

A Critical Study of Ibrahim Index of African Governance on Governance in Nigeria

Dr Musa Idris, FCIA

Department of Public Administration
Faculty of Administration
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria
+2347051337728
musaidrisaa@gmail.com

&

Tijjani Aliyu Adamu

Department of Public Administration
Faculty of Administration
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria
+2348039123456
tijjaniadamuis@gmail.com

Abstract

The Nigerian state is in contract with the citizens as enshrined in the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 to primarily maintain law and order and ensure the security and welfare of the people. Others include the protection of human rights, create sustainable economic opportunities and promoting human development. However, it is through governance that the will of the state is expressed and realised. In pursuance of this, the government of Nigeria over the years established institutions and enacted laws aimed at ensuring good governance. In spite of the efforts there have been increasing incidence of armed robbery, kidnapping and extreme violence. The rate of corruption and poverty has been on the rise while the infrastructure is deteriorating. The objective of this study is to make an analysis of the state of governance in Nigeria from 2000 - 2011. The research design was content analysis of data from the Mo Ibrahim Foundation. This was presented in tables using averages and percentages for analyses. The study established that the Nigerian state performed poorly in providing security to the citizens (16.7%), infrastructure (9.1%), health care (36.8%) and 29.3% in accountability. Nigeria however, performed moderately (52.8%) in public management, 46.5% in maintaining rules of law and 40.1% citizen participation, the country ranked far behind Egypt,

Ghana and South-Africa in all the indicators of the quality of governance in Africa from 2000 – 2011. The study concludes that the quality of governance has been poor for the period 2000 – 2011. The study among others recommends for holistic approach to governance by embracing all the components especially security of the citizens, provision of infrastructure and health care service delivery.

Keywords; Safety and rule of law, human rights, participation, sustainable economic opportunity, human development, good governance

1.0 Introduction

The Nigerian state owes a lot of obligations to the citizens as much as the citizens owe certain duties to the state. This relationship has been enshrined in the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999. Chapter II, sections 13 – 24 of the Constitution explicitly States the Fundamental Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy which every public servant swears to strive to preserve. Specifically, section 14(26) provides that “the security and welfare of the people shall be the primary purpose of government. Section 14(2c) also provides that “the participation by the people in their government shall be ensured in accordance with the provisions of the constitution. Sections 16, 17 and 18 of the constitution concern the economic social and education objectives of the Nigerian State (Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN) 1999). However, it is through governance that the will of the state is expressed and realised as the will of the state is the will of the government (Laski; 2004, 29). Therefore, the realisation of the objectives of the Nigerian state will depend on the quality of governance.

In pursuance of the attainment of good governance, successive administrations in Nigeria established relevant Ministries, Departments and Agencies (ADAs), enacted relevant laws and reformed the machinery of government (Abdullahi, 2007; 342 – 362, Oladipo 2007; 363 – 378 & Olaopa 2008; 127, 165) for effective service delivery. For instance, the security sector was reformed with a view to making it more pro-active and effective (Fayeye, 2007; 142 – 157, National Planning Commission, 2004, 157 & Zabadi, 2007; 122 - 142). The sector also received substantial funding within 1980 – 2009 (Ukpere & Otto 2012 6767) and received the highest share of our national budgets in 2012 and 2013. The health and educational sectors were also reformed (Lambo, 2007; 109 – 121, Okebukola, 2007; 83 – 90 & Lawal, 2007; 91 – 108).

Impressive array of institutions were established to fight corruption and instil transparency and accountability in the public service. These among others include the Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Commission (ICPC) vide the ICPC Act 2001 and the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) through the EFCC Act, 2004. Others include the Bureau of Public Procurement established by the Public Procurement Act, 2007, the Fiscal Responsibility Commission and the Nigeria Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative (NEITI) established vide the Fiscal Responsibility Act, 2007 and the NEITI Act, 2007.

Efforts were also made to empower the people, create jobs and reduce the incidence of poverty by establishing the Directorate of Foods, Roads, and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI), and the National Directorate of Employment (NDE) and between 1987 – 1980. The National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) was also launched in 2000. Others include the establishment of the Peoples' Bank of Nigeria (PBN), Nigerian Agricultural Cooperatives and Rural Development Bank (NACRDB) in 2000 – 2004 and Micro-Finance Banks in 2005 (Akanji 2002; 1 – 3 & CBN 2005, 1 – 9).

In spite of these efforts, there have been alarming incidence of actual and potential threats to individual and national security in Nigeria. These range from oil bunkering and kidnapping initially associated with the Niger-Delta Crisis but which later spread to the other parts of the country after the amnesty deal in 2009 (Shehu, 2011, 22). Amnesty International (2011, 6) estimates that over two hundred people were killed in communal and sectarian violence in Plateau State in December, 2010 alone. Over 2000 lives were earlier claimed in the same state in 1994, 2001, 2008 and 2010. The activities of the Boko-Haram terrorist organisation in Northern Nigeria especially the north-east is much more worrisome just as sophisticated incidences of armed robbery are widespread across the country.

The United Nation Development Programme (UNDP) Human Development Index (HDI) 2010 indicates that Life Expectancy at Birth (LEB) in Nigeria was as low as 48.8 years, the Mean Years of Schooling (MES) was 5.0 while the Gross National Income (GNI) Per-Capital was 2,156 Us Dollars. In 2011, the LEB was 51.9, MES was still 5.0 while the GNI slipped down to 2,069. The UNDP has over the years, classified Nigeria's HDI as low. It was 0.429, 0.449, 0.449 and 0.459 in 2005, 2009, 2010 and 2011 respectively (UNDP, 2011, 133). However, the rate of poverty has been on the rise in Nigeria. It was 54.4% in 2004 but rose

to 69% 2010 and further to an estimated rate of 71.5% in 2011 (National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) 2010, 20). The incidence of corruption in the Nigerian Public Service remains high as the country's Corruption Perception Index (CPI) ranges from 1.0 in 2001 to the highest of 2.7 in 2008.

