PARTICIPATORY COMMUNICATION IN PARLIAMENT-CONSTITUENTS RELATIONS: A STUDY OF THE VOICE AND ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS IN THE KADUNA STATE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

BY

Paul ONWUDE
MA/ARTS/4906/2011-2012

DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE AND PERFORMING ARTS
FACULTY OF ARTS
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,
ZARIA

NOVEMBER, 2016

PARTICIPATORY COMMUNICATION IN PARLIAMENT-CONSTITUENTS RELATIONS: A STUDY OF THE VOICE AND ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISMS IN THE KADUNA STATE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

BY

Paul ONWUDE
MA/ARTS/4906/2011-2012

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES, AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA, NIGERIA, IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER OF ARTS (M.A.) DEGREE IN DEVELOPMENT COMMUNICATION

DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE AND PERFORMING ARTS,

FACULTY OF ARTS

AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,

ZARIA

NOVEMBER, 2016

DECLARATION

I, Paul ONWUDE hereby declare that this dissertation entitled, **Participatory Communication in Parliament-Constituents Relations: A study of the Voice and Accountability Mechanisms in the Kaduna State House of Assembly**was written by me and is a product of my own research. It has not been presented in any previous application for a higher degree. All quotations are clearly indicated and sources of information have been acknowledged by means of reference.

_____ _____

Paul ONWUDE **Date**

CERTIFICATION

This dissertation entitled **Participatory Communication in Parliament-Constituents Relations: A study of the Voice and Accountability Mechanisms in the Kaduna State House of Assembly***by***Paul ONWUDE (MA/ARTS/4906/2011-2012)** meets the regulations governing the award of the degree of Master of Arts in Development Communication of the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

ProfessorOga Steve Abah _____ _____
Chairman, Supervisory Committee **(Signature)** **(Date)**

Professor Emmy UnujaIdegu _____ _____ Member,
Supervisory Committee (**Signature)** **(Date)**

Professor M. I.Umar-Buratai _____ _____
Head of Department **(Signature)** **(Date)**

Professor KabirBala _____ _____
Dean, School of Post Graduate Studies **(Signature)** **(Date)**

DEDICATION

This research work is dedicated first to God Almighty, and Jesus Christ His Son, his Mother Mary in the company of Angels and Saints; likewise, my wife and Children,also in remembrance of my first pairs of supervisors of this work: late Professor JenkeriZakariOkwori, Professor Samuel KafewoAyedime, including my late PG Coordinator Dr. Martin AdegbeAyegba of Blessed Memory.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To God Almighty, My King, for the gift of life, health, and His Faithfulness every day, Father, I say a big thank you! My unreserved appreciation goes to my supervisors Professor Oga Steve Abah, and Professor Emmy UnujaIdegu, including my PG Coordinator, Dr. Emmanuel Jegede whose insight, erudition and direction led to this scholarly piece and completion of this research. I remain indebted.

I particularly acknowledge Professor Oga Steve Abah, the Principal Investigator and Director of the Centre of Excellence on Development Communication-CEDC, ABU for the counseling and guide given to me to pursue this programme.

My Sincere appreciation goes to all lecturers and non-teaching staff in the Department of Theatre and Performing Arts, who have assumed roles of fathers, mothers, mentors and advisers to me in various capacities. In particular, I appreciate Dr. Emmanuel Jegede, Professor Emmy Idegu, Dr. Emmanuel Gana, and Mr. Silvanus Dangoji for their support, kind words of encouragement and assistance.

I am eternally grateful to the Almighty God, His Angles and Saints for the many times they granted me safe journey to and from Zaria in the cause of this programme. I also thank my wife and children for bearing with me, including my brothers, sisters and my Mama.

I acknowledge the support I received from my course mates, particularly Mr. Sunday Ogbe and Timothy Kpanja.

ABSTRACT

Over the years scholars have researched this concept and came to an understanding that democracy is inextricable from communication. Communication enhances democracy, facilitates interaction, inclusiveness and participation engendering representative democracy but this is not the case with Kaduna in particular. Therefore, this study examines the nature of the relationship between the parliament and constituents of the Kaduna State's House of Assembly. It studies the communication pattern between members of parliament and their constituents and attempts to show how the concerns and voice of the people are articulated side-by-side the accountability mechanisms between the people and their representatives. This research is based on the normative theory of participatory development communication known as the multiplicity paradigm. The study was a survey research method that made use of both quantitative and qualitative instruments namely the questionnaire and in-depth interviews techniques. The descriptive method was employed in analyzing data in this study for easy comprehension. In analyzing the data, SPSS version 20 was used. A theoretical mean of 3.0 was taken as a criterion to judge the mean for the items in the structured questionnaire having five Likert format. From the analyses of the data and information, the study found that there are participatory communication mechanisms that could be used to enhance participatory legislation. However, the challenge to this has been largely the exclusion of the people from this process of participation thereby rendering the mechanism ineffective. The study recommended that, there should an increase of inclusion and access to existing participatory communication channels in the Assembly like constituency meetings, including other participatory communication channels like the traditional communication channels of folklores, dances etc. This in turn would not only legitimize the legislative process, it engenders voice and accountability but also lead to sustainable democratic development in the long run. Thus, the study advanced the use of communication model which stirs and stimulates representative participation in the legislative process and improves the inclusiveness of the people's voices in the process and holds representatives accountable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE		PAGES
Cover page	- - - - - - - - -	i
Title page	- - - - - - - - -	ii
Declaration	- - - - - - - - -	iii
Certification	- - - - - - - - -	iv
Dedication	- - - - - - - - -	v
Acknowledgments	- - - - - - - - -	vi
Abstract	- - - - - - - - -	viii
Table of Contents	- - - - - - - - -	ix
List of Tables	- - - - - - - - -	xiii

CHAPTER ONE: GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1	Background of Study - - - - - - - -	1
1.2	Statement of the Problem (Rationale)- - - - - -	5
1.3	Aim of the study- - - - - - - - -	6
1.4	Objectives of the Study - - - - - - -	6
1.5	Research Questions - - - - - - - -	7
1.6	Significance of the Study - - - - - - -	8
1.7	Scope and Delimitation of the Study-- - - - -	8

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1	The Democratic Nature of Communication - - - -	10
2.2	Function of Communication - - - - - -	12
2.3.	Participatory Development Communication - - - -	14

2.3.1 Five characteristics of Freire's dialogue/Participatory Model- - 16
2.4 The Communicative Nature of Democracy-- - - - 21
2.4.1. Representative Democracy-- - - - - - 28
2.4.2 Types of Representative Democracy - - - - 31
2.4.3 Parliamentary/Legislative Institutional Structures, Systems, Processes and Procedures of Representation - - - - - 33
2.4.3.1 Constituency Delineation and Roll Call in the Assembly after Elections in furtherance of Representation- - - - - - 33
2.4.3.2 Parliamentary/Legislative Structures and Systems (arrangement) at the National Level- - - - - - - - 35
2.4.3.3 Parliamentary/Legislative Structures and Systems (arrangement) at the Sub-National (Kaduna State) level- - - - - - 44
2.4.3.4 Parliamentary/Legislative Processes and Procedures- - - 44
2.4.3.6 Members of Parliament/Representatives: Mandate, Functions, Voice and Accountability- - - - - - - 46
2.4.3.7 Functions of (Members)/Parliament- - - - - 54
2.4.3.8 Voice and Accountability (V&A) - - - - - 54
2.5 Parliamentary/Legislative Communication Mechanisms for Voice and Accountability (V&A)- - - - - - - 58
2.5.1 Institutional Voice and Accountability Mechanism in the Legislature- 60
2.6.1 PDC Principles- - - - - - - - 63
2.6.2 PDC Methodology- - - - - - - - 66
2.6.2.1 The Methodological Approach- - - - - - 67

2.6.2.2 The Participatory Development Communication (PDC) Model in Constituency- - - - - - - - 67

2.7 Participatory Communications Tools for Parliament-Constituents (V and A) Relations- - - - - - - - 83

2.8 Theoretical Framework- - - - - - - 88

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction - - - - - - - - 97

3.2 Research Design - - - - - - - 97

3.3 Population of the Study - - - - - - 98

3.4 Sampling Technique and Sample Size - - - - 99

3.5 Instrument of Data Collection - - - - - - 101

3.6 Questionnaire - - - - - - - - 101

3.7 In-depth Interviews - - - - - - - 102

3.8 Validity - - - - - - - - 102

3.9 Method of Data Collection - - - - - - 102

3.10 Method of Data Analysis - - - - - - 103

CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS OF DATA, PRESENTATIONAND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction - - - - - - - 104

4.2 Interpretation of Data - - - - - - - 104

4.3 Discussion of Findings - - - - - - 119

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction - - - - - - - - 124

5.2 Summary of the Study - - - - - - 124

5.2 Conclusion - - - - - - 126

5.3 Recommendations - - - - - - 126

References: - - - - - - - - 129

Appendix:- - - - - - - - - 147

List of Tables

Table 4.1: Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents- - - 106

Table 4.2: The Nature of Communication and Democracy, the Relationship between them in terms of their interdependence- - - 108

Table 4.3: The Models and Types of Participatory Communication Used for Representative Democracy - - - 111

Table 4.4: Communication Mechanism in Parliament and its usage in Enhancing Representation between Representative and their constituency- 114

Table 4.5: Improving constituents/Representative Relationship through more participatory communication Tools- - - - - 117

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of study

All human beings and indeed living things naturally like to be close to one another to understand each other, share feelings, experiences, concerns, expectations and find solutions to common problems. However, for them to be able to relate well, they need to understand each other's signs, symbols and code. To understand societal idiolects such as the codes, signs, symbols and other forms of communication, it is important that appropriate interpretation that conveys the same message is given or shared for understanding to be sought. Rosengren (2006) corroborates this by noting that "communication is a phenomenon basic to all human beings and to all things human".

The need for human society to interact with one another gave rise to communication. Through history, communication has been seen from different perspectives. Firstly, communication, as UNESCO (1980) noted, is a tool for human survival. It is a tool use to identify a set of people, race, nation; through their signs, codes and symbols and other idiolects people are associated with. For example, the use of Hieroglyphs has been used to understand the writings of Ancient Egypt. Hieroglyphs are basically a combination of logographic, that is, ideograph – ideas, concepts, and alphabetic symbols which give an idea of a communicative meaning. In the same manner, pictograph also conveys meaning through its pictorial resemblance to a physical object.

As one of the world powers in ancient civilisation, nations around Egypt started to learn what their symbols and signs stood for in other to be able to communicate, trade and

interact with Ancient Egypt (Wikipedia, 2013). However, at about 30, 000 B.C.E, communication began to take on an intentional and manufactured format when nations began to see the need to come together in order to exchange ideas and interact among themselves. This led to the documentation of events, sending letters and meeting in Peoples Assemblies; which was a natural consequence of improved understanding of each other's signs, codes and symbols as in pictograph, logograph and alphabets as exemplified in the Egyptian Hieroglyphs. Ancient Greece is another example that thrived on ancient communication systems. For example, even though Greek was one of the most developed languages at the time, communication systems such as the theatre, music, poesy, drama, painting, sculpture and even architecture were used as communication systems.

The advancement in the communication systems, especially the performing arts encouraged the frequency of communication between the peoples of Ancient Greece. It sets the machinery for cultures and territories within Ancient Greece to begin to understand themselves in the light of their arts, person and nation-state which led to the improvement of the indigenous communication system of Ancient Greece. This improvement consequently led to the general improvement in communication amongst the divergent cultures of the nation-states of Ancient Greece as they began to understand each other through common meanings attached to signs. Nevertheless, it must be stated that it took many years of interaction for ancient Egypt, Greece and Rome to develop shared communication systems within their territories. Some of the sign systems of an ancient civilisation are still dominant in the 21st century. Few of such examples can be seen in Mathematics (as in the plus sign [+]) international currencies as in the Dollar sign, Naira, Euro and Government institutions.

Within the same period when improvement in communication was bringing people together and Greek men were addressing the people in public squares, street corners and marketplaces, the first idea of democracy was being muted in Athens of Ancient Greece (Decaro, 2013). Hence, the evolutionary history of common meanings attached to signs for communicative purposes within and outside governance can be said to date back to thousands of years of the Egyptian hieroglyphs, Sumerian scripts, rhetoric or arts in ancient Greco-Roman periods which resulted in what we call communication today. In fact, it can be argued that rhetorically inspired democracy, as in Athenian government, has contributed immensely to the development or theorization of communication and vice versa. This interaction means that governance/democracy and communication are intertwined.

Democracy, be it representative or not, follows a two-way communication pattern. This supposes that communication within the bastion of democracy is two-way; that is, the sharing of information between the people and their elected representatives. This means that democracy should be participatory, deliberative, and people-oriented and as a result should follow defined communication pattern between the represented and the representative, who must be in constant communication with each other and have shared understanding in the thinking of governance for their constituency; in order to note and submit to the central government, what the concerns, feelings and expectations of the people are. But what implication does the principle of democracy, as in communication, have on the Nigeria-styled democracy?

Democracy and indeed representative democracy, in particular, were conceived and designed as a consultative mechanism for public decision-making on issues that affect the masses. However, in Nigeria, the communication pattern between the masses and their elected

representatives appear to be weighted so much so that there is disconnect between the aspirations of the people and what their government offers. Whilst this appears to be the problem of many constituencies, it is only the manifestation of the gap caused by the scarcity of information sharing between the elected representatives and the people.

The National or State Houses of Assemblies in Nigeria has no well-defined communication plan or strategies for relating to their constituencies. This over time has affected democratic governance in Nigeria as there is little or no communication or information sharing between the people and their representatives after elections. Especially, at the state level, the relationship between parliament-constituents is one-directional. Information flow from the centre – the government – to the people (this mostly comes with force) without a corresponding institutionalised feedback mechanism back to Government. Even though democracy entrusts power to the people and that the structure of Nigerian democracy is designed to be inclusive, it is in reality or practice exclusive.

The local government councils that are design to be the closest to the people is even devoid of inclusiveness. Ward representatives hardly share or exchange ideas or information with their wards or constituencies. This problem in itself is deeper than it appears. It trickles from the federal down to the state and local government levels and climaxes in the exclusion of the people in the processes of decision making. This brings about 'non-participation' in the sense that non-participation is in itself participation. However, this type of participation does not empower or make live meaningful. This type of participation brings the relationship between the parliament-constituents of Kaduna State's House of Assembly to light.

1.2 Statement of the Problem (Rationale)

Communication scholars and researchers have all submitted that communication is key to human survival and development and that no community can do without communication. At the heart of Legislative Representation and engagement is communication. It sought to hear from the people and be heard by the people. However, the concept of two-way or multiple communication models seems to have problems with the Nigeria parliament-constituents relations and interactions. What is obtainable in Nigeria seems to be the exclusion of the people from governmental participation within the context of parliamentary representation and feedback to constituents which has affected the voice of the people in governance.

This exclusion results in a dearth of communication or insufficient information from the members of parliament to the constituents. Few of the elected members of parliament with constituency offices do not have any developed channels of sharing information with the people of their constituency, let alone those without constituency office or any method of interaction at all. Furthermore, the practice of democracy in Nigeria does not encourage public participation in the process of policy formulation or development.

This has created some distance and apathy between the citizens and government. The manners and ways government is run in Kaduna State as well as in other states in Nigeria raise questions on whether members of parliament, in particular, have mechanisms for communicating with their constituents. Or are these mechanisms weak, insufficient and ineffective? Again, is it now possible and tenable that improved communication which historically brought people together to share ideas, concerns, expectation and to find a common solution to the public problem is still attractive or losing its potency in this regard? Or is communication no longer in the heart of democracy?In the light of these seething

questions, this study will examine the place of participatory communication in the parliamentary mandate of consultation and representation in the Kaduna State House of Assembly. This study examines the nature of the relationship between the parliament and constituents of the Kaduna State's House of Assembly. It studies the communication pattern between members of parliament and their constituents and attempts to show how the concerns and voice of the people are articulated side-by-side the accountability mechanisms between the people and their representatives.

1.3 Aim of the study:

The aim of the study is to determine the nature and link between communication and [representative] democracy with a view to suggesting ways with which communication can stir participation and development. And to facilitate participatory communication model that could improve parliament-constituents relations, voice and accountability in Kaduna State.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study are to:

1. Investigate the nature of participatory communication and its relationship with [representative] democracy.

2. To determine the types and usage of participatory democratic communication tools being used between the members of parliament and their constituencies in Kaduna State House of Assembly.

3. To analyze and evaluate the communication mechanisms in enhancing representation (between representatives and their constituency) in Kaduna State House of Assembly for any participatory attribute.

4. Identify ways in which participatory communication strategies/approaches and model could improve constituents and representative relation in Kaduna State.

1.5 Research Questions:

This study is guided by the following research questions.

1. What is the nature of participatory communication and what relationship does it have with democracy; are they separable?

2. What are the communication patterns or models used by the members of Kaduna State's parliament in sharing ideas between their office and their constituents?

3. Are there available communication mechanisms, systems and procedures in parliament and how has it been used by the representatives to enhance voice and accountability to the constituents?

4. What are the challenges in using the extant parliamentary communication mechanisms, systems and procedures between representatives and constituents in pursuit of the core parliamentary functions?

1.6 Significance of the Study:

This study has become imperative because of the need of inclusiveness in governance. With many governments in the world opening up more space for their citizens to participate on issues of governance, Nigeria cannot afford to leave its citizens behind as efforts are being made to position the country among elite nations in the world. Furthermore, as the Report of National Endowment for Democracy (NED 2014) shows, Nigeria is one of the exclusive democracies in the world.

