Citizens Participation and Quality of Governance In Nigeria

Idris, Musa
Department of Public Administration
Faculty of Administration
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria

&

Salisu Shehu Jafaru
Department of Public Administration
Faculty of Administration
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria

Abstract

Governance is increasingly becoming citizens centered. The active participation of the citizens in the formulation and implementation of public policies and programmes is expected to among others facilitate effective service delivery and good governance in general. Both governmental and non-governmental platforms were established through which the citizens either directly or indirectly participate with a view to improving the quality of governance. In spite of all these efforts, the desired quality of governance seems not to have been achieved in view of increasing rate of insecurity, poverty, and poor service delivery inter-alia. The objectives of this paper were to determine the level of citizens participation and the quality of governance in Nigeria between 2002 - 2010. Others were to examine the relationship between the two variables and make recommendations for improvement. The source of data was secondary. This was presented in tables and percentages. Tlie Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient was used in testing the hypothesis postulated. The study inter-alia revealed that both and level of citizens participation and the quality of governance in Nigeria was low. It has also been discovered that there was a significance relationship between the level of citizens participation and quality of governance. The study recommended for deliberate efforts aimed at creating broad based platforms such as community based and civil society organizations, professional association and political parties. Others were the involvement of these platforms in the initiation, formulation and implementation of government policies and programmes as well as the existence of a vibrant mass media to facilitate mass mobilization, integration and participation in governance.

Keywords: *Citizens, participation, quality of governance*

Introduction

The state owes a lot of responsibilities to the citizens as much as the citizens owe certain obligations to the state. It is through governance that the will of the state is expressed and realised through the formulation and implementation of public policies and programmes. The active participation of all segments of the citizenry in governance has therefore, of recent occupied a central stage as governance is increasing becoming citizens centred. The increasing decentralisation of fiscal, political, and administrative responsibilities not only to lower levels of governments and institutions but also communities has made the notion of participation a fundamental tenet in the promotion of good governance (Lewis and Naido, 2004).

Both public and private platforms exist through which the citizens are expected to directly or indirectly participate in governance. These include the National and State Assemblies as well as the local government councils. Others are community based, professionally oriented, political or gender based. Quite a number of civil society organisations also exist. The Nigerian government had in the past established an agency for Mass Mobilisation for Social Justice and self Economic Reliance (MAMSER) to mobilise and integrate the citizenry for participation in governance. This was succeeded by the National Orientation Agency (NOA) as part of the broader good governance agenda.

In spite of these efforts, the desired level of citizens participation seem not to have been achieved in view of increasing distrust, apathy, alienation and resignation of the citizenry to government policies and programmes. The qualities of governance also need much to be desired in view of increasing incidence of insecurity, poverty and declining standard of living. Why is the level of citizens' participation and quality of governance still low in Nigeria?

The objectives of the paper are to determine the level of citizens' participation and quality of governance in Nigeria. Others are to examine the relationship between the former and the latter, identify problems of participation and governance and make suggestions for improvement. The hypothesis postulated for the study is stated in both the Null (H_0) and Alternate (H_1) respectively in order to avoid bias thus: H_0; there is no significant relationship between the level of citizens participation and the quality of governance in Nigeria. (H_1); there is a significant relationship between the level of citizens' participation and the quality of governance in Nigeria.

This study will be of tremendous importance to research, policy and practice of governance as well as international assistance agencies and the civil society organisations. The rich and current literature as well as the reliable data will provide vital information to researchers. The identification of gap between

the theory and practice of participation and governance will enable policy makers and administrators alike fine tune their policies and strategies. Civil Society Organisations and International Assistance Agencies will also find the findings of the study relevant in assessing specific country performance for possible intervention.