The objective of this study is to critically analyse the state of governance in Nigeria between 2000 – 2011. The study will specifically examine the quality of governance in Nigeria in terms of the extent of security and rule of law as well as citizen participation and human rights in Nigeria. Others are to determine the extend of the creation of sustainable economic opportunity and the enhancement of human development in Nigeria. These analyses will be done in comparison with other African countries. The assumption underlying this study is that the Nigerian state has not been able to deliver good governance to the people.

The study spans from the year 2000 – 2011. This has been determined by the available of secondary data from the Mo Ibrahim Foundation. This can also be justified on the bases of being a period of return to sustainable democratic governance in Nigeria commencing from 1999. Good governance is more expected of a democratic dispensation than military dictatorship. The study also has a national coverage rather than regional for maximum utility. The criteria for assessing the quality of governance were four. These were, safety and rule of law, participation and human rights sustainable economic opportunity and human development.

Transparency International is the global anti-corruption watch dog concerned with fighting corruption and promoting transparency and accountability in governance. The United Nations Development Programme UNDP is globally acclaimed as the most reputable authority concerned with human development. The World Bank among others is also concerned with the issue of corruption. Non of these organisations used comprehensive indicators of good governance as did the Mo Ibrahim Foundation. This study will go beyond the general view of the quality of governance in Africa to specifics by focusing on Nigeria which the Mo Ibrahim Foundation could not do. In doing so, however, Nigeria's scores and rankings in governance will be compared with those of other African countries.

2.0 Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

The concepts of governance and good governance are being increasingly used in recent times in development literature. While the former is not new (United National Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, (UNESCAP) 2010; 1 – 2) the latter is relatively more recent (Santiso, 2010; 1). Scholars and institutions alike advanced different definitions of governance. For instance, UNESCAP (2010) defines governance as “the process of decision making and the process by which decisions are implemented or not implemented” involving both the formal and informal actors. UNESCAP (2010;2) asserts that good governance depends on the extent to which it is participatory, consensus oriented, transparent and accountable. Other attributes of good governance are the rate to which it is responsive, equitable and inclusive, effective and efficient and adherent to the rule of law.

Adamolekun (2002;3) defines governance as the exercise of political power to manage a nations affairs. He also identified the elements of good governance as rule of law, freedom of expression and association, electoral legitimacy, transparency and accountability, and development oriented leadership. Mogislevsky (2010, 2) in his contribution sees governance as the traditions and institutions by which authority in a country is exercised. He adds that governance involve the formation and stewardship of the formal and informal rules that regulate the public realm, the arena in which state as well as economic and societal actors interact to make decisions.

Abdullatif (2003;2) reiterating the view of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) opines that governance denotes the use of political authority and exercise of control in a society in relation to the management of its resources for social and economic development. This broad definition acknowledges the role of public authorities in establishing the environment in which other actor operate in determining the distribution of the benefits as well as the nature of the relationship between the government and the people. Similarly, Davidson (2004;3) describes governance as both a means and an end involving both formal and informal actors and the asserts that governance is the process of translating societal demands into choices, resulting in policy formulation and implementation. He adds that governance is concerned with the overall institutional environment in which citizens interact and within which economic, legal and administrative authority are exercised in managing a country's affairs at all levels.

Agere (2000;4 – 5) also opines that good governance is a means and also an end involving interaction of the state, private and civil society actors. It is an end in itself if it addresses the elements of governance satisfactorily. These elements are; transparency and accountability, combating corruption, promoting citizen participation and creating enabling legal framework. Governance is also a mean to an end since it is expected to ensure security, maintain law and order, enhance citizen participation, create sustainable economic opportunity and promote human development.

Mo Ibrahim Foundation (2012; 9 – 10) views governance from the point of view of the citizen as supply of political, social and economic goods and services that citizen has the right to expect from the state and that any state has the responsibility to deliver to the citizen. The foundation also identified the elements of governance. These are, safety and rule of law, participation and human rights, sustainable economic opportunity and human development. This definition is however, silent of the actors in governance.

From the views of UNESCAP (2010), Adamolekun (2002), Abdulateef (2003), Dowidson (2004), Agere (2000) and the Mo Ibrahim Foundation, governance is both a mean and an end environment. Government is only one of the actors but not the sole actor. Other actors include the private sector and civil society organisations. Governance is a means of translating the will of the state into reality through the maintenance of law and order, protection of lives and property and providing the socio-economic and political needs of the people. This can be done through MDAs, the private and the civil society.

The theoretical framework for this study is the theory of social contract. The exponents of the theory include Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau (Gaubu, 2003, 180 – 181). The theory of social contract explains the origin of the state from the liberal perspective. The theory sees the state as a product of mutual agreement of men with a definite purpose to serve certain social needs. It postulates that the state is not a natural institution, but an artificial device invented by men for their mutual benefit. It is intended to serve the interest of citizens since it is the product of the will of society. It is for this reason that as part of the contract, the sovereign state undertakes to among others provide security and maintain law and order. The citizens on the other hand must fulfil their part of the contract by paying their taxes and being patriotic among others. In relation to this study, the Nigerian state is in contract with the citizens. The contract document is the constitution wherein among others it provides for the Fundamental Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy in chapter II,

sections 13 – 24 of the constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999. Therein, the constitution provides for the political, social, educational and economic obligations of the Nigerian state to the citizens and the citizens duties to the Nigerian state.