This report agrees with that of the International Republican Institute (IRI 2013) which ranked Nigeria as a hybrid democracy, exclusive and reactionary. Since these reports, the Federal Government of Nigeria has tried to involve its citizens at the different level of governance; however, this involvement has not been able to produce many results because of the lineal communication model deployed. To this end, it is important to study the relationship between the Members of Kaduna State's Parliament and their constituents and the role that communication plays in democratic governance.

1.7 Scope and Delimitation of the Study

The paradigm of participatory communication was explored in this study. The different levels and modes of communication as well as participatory interactions in the act of legislation between constituents' members and representatives were explored and investigated. The study focused on the communicative interrelationship between Members of Parliament (MP) of the Kaduna State House of Assembly (KSHoA) and members of their constituencies.

It studied the communication model of three (3) senatorial zones having thirty-four (34) constituencies in Kaduna State. The study was a quantitative and qualitative research that made use of Members of State House of Assembly especially the 8th Assembly whose tenure of office is between June 3rd, 2015 and June 3rd, 2019. This study was limited to how these levels and models of communication were used in 2015 as well as the participation of the people in these constituencies.

Chapter Two

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1 The Democratic Nature of Communication

The point has been made already in this piece that communication is as old as man. However, it keeps improving and people continue to define it from various perspectives. Aristotle's notion of communication was a one-way model of speakers developing an argument and delivering it through speech to an audience which more or less sees communication as rhetorics and he did not see the interactive and the two-way nature of communication as at that time. This is because, at his time, rhetorics was the most known and popular form of communication that people can relate to, perhaps compared to the complex nature of the written communication of that era. That is hieroglyph and pictograph (Romarheim, 2005). The modern conception of Communication by scholars was derived from George Gerber's postulations that: "communication is social interaction through messages" (Mcqail 1994:10). This means that people need to come together to exchange ideas and have a common understanding of issues to be able to communicate effectively through messages delivered through various channels of signs, codes, symbols and languages in a verbal and non-verbal forms.

Resengren (2006), agrees with Garber that "communication is inter-subjective, purposive interaction by means of doubly articulated human languages based on symbols". These scholars agreed that communication is indeed interactive and went further to expand the conception of communication beyond the imaginations of Aristotle and Garber. He stresses the interactive nature of full human communications to be mutually influencing interactions,

mutually conscious because of its inter-subjective nature which allows everyone to be sure and conscious of what he/she is saying. That is to say, it is deliberately designed for a purpose and carried out by means of a sign, verbal symbols characterised by double articulation, and in turn building on fully developed systems of phonology, syntax, semiotic and pragmatics. However, scholars like Watzlawick, Bavelas, and Jackson disagrees with the issues of deliberateness , purposeful and intentional communication because certain communicative action are not intentional like sweating, fear and involuntary gestures that are expressed unintentionally. Hence, the phrase, "we cannot not communicate", meaning we communicate all the time both knowingly and unknowingly. (Watzlawick, P., Beavin-Bavelas, J., Jackson, D. 1967).

Furthermore, Rosengren (2006) noted that the word "communicate" is historically related to the word 'common'. According to Rosengren, it stems from the latin verb 'communicare' which means to 'share'; to 'make common'; which in turn is related to the latin word for common 'communise'. This means that when we communicate, we make things common; we thus increase our shared knowledge, our common sense, that is, of history, culture and development which are the basic pre-condition for all community. As McBride (1980) notes, "communication has become a vital need for collective entities and communities. Society as a whole cannot survive today if they are not properly informed…" Therefore, a society needs to communicate to have or share a common sense of history, culture and development to make any significant progress.

Again, O'Sullivan et al (1994) see communication from the standpoint of negotiation and interaction. Their view is that communication is the "negotiation and exchange of meaning in which messages, people-in-culture and reality interact so as to enable meaning to

be produced or understanding to occur". The definition again stresses and focuses on the relationship between constituent elements necessary for meaning to occur. And there has to be a text, sign, codes and people who 'read' the text within the meaning of their cultural and social experiences that defines both the people and the signs/codes they use. This, therefore, presupposes that meaning of communicated messages cannot be created outside the internal and external realities of the cultural environment, codes and text to which the audiences refers.

Romarheim (2005) corroborates this position by noting that communication is indeed a process by which people arrive at shared meanings through the interchange of messages. In a situation where people create and manage meanings and share their understanding of social reality, communication takes place. In addition, Arnold and Garcia (2011) opine that communication connects citizens, civil society, the media and government, forming a framework for national dialogue through which informed public opinion is shaped.

According to this definition, the key actors in communication are government, citizens, civil society, and the media, consisting of both the media professionals and the media environment where they operate. Communication, on a broader view, consists not only of processes and principles but also of structures or institutions that determine the way that communication takes place. Therefore, one can conclude that communication by its very nature is democratic because it has to be between two or more people, in this case government and people. Even in the case of intra-personal communication which is communication within oneself, it has to be between various parts of the body and how they interact to generate meaning or send a message.

So, communication is reaching out to a targeted audience and getting feedback. This is also true of democracy which is also overarching, mass oriented and participatory.

Communication and democracy are reverse side of the same coin. In fact, communication brings democracy to life through interactions as its umbilical cord and pivot. Romarheim (2005) is convinced that; "politics, as in democracy, without communication is like having blood without veins and arteries: it is not really going anywhere". McBride rather puts it directly. Acccording to him, "politics has an indissoluble relationship with communications". It was also observed that "rhetoric (that is, the art of persuasion), public speaking and democracy are inextricable. As long as there is rhetoric and public speaking to deliver that message, there will exist democracy; and as long as there is democracy, there will exist rhetoric and public speaking" Decaro (2013). Therefore, communication and democracy has the same nature that is interactive, inclusive, participatory and consultative and this includes Parliament-Constituents interaction.

2.2 Function of Communication

Communication fulfils certain role in a society. MacBride (1980) outlined some of these roles to include:

i. Information. The collection, storage, processing and dissemination of news, data, pictures, facts and messages, opinions and comments required in order to understand and react knowledgeably to personal, environmental, national and international conditions, as well as to be in a position to take appropriate decisions.

ii. Socialization. The provision of a common fund of knowledge which enables people to operate as effective members of the society in which they live and which fosters social cohesion and awareness thereby permitting active involvement in public life.

iii. Motivation. The promotion of the immediate and ultimate aims of each society, and the stimulation of personal choices, and aspirations; the fostering of individual or community activities, geared to the pursuit of agreed aims.

iv. Debate and discussion. The provision and exchange of facts needed to facilitate agreement or to clarify differing viewpoints on public issues; the supply of relevant evidence needed to foster greater popular interest and involvement in all local, national and international matters of common concern.

v. Education. The transmission of knowledge so as to foster intellectual development, the formation of character and the acquisition of skills and capacities at all stages of life.

vi. Cultural promotion. The dissemination of cultural and artistic products for the purpose of preserving the heritage of the past; the development of culture by widening the individual's horizons, awakening his imagination and stimulating his aesthetic needs and creativity.

vii. Entertainment. The diffusion, through signs, symbols, sounds and images, of drama, dance, art, literature, music, comedy, sports, games, etc. for personal and collective recreation and enjoyment.

viii. Integration. The provision to all persons, groups and nations of access to the variety of messages which they need in order to know and understand each other and to appreciate others living conditions, viewpoints and aspirations.

These functions of communication cut across any type or form of communication as the McBride Commission sees it. But in a nutshell and none technical terms, these functions can be summarised in a plain and simple language as Santucci (2005) observes:

i. Communication is used to obtain something; as when we order food at a restaurant or as a child desires something from his mother.

ii. To Control the behaviour of other people; as when officers give orders to their subordinates, or the director of an agency describes the tasks that the staff members are expected to accomplish in the following weeks;

iii. To inform somebody; as when a teacher delivers a lecture to students, or an extension agent explains a technical topic to a group of farmers;

iv. To satisfy a desire for knowledge; as when we ask a question about something, or student surf the internet to get information;

v. To express a feeling; as when a friend hugs another friend when they meet after a long time.

Basically, communication helps all to be functional human being and enables people to realise their potential by reaching out to other people and vice versa.

2.3. Participatory Development Communication

Although the focus of this research is Participatory Development Communication (PDC) in parliament-constituents relations, but one cannot proceed without stating that communication has been classified into various forms and categories: rhetoric and speech, drama, theater and performance studies, mass communication, political communication, health communication, gender communication, interpersonal communication, corporate communication, development communication and participatory development communication (Rebecca B. Rubin et al, 2010; Rosengren, 2006; Calhoun 2011; Kidd (2012).

Participatory Development Communication (PDC) actually dovetails from development communication, also called Communication for Development. According to

Quebra (2006), one of the originators of the term 'Development communication', it is the process of multilevel exchange of information within a society whose intent is to advance human development and which is channelled through selected media." Furthermore, development communication is the study of social change brought about by the application of communication research, theory, and technologies to bring about development. Development is a widely participatory process of social change in a society intended to bring about both social and material advancement including greater equality, freedom, and other valued qualities for the majority of people through their gaining greater control over their environment (Rogers 1976 in Services, 2003).

Again, the World Bank (2006) avers that development communication involves creating mechanisms to broaden public access to information on reforms; strengthening clients' ability to listen to their constituencies and negotiate with stakeholders; empowering grassroots organisations to achieve a more participatory process, and undertaking communication activities that are grounded in research. However, the effort to develop without the people's involvement is not sustainable. The need to engineer sustainable development gave rise to PDC. This form of communication started with the idea of using communication to promote development and now social change. Servaes (2003) states that:

Involving the people in community– so that they feel ownership of the Natural Resource Management (NRM) (or development) research or action project; so that it truly addresses their needs from their own perspective; and as such, so that they will commit to seeing the NRM (or development) initiative through until it is completed. Participation of the people enables us to devote our efforts and resources to concerns that they share and consider important. It builds on people's confidence and capabilities to undertake or again involve

themselves in future initiatives to address other NRM and development concerns. In short, the NRM (or development) initiatives become sustainable (parentheses supplied).

Bessette (2004) defines participatory development communication as "a planned activity, based on the one hand, participatory processes, and on the other, on media and interpersonal communication which facilitates a dialogue among different stakeholders around a common development problem or goal, with the objective of developing and implementing a set of activities to contribute to its solution, or its realization, and which supports and accompanies this initiative". Servaes (2003) elaborates that the point of departure in participatory communication takes place at the community level. According to Servaes, it is at the community level that the problems of living conditions are discussed, and interactions with other communities are elicited.

The most developed form of participation is self-management. This principle implies the right to participation in the planning and production of media content. Nonetheless, not everybody would be available to be part of all the processes for so many reasons and can be excused.Moreso, beyond the micro or community/local level, participatory communication in development also applies at the international, national, as well as project management (organisational) and individual level. Its foundation is in Freire (1970) basic model of dialogue, originally asserted in the context of educating the underdeveloped sectors of society, now considered an important development communication model (Freire 1970 in Servaes 2003). To Summarise, Section 14 (2c) CFRN, 1999, as amended, specifically secures the participation of the Nigerian people in their government according to the provisions of the constitution itself, whether it is participatory communication or other forms of participation.

2.3.1 Five characteristics of Freire's dialogue/Participatory Model

A closer study of Freire's model informs us on how best to proceed with participatory communication in development. Practitioners should ensure that five interrelated attributes or qualifiers of Freirian dialogue are in place if they are to employ participatory approaches in development.

a. Communication between equals. First, the model emphasizes equality between the change agent and the development partner. "Teacher" and "student", "extensionist" and "farmer", "expert" and "user", "communicator" and "audience", and "sender" and "receiver" interchange roles in a mutually beneficial two-way interaction. The redundancy in the preceding statement is intentional for purposes of emphasis. Our paradigm shifts from a view of our counterparts as development "beneficiaries" ("objects") to that of development "partners" and "colleagues" (fellow "subjects"). Freire thus differentiated his dialogue, which in the translation of his work was labelled "intercommunication", from a communiqué or top-down directive or memo where one party assumes a superior role and his/her counterpart is ascribed the subordinate role.

In the same vein, Servaes (2003) observes that participatory communication stresses reciprocal collaboration throughout all its levels. He uses MacBride et al's (1980) argument which promotes "more understanding of diversity and plurality, with full respect for the dignity and equality of peoples living in different conditions and acting in different ways".

b. Problem-posing. Freire likewise qualifies his model as a problem-posing dialogue, contrasted to a "banking-type" of education where teachers, trainers, extensionists, or development communicators merely "deposit knowledge", expecting the development "object" (in contrast to a self-determining "subject") to be able to "withdraw" these when the need arises. On the other hand, a problem- posing dialogue or participatory

communication draws from the learner's or people's stock knowledge, experiences, and insights, eliciting these by raising relevant thought-provoking questions rather than merely presenting prescriptive solutions to development problems. In this sense, Freire's educational philosophy does not depart much from that of ancient Greek philosopher Socrates, who emphasized dialectic reasoning through question and answer.

The model shifts the role of development communicators from just serving as transmitters, conveyors, translators, and disseminators of relevant information, to that of facilitators of a process of social change capitalizing on human learning at the individual level and in community. This shift in paradigm places lesser burden on the communication specialist to single-handedly choose and provide needed answers to fill information gaps associated with development needs and problems. On the other hand, this view of the communicator as facilitator adheres to the notion of development as a self-determined and self-initiated process best sustained when it is not artificially imposed from outside the community.

The communicator can best perform his/her role in development as facilitator, consensus-builder, mediator (Quebral, 2001), and conflict negotiator if guided closely by Freire's dialogic method. A communication theory patterned after the Freire model is Kincaid's (1979) convergence model which presupposes the goal of communication to be mutual understanding between sender and receiver of messages.

c. Praxis, a cycle of action and reflection. Translated into communication practice in development, a change agent refrains from lecturing and recommending development solutions without first drawing out from users their needs, own analysis of the

development problem and its possible solutions, and requests for technical information. Instead, s/he adopts the adult education approach of capitalizing on the people's experiences, an inductive approach to teaching that first analyses practice, then by reflection draws from such analysis theories and generalizations in the form of lessons learned.

In his most influential book Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Freire (1970) expounds on knowledge being the result of praxis or the cycle of action and reflection. Action is the practical application of knowledge while reflection corresponds to abstraction and theorizing. In practical terms, knowledge is incomplete without one or the other, but is richer when theory and practice are highly integrated. Tungpalan and Bulsara (1981 in Cadiz 1994) note that too much action and too little reflection is activism, while too much reflection and too little action, verbalism.

Development work thus involves engaging in action with partners; in the process, learning with them in alternating activities and evaluations or reviews of actions taken. Participatory development communication is thus best studied and theorized in action, perhaps from a critical perspective.

d. Conscientizing. Freire expounds on conscientization, a process of advancing critical consciousness. In a dialogue, development partners, as deliberate, construing, and goal-seeking participants, grow in understanding human, social and development processes. In this process, participants increase their willingness to take risks. They become a party to or stakeholders of social change, based on a conscious decision to engage in such change, uncomfortable as conditions brought about by change may be,

and based on a deeper understanding of their realities. In praxis, therefore, conscientization takes place.

A good measure of whether participatory development communication succeeds is dependent on whether the stakeholders are conscientize or empowered in the process or end of the development project. One of the major challenges for researchers and practitioners is the indicators, conscientization or being conscientize; which is often seen not in individual behaviours but in mechanisms and systems collectively put up by people in community. This aligns with Chu's (1987) recommendation for development communication research and evaluation to direct its attention less on individual behaviour and psychological variables to "institutional effects". This researcher conceives Chu's recommendation as "system level" effects. For example, did the community set up its own version of a communication center or library? Did the village officials institute a new policy or regulation providing a mechanism for people's participation in their deliberations?

Furthermore, conscientization is not only for development partners in community. As active participants in a dialogue between equals, it should also be evident in the change agent and development sponsors, managers, and facilitators coming from international, government, and non-government agencies and the academia. For example, has administrative procedures been revised to allow a certain degree of flexibility to accommodate the people's agendas?

e. Five Values. Finally, Freire explicitly states that the "true" dialogue happens in a context of five overriding values: love, humility, hope, faith in development partners' capability, and critical thinking –values that a classical and empirical social scientist would rather avoid for their "vagueness" and "subjectivity".

True to the qualitative researcher's ontological assumption of multiple realities, however, followers of Freire's dialogic approach to development openly claim this subjectivity and leaning in favour of resource-poor partners. These values can be translated into interpersonal communication protocols such as giving priority to active and non-judgmental listening over expressing oneself, much akin to Covey's (1989) Habit Number 5 of highly effective people, "seek first to understand, then to be understood". Hope is related to Covey's Habit Number 4, the win-win mindset or the abundance mentality.

2.4 The Communicative Nature of Democracy:

McBride (1980), Rosengren (2006) and Gastil (2008), Ken (2000) all agreed that communication is at the heart of all human endeavours including democracy. In fact, democracy is not possible without communication. McBride asserts that "politics has an indissoluble relationship with communications". Decaro (2013) links this position with rhetorics (persuasion) and public speaking noting that democracy is inextricable from communication. As long as there is rhetoric and public speaking to deliver that message, there exist democracy; and as long as there is democracy, there exist rhetoric and public speaking". Hacker et al (2000) also agreed with the above assertions that "way back, politics is (sic) a matter of verbal skills, management capacity and the art of negotiation. It is a collective routine of talkers and organisers". Furthermore, he asserted that "almost every political decision is taken in a meeting and face-to-face communications – only accepting media as a means of registration". He also agrees with Giddens (1984) that "politics and power … are made of communicative action aimed towards the acquisition and interchange of material and immaterial rules and resources (c.f. Giddens, 1984) these relationship are specified as relations of information and communication".