The study spans between 2002 - 2010. This was largely determined by the availability of data. The choice of the period can also be justified on the ground of being a period of return to sustainable democracy. Principles of participation and good governance are more expected of democratic than military regimes. The national coverage of the study was also made possible by the availability of data. The research design was content analysis using secondary source of data mainly from the MO Ibrahim Index of African Governance. The data was presented in tables, percentages, and averages. The Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient was used to test the hypothesis postulated.

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

A conceptual definition of the concept of participation is scanty in existing literature. Scholars and Practitioners alike therefore, advanced different operational definitions of the term based on their orientation and milieu. Harvey (2010) integrating the views of Etzioni (1993 and 1968), Friedman (1992) and Wilcox (1994) defines participation as social learning and empowerment, community spirit needed to strengthen the community as a moral infrastructure and leading towards an active society. The United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) (2010) defines participation as the informed, legitimate and organised use of intermediate institutions or representatives by citizens to make input into governance. This requires freedom of expression and association, women participation in labour and in parliament. This indicator centres on political, civil and gender spheres. It does not include the participation of the citizens in the initiation, formulation and implementation of government policies and programmes in the provision of essential services such as security, health, education and others.

Verma (2003) reiterates the views of Rigg (1967) and Jaguaribe (1973) in explaining the essentials of political participation. Riggs (1967) equates equality as reflecting the extent to which members of polity participate in shaping of its policies and to share in the benefits secured by their implementation as one of the variables of political development. Jaguaribe (1973) identifies the components of political participation as comprising of political mobilisation, political

integration and political representations. Thus narrowing the concept to political participation. This also makes the issue of mass communication imperative.

Mejos (2007) identifies two major forms of citizens participation as authentic and inauthentic. Authentic participation entails either solidarity or opposition with government plans, policies and programmes. The inauthentic aspects can be in the forms of conformism which can be in compliance with government policies and programmes or maintain neutrality in the accomplishment of common good. Non-involvement on the other hand entails avoidance, and disregard for those appearances of common for the common good. Dessy (2007) emphasises the importance of participation by observing that alienation of citizens leads to deprivation, ill health, illiteracy and corruption resulting to policy failures and poor service delivery. Harvey (2010) justifies citizens participation on the bases of facilitating synergy within and between the citizen and governments, social capital and capacity building as well as ensuring fair, open and collaborative governance.

From the point of views advanced by Harvey (2010), Verma (2003), Mejos (2007) and Dessy (2007), participation can be seen as the active involvement of the citizens in the socio-economic and political lives in a governmental set up with a view to improving the quality of governance. It facilitates citizens social learning and empowerment through mass mobilisation, creates community spirit, and increases trust and confidence between the citizens and the government. This promotes a spirit of patriotism in the citizens.

The concept of good governance is relatively new. It surfaced in 1989 in the World Bank's report on sub-saharan Africa which characterised the crisis in the region as a crisis of governance. Although, the concept is being increasingly used, its contours remain uncertain. The multitude of definition has generated an increasing confusion regarding the boundaries of the concept (Santiso, 2001).

Mogislevsky (2010) defines governance as the traditions and institutions by which authority in a country is exercised. He further asserts that governance refers to 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. Abdellatif (2003) reiterates the view of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDDP, 1997) in defining governance as the exercise of economic, political and administrative authority to manage a country's affairs at all levels. It comprises of the mechanisms, processes and institutions, through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations and mediate their differences. The core elements of good governance according to

the UNDP (1997) consist of participation, rule of law, transparency and responsiveness. Others are effectiveness and efficiency, accountability and strategic vision.

Succinctly put by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) 1995, and espoused by Abdellatif (2003), 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 encompass the role of the public authorities in establishing the environment in which economic operators function and in determining the distribution of benefits as well as the nature of the relationship between the ruler and the ruled.