3.0 Methodology

The research design for this study is content analysis of secondary data as published by the Mo Ibrahim Foundation from 2000 – 2011. The Mo Ibrahim Foundation is the leading afro-centric non-governmental organisation committed to making data available on the quality of good governance in Africa. It is also committed to promoting and rewarding good governance in the continent Africa. The foundation's data is the most robust, relevant and user-friendly. It uses the Ibrahim Index of African Governance (IIAG) in scoring and ranking African Governance in terms of percentage (%) using four major categories and eighty eight component indicators sourcing data from twenty three organisation (Mo Ibrahim Foundation, 2011, and 2012, 2).

The four major categories are; safety and rule of law which comprises of rule of law; accountability, personal safety and national security. The second category is participation and human rights which comprises of participation, rights and gender issues. The third category is sustainable economic opportunity. This consist of the quality of public management, conduciveness of business environment, standard and adequacy of infrastructural facilities and the development of the rural sector. The level of human development constitute the fourth category comprising of the provision of health, education and welfare services. Nigeria's scores and rankings from 2000 – 2011 in each of these categories will be presented in tables and analysed using averages and percentages. Nigeria's performance will also be compared with those of other African countries. The overall performance of the country in governance from 2000 – 2011 will also be presented and analysed.

4.0 Summary of Findings and Discussion

This section presents and analyses Nigeria's scores and rankings in each of the four components of governance. The country's overall performance will also be presented and compared with that of other African countries.

Table 1: Nigeria's Scores and Ranking in Categories

Year	Safety & Rule of Law			Participation and Human Rights			Sustainable Economic Opportunity			Human Development		
	Score	AV*	Ranking	Score	AV*	Ranking	Score	AV*	Ranking	Score	AV*	Ranking
2000	42.8	54.6	38	45.8	45.2	24	37.1	42.1	34	37.5	46.3	38
2001	41.9	54.6	42	41.9	45.6	27	35.6	42.3	35	40.4	51.1	40
2002	41.9	55.3	43	42.8	45.7	27	35.3	42.3	37	40.4	61.7	41
2003	41.2	54.8	42	40.2	44.9	28	36.1	42.5	35	39.6	51.4	41
2004	38.7	55.2	44	41.4	45.9	28	35.9	42.6	35	40.8	52.1	41
2005	42.3	55.4	42	39.9	46.6	30	36.0	43.6	36	42.1	52.2	38
2006	43.1	55.4	41	41.0	47.7	33	39.4	44.6	33	43.7	52.7	35
2007	44.4	55.1	41	40.0	47.9	32	39.9	45.2	34	44.1	53.9	37
2008	48.1	55.1	36	37.5	45.7	34	39.2	46.1	36	44.8	54.3	36
2009	45.8	53.7	38	33.7	45.5	41	41.8	46.8	33	46.5	55.4	33
2010	46.5	53.5	34	37.3	46.6	36	41.3	47.5	36	47.8	56.6	37
2011	40.6	53.3	44	38.5	47.6	37	41.1	47.3	37	47.8	56.7	39

Source: Adapted from Mo Ibrahim Foundation; 2012 Ibrahim Index of African Governance Data Report 2012 pp 28 – 63

AV* African Average

4.1 Safety and Rule of Law

Table 1 indicates Nigeria's scores and rankings out of fifty two African countries covered in each of the four major elements of governance from 2000 – 2011. The country's scores in safety and rule of law range from the highest of 48.1% in 2008 to the lowest of 38.7% in 2004. Nigeria's scores in this category were all below the corresponding African averages in each of the twelve years covered (2000 – 2011). The country's scores in this category undulate with no sign of steady improvement. For instance, the country's performance dropped to 38.7% in 2004 from 42.8% in 2000. The score however, rose to 48.1% in 2008. This was neither maintained nor improved upon as the score fell to 45.8 in 2009 and further to 40.6 in 2011. The country's average score for the dozen years was 43.11% which is far below the African average of 54.67%. In terms of ranking, Nigeria's best ranking was 34th position out of the fifty two countries covered. The country could not rank among the first 26 half within the twelve years. Nigeria's scores and ranking in the sub-categories of safety and rule of law, that is rule of law, accountability, personal safety and national security from 2000 – 2011 are presented in Table 2.

Table 2; Nigeria's Scores and Ranking in Safety and Rule of Law Sub-Categories

Year	Rule of Law Score			Accountability			Personal Safety			National Security		
	Score	AV*	Ranking	Score	AV*	Ranking	Score	AV*	Ranking	Score	AV*	Ranking
2000	44.7	51.0	33	26.7	42.1	41	16.3	52.0	51	83.6	73.1	28
2001	44.7	50.9	33	24.3	42.1	42	15.0	52.2	52	83.6	73.1	27
2002	44.7	51.7	33	21.9	42.1	43	16.3	53.0	52	84.8	74.2	24
2003	44.7	51.3	33	24.3	42.3	42	11.3	50.9	52	84.7	74.8	25
2004	44.7	51.3	33	25.5	42.5	42	13.8	52.0	52	71.0	75.2	35
2005	44.7	51.4	32	25.5	42.5	41	15.0	51.9	51	84.3	76.0	26
2006	46.5	51.7	30	25.2	43.0	42	15.0	51.1	52	84.4	75.8	26
2007	48.3	51.1	29	26.4	43.1	40	16.3	49.3	50	84.4	76.8	26
2008	55.0	50.3	22	28.7	44.4	32	25.0	49.2	47	74.4	76.4	36
2009	55.0	49.5	21	38.0	43.8	34	23.8	44.6	47	67.7	76.9	39
2010	42.4	48.5	29	36.8	43.0	32	21.3	44.4	49	84.4	78.2	28
2011	43.1	48.5	30	35.3	43.3	35	11.3	43.6	51	72.7	78.2	36