It is evidently and abundantly clear that scholars who have discussed this matter at one time or the other have all agreed that from the beginning, the art of communication and persuasion was vital to those in power. Communication, is so central to all social, economic and political activities at the community, national and international levels and that it creates a common pool of ideas, strengthen the feelings of togetherness. Hence democracy as a political method of public decision making (Schumpeter 1947:256 in Hoffman 2009), is also a process of mutually influencing one another like communication also does through interactions, the

exchange of ideas, sound reasoning and negotiations in a manner that people understand and accept as give and take "in a meeting and face-to-face communications" (McBride, 1980; Hacker 2000; Rosengren, 2006; Gastil, 2008; and Decaro, 2013).

Nonetheless, considering democracy more closely, it has been variously defined by many scholars and practitioners from many perspectives. It means so many things to so many people at different times throughout recorded history. Democracy to some people is just periodic elections. To others it is freedom of expression, association and religion. To some others, it is agitation, discontent, and anarchy amongst other things (Hoffman et al, 1988: 141). In the opinion of Crick (1982: 56 in Hoffman 2009), democracy is "the most promiscuous word in the world of public affairs".

Dunn (1979:11) also noted that every Tom, Dick and Harry claim to be democratic nowadays, including despots, one party states, religious bigots and ethnic chauvinists "because a democracy is what it is virtuous for a state to be". But, Hoffman et al (2009:103) states that what makes democracy so confusing is that its concept is almost universally acclaimed. The word "democracy" comes from the Greek word, Demos, which means – the body of citizens (Jacaranda Project, 2013). In the Seventeenth century, nobody who was anybody would have called themselves a democrat. As far as Landowners, Merchants, Lawyers and Clergymen were concerned – people of 'substance' – democracy was a term of abuse: a bad thing. James Madison, one of the founders of the American Constitution, has spoken of democracy as "incompatible with personal security or the right of property", obviously because the Liberals had refused to acknowledge the right of all adult male (at that time) to vote or participate in governance except property owners preferably male free born farmers.

Again, as Hoffman et al (2009:115) notes; John Cotton, a 17th century researcher in New England, spoke of democracy as the meanest and most illogical form of government since he asked a question: when the people govern, over whom do they rule? More so, King Charles (1600- 1649) upbraided English Liberals for labouring to bring in democracy, and told them that a subject and a sovereign "are clear different things" (Dunn, 1979:3). In the mist of all the struggles for democracy and universal adult suffrage and debate about what democracy really is, a former American President, Abraham Lincoln, grounded the concept clearly as "government of the people, by the people, for the people". That is to say government or governance should be about providing for the people, all citizens should be involved in deciding how they are governed, what should be done by whom and where and how much that would cost, just like in ancient Athens. As a people, they collectively decided their own destiny in a just and equitable manner.

The clarification of what democracy is by Abraham Lincoln did not automatically resolve the problem of general acceptance of democracy. For example, Rousseau, the 18th century French theorist, felt that democracy was unworkable. He said, it assumed a perfectionism that human nature belied, as was a form of government ever liable to 'civil war and internecine strife' (Rousseau, 1968:113). Just before the First World War, a government publication in the USA described democracy even in the 1920s as "a government of the masses [where] attitude towards property is communistic – negating property rights, results in demagoguism, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy" (Hoffman, 1988:141).

It was only after the First World War that democracy becomes a respectable term. Towards the end of the Second World War, the concept of democracy was redefined in other to bring it into line. As a result, the concept was theorized with practical realities of different

society in order to make it practicable. Joseph Schumpeter, an Austrian Economist and Socialist, led the way, contending that the notion of democracy is simply just a 'political method'. It is an arrangement for reaching political decisions: it is not an end in itself (Schumpeter, 1947:256). It is difficult to dispute this assertion; indeed democracy is a process and method of public decision making where all the people (direct democracy) or the representatives of the people (representative democracy) meeting to take position on public issues, which is made possible by interpersonal, group and organizational exchange of ideas and communication through multiple mediums.

In the light of the above and for the sake of clarity, it is important to look back at how the ancient city-state of Athens practiced democracy with a view to identify the form their democracy took and the embedded communications process, the similarity with what we practice now and its features. According to the account of Hoffman et al (2009: 108)

> It is true that during the fourth and fifth centuries BC, an astonishing model of popular rule came to exist in ancient Athens. A popular assembly met some 40 times a year. All citizens were actually paid to attend. All had the right to be heard in debate before decisions were taken, and this assembly had supreme powers of war, peace, making treaties, creating public works, etc. Judges, Administrators and Members of a 500-strong Executive Council were chosen, and since they only held office for one or two years, this meant that a considerable portion of Athenian citizens had experience of government.

It is clear from the report above, that about 2,500 – 3,000 years ago the Athenians practiced direct democracy in its cruddiest form where adult male citizens met to take decision on public issues and that it bear semblance with what we do today but with great improvements. For example, 'a popular assembly met 40 times a year'. Currently, we elect a popular National or State Assemblies that are paid full time and they meet 181 days per year

as seen in Section 63, CFRN, 1999. Although in their case there was no election, all male adult freeborn citizens attended the meetings directly and not represented (Direct Democracy).

Again, all those who had the rights to attend were allowed to communicate or air their opinions on issues to others and hear their responses or opinions too. The meeting was supreme and had the authority to discuss issues on war, peace, treaties and public works, like the Nigerian Assemblies or Congresses do today, where the sovereignty of the people resides (CFRN, Sec 14(2a)). It also granted powers to an Executive Council to implement its decisions and superintend over how things are done by the 500 strong Executive Council Member body. Today, that system is called parliamentary. Where the parliament elects/appoints a prime minister who then names his Executive Council from the parliament to carry out the decisions of the parliament and must retain the confidence of the parliament always, if not a vote of no confidence is taken and the Executive Council stands dissolved.

Sequel to the above, one can say the main features of the Athenian democracy were direct participation of all male adult freeborn citizens, numbered sitting days, deliberation and communication of ideas to one and other. Hanka et al, (2000) also agrees that "almost every political decision is taken in a meeting and face-to-face communications – only accepting media as a means of registration". This presupposes communication is central to every political process and activity. Again, the assembly was supreme in it decisions; including law and policy, gave approval to the Executive to implement its decisions and had oversight over them. However, they were not representatives because all the citizens that needed to participate in governance did so directly probably because the city was small and not complex like we have today.

As plausible as the Athenian democracy looks, some scholars believed that it was anchor on injustice but this researcher thinks that it was based on the reality of their time. Hoffman et al (2009) discussed this matter and imagined that "despite the fact that some scholars refer to Athenian democracy as 'pure' and 'genuine', it was rooted in slavery, patriarchy and chauvinism. Slaves, women and resident aliens had no political rights…"

Plato, in his Republica also challenged the very principle underpinning the Athenian democracy. According to him, it was a system of governance where fathers and sons 'change places', and 'there is no distinction between citizens and alien and foreigners', even 'the domestic animals are infected with anarchy'. Plato (428 – 347 BC) wondered what manner of democracy that had turn natural hierarchy by its head down. A thousand, three hundred and two years later, King Charles (1600- 1649) re-echoed the same concerns of Plato by noting that a subject and a sovereign "are clear different things" (Dunn, 1979:3).

The idea of this type of model of governance was too radical for the powers that be at that time to understand because it was a threat to them. It was the overthrown of Athenian dictator, Ceylon, by farmers and soldiers that gave birth to Athenian democracy. It was a popular revolt that turned the status quo into a democracy; where the people decided to govern themselves instead of relying on the sovereign rights of a monarch that most often abuse his/her powers, and that is why most monarchies did not like the idea of democracy.

For the Liberals they wondered how all manner of people could be said to participate in governance. John Jay, one of the authors of the famous Federal Papers declared that the 'people who own the country should governor it' (Hoffman1988:135). This is despite the fact that Liberals believe in equality of all men and freedom for individuals. Basically, in the 16th and 17th Centuries, Liberals stood for personal security and private property, liberty, equality

of all men and freedom for all, but could not come to terms with the concept of universal adult suffrage. However, conceded that male farmers with property should be allowed to vote, after the conservative criticisms of the Liberals, and that since they agreed to Universal Adult Suffrage in theory, by adopting equality of all men and individual freedom; it should also apply in practice.

It is worthy of note, that Liberalism as an ideology is very difficult to pin down. Besides, liberalism has various forms, streams of thoughts and persuasion within it ranks. However, key amongst it subsets are, Toleration liberalism, Contractarianism, Rights based liberalism and Utilitarianism. Whilst these concepts are not directly related to this study, it is important to state that the liberals were able to reconcile their differences with democracy after the French Revolution. They started soft pedaling on the vex issue of Universal Adult Suffrage and by 1928 women also achieved voting rights after the liberals successfully integrated democracy into liberalism, particularly prefixing democracy with the word 'liberal' to be known as liberal democracy (Hoffman 2009:107).

The successful marriage of liberalism to democracy signals the possibility of others to begin to imagine how they could corner democracy to their ideological subscriptions. This gave rise to the age of representative democracy which witnessed the birth of neologisms, such as 'aristocratic democracy' (which first happened in the Low Countries at the end of the 16th Century) and new references to 'republican democracy' (which began in the United States in the late 18th century). Later came 'social' and 'Christian democracy', and even 'bourgeois', 'workers'' and 'socialist democracy'. These new terms corresponded to the many kinds of struggles by groups for equal access to governmental power – struggles that resulted, sometimes by design and sometimes by simple accident or unintended consequence, in

institutions and ideals and ways of life that had no precedent. Not until the early decades of the 20th century did the right to vote for representatives came to be seen as a universal entitlement. That happened first for adult men and later – usually much later – for adult women 1928 to be precise. (John Keane, 2013).

2.4.1. Representative Democracy

The term representative democracy means the indirect participation of citizens in public decision making or in government through the representative. It is a variety of democracy founded on the principle of elected officials representing a group of people, as opposed to direct democracy that was practised in Athens. Angus and Christine (2010) defines a representative democracy (also known as a republic in the U.S) as "a state in which supreme power is held by the people and exercised by their elected representatives which have an elected or nominated president rather than a monarch that is guaranteed by a constitution" (Emphasis is mine).

The Roman Republic was the first government to practice a representative government. The Roman model of governance inspired many political thinkers over the centuries (Livy 2002) and today's modern representative democracies imitate more the Roman than the Greek models because it was a state in which supreme power was held by the people and their elected representatives, and which had an elected or nominated leader (Watson, 2005). Furthermore, European medieval tradition of selecting representatives from the various estates (classes, but not as we know them today) to advise/control monarchs led to relatively wide familiarity with representative systems inspired by Roman systems (Gallagher et al, 2011). Representative democracy came into particular general favour in post-industrial revolution nation states where large numbers of subjects or (latter) citizens evinced interest in politics,

but where technology and population figures remained unsuited for direct democracy. Besides, the geography of modern nation-state, where people live in far flung areas makes it impossible to meet in one place to take public decisions.

However, considering that public institution does not take citizen's concerns seriously necessitated the interest of citizens' active participation in governance. Hoffman et al (2009) has pondered on this and opined that "urban decay; ill-planned housing estates, the ravages of property developer, all these and related issues, compel people to become concerned with politics".These accounts for why citizens send representatives that best reflect their concerns, sentiments to the legislature or parliament and supervised them to ensure they truly reflects the wishes of the people because "citizens are too many, too busy to participate directly, therefore sends representatives. Considering all of these challenges that prevents citizens from being in the duma (parliament) directly, Adolf Gasser (1947) suggested some key criteria, amongst others, to consider when sending a representative, he said; "Society has to be built up from bottom to top. As a consequence, society is built up by people, who are free and have the power to defend themselves". This idea is in consonance with bottom up development model that participatory communication approach enables through the involvement of all the people concerned.

Scholars like Hoffman (2009) put it this way:

> Representation, it should be said, involves empathy – the capacity to put yourself in the position of another – and while it is impossible to actually be another person, it is necessary to imagine what it is like to be another. Hence, as noted above, accountability is 'the other side' of representation: one without the other descends into either impracticality or elitism. The notion of empathy points to the need for a link between representatives and constituents.

This is actually the crux of the matter. Given that for so many reasons already enumerated above, all citizens cannot participate directly in the legislature and therefore have to send agents to take decisions on their behalf. However, such representation is becoming a challenge because many representatives go to the parliament and take decisions without recourse to the principals – the people. When some of these decisions are taken, it hardly reflects the yearning of the principal. These makes citizens wonder: 'whose authority is the representative exercising?' To make things worse, representatives do not give an account of their actions to the constituents.

This informed why Rousseau stated that "representation is necessarily alienation" (social contract). To find solution to the problem of alienation, Hoffman et al (2009) suggested that "only through a combination of the direct and the indirect – hands-on participation and representation – can democratic autonomy be maximized. Of course, there are dangers that representatives will act in an elitist manner." So, in addition to sending representatives, constituents should organized themselves into civil groups to participate in governance indirectly like belonging to political associations, professional groups, trade unions, attend parliamentary public hearings and other avenue of airing their voices.

Macey (1993), pointed out that representatives seem not to continuously consults their constituents probably because of how they understand their role as regard their representation of/and relationship with constituents based on 3 main perspectives of how they should represent their constituents, namely:

a. A legitimizing functions (i.e. Federalist point of view).

b. An advocate for his/her constituents.

c. Guardians, promoting neither their own narrow interest nor those of their constituents (Edmund Burke's view) but the interest of the society as a whole.

But, of all the three different perspectives, the representative as "an advocate for his/her constituents" is the most popular and widely practiced. The reason for this is not far-fetched; a representative is just an agent and should do the bidding of the people so the people can take their own destiny in their hands. Again, Hoffman et al (2009) puts it succinctly, for them, "representation requires accountability (feedback), so that people can directly get decisions made which help them to govern their own lives".

2.4.2 Types of Representative Democracies

Representation in democracy takes two forms, namely Parliamentary and Presidential systems legislature. The term is mostly used in interchangeably. While the former is fusion of legislative and executive powers in one assembly, the latter is a total separation of powers. In some countries like France and francophone countries, the system is a mixture of presidential and parliamentary systems. In the final analysis, they all represent the citizens. It is just a matter of which model of representative democracy one chooses to practice, what proportion of the citizen a particular MP represents and when their elections are held. Also in both systems, the legislature can dismiss the executive council.

In the parliamentary system, the executive council (also called government) are constitutionally responsible to the parliament and must retain the confidence of the parliament but the government (that is, the executive council) can dismiss parliament when they call for early elections. Most times, in the parliamentary system, it is the executive council that sets the agenda for parliamentary discussions/debate most times.

Meanwhile in the presidential system and separation of power regimes, the president, who is the only elected head of the executive agencies, reports to the legislature through approval of money bills, executive and judicial appointments and oversight. Unlike in the parliamentary system, where the executive council sets agenda for the parliament, the president in a presidential system cannot set legislative agenda and does not have the power to dismiss the legislature rather it is the legislature that can impeached or dismiss the president for high crimes and misdemeanors and everybody working with him and for him also stands impeached. This mechanism holds both the president and the executive accountable to the legislature. In this way, the other arms are answerable to the legislature. This doctrine supports the notion of supremacy of the legislature, but this assertion is also limited to the control and supervision by the sovereign – the people.

It is however instructive to note here that both the legislature/parliament need to cooperate with the executive arm or the executive council respectively and vice versa because, for example, in the parliamentary system the executive council can undermine the parliament if it refuses to cooperate by calling for early election and dissolve the parliament and in the case of the presidential system, there is no absolute separation of powers but mutual relationship since the legislature needs the executive to at least fund the cost of its legislative initiative and the executive need the legislature because even the government has to act in accordance with the law and get the annual budget approved, at least in its favour, in the case of a budget making legislature.

The major difference in the two systems is the politics of getting elected to represent the people. In the parliamentary system, it is strictly party based because it is the number of seats a political party wins that enables it to form a government while in the presidential

system, the legislature is elected separate from the executive and two different political parties could control the two arms differently and party discipleship is not strict. Nonetheless, the two systems represent the people but have different approaches to achieving representation (Laver 2013).

2.4.3 Parliamentary/Legislative Institutional Structures, Systems, Processes and Procedures ofRepresentation

For representation to be effective and achieve the desired results, it has to be well organized in such a manner that the sovereign – the people, can get their wishes through and receive feedback; including from time to time intervening in the process. As Hoffman et al (2009) observes, "only through a combination of the direct and the indirect – hands-on participation and representation – can democratic autonomy be maximized". Representation, whether in the parliamentary or presidential system is the same thing, hence the interchangeable use of the terms; legislature and parliament. Although the approach adopted in delineating the constituency and the way and manner a particular representative is elected may differ in the two systems. However, in the Assembly Complex things are organized the same or similar manner in the two systems.

2.4.3.1 Constituency Delineation and Roll Call in the Assembly after Elections in furtherance ofRepresentation

Sections 71 (a) and (b) of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (CFRN 1999), as amended, directs Independent Electoral Commission (INEC) to divide the States into three senatorial districts and 360 Federal Constituencies of possibly equal population. This is based on the number of Federal Representative Seats of 360 and 3 Senatorial District per State, of almost equal population created by Section 49, CFRN (1999) as amended. In addition, the Constitution also expects that population will grow and there will be need to represent every interest, people and shade of opinion. Section 73 (1) & (2) empowers INEC to from time to time review the District and Constituency. According to it, each Constituency and District shall send one person each to represent them based on section 77(1). This position

supports the arguments of Gasser (1947) that Society has to be built up from bottom to top. As a consequence, society is built up by people, who are free and have the power to defend themselves".

Hoffman et al (2009) asserts that "representation involves empathy – the capacity to put oneself in the position of another – and while it is impossible to actually be another person, it is necessary to imagine what it is like to be another. Hence, accountability is the other side of representation; one without the other descends into impracticality or elitism. The notion of empathy points to the need for a link between representatives and constituents". Although scholars like Hoffman are pushing for a further delineation of constituency by Feminism, Disability amongst others, other than the current practice of geographical representation. But that may be some distant time in the future. For now, it is our role to ensure that the current practice of representation facilitate every shade of voice and concerns of constituents.