In his contribution to the definitional crisis, Davidson (2004) defines good governance as the process of translating societal demands into choices, resulting in policy formulation and implementation. He asserts that governance is concerned with the overall institutional environment in which citizens interact and within which economic, legal, and administrative authority are exercised to manage a country's affairs at all levels. The World Bank Researcher identifies the four pillars of good governance as; participation, accountability, transparency and predictability rather than arbitrariness. Woods (2000) in a similar vein, sees good governance as encompassing the states institutional arrangements, the processes for formulating policy, decision-making, and implementation, information flows within government, and the overall relationship between citizens and government.

The MO Ibrahim Foundation (2007) defines governance as the supply of key political goods. These are; safety and rule of law, participation and human rights, sustainable economic opportunity and human development. The indices of good governance as identified by MO Ibrahim foundation are in many respects similar to those identified by Davidson (2004), UNDP (1997) and Woods (2000). These are also in conformity with the Fundamental Objectives and Directives Principles of State Policy as contained in chapter two of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 (FRN, 1999).

The definitions advanced by Abdellatif (2003), Davidson (2004), Mogilevsky (2000) and Woods points that governance is the exercise of political, legal, economic and administrative authority in formulating and implementing policies and programmes using available resources to meet the demands of the citizenry in an efficient, effective and equitable manner. It encompasses the role of the public authorities in creating an enabling environment in which economic operators function as well as the relationship between the rulers and the ruled. In all the definitions advanced, the issues of

safety and rule of law citizens participation, transparency and accountability, enabling economic environment and human development appeared prominently as indices of good governance.

The theoretical framework used for the study is Karol Wojtyla's Theory of participation. It was used by Mejos (2007) as a framework in his Critique Against Alienation. According to this theory, participation basically serves to express the property by which persons exist and act together with others while not ceasing to fulfil ourselves. That is, it allows the realisation of oneself as well as the realisation of the community. The ability to participate shows that a person can enter into interpersonal relationship with other persons and at the same time fulfil himself in his actions. It allows citizens to experience themselves and humanity of other persons and institutions. In this sense, the common good and individual good meet in the person and he seek them not alone but together with other persons and institutions.

In relation to this study, the citizen either individually or collectively interact within themselves and or with the institutions of the state (Community Based Organisations, Professional Bodis, Civil Society Organisation, National and State Assembly and Local Government Councils etc) to meet their individual and collective needs as citizens. The common good desired by the citizens for participating are the provision of safety and security, rule of law, transparent and accountable government, the provision of enabling economic environment, and the efficient and equitable distribution of basic services such as health and education inter-alia.

Summary of Discussions and Findings

The independent and dependent variables in this paper are citizens' participation and quality of governance respectively. The data on both citizens' participation and the quality of governance were obtained from MO Ibrahim Index of African Governance. Although the Index classifies citizens' participation as one of the indicators of governance, it is separated and used as the independent variable. The indicators of citizens participations are; political participation, strength of democracy, free and fair election, gender equality, women participation in labour and in parliament. Others are freedom of association and expression and the existence of virile civil society. The indicators of good governance as used in the study are; safety and rule of law, sustainable economic opportunity and human development.

The Level of Citizens Participation

The data on Nigeria's scorers in percentage and ranking out of fifty three African countries as obtained from MO Ibrahim foundation for 2002 - 2010 is presented in table one below.

Table 1: Nigeria's Scores and Ranking in Citizens Participation

Year	Participation (%)	Ranking
2002	46.4	25
2003	43.3	27
2004	43.1	27
2005	43.0	27
2006	44.0	28
2007	42.9	30
2008	44.2	31
2009	41.8	33
2010	38.0	-

Source: *Ibrahim Index of African Governance Scores and Ranks www. moibrahimfoudnation.org*

The data in table 1 above indicates that the level of citizens' participation in governance was highest in 2002 with 46.4% and lowest in 2010 with only 38%. The level of citizens' participation decreased gradually from 46.4% in 2002 to 43.0% in 2005. It however staggers between the highest of 44.2% falling, to the lowest of 38.0% between 2006 and 2010. Nigeria's average score in citizens' participation for the period 2002 - 2010 was only 42.9 %. These low scores are reflected in Nigeria's ranking which varies from the best 25th in 2002 to the poorest of 33 in 2009 bearing in mind that the 2010 ranking was not available. This poor scores and rankings indicate that the level of citizens' participation in governance was low.