Source: Adapted from Mo Ibrahim Foundation; 2012 Ibrahim Index of African Governance Data Report 2012

pp 30 – 37

AV*African Average

4.1.1 Rule of Law

The components of rule of law consist of effectiveness of the judicial process and the independence of the judiciary in Nigeria. Others include the extent of the enforcement of sanctions, legitimacy of transfer of power, protection of property rights and property freedom. Nigerians scores in adherence to the rule of law as enshrine in section 17(2) of the constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria range from the highest of 55.0% in 2008 and 2009 to the lowest of 42.4% in 2010. Out of the twelve years, the country's scores exceeded the African average only in 2008 and 2009. However, Nigeria's scores for the remaining ten years were below the African average for those years. Nigeria's average score for the twelve years was 46.5% as compared to 50.6% for the African average indicating that the country's score was below African average.

The country's ranking from among the fifty two covered have not been encouraging either especially from 2000 – 2007 as Nigeria could not rank among the first half (26). The rankings however, improved to the 22nd and 21st in 2008 and 30th positions in 2010 and 2011 again. In 2011, Nigeria ranked 30th for behind Botswana, South Africa, Ghana, Niger and Egypt that ranked 1st, 2nd, 5th, 7th and 15th respectively.

4.1.2 Accountability

The indicators of accountability are the extent of transparency and corruption in the public sector, rural areas and the level of prosecution for abuse of office. Nigeria's scores in these indicators have been poor. The highest score was 38.0% in 2008 and 2010 when the African average were 44.4% and 43.0% respectively. The country scored as low as 21.9% in 2002 when the African average for the year was 42.1%. The average accountability score for the dozen years for Nigeria was 29.3% which is a very poor score. In comparison, the African average for the same years was 42.9%.

Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index (CPIs) for Nigeria were not encouraging either. It was 1.0, 1.6, 1.4, 1.6, 1.9, 2.2 and 2.2 in 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007 respectively. It however, rose to 2.7 in 2008 only to slip – down to 2.5 in 2009 and further to 2.4 in 2010 and 2011. On the contrary, it means the rate of corruption still remains high as it was 90%, 84%, 86%, 84%, 81% and 78% in 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007

respectively (Transparency International, 2011). This runs contrary to the provision of section 15(5) of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria which provides that “the state shall abolish all corrupt practices and abuse of power.”

With these poor scores in transparency and accountability, the country’s rankings were not impressive either. Nigeria’s best rankings were 32nd in 2008 and 2010 and 34th position in 2009 out of 52 countries. On the other hand, Nigeria ranked 41st, 42nd and 35th out of 52 countries in 2000, 2001 and 2011 respectively. The country trailed far behind Botswana, South Africa, Ghana, and Egypt that ranked 1st, 5th, 8th and 12th respectively in 2011.

4.1.3 Personal Safety

Another sub-category under the safety and rule of law category is personal safety. The indicators of personal safety are freedom of the citizens from domestic and political persecution, social unrest and safety of the person. Others are freedom from violent crime and human trafficking (Mo Ibrahim Foundation, 2012,4). Nigeria’s scores in providing security for the citizenry have been very poor. It was as low as 11.3% in 2003 and 2011 to the highest 25.0% in 2008 when the continental averages for the same years were 50.9%, 43.6% and 49.2% respectively.

Nigeria’s average score in personal security of the people was 16.7% for the twelve years compared to the continental average of 49.5% for the same period. The country ranked last (52nd) behind twenty years old war ravaged Republic of Somalia in 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2006. Nigeria also ranked 51st out of 52 only ahead of Somalia in 2011. The country’s performance in the primary function of the Nigerian state has been very poor. This is contrary to section 14 (2b) of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 which provides that “the security and welfare of the people shall be the primary purpose of government ...”

4.1.4 National Security

The fourth sub-category of the safety and rule of law category is national security. The level of national security is determined by absence of cross-border tensions, government involvement in armed conflicts and domestic conflicts. Others are political refugees and internally displaced persons. Although, Nigeria’s performance in ensuring personal safety was very poor, the country fared better in terms of national security. Nigeria scored 84.8% in 2002 being the highest and the

lowest was 67.7% in 2009 – when the continental averages were 74.2% and 76.9% respectively. The country's average score for the twelve years was 80% which is above the continental average of 75.7% of the same period.

In spite of this impressive performance, Nigeria's best ranking was 24th in 2002. The country however, ranked 39th and 36th in 2009 and 2011 respectively. This means that though, the country performed well in terms of national security, many other countries performed better. For instance, Zambia, Botswana, South Africa, Ghana and Egypt ranked 1st, 3rd, 8th, 17th and 26th in 2011 respectively as Nigeria ranked 36th.

4.2 Participation and Human Rights

Nigeria's scores in participation and human rights category range from the highest of 45.8% in 2000 to the lowest of 33.7% in 2009 when the continental averages for the same years were 45.2% and 45.5% respectively. Nigeria's average score for twelve years was 40.0% which was below the continental average of 46.0% for the same period. Nigeria ranked 24th out of 52 in 2000 but ranked 41st in 2009. In 2011, the country ranked 37th far behind South Africa and Ghana that ranked 3rd and 6th respectively. Nigeria's scores and ranking in each of the indicators of this sub-category is presented in Table 3.