The idea of Roll Call in the first meeting or session of the Legislature, according to Order 2, Rule 2(2b), Senate Standing Orders, 2011, as amended, and Order 2, Rule 2(2b) Standing Orders of the House of Representatives, is to ensure (amongst other things) that representatives actually turn-up from the Senatorial Districts and Federal Constituencies to take their Seats and represent their people as expected by the constitution, instead of heading another direction or feeling cool at home. Again, once Representatives arrives the National Assembly or State Assemblies getting some or majority of them to go back to their constituency becomes a challenge. Therefore, there is the need to strengthen the existing mechanisms for communication in the parliament and also build new ones.

2.4.3.2 Parliamentary/Legislative Structures and Systems (arrangement) at the National Level:

i. The Parliamentary/Legislative Structures:

Structure in the legislature includes physical forms (buildings) and the way different parts and departments are linked or function; the way in which the different parts of something link or work together, or the fact of being linked together. It encompasses the arrangements made to facilitate the work of its members, political and administrative frame-work. For Example, Chambers for Plenary discussions and Committees for detail parliamentary work and Offices for administration of parliamentary affairs (Ojogwu and Wakawa 2011) and Encarta® (2009). It is designed to facilitate the work of Representatives and Legislative/Administrative Bureaucrats.

The Legislative Institution is organized in such a way that alongside the political functionaries are legislative officers who provide the services required by these political functionaries. For example, the National Assembly comprises two Houses/chambers – the Senate and the House of Representatives, each headed by a Presiding Officer and hisher Deputy who are the political heads. Responsible to the two Houses is the Clerk of the National Assembly who is also the Accounting Officer of the National Assembly. He is assisted by a Deputy Clerk to the National Assembly, who also acts for the Clerk to the National Assembly when the latter is absent. And this is mostly guided by the Constitution and the House or Senate Standing Rules.

This basic arrangement is derived from the Sections 47 to 51 of the 1999 Constitution as amended. Built upon this constitutional arrangement are provisions made in the Standing Rules/Orders of each of the Houses for other political functionaries: House Leader, Party Leaders, Whips and Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen of Committees, each with his/her

functions clearly stated. Servicing each of these Houses are the Chamber Deputies of the Clerk of the National Assembly – the Clerks of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The two Officers are responsible to the Clerk of the National Assembly and the Presiding Officers and manage the administrative affairs of their respective Houses as well as execute their legislative decisions on behalf of the Clerk to the National Assembly. Each House is a Legislative Department headed by the Clerk of that House (Senate and Reps), composed of officers who carry out the legislative work of their respective Houses and implement their political decisions under the directive of their respective Clerks.

The Clerks of the Senate and the House of Representatives perform legislative and administrative functions as heads of the Departments of their respective Houses and report back to the Clerk to the National Assembly as occasion warrants. Under them are other Legislative Staff from the Deputy Clerks down the line. They service the Chambers, the various Committees and perform other services for Members both collectively and individually.

ii. Philosophy of the Two Legislative Chambers/Houses Structure

The venue of meetings in representative democracy is called a Chamber/House no matter the nickname it may bear in different countries. This is where plenary debates or discussions take place. It is mostly divided into upper and lower chambers. There are reasons for the division of this arm of government as explained by the designers of this organ of government in USA.

However, we begin with what the law says about this in Nigeria. Section 14 (2a) of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (CFRN 1999) as amended, declares that "sovereignty belongs to the people of Nigeria from whom government through this

constitution derives all its powers and authority" presupposes that the representatives or agents of the people are the first and strongest organ of society and government working for the people (Michael and Lori 2009). Hence, it is only natural for power to flow from the people to their representatives and then to other arms or organs of government to carry out the wishes and desires of the sovereign.

In recognition of this, therefore, section 4 (1 – 9) vested all legislative powers in the Federal Republic of Nigeria on the National Assembly which shall consist of the Senate and House of Representatives and that of the States of the Federation. Following this is the Executive Arm in Section 5 and then the Judiciary in section 6 (CFRN 1999), as amended. This is also in agreement with what was practice in Athenian democracy where the assembly appoints 500 members executive council to implements it decisions and others to adjudicate cases (Hoffman et al. 2009: 108). So, it is only natural that where the people are the sovereign, the legislature is the first arm of government because they represent the people – the sovereign. James Madison, one of the framers of the USA Constitution and designers of the Presidential system, "did not believe in the total equality of the three branches of Government, but in Legislative Supremacy. In republican government the legislative authority, necessarily, predominates" (Federalist No. 51).

Although, the framers of the Nigerian Constitution did not tell us why they choose a bi-cameral legislature at the federal level and were silent on that of the State House of Assembly, except, perhaps, that we copied it from the USA. However, the framers of the US Constitution gave us some insight as to why they divided the strongest arm of government into two houses as contained in the Federalist Papers reported by McKey (2012) which reads:

> The Concept of separation of powers calls for a division of forces in terms of function where government entities do not speak for different segments of society, but rather for efficiency's sake address different tasks of the whole society. As Madison suggests in Federalist nos. 62 and 63, a Senate is needed to give government sufficient credit with foreign powers, not that the Senate will represent a different class in America, one commanding respect abroad, but rather a body sitting for a longer period (6 years), one renewed by staggered elections, giving the continuity necessary for commitment to treaties and an international order. The whole House of Representatives can be voted out of office every two years, thus ensuring accountability to the electorate, not only for the House but for the whole government (since the House originates control of the purse strings of the whole government). The Senate, by contrast, supplies a different function, a steadiness of aspect, a predictability in the eyes of foreign powers – qualities proper to the Senate in making treaties and confirming Ambassadors.

For Madison, separation also meant a mutual check between the two Houses, wherein the Senate does not speak for an aristocracy over (and) against the people but for the 'national character' or reputation that Senators are pledged to uphold (Federalist no. 63), while Representatives will, with the people on their side at all times, be able to bring back the constitution to its primitive form and principles (Federalist no. 62). A Senate as a 'second branch of the legislative assembly distinct from and dividing the powers with the first' must be in all cases a salutary check on the Government.

Madison gives a third reason for the separation of powers beyond efficiency and the balancing of constitutional values against each other, namely legitimacy. In Federalist no. 10 he says that the concentration of all powers in one place is the very definition of tyranny.Therefore, the framers of the US Constitution were very clear on what they wanted the legislature to be like; that is, the avoidance of majoritarian tyranny if legislative power is just in one legislative house, as it is seen in Nigeria's State Houses of Assembly. There is a need to be on guard to forestall a situation of tyranny in the State Houses of Assembly, even now there are so many

negative developments in the State Assemblies because there is no other arm of the Assembly to cross check what the Assembly agrees to or rejects.

The senate is to act as a check on the Representatives and vice versa. They also intended that the Senate should be a mature branch of the legislature that gives stability to government and foreign relations and the age requirement to be in the Senate speaks volume of that and the House of Representatives to always remain vibrant and bring back the full import of the spirit and letter of the Constitution as the express wishes of the people in addition to their regular constituency consultations. It is also to ensure efficient in the management of public affairs through task specialisation and a second opinion on matters of life and death always discussed in the Senate through public policy.

However, in the case of Nigeria, for example, the House of Representatives does not 'resonates control of the purse strings of the whole government' because the Constitution directs that the Appropriation bill be laid before the two chambers of the National Assembly. This gives room to the pro-government stability senate to always scuttle efforts to hold the executive arm accountable through the budget, but there are always differences that a joint conference committee would always look at, to resolve the differences and harmonize. Nonetheless, the House of Representatives can override the Senate because of their number, when they feel strongly about an issue. Again, only the senate has the powers to approve nominations from the executive arm but on issues of deployment of Nigerian Armed forces for both local and foreign operations and the domestication of treaties, it is a responsibility that is shared by the House of Representatives and the Senate.

More specifically, Michael et, al. (2009) throws more light on the matter thus:

> In a republican form of government, the legislature would be the strongest branch and thus the branch that would tend to absorb all power. It is inherently stronger than the other branches, in part because it enjoys the greater sympathy of the people since its members are drawn from local communities. However, the legislature also has the power of the purse and the power to pass laws that might be used to encroach on the powers and functions of the other branches. The primary examples of legislative power experienced by the framers at the Constitutional Convention were largely negative. Most state governments were marked by legislative supremacy in which the legislative branch dominated politics and tended to become abusive.

James Madison puts it most succinctly in Federalist 48: "The legislative department is everywhere extending the sphere of its activity and drawing all power into its impetuous vortex." As the strongest branch, then, the framers placed the strongest checks on Congress, and one of those checks is to divide the legislature internally into two chambers.

Federalist 51 constitutes the central argument explaining the checks and balances system, and there Madison argues that this internal division of Congress into two chambers will "render them, by different modes of election and different principles of action, as little connected with each other as the nature of their common functions and their common dependence on the society will admit."

So, although Congress as a whole is founded on popular support, its two chambers are structured differently, in part to separate them and to make collaboration difficult. Lawmaking requires the agreement of two different legislative chambers, each of which can check the other.

If a conspiracy against the people ever began to work its way into the lawmaking branch of government, it would have to infect two very different institutions, with different incentives and different political perspectives.

Thus, Congress's bicameral structure increases the protection of the nation against the strongest branch. Therefore, the objectives of the framers of the US constitution and designers of the presidential system are being met. However, one wonders why the State Houses of Assembly in Nigeria are not a bi-cameral (two Houses) but a uni-cameral legislature? The CFRN 1999 as amended was silent on it but said in section 92(1) there shall be a Speaker, and a Deputy Speaker of the State House of Assembly, which can be interpreted as one Speaker for one Legislative House of Assembly. But nothing in this section say that the House of Assembly cannot be divided into two separate chambers with a senate or chambers of deputies through an act of the Assembly in furtherance of the provisions of section 92(1), perhaps, except that it is a constitutional provision that may need to be amended, some would argue. But where there is a lacuna in the law, international parliamentary practice and procedures could fill the gap as usual.

Again, is it that the House of Assembly is not capable of tyranny or there is no need for a second opinion, or, that it cannot be hijacked by another interest other than the interest of the people? These are questions that should be examined and addressed. The concept of separation of powers even in the first arm of government, the legislature, is well thought out and it is working in the Nigerian National Assembly. The state assemblies need to be brought to the same status for our democracy to develop well.

iii. The Committee(s) - of the house, standing, special, ad-hoc

In addition to this basic political arrangement and apart from performing their law-making roles in the Chamber, Members are also assigned to Committees and Sub-Committees. This arrangement greatly eases the making of laws through division of labour. Thus by the contributions in Committees, Members play a more significant role in the formulation and

consideration of public policy than they do in open debate on the floor of the House. The Standing Rules of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Federal Republic of Nigeria broadly categorized Committees into Special and Standing Committees (See Senate and House Standing Orders XVII).

iv. Constituency Office(s):

The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria did not make express provisions for Constituency Offices but it is implied in Section 71 in CFRN 1999. Since members of the National and Houses of Assembly are drawn from constituencies and that is the practice globally. Again, in situations where there are no constitutional, statutory or house rules procedures on constituency offices, international parliamentary law fills in the gap and since that is the practice in world parliamentary practices/conventions, it is deemed to be in existence. Besides, RMFC in Section (84(1) are mandated to fix the allowance for public office holders and also provide constituency allowance for project, therefore it can be argued that constituency 'offices' are established by administrative means and hence, the budgetary provisions as made by the Nigerian Revenue Allocation and Fiscal Commissions, has the constitutional mandate to fix salaries, wages and allowances of public officers in Nigeria. The Commissions directs that 250% of annual basic Salary of the Senate president should go for constituency office; Senators 200%, Speaker House of Reps 250%; Members 100%, Speaker of the SHoA 100% while SHoA Members gets 50% (RMFC report 2007).

But a study by the Policy Analysis and Research Project of the National Assembly reveals that most of representatives do not have a functional constituency offices, staff and functional email and telephone numbers (Benjamin 2010). Even in places like Belgium, Spain and Poland where constituency offices and relations are not compulsory or constitutionally

required, the political parties are now insisting that representatives must have a local connection to constituents before they are featured as flag bearers of their political parties. Also in Britain, France as well as other countries where it is not a requirement of the law and are not paid, members ensure that they go to their constituency every week to consult with their people (Micheal, 2011).

In Nigeria, anecdotal reports indicates that representatives avoid their constituents for so many reasons, namely; personal request like school fees, money for marriage and burial ceremonies, festivity money to slaughter Cow, Goat etc., instead of community request. Nonetheless, to encourage frequent between constitutents and Representatives, the Revenue Mobilization, Allocation and Fiscal Commission (RMFC) in pursuant to sections 70 and 84(1) fixed constituency allowances for Members of the Assemblies to enable them set up their Constituency Offices, staff it and meet with constituents more frequently in a conducive atmosphere for the purposes of improving the voice and accountability of the Members and constituents respectively. Therefore, refusal to open an office or open a sub-standard and dehumanizing office is criminal because funds for standard constituency office was allocated to representatives for constituency office and not open one, staff and equip them appropriately, amounts to receiving money under false pretense which offends sections 1 of the Advance Fee Fraud and other Fraud Related Offences Act, 2006, Section 16(1) of the EFCC Act, 2004 and Sections 17 and 18 of the Money Laundry (Prohibition) Act, 2011. Again, the type of office reported to have be opened by some members are unacceptable considering the amount of money they are given.“These categories do not really qualify to be called constituency office as they lacked most of the facilities expected to be in such office for effective productivity. Some of them were so filty to the extent that the staff could not receive the Researcher and his

Field Assistant during the field survey; but in their neighboring party offices that were located within the same vicinity. Similarly, such offices had just 1-3 maximum staff. The location of some of the offices was something else that beat's ones imagination considering the fact that huge resources are usually allocated annually to the lawmakers for this purpose. (Benjamin 2010:17) It is expected that Members should have a constituency office that is well staffed, equipped and with functional communications systems like phone numbers, email or surface mail addresses and interactive website addresses that would enable their constituents reach them any time, hence the constituency allowance granted to Members of the National Assembly.

v. Leadership/Members and Clerk Offices:

Section 50 (1) a – b of the CFRN 1999, as amended, created the office of the Senate President, Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Office of the Clerk to the National Assembly and such other staff as may be prescribed by an act of the National Assembly (Section 51,1999 CFRN). Therefore, in furtherance of the realization of the objectives of recruiting "such other staff" would require, the National Assembly has established a number of departments which provides specialized services.

Ojogwu and Wakawa (2011) describes such departments as the Common Services Departments which include: Administrative/Personnel, Finance and Supplies, Legislative Budget and Planning, Information and Publications, Library, Research and Computer Services, Legal Services, Estate and Works. These departments complement the two Legislative Branches – Senate and House of Representatives. In addition to these; are five principal divisions under the direct supervision and control of the Clerk to the National Assembly, namely; the Common Services, the national Secretariat of Nigerian Legislatures,

the Medical Services, the Internal Audit and the Sergeant-At-Arms, including legislative aides of all descriptions who supports the permanent staff and engaged as personal staff to Members in non-permanent capacity – although paid by the National Assembly Service Commission.

So, Members are given the privilege of appointing a fixed number of Legislatives Aides to assist them in diverse ways – particularly in carrying out research work and assisting in discharging Members' constituency responsibilities. Legislative Aides are not substitutes for any permanent staff. Being only personal aides to Members, they are therefore not expected to be involved in the performance of the official duties of the permanent staff.

vi. Special Aides on Consultancy Basis

In addition to legislative aides, provisions are also made to enable committees hire consultancy services on an ad-hoc basis. These consultants perform specific services for which they are paid. Recommendation for hiring consultants by Committees should be made through the Clerk to the National Assembly to the Presiding Officers of each House in the first instance.

2.4.3.3 Parliamentary/Legislative Structures and Systems (arrangement) at the Sub-National (Kaduna State) level

The legislature at the State or Sub-national level is almost the same with the National Assembly but with some difference in departments servicing them. The parliamentary practices and procedures are the same since the National Assembly is mostly used as a benchmark for the state legislature. Nevertheless, we would be more detail with the legislature at the State level since our study uses the Kaduna State House of Assembly as a case study.

2.4.3.4 Parliamentary/Legislative Processes and Procedures

Parliamentary law, practice and procedure are a set of rule(s) of action for all deliberative bodies governing the introduction, modification, discussion and decision of propositions. It consists of the recognized rules, precedents and usages of legislative and deliberative bodies by which their procedures are regulated. According to Manson (2010) a good parliamentary procedure ensures justice to everyone, prescribes order, reflects kindness and generosity, provides constructive use of limited time and gives one a sense of self-confidence (Parvizi, 2013). Section 60 of the CFRN 1999, as amended gave the assembly the powers to make its own rules and it is in pursuant to that section that the National and State Assemblies make their rules and even adopts some rules and practices from other jurisdiction. However, a domestic law from which the parliament or legislature draws it life from takes pre-eminence in addition to the House Standing Orders which the constitution gave recognition. In the event of any lacuna, the parliament would have to turn to global international parliamentary practice, procedures and convention. In the case of Nigeria, for example, Sections 49 and 71 of the CFRN 1999, as amended directed that Senatorial District and Federal Constituencies be created but did not explicitly provide for Members compulsory relations with Constituents, where the constituency is created from.

This, some scholars have claimed, is implied since there cannot be constituency without constituents. In this type of situation or gap, it is for the parliament to search for best international practice and convention on this matter; which automatically forms international parliamentary customary law (convention) on parliament to determine the course of action. It is also important to note also that, parliamentary practice in one parliament alone cannot be

considered as best practice until is given global acceptance in the community of practice before it can become international parliamentary law/convention (Mason 2010).