Quality of Governance in Nigeria

The data on the quality of governance in Nigeria between 2002 2010 were obtained from the MO Ibrahim Foundation. The indices of; safety and Rule of

Law, sustainable economic opportunity and human development were used and presented in the table below.

Table 2; Nigeria's Scores and Ranking in Governance 2002 - 2010

Indicators	Safety and Rules of Law		Sustainable Economic Opportunity		Human Development		overall Score
Year	Score (%)	Ranking	Score (%)	Ranking	Score (%)	Ranking	Score C%)
2002	42.7	43	36.7	34	46.0	23	41.8
2003	42.3	43	35.7	38	46.2	25	41.4
2004	42.2	43	36.5	36	46.1	24	41.6
2005	40.5	45	37.3	36	47.6	23	41.8
2006	42.6	43	37.7	34	48.5	22	42.9
2007	43.8	44	40.3	33	49.9	22	44.7
2008	44.8	43	43.3	34	50.4	24	46.2
2009	50.6	46	42.6	34	50.8	25	48.0
2010	48.0	-	43.0	-	43.0	-	44.7

Source: Ibrahim Index of African Governance Scores and Rankings www.moibrahimfoundation.org

The data in table 2 indicates that Nigeria's overall scores in governance ranges between the highest of 48.0% in 2009 to the lowest of 41.4% in 2003. In essence, the country could not score up to 50.0% in quality of governance in any of the nine years. The total average score was 43.7% for the nine years. This is not a good performance. The country however, earned more scores in human development criterion when compared to sustainable economic opportunity and safety and rule of law. This is reflected in the country's better ranking in human development vis-à-vis those of the other criteria.

Test of Hypothesis

In determining the level of significance of the relationship between the level of citizen participation and the quality of governance, the Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient was used with the aid of the Statistical Package for Social

Sciences (SPSS). The computer print-out of the data in tables 1 and 2 are presented in tables 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Table 3: Level of Citizens participation in Nigeria; 2002 – 2010 (Independent Variable)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2002	46	11.9	12.0	12.0
	2003	43	11.1	11.2	23.2
	2004	43	11.1	11.2	34.4
	2005	43	11.1	11.2	45.6
	2006	44	11.3	11.5	57.0
	2007	42	10.8	10.9	68.0
	2008	44	11.3	11.5	79.4
	2009	41	10.6	10.7	90.1
	2010	38	9.8	9.9	100.0
	Total	384	99.0	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.0		
Total		388	100.0		

Source: Computer Output

Table 4; Quality of Governance in Nigeria2 002 – 2010 (Dependent Variable)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2002	41	10.6	10.6	10.6
	2003	41	10.6	10.6	21.1
	2004	41	10.6	10.6	31.7
	2005	41	10.6	10.6	42.3
	2006	42	10.8	10.8	53.1
	2007	44	11.3	11.3	64.4
	2008	46	11.9	11.9	76.3
	2009	48	12.4	12.4	88.7
	2010	44	11.3	11.3	100.0
	Total	388	100.0	100.0	

Source: Computer Output

Table 5: Level of Citizens participation (Independent Variable) Quality of Governance 2002-2010 (Dependent Variable) Crosstabulation

			Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking in Governance 2002-2010 (Dependent Variable)									
			2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total
Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking Citizens participation (Independent Variable)	2002	Count	41	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
		Expected Count	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.9	5.0	5.3	5.5	5.8	4.8	46.0
		% within Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking Citizens participation (Independent Variable)	89.1%	10.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking in Governance 2002-2010 (Dependent Variable)	100.0%	12.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	12.0%
		% of Total	10.7%	1.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	12.0%
	2003	Count	0	36	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