Table 3; Nigeria's Scores and Ranking Participation and Human Rights Sub-Categories

Year	Sub-Categories								
	Participation			Rights			Gender		
	Score	African Average	Ranking	Score	African Average	Ranking	Score	African Average	Ranking
2000	53.9	41.7	18	46.1	46.6	24	37.5	47.3	41
2001	43.9	44.0	25	46.1	45.4	24	35.6	47.4	46
2002	53.9	45.0	22	39.2	44.2	29	35.3	47.9	46
2003	47.3	42.5	24	37.6	44.0	30	35.7	48.1	44
2004	47.3	44.0	25	40.0	45.0	30	37.0	48.5	41
2005	47.3	45.2	24	35.2	45.2	32	37.2	49.4	41
2006	47.3	48.3	27	39.8	44.9	31	35.9	49.8	44
2007	36.7	47.9	32	44.7	45.4	27	38.6	50.4	42
2008	30.8	42.8	29	45.5	43.6	25	38.2	50.7	45
2009	26.3	43.0	39	37.7	41.7	31	37.2	51.9	46
2010	26.3	44.0	37	48.2	43.4	19	37.5	52.4	45
2011	28.8	45.0	38	48.3	43.9	23	38.3	53.6	48

Source: Adapted from Mo Ibrahim Foundation; 2012 Ibrahim Index of African Governance Data Report 2012 pp 30 – 37

4.2.1 Participation

The level of participation is determined by the extent of free and fair elections at all levels of government, political participation, electoral self determination and the effectiveness of power to govern. Nigeria's highest score in this subcategory was 53.9% in 2000 but as low as 26.3% in 2009 and 2010 when the continental averages for 2009 and 2010 were 44.0% and 45.0% respectively. The country's average score for the dozen years was 40.1% as compared to the continental average of 44.5% for the same period.

Nigeria's best ranking in this sub-category was 18th out of 52 in 2000. As at 2011, the country ranked 38th far behind South Africa and Ghana that were ranked 5th and 6th respectively. This is contrary to the provisions of section 14(2c) of the constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 which provides that "the participation by the people in their government shall be ensured in accordance with the provisions of the constitution."

4.2.2 Rights

This comprises of adherence to core international rights. Others are workers' rights, freedom of expression, association and assembly, as well as civil liberties. Nigeria's scores and rankings in this sub-category were not impressive as the country's highest score was 48.3% in 2011 while the lowest was 35.2% in 2005. The country's average score the sub-category was 42.2% below the continental average of 44.4%. The country's best ranking was 19th in 2010. In 2011, Nigeria ranked 23rd far behind South Africa and Ghana that were ranked 6th and 3rd respectively.

4.2.3 Gender

The indicators of the gender sub-category are gender equality, gender balance in primary and secondary education and women participation in the labour force. Others include equal representation in rural areas, women in parliament, women's right and legislation on violence against women (Mo Ibrahim Foundation, 2012, 4). Nigeria's highest score in this sub-category was 38.6% in 2007 while the lowest of 35.3% was in 2002. The country's average score for the dozen years was 36.8% which is below the African average of 49.8% same period. Nigeria's rankings in this sub-category were not impressive either as the country could not

rank among the first 40th position for the twelve years. The country ranked 48th in 2011 far behind South Africa and Ghana that were ranked 2nd and 17th respectively.

4.3 Sustainable Economic Opportunity

Nigeria's scores in sustainable economic opportunity category as presented in Table 1 range from the highest of 41.8% in 2009 to the lowest of 35.3% in 2002. The country's scores for the twelve years were all below their respective African averages. Nigeria's average score for the twelve years (2000- 2011) was 38.2% which is below the continental average of 44.4%. The country's best ranking was 33rd in 2006 and 2009 out of 52 African countries. In 2011, Nigeria was ranked 37th trailing far behind Egypt, South Africa and Ghana that were ranked 3rd, 8th and 13th respectively. Nigeria's scores and rankings in each of the sub-categories of the sustainable economic opportunity category are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Nigeria's Scores and Ranking in Sustainable Economic Opportunity Sub-Categories

Year	Public Management			Business Environment			Infrastructure			Rural Sector		
	Score	AV*	Ranking	Score	AV*	Ranking	Score	AV*	Ranking	Score	AV*	Ranking
2000	51.7	49.6	25	43.5	46.8	32	7.6	27.0	46	45.6	45.6	29
2001	45.7	49.8	34	43.5	47.3	32	7.6	27.1	46	45.6	45.6	29
2002	44.6	50.1	36	43.5	47.1	33	7.7	27.3	46	45.6	45.6	29
2003	47.5	50.8	32	43.5	46.8	32	8.0	27.6	46	45.6	45.6	29
2004	50.7	51.67	30	39.0	46.1	37	8.3	27.9	46	45.6	45.6	29
2005	50.2	52.7	34	40.3	48.3	38	8.7	28.3	46	44.9	45.7	31
2006	62.7	54.5	12	42.6	48.4	33	9.1	28.8	45	43.3	47.3	33
2007	63.8	55.4	13	43.2	48.9	34	9.4	29.3	47	43.3	47.7	34
2008	62.9	54.9	12	42.9	48.9	36	10.2	30.0	47	40.8	50.5	36
2009	57.0	54.4	26	47.8	50.0	34	10.6	30.0	47	51.7	53.6	29
2010	55.3	55.4	31	47.4	50.0	33	11.0	31.8	47	51.7	53.7	29
2011	55.8	54.7	25	46.9	50.0	32	11.4	32.1	48	50.3	53.7	31

Source: Adapted from Mo Ibrahim Foundation; 2012 Ibrahim Index of African Governance Data Report 2012

pp 30 – 37

AV* African Average

4.3.1 Public Management

The indicators of public management sub-category are Nigeria's statistical capacity, the quality of public administration, the level of inflation as well as diversification of the economy. It also include the level of foreign reserve, the effectiveness of budget management, ratio of total expenditure, ratio of budget deficit or surplus to GDP. Others were fiscal policy, ratio of external debt service to exports, reliability of financial institutions and revenue collection (Mo Ibrahim Foundation, 2012;5). Nigeria's scores and rankings in sustainable economic opportunity have been impressive compared to other sub-categories.