2.4.3.6 Members of Parliament/Representatives: Mandate, Functions, Voice and Accountability

Sections 4(2) and Section 7 of CFRN 1999 mandated the National and State Assemblies respectively to "make law for the peace, order and good government of the federation or any part thereof" and the same for the State and any part thereof. This is the mission statement of the Assemblies. The framers of the constitution therefore put squarely the responsibility to ensure peace, order and good governance/government on the lap of the Assemblies. And these can be implemented through law making and oversight which are the mechanisms provided for the legislature to give life to its mandates. In fact the Constitution stipulates what the deliverables of the National and State Assemblies respectively are as directed in section 88 (2)(a)-(b) and section 128 (2)(a)-(b) to "… correct any defects in existing laws…; And expose corruption, inefficiency or waste in the execution or administration of laws within its legislative competency and in the disbursement or administration of funds appropriated by it". In other jurisdictions, it is possible that their constitution may dictate additional issues or dimensions but for Nigeria, the mandate of the Parliament is as stated above.

2.4.3.7 Functions of (Members)/Parliament

i. Lawmaking

Representing the public means more than articulating citizen preferences; it also involves having a say in translating preferences into policy through enacting legislation. The representative and lawmaking functions co-exist in an uneasy but necessary relationship.

Lawmaking requires reconciling of differences once articulated, as well as pressing the legislature's claim to power against the executive and other power-holders, such as political parties. This requires legislative processes capable of reconciling conflicts and bringing to bear enough expertise to be taken seriously by the executive branch and other actors in the system. In most legislative bodies, the workhorses of this portion of the process are committees.

The more effective committee systems simultaneously provide arenas for expressing differences and environments, which foster compromise and decision. Where committee deliberations are important in shaping the behaviour of the whole legislature, committee members have power incentives to specialize and to become both advocates of popular positions and develop negotiating skills to shape outcomes. And when a committee system is comprised of specialized bodies, capable of effectively considering legislation in their own areas, the whole legislature develops the capacity to deal with the executive branch across a wide range of topics in sufficient depth to be serious governing partners.

i. Oversight

Oversight occurs after a law is passed and involves monitoring executive activities for efficiency, probity, and fidelity. While most legislatures have some formal oversight powers, effective oversight is difficult to exercise because it requires information about executive branch activities, the legislative capacity to process that information, legislative will to act, and the power to back up demands for improvement/access/responsiveness. Oversight, even more than lawmaking, puts the legislature into an adversarial relationship with at least some portion of the executive branch. Thus, in parliamentary systems with a dominant majority (like the United Kingdom and Canada), oversight tends to be less developed than in presidential

systems, especially when competing parties can each control a branch of the government (as in the United States).

Among the most useful oversight powers and capacities found in effective legislatures are: a capacity to remove executives (through votes of no confidence, impeachment, etc.), the power to get information from the executive (compel testimony, require reports, etc.), the effective use of the power of the purse, and a functioning committee system capable of knowledgeably monitoring and assessing executive branch behaviour. All are useful in themselves, and as ways of indirectly compelling the executive branch to heed legislative concerns. Successful oversight, in turn, can feed back into better law-making as experience gained in implementing past laws can be incorporated into future laws, and in better representation when legislators become more adept at shaping the administration of laws to consider impacts on constituents.

ii. Representation

Where they function, legislatures are useful "nerve endings of the polit" in the sense that they are often the branch of government to which popular complaints/dissatisfactions/demands for action are first articulated. This is so because legislatures typically operate with greater transparency, or at least with less secrecy, in comparison with either the judicial or executive agencies. They are diverse in their memberships (usually designed to represent a broader range of interests/characteristics/places) from which a first hearing and early support may be gained. Constituents have greater access; they are often more likely to feel that they have a claim on a representative than on other government officials. And legislative proceedings are often organized to maximize public

attention to particular controversies and to offer participation opportunities ranging from contacting individual representatives to organized hearings.

Not surprisingly, a common legislative role is as an arena for the articulation of societal differences over policy. The richer the information environment surrounding legislature in terms of the vitality of the civil society and the vibrancy of member relationships with constituents, the greater the flow of these sentiments into the consciousness of those who run the government. Aside these globally traditional functions of the parliament, new additional functions/roles of the parliament is emerging, namely, accountability, communications, linkage, legitimation, diplomacy which may be expressly stated or implied in the status of a country or new practices in parliamentary circles around the world.

iii. Accountability

According to Hoffman et al (2009), "the other side of representation is accountability". This statement is key because representation is one of the three major functions of the legislature and, or, a Member of Parliament. But most often, representatives forget that as someone who is asked to represent people, one has the responsibility to account or give feedback on how well the assignment of representation is going by accounting for all of the actions and in action taken on behalf of the people one is representing. Historically, the concept of accountability was closely linked to accounting in the financial sense. It has however moved far beyond its origins and has become a symbol of good governance both in the public and private sectors. Accountability refers to institutionalised practices of giving account on how assigned responsibilities are carried out.

From a human rights perspective, accountability is best understood as the character of the relationship between two sets of actors: rights holders and duty bearers. An accountable relationship is one in which duty bearers (leaders, government departments, administrators and service providers) are obliged to account for and take responsibility for their actions. While rights holders (citizens or clients) are able to hold these duty bearers to account. In the ordinary sense of the word, accountability can be broadly defined as - a social relationship where an actor (an individual or an agency) feels an obligation to explain and justify his or her conduct to some significant other (the accountability forum, accounts, specific person or agency).

Against this backdrop, therefore, accountability requires both answerability and enforceability. To be accountable, representatives/politicians, civil servants and service providers must be answerable for their actions; they must explain or justify what they do and

why they did what they do. It must also be possible to sanction or reward decision makers for their performance (enforcement). Accountability is the hallmark of modern democratic governance. Democracy remains clichéd if those in power cannot be held responsible in public for their acts or omissions, for their decisions, their expenditure or policies.

a. Types/Categories of Accountability:

Accountability can be horizontal, vertical or a hybrid of the two. Horizontal accountability is embodied in the checks and balances internal to a state. It is carried out by state institutions and agencies, which are designed to oversee and sanction other state institutions. These institutions might include the judiciary, parliament, anticorruption and human rights commissions, and ombudsmen. "Horizontal accountability is exercised through the checks and balances in governmental systems designed to ensure that due process is followed in governmental decision making" (O'Donnell, 2010). O'Donnell suggests that horizontal accountability, for example, can be improved through various organisations like the Human Rights Organisations, Independent Election Commissions, and watch dog agencies, but these agencies would often lack bite unless followed by the media or activists (ibid: 152).

Vertical accountability is embodied in mechanisms used by citizens and other non-state actors to hold their representatives to account. Elections are the most obvious form of vertical accountability. Other forms include direct civic engagement, lobbying and mass mobilization. Vertical accountability, can also refers to the relationship between the citizen and the State, while horizontal accountability is broadly internal to the State structure itself (Jayal, 2008). Vertical accountability can be exercised through elections and other mechanisms by which citizens control governments.

Social or hybrid accountability relies on civic engagement to build accountability. Social accountability mechanisms enable citizens, civil society organizations and communities to hold government officials and service providers accountable. Examples of social accountability mechanisms include participatory planning and budgeting, public expenditure tracking, citizen monitoring of service delivery, lobbying and advocacy campaigns. The hybrid form of accountability which cuts across the traditional distinction between horizontal (government to government) and vertical (citizen to government) requires institutional support in the form of a legal mandate for the non-government actors to act as agents of public sector oversight, easier access to information, right of observers to issue dissenting reports and the existence of clear procedures for conduct between citizen and public sector actors. It aims to achieve vertical accountability and energizes intra-State horizontal accountability mechanisms leading to greater accountability in the political systems.

Furthermore, social accountability in recent times has emerged as a mechanism, which has characteristics like bottom up, sometimes institutionalized or sometimes open spaces and "ex ante" or "simultaneous" accountability. In simple terms, social accountability is mainly demand driven, spontaneous and operates from the bottom up and it can be defined as 'action taken by citizens or civil society to hold government to account for its decision and actions'. These forms of social accountability can be broadly divided into two, 'supply driven' and 'demand driven' initiatives which cuts across both vertical and horizontal processes of accountability thus:

a) Supply driven accountability initiatives where the state or government initiate accountability mechanisms which create interface and engage citizens and/or civil society.

b) Demand driven accountability initiatives where Citizens and/or civil society leads accountability mechanisms which create interface and engage government/State institutions.

Supply driven social accountability mechanisms comprise of actions or processes of accountability initiated by the state or government. Social accountability processes carried out by local government institutions or local level vigilance and monitoring committees as stipulated by the government in the guidelines/policies of various social sector programmes would fall in this category. Such mechanisms are operationalized mainly in accordance with the policies or laws laid down by the State.

Hence, this method of social accountability is expected to be more regular, frequent and institutionalized. Some example from around the world shows that some mechanisms like Citizen's Charter, Popular Participation Law (Bolivia), Participatory Budgeting (Brazil) Citizen Participation Law (Mexico), Social Audit in Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme (India), Community Monitoring in National Rural Health Mission (India) and the Right to or Freedom of Information Laws among others have been initiated by the state to provide space to citizens for monitoring the development programmes and governance processes. The State here assumes the leading role in activating the accountability mechanisms and engages with citizens in various ways. The state, thus, sets in motion accountability mechanisms, which makes it directly accountable to citizens.

Demand Driven social accountability mechanisms comprise of actions or processes initiated by citizens in specific locations for ensuring the State's accountability. Such actions are spontaneous and arise on demands by the citizens, hence often they are infrequent or they may elapse if the demand for accountability is addressed by State institutions. Nevertheless, citizens endeavour to institutionalize these instruments in order to make these permanent in

local government. The leading role for activating this mechanism lies primarily in the hands of citizens or CSOs and civic actions take place in 'open' spaces. For example, citizens and civil society have been using participatory performance monitoring, gender responsive budget, analysis of budget for local bodies, community monitoring, citizens' report card on health, water and sanitation, social audit, expenditure tracking, for a long time to ensure States are accountable. The tools used for engagement in both types of social accountability mechanisms are largely similar; that is, meetings, dialogues, public hearings, survey reports and other oral evidence gathering methods to ascertain the outputs of the social sector programmes. These mechanisms are different from the government's traditional accountability agencies as they crosscheck outputs and outcomes through physical verification and oral evidence from the citizens, instead of relying only on secondary documents.

Social accountability initiated by citizens has proven to be direct instruments of accountability in the hands of citizens. These mechanisms if used with appropriate communication techniques (engagement with print and electronic media) along with advocacy can trigger actions by courts and oversight agencies such as ombudsman, public accounting, auditing bodies, and legislative oversight to correct the malfunctioning of government institutions. Accountability, in other words, can be upward, downward or outward. Administrators or service providers who are upwardly accountable are answerable to higher-level authorities (local administrators who are answerable to line ministries).

Downward accountability, on the other hand, entails accountability of higher level authorities to lower levels of authority, including the accountability of elected officials and administrators to citizens. Most often, the chain of accountability is upward, not downward with officials answerable only to their higher ups, not to those they are supposed to serve.

Outward accountability occurs when domestic actors including government are answerable to external donors or development actors. In some contexts there appears to be a strong drive toward external rather than internal accountability (World Bank 2008; Goetz and Gaventa 2001; O'Neil, Foresti et al. 2007; DFID 2008).

iv. Communication

According to Kurtlz (1997), communication between members of parliament and their constituents are an article of faith in the U.S congressional Office. Besides, "representative democracy offers channels of communication with citizens in the decision making processes of governance and establishes institutions for making them responsive to citizen's demands" (Kurtlz 1997). Therefore, communication in this context means the willingness, ability and structure to supports communications with constituents. As a representative of the people, the MP is duty bound to give feedback/report card and communicate with constituents in a frequent manner that gives/enable constituents to make life saving decisions.

It is also said that the other side of representation is accountability (Hoffman et al, 2009) but for accountability to happen it has to ride on the back of effective communication, hence communication is a core function of the MPs. This is because feedback or accountability (the sense of feeling obliged or duty bound to report back to the one who commissioned the Representative or Agent) is not possible without communication. Once an MP expresses the willing to communicate with his constituents as a duty, since not doing so is negligence of duty, he/she must be able to communicate in a way that he/she is comfortable and there should be structures, mechanisms and systems that help him or her to communicate.

2.4.3.8 Voice and Accountability (V&A)

Voice and accountability captures perceptions of the extent to which a country's citizens are able to participate in selecting and holding their government to account, as well as freedom of expression, freedom of association, and a free media (GSDRC report 2009). Again, voice and accountability can be seen in a broad term comprising several areas of intervention - including civic education, rights awareness, empowerment, democracy promotion and support to civil society and the media" (GSDRC report 2009). Other scholars have labeled voice and accountability as: social accountability, multi-stakeholder engagement, multi-stakeholder initiatives, civic empowerment and rights, public engagement in policy making and government, institutions of accountability, demand for good governance/demand-side, aid and domestic accountability and so on (Odugbemi and Lee (2011).

Irrespective of the label above, voice and accountability in this research is seen as citizens participation. Stiglitz (2001:221) summarized this view thus: "participatory processes (such as 'voice,' openness and transparency) promote truly successful long-term development". One of the key elements of this insight is the recognition that participation is precisely voice. Again, Stiglitz further observed that "participation does not refer simply to voting. Participatory processes must entail open dialogue and broadly active civic engagement, and it requires that individuals have a voice in the decisions that affect them" (Stiglitz 2001: 223). This submission tallies with the labeling provided by scholars like Thomas and Antonio (2008).

Therefore, in more specific terms voice refers to both the capacity of people to express their views and the ways in which they do so through a variety of formal and informal

channels and mechanisms. Referring primarily to the efforts of the poor to have their views heard by more powerful decision-makers, voice can include complaint, organized protest, lobbying and participation in decision making, service delivery or policy implementation (Goetz and Gaventa, 2001). Thus, voice can be seen as a metaphor for the variety of ways in which people express beliefs and preferences. Voice can be expressed individually or collectively. It can stake out original claims or react to official decisions. Moreover, any of these variants may be peaceful or socially disruptive, and may take place within the arenas of civil society, between and inside political parties, through interactions between citizens and state institutions, or within the state itself.

The 'voice' of socially excluded groups may be elicited as part of consultative exercises by public and private power-holders, with no promise that their views will be acted upon, or it can be asserted by right, with a legitimate expectation of consequent action. These distinctions do not exhaust the range of conceptual quandaries associated with the term, but are suggestive of the many factors that must be considered when seeking to understand the concept of voice or its application to problems of human development. Nonetheless, Goetz and Jenkins (2002, 2005) suggest that voice matters for three related reasons.

Firstly, voice has intrinsic value – it is good for people to have the freedom to express their beliefs and preferences. Secondly, voice is an essential building block for accountability; it is only by speaking up – directly or through channels such as Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and parliament – that the poor have a chance to see their preferences, opinions and views reflected in government priorities and policies and to ensure that these are implemented. Thirdly, the exercise of voice, and the conversations that result, plays an important role in

enabling communities to arrive collectively at the standards – the values and norms of justice and morality – against which the actions of power-holders will be judged.

The term 'voice' is drawn from Albert O. Hirschman's classic study Exit, Voice and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organisations, and States (1970). Hirschman classifies voice as just one of three strategies through which people seek to exert influence. The other two – when they exist as practical options – are exit and loyalty. Exiting implies seeking an alternative to the existing organization, when one is formally available, or else making do with some informal substitute. Loyalty implies improving one's prospects through attachment to the centers of power. In the context of governance, 'voice' is understood to describe how citizens express their interests, react to governmental decision-making or the positions staked out by parties and civil society actors, and respond to problems in the provision of public goods such as education and health services, infrastructure, or defense.

In the same vein, accountability is used in this context as espoused by Bessette (2001: 38–39): as the principle that government decision-makers in a democracy ought to be answerable to the people for their actions. The modern doctrine owes its origins to the development of institutions of representative democracy in the eighteenth century. Also (Odugbami 2008) opines that popular elections of public officials and relatively short terms of office were intended to give the electorate the opportunity to hold their representatives to account for their behaviour in office. Those whose behaviour was found wanting could be punished by their constituents at the next election. Thus, the concept of accountability implies more than merely the tacit consent of the governed.

It implies both mechanisms for the active monitoring of public officials and the means for enforcing public expectations. This suggests that the ability of citizens, civil society, and

the private sector to scrutinize public institutions and governments and to hold them to account. This ability includes, ultimately, the opportunity to change leaders by democratic means. Hence, in a democratic governance context, an accountable relationship is one in which voice is met by responsiveness. Citizens must not only have voice, the state and service providers must be receptive to their views and be willing and able to modify their actions accordingly. This view informs the positions/disposition of many of the largest donors today, who profess the view that communities and citizens should be centrally involved in program planning whenever possible because they are most likely to understand relevant traditional knowledge and local past practices (U.K. Department for International Development 2006; Green and Chambers 2006; Pruitt and Thomas 2007).

