007.

List of Projects/Programmes Implemented by the Ministry of Works and Housing in Kogi East Senatorial District from January 2007 to Date

District	Project/Programmes	LGAs
Kogi East	Construction of Ankpa Amoke/Imane Road (30km) – Surface Dressing	Ankpa
	Construction of Idah Onyedega Road (34km) –Surface Dressing	Idah/Ibaji
	Construction of Okpo/Agwodaba/Etutekpe Road (6km) –Surface Dressing	Olamaboro
	Construction of Shintaku/Odugo/Mozum Road (35km)	Bassa
	Construction of Anyigba Township Road Lots 1 and 3 (11km)	Dekina
	Construction of Icheke-Ogane/Icheke-Aj'edibo/Abejukolo Road (10km)	Omala
	Construction of Idrisu Okpachala/Bagaji-Ajokpachi Road (22km)	Omala
	Rehabilitation and Erosion Control on Oguchekwo Street Angwa Ede Ankpa (3.5km)	Ankpa
	Construction of Ubiga/Agojeju/Idah Road 91.8km)	Idah
	Construction of Abejukolo Erosion Control Phase II (N/A)	Omala
	Abejukolo Erosion Control Phase I (N/A)	Omala
	Ugwolawo Emergency Erosion Control Project (N/A)	Ofu
	Construction of Egume/Ogodu/Ofugo road (52km)	Dekina
Housing Projects		
1	Construction of 105 No. of 1-Bedrooms Detached housing Scheme in LGA Headquarters	In all the 21 LGA Headquarters
2	Construction of 210 No. of 2-Bedrooms Detached housing Scheme in LGA Headquarters	In all the 21 LGA Headquarters
3	Construction of 105 No. of 3-Bedrooms Detached housing Scheme in LGA Headquarters	In all the 21 LGA Headquarters
4	Renovation/Rehabilitation of Hospitals and Schools	In all the 21 LGA Headquarters
5	Renovation of high Courts Building in Lokoja	Lokoja

Source: *Kogi State Ministry of Works and Housing, Lokoja, 2015