These range from the lowest of 44.6% in 2002 to the highest of 63.8% in 2007. The country's average score in this sub-category was 53.99% slightly above the continental average of 52.8% for the same period 2000 – 2011. Nigeria's scores of 62.7%, 63.8% and 62.9% in 2006, 2007, and 2008 ranked the country 12th, 13th, and 12th respectively out of 52 countries covered by the survey. In spite of this performance, Nigeria still ranked far behind South Africa and Ghana which occupied the 1st and 14th positions respectively.

4.3.2 Business Environment

The second sub-category of this category comprises of the competitiveness of the business environment, conduciveness of investment climate and the robustness of rural business. Others include the availability of rural financial services and the extent of bureaucratic red tape impeding business activities. Nigeria's highest score in this sub-category was 47.8% followed by 47.4% in 2009 and 2010 respectively while the lowest was 39.0% in 2004 when the continental average was 46.1%.

The country's average score for the dozen years was 43.7% against 48.3% continental average for 2000 – 2011. Nigeria's best ranking was 32 out of 52. The country was ranked 38th in 2005. In all the twelve years, Nigeria's scores have been below the corresponding African average. The country could not rank among the first 26 out of the 52 countries covered.

4.3.3 Infrastructure

The indicators of infrastructure are access to electricity, road and rail-networks and air transport facilities. Others include accessibility and affordability of telephone and information technology, as well as digital connectivity (Mo Ibrahim Foundation 2012, 5). Although, Africa's scores in this sub-category are generally low, Nigeria's score were among the poorest. It was as low as 7.6% in 2000 and 2001 to the highest of 11.4% in 2011 which was less than the African average of 32.1% for the same year. The country's average score for the twelve years was 9.1% which is far less than the continental average of 28.9% for the same period. Nigeria's best ranking in this sub-category was 45th out of 52 in 2006. The country ranked 48th in 2011 far behind Egypt, South Africa and Ghana that were ranked 6th, 12th and 29th respectively.

4.3.4 Rural Sector

The last sub-category under the sustainable economic opportunity category is the development of the rural sector. The indicators of this sub-category are allocation of public resources for rural development, access to land and water resources, effectiveness of agricultural extension services and provision of agricultural input and produce markets. Others include policy and legal framework for rural organisations and dialogue between government and rural organisations. Nigeria's scores in this sub-categories were moderate and in tandem with the African averages for the dozen years. The country's highest was 51.7% in 2009 and 2010 while the lowest was 40.8% in 2008.

Nigeria's average score for all the twelve years was 46.2% slightly below the continental average of 48.4%. In spite of this moderate performance, the country could not rank among the first 26 out of 52. Nigeria ranked 29th in most of the years. The country ranked 31st in 2011 far behind Egypt and Ghana which were rated 4th and 16th respectively.

4.4 Human Development

The last category for determining the quality of governance in Nigeria is the level of human development since development is increasingly becoming human centred. As indicated in table 1, Nigeria's scores in human development vary from the lowest of 37.5% in 2000 to the highest of 47.8% in 2010 and 2011. The

country's scores increased slightly but steadily over the years except for 2003 that fell slightly to 39.6% from 40.4% in 2002. In spite of these gradual but steady increases all the country's scores were below the corresponding years' African averages. In all, Nigeria average score for the twelfth years was 42.9% which is below the continental average of 52.9%. The UNDP HDI for Nigeria were not much different from those of Mo Ibrahim Foundation. It was 0.449 (44.9%), 0.454 (45.4%) and 0.459 (45.9%) in 2009, 2010 and 2011 respectively (UNDP, 2001, 133).

The country's best ranking in human development was 33rd out of 52 in 2009. Nigeria ranked 39th in 2011 far behind South Africa, Egypt and Ghana that were ranked 7th, 9th and 11th respectively. The sub-categories of human development are welfare, education and health care services delivery. Nigeria's scores and ranking in each of the three sub-categories are presented in tables and analysed in the subsequent sub-sections.

Table 5; Nigeria's Scores and Human Development Sub-Categories

Year	Welfare			Education			Health		
	Score	African Average	Ranking	Score	African Average	Ranking	Score	African Average	Ranking
2000	41.3	46.8	35	47.5	44.8	20	23.7	47.3	48
2001	41.4	46.9	35	48.3	45.9	20	31.6	60.6	48
2002	41.4	47.1	35	48.0	46.3	22	31.8	61.6	50
2003	41.3	47.3	35	50.1	47.3	21	27.4	59.6	50
2004	41.4	47.5	36	51.6	48.0	20	29.4	61.0	50
2005	42.0	47.7	35	51.9	48.8	20	32.4	60.1	49
2006	44.1	48.0	32	51.0	49.4	21	35.9	60.6	49
2007	45.3	48.7	33	48.8	50.9	24	38.0	62.2	46
2008	44.2	49.3	36	48.2	50.8	25	41.9	62.7	44
2009	43.7	50.0	36	48.4	51.8	25	47.5	64.4	44
2010	43.6	50.6	37	49.0	53.6	28	50.7	65.6	44
2011	45.0	50.8	34	47.6	53.8	30	50.7	65.6	44

Source: Adapted from Mo Ibrahim Foundation; 2012 Ibrahim Index of African Governance Data Report 2012
pp 64 – 69

4.4.1 Welfare

The indicators of this sub-category comprise of the presence of welfare regime, social protection and labour, absence of social exclusion and provision of welfare services. Other include equity of public resource use, access to water, sanitation and environmental sustainability. Nigeria's scores and rankings in this sub-category have not been impressive. The scores range from the highest of 41.3% in 2000 and 2003 to the highest of 45.3% in 2007. The country's scores in the twelve years were all lower than the corresponding African averages as indicated in table 5. Nigeria's average score for the twelve years (2000 – 2011) was 42.9% as compared a continental average of 48.4%.