2.5 Parliamentary/Legislative Communication Mechanisms for Voice and Accountability (V&A)

Since parliament or the legislature is the only arm of government that derives its power directly from the constituents, it is directly answerable to the people or constituents. Hence the constitutional, parliamentary and institutional mechanisms to hold the MP accountable or to enable the MP give account for his account and take responsibility for his in-action. The mechanisms also enhances the citizens voice, which is provision of opportunity to citizens to air their opinion and lend their voices to issues of interest to them in the parliamentary process since the business of government is too serious to allow only MPs handle it. If it were possible, everybody would be in the parliament but were it is not possible, so other avenues are provided for constituents to have a say, and these mechanisms includes;

a. Periodic Election to the Legislature

Section 76 of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria of 1999 directs the INEC to conduct elections into the National Assembly pursuant to Section 71 and 77 of the Constitution which created senatorial districts and federal constituency and in a manner prescribed in the above sections respectively. This empowers constituents to hold representatives who emerge from their constituency accountable and to ensure that the electorate dictates issues emerging from these constituencies; hence, constituency meetings exist in pursuant to this section. So, popular elections of public officials and relatively short terms of office were intended to give the electorate the opportunity to hold their representatives to account for their behaviours whilst in office. Those whose behaviours were found wanting could be punished by their constituents at the next election. Hence, the concept of accountability implies more than merely the tacit consent of the governed. It implies both mechanisms for the active monitoring of public officials and the means for enforcing public expectations (Odugbami, 2008).

b. Constituency Office and Allowances

Sequel to section 71 (a) – (b) that created constituencies and senatorial districts, it is assumed that constituencies and districts are created out of constituents; therefore, it would be necessary for MPs to have constituency offices to consults with constituents. Based on this informed position, the Revenue Mobilization and Fiscal Commission (RMFC) in pursuant to sections 70 and 84(1) fixed constituency allowances for Members of the Assemblies to enable them set up their Constituency Offices, staff it and meet with constituents more frequently in a conducive atmosphere for the purposes of improving the voice and accountability of the Members and constituents respectively. Therefore, the Revenue Mobilization, Allocation and

Fiscal Commission (2007) allocated constituency allowance to the NASS and SHoA as follows:

1. Senate 250% of Annual Basic Salary.
2. House of Representatives 100% of Annual Basic Salary.
3. State Houses of Assembly 50% of Annual Basic Salary.

Therefore, it is criminal for any member to receive these allowances and not set up a functional constituency office that afford constituents the opportunity to voice their opinions and interact with their MPs. It is criminal because Members received this allowance to go and open a constituency office but don't and it amounts to receiving money under false pretense which offends sections 1 of the Advance Fee Fraud and other Fraud Related Offences Act, 2006, Section 16(1) of the EFCC Act, 2004 and Sections 17 and 18 of the Money Laundry (Prohibition) Act, 2011.

c. Recall of Members of Assemblies

The CFRN of 1999, Section 69 empowers the constituents to recall any senator and elected representatives of the National assembly, House of Representatives or State Houses of Assembly upon a petition in that behalf, signed by more than half of the persons registered to vote in that member's constituency alleging their loss of confidence in that member. This petition will be subjected to a referendum conducted by INEC and once majority of registered voters in that constituency agrees to it, the member is recalled.

This provision is not subject to any conditionality as to the matter that it covers. Once constituents losses confidence in a member and the procedure of recall is complied with, the member stands recalled. This is a huge voice and accountability mechanism provided by the constitution.

d. Judicial Review of Legislative Action

Section 4(8) of the CFRN (1999), as amended, empowers the peoples to seek judicial review of legislative actions. If a member of the National Assembly and indeed feels his rights and privilege has been impeded upon he/she can approach the court for judicial review. And if any citizens feels that his constitutional rights has been violated or is going to be violated by an act of the National Assembly or State Assembly, he/she can go to court and challenge it and get succour in that regard. Again, this is another constitutional mechanism for voice and accountability available to constituents.

2.5.1 Institutional Voice and Accountability Mechanism in the Legislature

a. Standing Orders

This is an internal mechanism devised to enable the smooth running of the House. Middleton (2007) describes Standing Orders as "rules of order, or rules of procedure that are the formal written rules an assembly adopts as the guidelines for conducting business. These rules maintain orderly deliberation and describe the responsibilities and privileges of the members and officers. The rules ensure smooth running deliberations with definite procedures for dealing with disagreements". Parliamentary procedure ensure justice to everyone, prescribe order, reflect kindness and generosity; provide constructive use of limited time and give one a sense of self-confidence while protecting the rights of individuals, minorities and to enable majority to make official determination of issues on the conference floor.

For the rule to facilitate order for smooth deliberation and justice, it has to clearly communicate to all members of the assembly and a tool for communication, voice and accountability. As Bierbaum (2013) also observes, "parliamentary procedure is a form of communication among people who were striving to make complex group decisions and then work together to implement those decisions". Besides, because it allows members and their constituents the chance to air their voices and it provides constituents entry points for accountability. This is the leading institutional mechanism that enables voice and accountability in the legislature.

b. Public Gallery

The Gallery in the legislative chamber is provided to enable the public or constituents to participate in the plenary session by way of observing and listening to proceedings in the houses of parliament.

c. Committee on Public hearings

Committees of the legislature often from time to time organize public hearing to receive input from the general public, professional groups; civil society groups among others on a particular subject-matter before the committee with the leave of the House, mostly during plenary.

d. Publication of Journals

The legislature is expected to publish its decisions in a journal hence the establishment of publication or editorial department. This is for the purposes of making public its decisions and for the public to take notice. Section 88(1) of the CFRN of 1999 as amended specifically implied that the Assembly shall "by resolution publish in it journal" its decisions. The open parliament (2012) also demands that "parliament shall create, maintain and publish readily accessible records of its plenary proceedings, preferably in the form of audio or video recordings, hosted online in a permanent location, as well as in the form of a written transcript or Hansard". This also covers reports of committee proceedings, including documents created and received, testimony of witnesses at public hearings, transcripts, and records of committee actions, shall promptly be made public. These parliamentary conventions and constitutional directives make it obligatory for the parliament to publish journals and other periodicals.

e. Interactive Websites

The OSCE Parliamentary Assembly's Declaration on Parliamentary Openness (2012), requires that all parliament have functional website. They demanded that "the maintenance and regular updating of a comprehensive parliamentary website is a vital aspect of parliamentary openness in the modern, interconnected world. Parliament shall ensure that

parliamentary information is available in electronic format and shall regard online dissemination as an essential means of communication". In fact, "most MPs around Europe have their own websites, but the Jury is still out as to whether these are likely to facilitate two-way communication between MPs and Constituents or merely allow MPs to promote themselves". Gallagher et al, 2011. So, it is expected that the legislature should have interactive website to relate with its stakeholders and not dissemination site to promote their work only.

f. Public Petition Committee

The Public Petition Committee of the Legislature is the committee saddled with the responsibility of receiving and treating petitions received from the publics or constituents regarding public issues or specific constituents concerns including issues bothering on the mandate of the legislature itself. Therefore, it is a good mechanism of voice and accountability. However, only few people know of it or utilize it.

2.6 Participatory Communications Principles, methodology and Approach for Parliament-Constituents (V & A) Relations

2.6.1 PDC Principles

Servaes and Melkote (2005) states that "there are two major broad approaches to participatory communication that everybody today accepts as common sense. The first is the dialogical pedagogy of Paulo Freire (1970, 1973, 1983, 1994), and the second involves the ideas of access, participation and self-management articulated in the UNESCO debates of the 1970s (Berrigan, 1977, 1979). Every communication project that calls itself participatory accepts these principles of democratic communication", namely;

a. Dialogic

In the words of Freire (1970), dialogue is "the encounter between men in order to name the world. Those who have been denied their primordial right to speak to the world must first reclaim this rights and prevent the continuation of this act of exclusion". Freire points out the need for participants to assert themselves, see the world their own way, identify their problem and collectively find solution from a dialogic point of view of information sharing which is the bedrock of participation. For Freire, free and open dialogue is a situation whereby people can "name the world" which is voice and the principle of reflection-action- reflection.

b. Voice

The whole idea of participatory communication is allowing the people to be involve in identifying their issues and giving them the opportunity to say their view or "name the world" while articulating their ideas in finding solution to the problem. In more specific terms, voice refers to both the capacity of people to express their views and the ways in which they do so through a variety of formal and informal channels and mechanisms.

Freire's concern was a shift in power, giving voice to marginalized groups, time and space to articulate their concerns, to define their problems, formulate solutions and to act on them together, including deciding the right communication channel.

c. Liberating Pedagogy/Facilitation

For dialogic communication to happen, someone or something has to articulate the process. A catalyst is typically a person, either internal to the community or external, acting to facilitate the dialogue. A Member of Parliament could be a catalyst in his constituency, especially in a situation where he has the responsibility to report back to them or a radio or

television programme could be a catalyst. The idea of a catalyst is not to provide solution to a pre-define problem but to facilitate a dialogue whereby collective problem identification, articulation and solution would take place (Freire 1970). Freire pointed out that this must be based on four principles, namely; love, humility, faith and hope. It is basically the establishment of mutual trust, which is action oriented awareness raising.

d. Action-Reflections-Action

Participatory communication is action oriented. It enables empowerment and the process of empowerment is action oriented. This involves the articulation of awareness raising and commitment to action by all stakeholders especially the community.

e. Dialogic Media Space and Access

A media is said to be dialogic, if the existing media environment stimulate dialogue and empowerment processes. Also the legal framework should allow media diversification of media types and mass-tification of media access. Are opportunities provided for people and groups to participate in the media processes? So for communication to be said to be truly two-way and participatory, it needs a communication channel and spaces that enables it. Participatory strategies must emphasize media that allows more dialogue and create spaces for voice such as community based media, interactive websites, traditional mass media with interactive mechanisms like phone-in opportunity and a theatre that allows audience participation.

UNESCO (1977 in Servaes 2005) notes that access and participation means "use of media for public service. It may be defined in terms of the opportunities available to the public to choose varied and relevant programs and to have a means of feedback to transmit its reactions and demands to production organizations" and participation in the other hand,

"implies a higher level of public involvement in communication systems. It includes the involvement of the public in the production process, and also in the management and planning of communication systems". For example, Rodriguez (2001 in Servaes 2005) noted that "citizens media are highly participatory by providing access and space for people to participate in all phases of media production".

However, the context of participatory communications and media space in a constituency would determine the appropriateness of the media to apply. For instance, theatre can be used not only for one-way communication but also in very participatory and dialogical ways, as in Augusto Boal's Forum Theatre. So, to bring participation to life in communication, the right media that promotes communication and dialogue is key and that also determine whether a communication process is truly participatory that allows the stakeholders voice to come out through the process. These guiding principles are widely accepted as the foundation of participatory development communication.

2.6.2 PDC Methodology:

The Parliament-Constituents Communication methodology discussed here is adapted from Basset (2004) Participatory Development Communication methodology which can be applied to improve the MPs-Constituents Communication Relations. Basset (2004) himself pointed out that "there is no single, all-purpose recipe to start a participatory development communication process. Each time we must look for the best way to establish the communication process among different community groups and stakeholders, and use it to facilitate and support participation in a concrete initiative or experimentation driven by a

community to promote change. It is important to adapt one's intervention to each different situation and to each specific group".

In the context of this study, we would adapt Basset's suggestions and come up with a few others that will appropriately speak to the Constituents-Member/Parliament communication context. This should be in a logical manner and process based on a prior familiarity with Constituency settings, beginnings with the expression of development needs in a given community/constituency, and involves specific/all stakeholders in addressing those issues identified by all. Moreover, all these specific steps are not primarily about applying techniques, but also about building mutual understanding and collaboration, facilitating participation and accompanying a development dynamic.

2.6.2.1 The Methodological Approach

Participatory development communication (PDC) supports a participatory development or research for development process. This process is usually achieved through four main phases, which of course are not separated but are interlinked, that is; diagnosis, planning, intervention or experimentation, and assessment. These phases are further broken down into ten specific steps that support the analysis. However, the process of planning and developing PDC itself is not sequential per se.

2.6.2.2 The Participatory Development Communication (PDC) Model in Constituency

It is important to consider these steps as reference points in a global and systematic process. Bearing this in mind, the ten steps that enables the diagnosis, planning, intervention and assessment participatory development communication in constituency or any grass roots development are as follows:

Step 1: Establishing a relationship with a local community and understanding the local setting. Establishing a relationship with the constituency, that is in the case of representatives who are city based and would like to know their constituents better, but it is a process that will develop all along the way, through the continuous interaction of members of parliament with the people of his/her constituency.

At the beginning, it refers to collecting preliminary information on the constituency and its environment, entering the constituency, getting to know the people and the resource persons in the constituency, developing a more thorough collection of information with the participation of the local people and resource persons, and facilitating a dialogue with them. But what it really means is building a relationship, developing collaboration mechanisms, facilitating and nurturing the exchange of information and knowledge, negotiating roles and responsibilities, and most importantly, building mutual trust.

Step 2: Involving the constituents in the identification of a problem, its potential solutions, and the decision to carry out a concrete initiative. The second step consists involving the constituency in the identification of a problem and potential solutions, and in making a decision to carry out a concrete initiative. This means that as a representative/facilitator of the participatory process you will help constituents and other stakeholders to; identify a specific development problem, discuss its many dimensions, its causes and potential solutions.

STEP 3: Identifying the different constituency groups and other stakeholders concerned with the identified problem (or goal) and initiative. Who are the different constituency groups and the other stakeholders concerned with the selected problem and solution?

At this stage, the Representative or the development practitioner needs to identify the different constituency groups or categories of people concerned with a given problem or with a given

development action, and to identify the best way of making contact and establishing dialogue with each of them. The same applies to the other stakeholders involved in the given problem and solution to experiment.

Addressing ourselves to a general audience such as "the community" or "the people of such-and-such village" does not really help in involving people in communication. Every group that makes up the constituency, in terms of age, sex, ethnic origin, language, occupation, social and economic conditions, has its own characteristics, its own way of seeing a problem and its solution, and its own way of taking actions. Therefore, it is important to approach them separately from their own point of view of how the problem affects them and possible solutions.

Step 4: Identifying communication needs, objectives and activities: Starting with communication needs. When planning communication strategies, many tend to take a very broad problem as a starting point (desertification, for example), and then to move right into planning communication activities (information sessions, awareness campaigns). The result is that the target is often missed and, despite all the activities undertaken, the problem remains untouched. To avoid situations of this kind, we should start from the identification of material needs expressed by local constituents and identify the communication objectives we want to achieve before undertaking specific activities. Therefore, what is the material and communications needs within that context?

a. Material needs and communication needs

Development needs can be categorized broadly between material needs and communication needs. Any given development problem and attempt to resolve it will present needs relating to material resources and to the conditions to acquire and manage these.

However, we will also find complementary needs which involve communication. For example, for sharing information, influencing policies, mediating conflicts, raise awareness, facilitating learning, support decision-making and collaborative action etc. Clearly, these two aspects should go hand in hand and be addressed in a systemic way by any representatives or development effort. This means therefore that any communication objectives must inadvertently too solve material needs of the constituency and vice versa.

Participatory development communication puts the focus on the second category of needs and ensures that they are addressed, together with the material needs the Representative or development intervention effort is concentrating on. For example, in an initiative aiming to resolve water conflicts in a village, we will probably find a need for an improved access to water, and development initiatives are needed to address that need. At the same time however, we may find out that in order to find adequate solutions in the present context, we must first understand the reasons behind the conflicts, such as the time schedule for various categories of users or the conflicting needs of herders, women and farmers. Or we may find that villagers do not know how to set up or manage effectively a water management committee. Or there may be a need for the village authorities to advocate for more water access, such as the drilling of another well, to the national water program.

Another example could be that in a community initiative aiming to manage collectively a forest, there may be material needs such as tools to cut wood, seeds to plant new trees, access to drinkable water, etc. and again development resources are needed to address those needs. At the same time, people must understand the necessity to manage the forest if they want it to survive, and be able to take into consideration the specific needs of different

categories of users. There may also be needs relating to learning different techniques, or needs relating to the setting up of a community forestry management mechanism.

To identify such needs, it is not enough to ask the question directly in a community meeting. This work needs to be done with each group of participants, both those most directly affected by the problem and those who are in a position to help resolve it. Sometimes, needs will be identified not through direct answers from community members, but through an observation of the different practices in use or by comparing the answers or lack of answers of the different groups. Again, this identification of needs must be linked to the problem or to the goal identified previously and to the initiative to be carried out. The question which can guide us in this is the following: what do the different groups we are working with need in order to experiment with or implement a specific set of activities, which can help solve a specific problem?

b. Communication objectives

Communication objectives are based on the communication needs of each specific group concerned by a specific problem. These objectives are identified and then prioritised. The final choice of objectives may be made on the basis of the needs that are most urgent, or those most susceptible to action. They are then defined in terms of the action which needs to occur for the objectives to be achieved.

Generally, in the context of natural resource management, for example, the objectives are linked to one or several of these communication functions: raising awareness, sharing information, facilitating learning, supporting participation, decision-making and collaborative action, mediating conflicts, influencing the policy environment. An important aspect though is not to limit oneself to awareness-raising objectives. It may be important to raise awareness for

a constituency management of a forest, or for a better constituency management of water resources. However, this objective should be accompanied by other objectives aiming to:

- develop a plan for such a management,
- set up a constituency mechanism to carry it forward and monitor it,
- learn specific forestry techniques (in the case of the first situation).

One question we may ask ourselves in identifying these objectives is the following: what are the results, (in terms of knowledge, attitudes, behaviour or problem-solving capacity) that each group of participants should be expected to achieve by the end of the initiative? Each of these results then constitutes an objective. In this way, we will have a general objective, which defines the final results that we hope to accomplish, and more specific objectives relating to each of these results, which will serve as the basis for the activities to be undertaken.

It is best if these objectives can be set out in observable terms, because that will greatly facilitate subsequent evaluation. However, we should not overdo that. For example, it may be very difficult to tell, at the end of a communication strategy for improving soil fertility, whether we have "reduced desertification risk". It will be easier to ascertain whether the specific constituency groups with whom the communication facilitator worked understand the process of desertification as it takes place in their own setting, whether they are aware of appropriate protective measures, and have put one or more of these into practice.

But on the other hand, to be too specific may be as problematic as to be too general. It may be more appropriate to formulate an objective as "to facilitate the understanding of causes related to a water conflict problem in the constituency" than to formulate it as "75% of the constituency members will be able to identify five causes related to the water conflict problem

in the community". The latter would be a better formulation in the context of a class (pedagogical objectives) but is rather unproductive at the scale of a constituency. Again, this planning exercise should be done with the participation of the various groups of participants and resource persons working with the initiative.

c. From communication objectives to communication activities

The next stage is to regroup the different objectives involving the same constituency groups and to consider the best way of supporting each group in achieving them. For each group of participants and for each objective, we should then ask ourselves what the most appropriate modes of communication are? For example, if we want to work closely with women on water use, in many settings, it may be better to arrange first for a global meeting with husbands and wives to explain the intention, discuss the problem and then arrange for working exclusively with groups of women, than trying to isolate women for participation in communication activities. It is on the basis of such strategic considerations that communication activities are then identified and ranked by order of priority. It is particularly important at this point to be realistic about the feasibility issues and not to compile an endless list of activities that is too ambitious.