	Expected Count	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.9	5.2	5.4	4.5	43.0
	% within Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking Citizens participation (Independent Variable)	.0%	83.7%	16.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking in Governance 2002-2010 (Dependent Variable)	.0%	87.8%	17.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	11.2%
	% of Total	.0%	9.4%	1.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	11.2%
2004	Count	0	0	34	9	0	0	0	0	0	43
	Expected Count	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.9	5.2	5.4	4.5	43.0

	% within Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking Citizens participation (Independent Variable)	.0%	.0%	79.1%	20.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking in Governance 2002-2010 (Dependent Variable)	.0%	.0%	82.9%	22.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	11.2%
	% of Total	.0%	.0%	8.9%	2.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	11.2%
2005	Count	0	0	0	32	11	0	0	0	0	43
	Expected Count	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.9	5.2	5.4	4.5	43.0
	% within Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking Citizens participation (Independent Variable)	.0%	.0%	.0%	74.4%	25.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%

		% within Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking in Governance 2002-2010 (Dependent Variable)	.0%	.0%	.0%	78.0%	26.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	11.2%
		% of Total	.0%	.0%	.0%	8.3%	2.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	11.2%
	2006	Count	0	0	0	0	31	13	0	0	0	44
		Expected Count	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.8	5.0	5.3	5.5	4.6	44.0
		% within Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking Citizens participation (Independent Variable)	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	70.5%	29.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking in Governance 2002-2010 (Dependent Variable)	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	73.8%	29.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	11.5%

		% of Total	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	8.1%	3.4%	.0%	.0%	.0%	11.5%
	2007	Count	0	0	0	0	0	31	11	0	0	42
		Expected Count	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.8	5.0	5.3	4.4	42.0
		% within Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking Citizens participation (Independent Variable)	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	73.8%	26.2%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking in Governance 2002-2010 (Dependent Variable)	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	70.5%	23.9%	.0%	.0%	10.9%
		% of Total	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	8.1%	2.9%	.0%	.0%	10.9%
	2008	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	9	0	44
		Expected Count	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.8	5.0	5.3	5.5	4.6	44.0

	% within Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking Citizens participation (Independent Variable)	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	79.5%	20.5%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking in Governance 2002-2010 (Dependent Variable)	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	76.1%	18.8%	.0%	11.5%
	% of Total	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	9.1%	2.3%	.0%	11.5%
2009	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	2	41
	Expected Count	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.7	4.9	5.1	4.3	41.0
	% within Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking Citizens participation (Independent Variable)	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	95.1%	4.9%	100.0%

		% within Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking in Governance 2002-2010 (Dependent Variable)	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	81.3%	5.0%	10.7%
		% of Total	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	10.2%	.5%	10.7%
	2010	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	38
		Expected Count	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.6	4.8	4.0	38.0
		% within Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking Citizens participation (Independent Variable)	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking in Governance 2002-2010 (Dependent Variable)	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	95.0%	9.9%

	% of Total	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	9.9%	9.9%
Total	Count	41	41	41	41	42	44	46	48	40	384
	Expected Count	41.0	41.0	41.0	41.0	42.0	44.0	46.0	48.0	40.0	384.0
	% within Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking Citizens participation (Independent Variable)	10.7%	10.7%	10.7%	10.7%	10.9%	11.5%	12.0%	12.5%	10.4%	100.0%
	% within Responses on Nigeria's Scores and Ranking in Governance 2002-2010 (Dependent Variable)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	10.7%	10.7%	10.7%	10.7%	10.9%	11.5%	12.0%	12.5%	10.4%	100.0%

Table 6; Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.989	.001	131.063	.000[c]
Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	.990	.001	134.382	.000[c]
N of Valid Cases		384			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

The calculated value of Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient in table six above was 0.990 while the critical value at nine degree of freedom (n) and 0.05 level of significance (α) was 0.600. Thus, the calculated value of 0.990 is greater than the critical value of 0.600. The decision rule is that accept H_0 if calculated value is less than the critical value and vice-versa. In this case, the H_0 which states that; there is no significant relationship between citizen participation and the quality of governance in Nigeria is rejected. Conversely, the H_1 which states that; there is a significant relationship between citizens participation an the quality of governance in Nigeria is accepted.