The country's rankings were not impressive either. Nigeria's best rank was 32nd position out of 52 countries. In 2011, the country ranked 34th far behind South Africa, Ghana and Egypt that were placed 4th, 8th and 10th respectively. This indicates that the Nigerian state has not been able to adequately achieve the objectives of the social contract with the citizens as contained in sections 14(2b), 17)2a-d(and 20 of the constitution relating to welfare, equal opportunities to public resources and environmental sustainability respectively.

4.4.2 Education

The education sub-category consists of the quantity and quality of education provided by the government in Nigeria, ratio of pupils to teachers in primary school and primary school completion rate. Other indicators include the rate of secondary and tertiary institutions enrolment and the rate of literacy in the country (Mo Ibrahim Foundation, 2012, 5). Nigeria's scores and rankings in this sub-category were better than others.

Nigeria's scores as presented in Table 5 on the education sub-category were greater than the continental averages from 2000 – 2006 but slightly below them from 2007 – 2011. The country's highest score was 51.9% in 2005 while the lowest was 47.5% in 2010. The country's lowest score was however above the continental average of 44.8% in 2000. Nigeria's total average score for the twelve years was 49.2% very slightly below the continental average of 49.3%. Nigeria for first time ranked among the first half of 52 from 2000 – 2005. The country however ranked 30th in 2011 far behind South. Egypt and Ghana that ranked 5th, 9th and 12th respectively. In spite of this seeming better performance, the score was less than 50.0%. The Nigerian state has not been able to eradicate illiteracy by providing free and compulsory universal primary education, free secondary and

university education as well as adult literacy programmes as provided in section 18 (1 – 3) of the constitution.

4.4.3 Health

Reduction in maternal and child mortality, immunisation against measles diphtheria, antiretroviral treatment provision and the prevention/treatment of malaria and tuberculosis constitute the indicators of the health sub-category. Although Nigeria’s scores increased over time from 23.7% in 2000, 38.0% in 2007 and 50.7% in 2011, the country’s average scores in each of the eleven years have been far below the African averages. The country’s total average score was 36.8% far below the average of 60.9% for the twelve years (2000 – 2011).

Nigeria’s ranking in this sub-category have been equally very low. The country ranked 50th out of 52 in 2002, 2003 and 2004. Nigeria was also placed 49th in 2005, 2006 and 2007. In 2011, the country ranked 44th far behind Egypt, South Africa and Ghana that were placed 9th, 16th and 19th respectively. This is contrary to the provisions of section 17(3d) of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 which provides that the state shall ensure that “there are adequate medical and health facilities for all persons.”

4.5 Nigeria’s Composite Scores and Ranks

Having presented and analysed Nigeria’s scores and rankings in each of the four categories and sub-categories of governance, it is pertinent to present data and analyse the country’s composite scores and ranks as presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Composite IIAG; 2000 – 2011 Scores and Ranks for Nigeria

Year	Score (%)	African Average	Ranks
2000	40.8	47.0	36
2001	39.9	48.4	37
2002	40.1	48.8	36
2003	39.3	48.4	37
2004	39.2	49.0	38
2005	40.1	49.5	40
2006	41.8	50.1	37
2007	42.1	50.5	38
2008	42.4	50.3	38
2009	42.0	50.3	40
2010	43.2	51.0	41
2011	42.0	51.2	43

Source: Adapted from Mo Ibrahim Foundation; 2012 Ibrahim Index of African Governance Data Report 2012 p. 24

The overall scores of Nigeria in quality of governance as presented in table 6 shows the poor state of governance in the country. The score range from the lowest of 39.2% in 2004 to the best of 43.2% in 2010. The country's scores in each of the twelve years were far below each corresponding year's African average. Nigeria's total average score in governance for the twelve years was 41% which was below the continental average of 49.5%. The country's best rank was 36th out of 52 in 2000. The country ranked 43rd in 2011 far behind South Africa, Ghana and Egypt that were placed 5th, 7th and 14th respectively.

5.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

From the data presented in tables 1 – 6 and analysed, the study concludes that the quality of governance in Nigeria for the period 2000 – 2011 has been very poor-particularly in ensuring the safety of the citizenry, accountability, provision of infrastructure, gender and health care service delivery. The country's scores in ensuring national security and public management were fair Nigeria's scores in most of the sub-categories were below the corresponding African averages. The country's average score in governance for the twelve years was 41.1% which is near failure.

Nigeria's ranks in all the categories and sub-categories were not better either as the country could rank among the first half of 52 (26th) in any of the category ranking for all the years except in the participation and human rights categories in 2000 only as indicated in Table 1. The country ranked behind twenty two years war ravaged Somalia in providing safety for the citizens in 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006. In 2011, the country ranked 51st only ahead of Somalia. In comparison, Nigeria ranked behind South Africa, Egypt and Ghana in all the categories and sub-categories of governance. In relation to the theory of social contract and the provisions of chapter II, sections 13 – 24 of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999, the Nigerian state performed poorly in executing the task of governance and the social contract with the citizens. In view these findings, the study recommends for a more even spread of emphases on the sub-categories of governance because they are systemic. For instance greater concern for national security to the neglect of safety of the citizens and the rule of law can lead to oppression and tensions. In essence, security should not be only state-centred but should be also people centred.