Step 5: Identifying appropriate Communication tools and the planning process. Until now we have gone through a planning process which starts with identifying specific groups, their communication needs and objectives, and goes on to identify communication activities and then communication tools.The process is different from when people say, "we're going to do a video, or a radio program, or a play", without knowing exactly what contribution it will make to the initiative. Here, we want to respond to specific communication needs. We identify the communication objectives we want to attain and communication activities are developed for that purpose. Now, the communication tools we are going to use in those activities are exactly those tools. They are not the "product" or the "output". We use them to achieve the communication objectives we are pursuing with each category of stakeholders we are working with in the constituency.

The expression “Communication Tools” is probably alarming here, but everyone is familiar with the notion of communication “media”. Generally, we distinguish between the mass media (newspapers, radio, television), the traditional media (storytelling, theatres, songs), “group” media (video, photographs, posters), and community media such as short-range rural radio broadcasting.The media, and the different forms of interpersonal communication, are our communication tools in this context. If we use the expression “communication tools” here, it is to stress the instrumental nature of these media; their purpose in this case is not to disseminate information, but rather to support the process of participatory communication. From this perspective, therefore, it is important to choose those communication tools which will support two-way communication and which are in relation with what we want to do and the people we want to work with. In addition, it is important also to consider the current communication tool in the constituency that they are used to, the cost in terms of affordability and time needed to prepare communication materials, including the utilization of the tool, that is, how the communication tool would be used. For example, it would be useless if one uses flip chart to communicate in a predominantly illiterate constituency instead of using storytelling or dance drama in the local language.

Step 6: Preparing and pre-testing communication content and materials and involving participants in identifying and preparing communication content and materials. Participatory communication is not always associated with producing material and content. When it is, however, there are some considerations to keep in mind. The use of communication tools implies not only to the development of messages, content and materials, but also a pre-testing phase aimed at confirming the effectiveness and relevance of the messages and materials, and the ways in which the tools and materials have been deployed. You are encouraged to involve

participants in identifying the communication materials. Whenever possible, it is also useful to involve them in preparing the materials. In many cases, of course, there will be a need for resource persons with the particular skills required, but it is better if this process can be monitored by some of the participants.

STEP 7: Facilitating partnerships. The development of local partnerships in the constituency is the key factor in the success of participatory communication activities. It is a difficult thing to do for Representative who are used to working only within their aides. Even NGO workers sometimes find this a challenge. Building partnership constituents often require a change in attitude. This is why the representative or researcher or practitioner should invest their energies in building partnerships and involving partners and collaborators in the revision of the communication plan while she/he is developing a communication strategy to support the development initiative or experimentation to be carried on by the constituents.

Step 8: Producing an implementation plan. Producing an implementation plan includes planning to undertake specific activities, identifying responsibilities and tasks, establishing the timeline for the communication strategy and preparing the budget for each activity. It can be useful at this point to review the preliminary steps of communication planning.

a. Problem or goal and development initiative

Firstly, the representative or the development practitioner and the constituency have identified a specific problem they want to tackle. An initiative to experiment with a set of solutions or actions was then decided.

b. Specific groups

The different community groups, policy makers and other development stakeholders affected by the problem or involved in the solution have been identified. The representative or

practitioner, together with constituents' representatives will then identify the specific groups with whom they will work with in priority.

c. Communication needs and objectives

The needs of each of these groups in terms of communication, information, awareness, learning new knowledge or new techniques, etc., have been identified and prioritized. Based on the needs selected from this list, communication objectives have been identified in a way that spells out what is to be accomplished with each specific group at the end of the communication initiative.

d. First draft of an implementation plan:

To plan the sequencing and the follow-up of the communication activities and to identify areas of responsibility, it may be useful to organize the different choices that have been made in a table. Where each planned communication activity is linked to an objective.

e. Planning the follow-up of the activities

We are now ready to plan the follow-up of the activities. Some practitioners call it "monitoring plan" and use it as a reference tool during monitoring and evaluation. This planning will allow us to determine whether activities are being conducted as and when planned. To do this we recast and complete the table by identifying the following in greater detail:

- The order and sequence of activities.
- The timing and the duration, details of date, time and place.
- The individuals responsible for each activity.
- The partners and resource persons involved, other persons invited.

- The material requirements (e.g. room, chairs, documents, film projector).
- Budget needs (e.g., cost of gasoline for getting to the activity site).
- This table can be used for forecasting the activities before they are carried out, as well as for monitoring the overall performance of the activities.

f. Establishing the time line

The preparation of this follow-up plan leads us to identify the period of time over which the activities will be conducted. It is important to establish a realistic time schedule for the various activities: making initial local contacts, deepening our knowledge of the problem, planning communication activities, carrying them out, and evaluating them.

This schedule should also be consistent with three different calendars:

- The periods of availability of the different constituency groups, the representative/aides or practitioner intends to work with.
- The agenda of the technical agents involved in the activities.
- The moments of availability of the Representatives/Aides or practitioners themselves.
- Thus, there are several elements that must be taken into consideration
- The timing of activities.
- The availability of participants and resource persons.
- The research team or practitioner's own availability.
- The availability of required materials and equipment.
- We must never forget that in situations where travel and communication are difficult, and where material resources are scarce, the most modest activity often takes much longer than initially expected. When we also have to coordinate a set of activities involving a number of

partners, things become really complicated. It is best, therefore, to be modest in your ambitions.

g. The support budget

When the time comes to prepare the support budget for the communication strategy and each of its activity, we must think carefully about the notion of cost. The idea is not to build up an impressive budget, but to encourage groups of participants to take responsibility for activities. This is why we speak of a support budget rather than an operational budget. This goes hand in hand with earlier comments about changing mentalities and ways of doing things in connection with the implementation of local development "projects". It is important that constituency groups involved in the process participate in putting together the means of experimenting or implementing a given solution: it is the only way in which constituents can reclaim the initiative they develop as their own.

h. Preparing the budget

Preparing a budget involves several different stages. We must first identify the human and material resources needed to carry out each activity; resource persons and physical resources, materials and equipment, fuel needs (exchange visits, travel by resource persons), consumable supplies (photographic film, paper, batteries, ink, poster paint, etc.). The participation of resource persons should not usually imply costs chargeable to the budget, except for travel to the locale of the activity. This being said, in some countries, resource persons working in many technical services are paid so little, that it makes sense offering compensation for their participation, even if it is in theory part of their mandate. This must be examined case by case and not constitute an automatic process. For material resources, we

need to ask which materials we can borrow, which we need to buy, and those that we can produce. Then we must identify which activities entail specific costs.

Secondly, we must review each of these needs, weigh their importance, and ask ourselves if there is an alternative. We should think carefully about what expenses are really necessary. For example, renting chairs for a meeting or providing snacks or meals for participants can hardly be said to be essential. Nor can that be said of the costs of developing several films to document the activity, when one film would do.

Thirdly, for each of these needs, we must identify those that can be covered by the representative or practitioner's own organization, by the budget or by contributions from various partners and collaborators. Some costs may be borne by the municipality or local agencies, or by the participants in the communication activities. Participants can often prepare snacks, for example. The mayor or the prefect may be able to provide physical premises. It is important to involve local players in supporting the cost of these activities. Even if the contribution is minimal or symbolic, it allows participants and resource persons to feel a sense of ownership over the activity, and not to regard themselves merely as beneficiaries or as invited guests.

Finally, we must estimate and add in the expenses involved in covering the material resources needed for each activity, and ask whether they are worth the cost. We may often find that we must review our choices, in the light of the resources that we have been able to assemble.

Step 9: Monitoring and evaluating the communication strategy and documenting the development process.

a. Why evaluate?

During the intervention phase of the research or development initiative, the communication component will focus on the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the communication strategy and on documenting the participatory development communication process.The production of a monitoring plan and of an evaluation framework linked to it will help everyone involved in the activities to monitor what is being accomplished and facilitate its evaluation. The joint elaboration of such a plan by all stakeholders using simple methods such as brainstorming, observation, visualisation and can be very helpful.

However, the most crucial consideration here is the way in which representative and practitioners approach the evaluation process together with their partners – the community members and the other development stakeholders – so that the evaluation process becomes a learning experience for everyone involved in it.We define evaluation as a judgment based on the information collected. There are two main reasons for conducting an evaluation:

- To find out if we are on the right track or whether we need to adjust our course during the execution of the activity.
- To find out if we have achieved our original objectives, and if the results have had an impact on the problem identified at the outset.

Step 10: Planning the sharing and utilization of results

At the end of the participatory communication or development cycle, constituent members, representative and practitioners assess together the results of their work. Sometimes, this assessment will point to a redefinition of the problem or solution identified at the beginning of the cycle. Or it may lead them to reconsider some of the choices made during the planning phase. When the intervention has led to the desired results, the next step involves the

sharing of this knowledge with different groups of stakeholders as well as scaling efforts with other constituency or other groups of stakeholders.

Knowledge sharing refers to making information available in different formats to different groups of users and asking for [their] feedback. It is one step ahead of a simple dissemination of information. Scaling efforts usually focus on one of the following activities of extension, outreach or advocacy extending the process to other groups in the constituency or to another constituency; replicating the process at a larger scale, involving a larger number of constituency; using the knowledge produced at the constituency level to act on a policy level (influencing policymakers or networking with organizations).

These two sets of activities introduce a new planning exercise. The idea is not only to transmit specific information to other stakeholders but also to identify the conditions in which they could use such information and knowledge to foster change.The first step will consist in determining the goal(s) to pursue. Representative, practitioners and constituency members will then use the same logic as the one used for planning the communication strategy. The problem resolution or the goal to which the participatory development Communication activity is contributing will answer questions such as what is the relevant knowledge that should be produced by the communication or development activity.

a. The specific groups concerned

Apart from the participants, who could make use of the communication results or of the knowledge about what has been achieved in the constituency?

- What are the appropriate communication strategies for reaching them?
- What are the appropriate channels and tools of communication for each of them?

b. The communication needs

- What are their needs in terms of information and communication?
- What will they need in order to be able to use the information?

c. The objectives

What should be the objectives of the dissemination or the scaling up activity, for each of the specific groups that we want to reach? Asking these questions at the onset of activities also means that we can involve representatives of the different groups identified in the communication or development activity. This usually helps in increasing the receptivity of those groups after the process is completed. The sharing of the relevant information and the accompanying extension inside a given constituency or in neighbouring local constituency will be facilitated if during the communication activity circle, participating constituents are trained to explain to others what they are involved in and if appropriate communication channels are identified for doing so.

Scaling up at the level of policymaking will also be facilitated if during the communication activity circle or development activity, specific key persons are identified and if they are made aware of the process at work and invited to share questions or suggestions. The idea is not only to inform them of a specific content but also to identify the conditions in which they could use such information and knowledge to foster change. In both cases, the process will be reinforced if during the communication circle or development activity, for each specific group, appropriate modes of approach and of presenting the information are identified. This means seeking ways of presenting the information from the angle acceptable to these specific groups, with the type of format they use, and considering the appropriate timing and context.

The way development organizations usually present their work is generally not intended to reach potential users and the format used for this purpose does not take into account users' preferences and needs. The angle must be shifted from information content to user's needs. This planning step is the beginning of a new cycle that may start a new intervention or focus on disseminating the lessons learned during the communication activity circle or development activity. Gathering a few ideas on this issue at the beginning of the process will help to develop it during the implementation or development activity. It will also help to review the different choices made during the planning of the participatory development communication initiative.

2.7 Participatory Communications Tools for Parliament-Constituents (V and A) Relations

Based on the PDC principles outlined above, there are several Participatory Development Communication tool approaches that can be adopted based on the cultural disposition of an MP's constituency, location and available infrastructures. Also the identification of appropriate communication tools, should take into account communication tools already in use in the local community, how much does it costs, time and technical conditions of use, and the various kinds of utilization.

Bessette (2004) classified the tools into "interpersonal communication tools" (discussion and debate; visioning sessions; focus group discussions), "PRA techniques" (role-playing; visits, tours, workshops and exhibitions), "group" media tools (photography, drawings, flip charts, posters and banners, video recordings; audio recordings), "traditional" media tools (theatre, songs, music, sayings, stories), "mass" media tools (rural radio, local

press, television) “information and communication technologies” tools (the computer as a slide show projector; using the internet).

So, an MP and constituents should all participate in deciding which suit their situation and what they can afford and which fulfill their communication objectives. Currently, the parliamentary practice in more advance democracy, particularly in the US Congress, is the use of Interpersonal and Mass Media tool approach adopted by MPs to communicate with their constituents. Some examples of the tools are as follows:

1. One-to-One Communication

This type of interpersonal communication includes face-to-face meetings, telephone, e-mail and letter. Often, many members of Congress initiate their own one-to-one communications by sending out congratulatory letters to constituents who receive a significant scholarship, award or other noteworthy accomplishment. One Georgia state legislator makes it a practice to call 20 of his constituents every day during that state's 40-day legislative session to ask citizens how they feel about issues currently before the legislature (Kurtz 1997).

2. Newsletters

Legislators in countries with highly literate populations and good postal communication systems often communicate through newsletters. Most members of the U.S. Congress and many state legislators send out newsletters to selected people (usually their most active supporters) in their districts at least once a month during legislative sessions. The speaker of the Michigan House of Representatives summarizes the benefits of such regular written communication thus:

I started writing a weekly report [to my constituents] the first week I arrived in the legislature. It's been a tool I've used to build not only communication but also a level of trust. When I decide to vote my conscience over my constituency, my [key supporters] may not agree with me but they have respect and trust in how I arrive at my decisions. (Kurtz 1997).

These newsletters (known as "householder letters" in Canada) are typically two to four pages in length and report on issues before the legislature. They often include a questionnaire that constituents can return to express their viewpoints to their representatives. They may also advertise or promote legislators' willingness to help solve constituents' problems with government agencies. Many legislators send these newsletters to media in their districts, and newspapers often publish them as submitted.

The viability of newsletters as an effective means of communication to constituents depends not only on the ability of the population to read and the quality of a country's communication system but also on the resources available. The U.S. Congress provides its members with a "franking" privilege that allows them to make virtually unlimited mass mailings of newsletters to their constituents. Many U.S. state legislatures provide their members an office or postage allowance that at least partially defrays the cost of sending newsletters. In legislatures that do not provide funds for this purpose, political parties or a legislator's campaign fund often pay for newsletter mailings. In countries where legislators have fewer resources, members of the same political party or regional delegation may pool resources to send out newsletters or post them in community gathering places.

3. Media Releases

A handbook on constituent relations for members of the Malawi parliament advices that press releases can be a cheap and effective way of having your activities covered by the

media. You should issue a press release whenever you accomplish a major goal, initiate a large project or do something interesting or unusual in your constituency. Do not issue a press release every time you hold a public meeting - save press releases for important events (NDI 1996b, 7 in Kurtz 1997). Many parliamentarians around the world who recognize that mass media are a cost effective way to get their message to their constituents follow this advice. Many newspapers, radio and television stations are looking for material and will often publish or broadcast press releases as written. Many U.S. legislators go beyond press releases to produce radio and television tapes or feeds to broadcast media outlets in their district. The companion paper to this one on public participation in the legislative process deals in more detail with the subject of media relations (Kurtz, 1997).

4. Public Meetings

Legislators in different parts of the world commonly hold public meetings in their districts to share information about their work and to obtain the views of citizens on community issues and problems. These sessions, often called town meetings in the United States, may be general in nature or designed to address a specific problem or piece of legislation. Legislators announce these meetings well in advance through mailings, public notices and advertisements. Legislators also often communicate with constituents by participating in other organizations' meetings.

Many parliamentarians regularly attend meetings of civic groups or NGOs in their constituencies. They may attend simply to "see and be seen", or they may request opportunities to speak before such groups. Most civic organizations like to hear from their elected representatives and willingly make spots available on their programs. Meetings of other governmental entities may also provide opportunities for communication. For example,

Botswana parliamentarians commonly attend the traditional tribal Kgotla, a regular gathering of village elders for considering community issues, to consult constituents on proposed legislation before the parliament.

All of the above one-to-one communications assume that legislators have something to communicate – that is, they have stories to tell about things that their legislature has accomplished. Legislators who are not prepared to report on their work may be embarrassed in meeting with inquiring constituents. Legislative staff, political parties and legislative support organizations can provide valuable assistance by preparing summaries of accomplishments that legislators can report to their constituents.

5. Many-to-Many Communication

Finally, to conclude this discussion of methods of communication, we should note that special interests may use a third general method of interaction: many-to-many communications. Organized lobbying campaigns encourage large numbers of constituents to send post cards or letters to their own members of the legislature as well as other influential legislators on that issue. Letters generated from such "grass roots" lobbying efforts are often the only exceptions to the rule that all mail receives a response from a member of Congress.

In advanced democracy like the US, the tools adopted by MPs could be considered appropriate for their own level of development. However, in Nigeria and other developing nations those tools may not be sufficient especially in constituencies where there are no infrastructures and illiteracy is prevalent. Therefore, it is advisable for MP to adopted some of the participatory communication tools outline by Bessette (2004) to use as constituents communication tools like the "group" media tools (photography, drawings, flip charts, posters

and banners, video recordings; audio recordings), "traditional" media tools (theatre, songs, music, sayings, stories) which would fit into a constituency with weak infrastructure and low level of literacy and could also get the job done. In cases where there are local mass media tool like local radio, television and newspapers that use local languages that the constituents feel comfortable with, it could also complement. This is in addition to interpersonal and mass media tool used widely in the US and other advance democracy.