Conclusions and Recommendations

From the data in tables one and two, the study concludes that both the level of citizens' participation and the quality of governance in Nigeria for the period 2002 – 2010 were low. The hypothesis tested also indicated that there was a significant relationship between the level of citizens' participation and the quality of governance in Nigeria. In other words, the low level of citizens' participation was responsible for the poor quality of governance in Nigeria. Thus, the quality of governance can be improved upon by increased citizens' participation. In relation to the theoretical framework, the individual common good (good governance) sought by the citizens through collective action have not been achieved as a result inadequate participation.

In view of this, the study recommends the reform of the political party system with a view to making them broad based and grassroots oriented. The electoral process should also be made more transparent to ensure genuine representation and strengthen democracy. Policies geared towards the participation of the under privilege and women such as the gender policy should be vigorously pursued and faithfully implemented.

Enabling laws should be enacted and enforced to facilitate the formation and sustenance of viable community based organisations and other civil society organisations. These platforms also deserve both government and international donor – agencies support especially in capacity building of their members. Similarly, the government should as a matter of policy involve professional associations, community based organisations, and civil society organisation in the initiation, formulation and implementation of policies and programmes aimed at improving the quality of governance.

Grassroots mass mobilisation and integration of the citizenry is also very essential to their participation in the affairs that affect them. A vibrant mass media and accessible information communication technology is required in order to achieve.

References

Abdellatif, A.M. (2003) *Good Governance and its Relationship to Democracy and Economic Development,* Presented at Worship IV on Democracy, Economic Development and Culture Organised by Global Forum III on Fighting Corruption and Safeguarding Integrity, Seoul, 20 - 31 May.

Davidson, S. (2004) *The Role of Governance in Achieving Millennium Development Goals,* Vietman the World Bank.

Dessy, S. (2007) *Client Power, Citizen Participation, Institutions and Service Delivery; Theory and Evidence with Special Emphasis on Africa.*

FRN (1999) *Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999,* Lagos, Federal Government Press.

Harvey, A. (2010) *Public Participation; Theory and Practice,* the Heritage Council.

Lewis, S.G. and Naido, J. (2004) *Whose Theory of Participation? School Governance Policy and Practice in South - Africa,* Current Issues in Comparative Education Vol. 6 (2) 100 - 112.

Mejos, E.A. (2007) *Theory of Participation,* htt://www.kritike.org/journal/issue vol. I., No. 1,71-85.

Mogilevsky, R. (2010) *What is Good Governance, Main Aspects and Characteristics,* Kyrgystan, Centre for Social and Economic Research.

Ibrahim Index of Africa Governance (2009), *Ibrahim Index of African Governance Summary,* Accessed on August 8th, 2010 from www.moibhrahimfoundation. org

Ibrahim Index of African Governance (2007) *Indices and Governance,* www.moibrahimfoundation.org

Santiso, C. (2001) *Good Governance and Aid Effectiveness; the World Bank and Conditionality,* the Georgetown Public Policy Review, Vol. 7, No. 1, 1 - 22.

Spiegel, M.R. and Stephens, LJ. (1999) *Statistics,* New York, McGraw Hill.

UNESCAP (2010) *What is Good Governance?* Accessed on February 12, 2010 from http://www.unescap.org/pdd/prs/projectactiviites/ongoing/gg/governance.asp

Verma, S.P. (2003) *Modem Political Theory,* New Delhi, Vikas Publishing House PVT Ltd.

Woods, N. (2000) *The Challenge of Good Governance for the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank Themselves,* World Bank, Vol. 28, No. 5, 1 - 15.