In addition, efforts should be made to enhance the participation in both the formal and informal settings as current efforts are made only at promoting women

participation in politics and public service. In a similar vain, efforts at crating sustainable economic opportunity should go beyond public management alone. Efforts should equally be made in creating a conducive business environment by reducing bureaucratic red-tape, creating competitive environment, safety of live and property. The state of infrastructure in terms of access to electricity, modern rails and roads as well as air transport facilities must be improved. Finally, the poor state of health care service delivery should be improved upon by extending emphases to rural areas which are more endemic. More importantly, all the sub-categories of governance should be given due concern since they are all mutually exclusive in order to improve the state of governance in Nigeria.

References

- Abdullahi, S.A. (2007). The civil service reforms. In H. Saliu, E. Amali and R. Olawepo (Eds). *Nigeria's reform Programme; Issues and Challenges* (pp. 342 – 362). Ilorin; Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, University of Ilorin.
- Abdullatif, A.M. (2003, May). Good governance and its relationship to democracy and economic development. Presented at Workshop IV on Democracy, Economic Development and Culture, Organised by Global Forum III on Fighting Corruption and Safeguarding Integrity. Soul, 20 – 31.
- Adamolekun, L. (2002). Governance context and reorientation of government. in L. Adamolekun (Ed). *Public Administration in Africa. Main Issues and Selected Country Studies*. Ibadan, Spectrum Books Limited.
- Agere, S. (2000). *Promoting good governance, principles, practices and perspectives*. London; Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Akanji, O.O. (2002). Micro-finance as a strategy for poverty reduction. *Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) Economic and Financial Review*, 39(4).
- Amnesty International (2011). *Nigeria; loss of life, insecurity and impunity in the run-up to Nigeria's election*.
- Davidson, S. (2004). The role of governance in achieving millennium development goals. Vietnam; the World Bank.
- Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (Establishment) Act, Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004).
- Fayeye, J.O. (2007). Reforming the security sector. In H. Saliu, E. Amali and R. Olawepo (Eds). *Nigeria's Reform Programme; Issues and Challenges* (pp 142 – 157). Ilorin; Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, University of Ilorin.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999). *Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999*. Lagos; Federal Government Press.
- Fiscal Responsibility Act, Federal Republic of Nigeria (2007).
- FRN (2005). *Micro-finance policy, regulatory and supervisory framework for Nigeria*. Abuja; CBN.
- Gauba, O.P. (2007). *An introduction to political theory*. Second Edition. Delhi; Macmillan India Ltd.
- Lambo, E. (2007). An overview of the health sector reforms. In H. Saliu, E.g. Amali and R. Olawepo (Eds). *Nigeria's Reform Programme; Issues and Challenges* (pp 109 – 121). Ilorin; Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, University of Ilorin.

- Laski, H.J. (2004). *Grammar of politics*. Delhi; Surject Publications.
- Lawal, A. (2007). *A cybernatic appraisal of reforms in the education sector*. In H. Saliu, E. Amali and R. Olawepo (eds) *Nigeria's Reform Programme; Issues and Challenges* (pp 91 – 108). Ilorin; Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, University of Ilorin.
- Mo Ibrahim Foundation (2011). 2011 Ibrahim index of African governance summary. Accessed on 30th October 2011 from mo ibrahim foundation org.
- Mo Ibrahim Foundation (2012). 2012 Ibrahim index of African governance data report. Accessed from Moibrahim foundation. orgon/22ndoctober,2012
- Mo Ibrahim Foundation (2012). 2012 Ibrahim Index of African Governance Summary. Accessed on September 2nd 2012 from moibrahim foundation org.
- Moglovsky, R. (2010). What is good governance? main aspects and characteristics. Kurgystan; Centre for Social and Economic Research.
- National Planning Commission (NPC) (2004). Nigeria, national economic empowerment and development strategy (NEEDS). Abuja, NPC.
- NBS (2010). Nigeria's poverty profile.
- Nigeria Extractive Industry Initiatives (NEITI Act, Federal Republic of Nigeria (2007).
- Okebukola, P. (2007). The educational sector reforms. In H. Saliu, E. Amali and R. Olawepo (Eds). *Nigeria's Reform Programme; Issues and Challenges* (pp 83 – 90). Ilorin; Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, University of Ilorin.
- Oladipo, J.A. (2007). *Reforming the civil service*. In H. Saliu, E. Amali and R. Olawepo (Eds). *Nigeria's Reform Programme; Issues and Challenges* (363 – 378). Ilorin; Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, University of Ilorin.
- Olaopa, T. (2008). *Theory and practice of public administration and civil service reforms in Nigeria*. Ibadan; Spectrum Books Limited.
- Public Procurement Act, Federal Republic of Nigeria (2007).
- Santiso, C. (2001). Good governance and aid effectiveness; the world bank and conditionality. *The George Town Public Policy Review* Vol. 7, No. 1, 1 – 22.
- Shehu, A. (2011, November). Corruption and conflict in Nigeria; implications for peace, security and national development. Presented at the Third Public Lecture of the Institute for Peace and Conflict Resolution, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Abuja, Nigeria on 24th November, 2011.

- The Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Act, Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004).
- Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index (2000 – 2011 Editions).
<http://www.transparency.org>
- Ukpere, W.I. and Otto, G. (2012). National security and development in Nigeria. *African Journal of Business Management*. Vol. 3, No. 23, pp. 6765 – 6770.
- UNDP (2011). Human Development Report. 2nd November, New York.
- UNESCAP (2010). What is good governance? retrieved on 2/12/2010 from <http://www.unescap.org/pdd/prs/projectactivity/ongoing/gg/governance.asp>
- Zabadi, I.S. (2007). Security sector reforms. In H. Saliu, E. Amali and R. Olawepo (Eds). *Nigeria's Reform Programme; Issues and Challenges* (pp 122 – 141). Ilorin, Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, University of Ilorin.