2.8 Theoretical Framework

a. Modernization and Dependency theories:

In a nutshell, the core development communication theories are Modernization and Over-dependency. The most dominant theory, however, is the modernization theory that was popular during the early days of development communication research. It presupposes that communication can be used to make less developed areas of the world to be developed like those of the North American and Western Europe. This notion further informed the diffusion of innovation approach to the theory. Here, modernization is conceived as a process of diffusion whereby individuals move from a traditional way of life to a different, more technically developed and more rapidly changing way of life. The thought mainly evolved from sociological research in agrarian societies, which stresses the adoption and diffusion processes of cultural innovation. This approach is therefore concerned with the process of diffusion and adoption of innovations in a more systematic and planned way (Servaes and Milekhoa 2005).

Criticisms

Newer perspectives on development studies claim that this is a limited view of development communication. They argue that diffusion model is a vertical or one-way perspective on communication and that development will accelerate mainly through active involvement in the process of the communication itself; and that communication theories such as the 'diffusion of innovations', the 'two-step-flow', or the 'extension' approaches are quite congruent with the above modernization theory. The elitist, vertical or top-down communication orientation of the diffusion model is obvious.

The best known critic of the modernization theory is Ander Gunder Frank (1969 in Servaes and Melkote 2005). His criticism is fundamental and three-fold: the progress paradigm is empirically untenable, has an inadequate theoretical foundation, and is, in practice, incapable of generating a development process in the Third World. Moreover, critics of the modernization paradigm charge that the complexity of the processes of change are too often ignored, that little attention is paid to the consequences of economic, political, and cultural macro-processes on the local level, and that the resistance against change and modernization cannot be explained only on the basis of traditional value orientations and norms, as many seem to imply.

b. Over Dependency:

Unlike the Modernization theory which started with President Harry Truman's 4th Agenda, the dependency approach emerged as response to the claims of the modernization theorists from the convergence of two intellectual traditions: one often called neo- Marxism or structuralism, and the other rooted in the extensive Latin American debate on development that ultimately formed the ECLA tradition (the United Nations' Economic Commission for Latin America).

The so called 'father' of the dependency theory, however, is considered to be the American, Paul Baran (1957 in Servaes and Melkote 2005) who is the spokesperson for the North American Monthly Review group. He was one of the first to articulate the thesis that development and underdevelopment are interrelated processes; that is, they are two sides of the same coin. In Baran's view, continued imperialist dependence after the end of the colonial period is ensured first and foremost by the reproduction of socioeconomic and political structures at the periphery in accordance with the interests of the centre powers. This is the main cause of the chronic backwardness of the developing countries, since the main interest of Western monopoly capitalism was to prevent, or, if that was impossible, to slow down and to control the economic development of underdeveloped countries. As Baran uncompromisingly puts it, the irrationality of the present system will not be overcome so long as its basis, the capitalist system, continues to exist.

Santos (1970 in Servaes and Melkote (2005)): further argues that "dependence is a conditioning situation in which the economies of one group of countries are conditioned by the development and expansion of others. A relationship of interdependence between two or more economies or between such economies and the world trading system becomes a dependent relationship when some countries can expand through self-impulsion while others, being in a dependent position, can only expand as a reflection of the expansion of the dominant countries, which may have positive or negative effects on their immediate development. In either case, the basic situation of dependence causes these countries to be both backward and exploited.

Dominant countries are endowed with technological, commercial, capital and socio-political predominance over dependent countries—the form of this predominance varies

according to the particular historical moment—and can therefore exploit them, and extract part of the locally produced surplus. Dependence, then, is based upon an international division of labour which allows industrial development to take place in some countries while restricting it in others whose growth is conditioned by and subjected to the power centres of the world."

Criticisms

Hence, according to the dependency theory, the most important hindrances to development are not the shortage of capital or management, as the modernization theorists contend, but must be sought in the present international system. The obstacles are thus not internal but external. This also means that development in the centre determines and maintains the underdevelopment in the periphery. The two poles are structurally connected to each other.To remove these external obstacles, they argue, each peripheral country should dissociate itself from the world market and opt for a self-reliant development strategy. To make this happen, most scholars advocated that a more or less revolutionary political transformation will be necessary. Therefore, one may say that the dependency paradigm in general as well as in its subsector of communication is characterized by a global approach, an emphasis on external factors and regional contradictions, a polarization between development and underdevelopment, a subjectivist or voluntaristic interpretation of history, and a primarily economically oriented analytical method.

As a result, the only alternative for non-aligned nations was to disassociate themselves from the world market and achieve self-reliance, both economically and culturally. The New International Economic Order is one example of attempts toward this end. However, many less developed or developing nations cannot afford to do that because they are simply too weak economically, and too indebted to operate autonomously. Hence, McAnany (1983:4)

characterized dependency theory as "... good on diagnosis of the problem ... but poor on prescription of the cure." This is so because dependence theorists were able to understand and interpret the root causes of under development but could not prescribed solutions to it. This gave the room for the emergence of the alternative paradigm which this thesis is based.

c. Multiplicity Paradigm: Normative Theory of Participatory Communication:

This research is based on the multiplicity paradigm which emanates from the criticisms earlier mentioned theories suffered. According to Servaes and Malikhao (2005), the multiplicity paradigm stresses the importance of cultural identity of local communities and of democratisation and participation at all levels –international, national, local and individual. It points to a strategy, not merely inclusive of, but largely emanating from, the traditional 'receivers'. Paulo Freire (1983: 76) refers to this as the right of all people to individually and collectively speak their word: "This is not the privilege of some few men, but the right of every (wo)man. Consequently, no one can say a true word alone –nor can he say it for another, in a prescriptive act which robs others of their words. And this normative theory of participation actually gave birth to the now known Participatory Development Communication which this study is anchored on.

The basic assumption is that there are no countries or communities that are completely autonomous and that are completely self-sufficient, nor are there any nations whose development is exclusively determined by external factors. Every society is dependent in one way or another, both in form and in degree, on another societies, hence the concept of multiplicity of cultural identity. Thus, a framework was sought within which both the centre and the periphery could be researched separately and in their mutual relationship both at global, national and local levels.

Servaes and Melkote (2005) further assert that:

> In order to share information, knowledge, trust, commitment, and a right attitude in development projects participation is very important in any decision-making process for development. Therefore, the International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems, chaired by the late Sean MacBride, argued that "this calls for a new attitude for overcoming stereotyped thinking and to promote more understanding of diversity and plurality, with full respect for the dignity and equality of peoples living in different conditions and acting in different ways" (MacBride, 1980: 254).

This model stresses reciprocal collaboration throughout all levels of participation. As newer approaches have argued, the point of departure must be the community. It is at the community level that the problems of living conditions are discussed, and interactions with other communities are elicited. The most developed form of participation is self-management. This principle implies the right to participation in the planning and production of media content. However, not everyone wants to or must be involved in its practical implementation. More importantly is the fact that participation is made possible in the decision-making regarding the subjects treated in the messages and regarding the selection procedures. Nevertheless, participation does not imply that there is no longer a role for development specialists, planners, and institutional leaders. It only means that the viewpoint of the local groups of the public is considered before the resources for development projects are allocated and distributed, and that suggestions for changes in the policy are taken into consideration.

Principally, this thought of respect and participation of the local people or communities is based upon constructs proposed by Paulo Freire, a Brazilian educator-philosopher. This constructs is also the underlining philosophy of the multiplicity paradigm that insists on cross cultural interface in the process of development and the advocacy to recognized local knowledge, resources and cultural difference within the context of any developmental agenda.

Freire's ideas have provided the central organizing framework for numerous people-centric development interventions. (Minkler&Wallerstein, 2002; Singhal, 2004; White, Nair &Ascroft, 1994, in Servaes and Milekhoa (2005).

Essentially, Freire's ideas concerning people's participation became popular in the late 1960s when revolutionary social movements arose in most Latin American countries. Freire's work (1970/1998, 1970/2000, 1973), conducted mostly in adult literacy programs in Brazil and Chile, focused on the pedagogy of liberation, achieved through critical thinking and collective action. Freire's philosophy of education and his ideas about participation are grounded in the belief that people are meant to be free from any form of material, social and psychological limitations (Soler-Gallart&Brizuela, 2008; Thomas, 1994).

For Freire, literacy and education are universal rights achieved through cultural communication, and not through cultural transmission from teachers (educated people) to students (uneducated people) or from developed to developing countries. The central concept of Freire's theory of liberation, a process of overcoming limitations, challenges, and oppression, is conscientization. Conscientization refers to the process in which men, not as recipients, but as knowing subjects, achieve a deepening awareness both of the socio-cultural reality which shapes their lives and of their capacity to transform that reality (Freire, 2000). Freire also explains that "conscientization implies going beyond the spontaneous phase of apprehension of reality to a critical phase, where reality becomes a knowable object, where man takes an epistemological stance and tries to know" (Freire, 1971:3). Awareness raising is not an abstract idea, for it implies taking action to bring about change. As Freire (1971:5) avers;

> Conscientization implies that when I realize that I am oppressed, I also know I can liberate myself if I transform the concrete situation where I find myself oppressed. Obviously I cannot transform it in my head: that would be to fall into the philosophical error of thinking that awareness creates reality, it would be decreeing that I am free, by my mind.

Conscientization is thus a process that allows people to become aware and conscious of their deprived nature and tries to examine the issues and question the structures and situation that led to their present predicament. Freire proposed that people can free themselves from such disadvantaged position and oppression if they are given a chance to pose problems and critically reflect on the existing structures of oppression. Becoming aware of one's conditions is achieved through an iterative process of reflection and taking action, which provides the stimulus for change.

Freire used dialogue as an integral part of the conscientization process. Dialogue between the learners and the teacher proceeds by posing problems that stimulate critical thinking, making communication an integral part of the conscientization process. Dialogue is based on the premise that the teacher, along with the student(s), is a co-learner, and that together they engage in a process of problem-posing as opposed to problem-solving, learning from lived experience, reflecting on the problem and taking action based on a collective response, this continuous and iterative process of reflection and action results in the learners gaining self-confidence to overcome obstacles to their growth.

Freirean dialogic communication occurs when the teacher uses generative words or generative themes to stimulate a group discussion among the learners. This pedagogic approach, called culture circles or learning circles, is used to problematize the issues raised by the generative words and the situations represented by these words and themes. This process is achieved through dialogues and leads to learners gaining self-confidence and raising their

consciousness to overcome oppression. The concept of dialogic communication is operationalized through dialogue and reflection which could be codified. The codification consists of multiple stages (Freire, 1970/1998).

The first is descriptive, and includes pointing out the various elements that constitute the situation. The second stage, which includes problematization, seeks to determine deeper structures. The generative words or themes are chosen from the learners' environment to help problematize a situation, because apart from learning, the learners need to engage in a critical analysis of the larger social framework. For example, the words favela in Brazil and callampa in Chile each represent nuances of the social, economic, and cultural reality of the slum dwellers in those countries. Thus, when favela and callampa are used as generative words, the codification represents the social situations in the slums of the respective countries (Freire, 1970/1998).

The generative words evoke fundamental needs of people such as housing, food, employment, health and so forth, and all of these needs are contextualized within the person's situation and daily experiences of life in a slum. When such a process is done iteratively using multiple generative words, the learners begin to critically examine their environment and their place within the society. Thus, codification as a form of education helps to learn the root causes of oppression. The purpose is to teach a way to code and decode situations using cultural referents including words, pictures and daily situations.

In summary, Freirean ideas provided the framework for the multiplicity paradigm that guides and shaped participatory development communications. Also the participatory communication principles, methodology and strategies espoused above were influenced heavily by this normative theory. For example, the Freirean constructs talked about the

cultural realities of the local communities that require the communities to be conscientized through generative words that helps them to analyze their situation, is a combination of internal and external resources achieved through dialogic communications, one of the principles of Participation Development Communication guided by the Multiplicity paradigm. This research relies on concepts such as Dialogic Communication, Cultural identity, Reflection, learning circles and Action, people as conscious beings, respect for local knowledge, "naming the world" to take Collective/Participatory action to pose research questions.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

Research Methodology of any given study forms the basis in providing the study with rules and guidelines on how to go about the study. This provides to the study steps in understanding the population as well as the sampling techniques and sample size. More so, the research methodology also stipulates the instrument or sometime instruments for data collection, validity of the instruments, the method of data collection and method of data analysis.

3.2 Research Design

The study into Participatory Communication in Parliament-Constituents Relations: A study of the Voice and Accountability Mechanisms in the Kaduna State House of Assembly employs both quantitative and qualitative survey research method. The justification for the use of this research design is its aim at describing the extent of participatory relationship between the Members of the House of Assembly and their Constituencies.

Based on the importance attached to the House of Assembly in today's democratic governance and the near absence of truly representative representation, it is needful to further carry out analytical and empirical research that would qualitatively and quantitatively present us with a clearer picture on the extent of the relationship between the electorate and their elected representatives as well as participatory communication hence the adoption of the survey research method to obtain relevant data.

3.3 Population of the Study

The population of a study is the census of all item or subject that possess the characteristic or that has knowledge of the phenomenon being studied (Asika, 2001 and Kothari, 2004). This means that the population becomes the subjects or elements used in a study. However, the study was limited to just sample registered voters in Zone A, B, and C of the Kaduna State House of Assembly Constituencies. Nonetheless, recent reports by UNFPA (2014) gave the total population for Kaduna State to be 7,580,743.02 at an annual growth rate of 3%. Notwithstanding, the study is meant to cover Kaduna state 34 Constituencies but limited to samples taken from the following zones, constituencies and number of registered voters:

S/No	Zones	Constituency/ Areas	Areas	Registered Voters
1.	Zone A	Basawa	Samaru, Jema'a, Bomo, Basawa	64,467
		SabonGari	Chikaji, Muchiya, JushinWaje, Hanwa, Dogarawa, Zabi, UngwanGabas	108,689
		Makarfi	Makarfi, Gazara, Danguzuri, NasarawaDoya, Mayere, Dandamisa, Gwamki, Gubuchi	80,698
		Zaria	Kwarbai I, II, UngwanJuma, Lima Kona, Kaura, UngwanFitila	120,549
2.	Zone B	Doka	Shaba, Gaji, UngwanLiman, Maiburi, Kabala, UnwanSarki	128,503
		UngwanSanusi	S/Gari South, North, Badiko, UnwanSanusi	87,274
		Makera	Barnawa, Kakuri, KakuriHausawa, Makera	90,845
		Tudun Wada	T/Wada North, South, West, T/Nupawa	92,462
3.	Zone C	Chikun	Sabon Tasha, Gwagwada, Kakau, Kujama, Kuriga, Nasaarwa, MarabaRido, UngwanYelwa, Trikaniya	174,306
		Jamaa	Kafachan A, Kafachan B, Maigizo, Kaninko, Jagindi, Godogodo, GidanWaya, Atuku, Asso, Badde, Kagoma and Takau	170,302
		Kachia	Aguntu, Awon, Doka, Gumel, GidanTagwai, Kwaturu, Ankwa, Katari, Bishini, Kachia Urban, SabonSarki and Kurmin Musa	131,246
		Kagarko	Kagarko North, South, Kushe, Jere North, South, Idda, Aribi, KurmiJibrini, Katuga and Kukui	86,871
4.	**Total**			**1,336,212**

Source: Independent National Electoral Commission, 2010

3.4 Sampling Technique and Sample Size

The study uses the probability sampling techniques. Probability sampling uses mathematical guidelines where each unit's chance for selection is known. In this study, the Stratified sampling ensures that a sample is drawn from a homogeneous subset of the population that is, from a population that has similar characteristics in this case the electorate and their elected representative. For this study, the focus is on Participatory Communication in Parliament-Constituents Relations: A study of the Voice and Accountability mechanisms in the Kaduna State House of Assembly and the characteristics/elements/mechanisms of their Interactions, that is, how participatory. Are constituents able to have two-way communication interaction with their Representative and are Voice and Accountability achieved? Which mechanism supports this relationships and processes in the Assembly toward the attainment of improved Voice and Accountability in the various ways in which voice can be expressed?

Hence, the homogeneity of the population where it is limited to the Members of the Kaduna State House of Assembly helped the quantitative research to reduce the possibility of sampling error. The second type of sampling technique used in this study was the Non-probability sampling technique. The Nonprobability sampling does not follow the guidelines of mathematical probability and this was applied to the qualitative aspect of the research. For this study, the cluster sampling which is a non-probability sampling technique was used to locate the population of the study.

In reducing the population to a sample size that was used to investigate the phenomenon, this formula as propounded by Krejie and Morgan (2001) was used to determine the sample size of the known estimated population of 34-MemberHouse of Assembly constituencies in Kaduna state.

S = x^2NP (1− P) ÷ d2 (N −1) + x2 P (1− P).

S = required sample size.

x^2 = the table value of chi-square for 1 degree of freedom at the desired confidence level (3.841).

N = the population size.

P = the population proportion (assumed to be 0.50 since this would provide the maximum sample size).

d = the degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion (.05).

Thus s = x^2NP (1− P) ÷ d^2 (N −1) + x^2 P (1-P).

= 3.841x 1,336,212 x.50 (1-0.50) /0.05x0.05 (1,336,212 -1) +3.841x.50 (1-0.50)

= 1,283,097.573÷ 3,341.48775

= 3.83.98

= 384

The formulae above can be alternatively explained with the table provided by the Research Advisors (Refer to Appendix III):

The calculated sample size for the study is therefore 384 persons in all, but was rounded up to 386 persons in all. The sample size for the study was 384 population based on the range of 250,000 -300,000,000 people in total population size as suggested by the Table above. Noting that the combined Registered Voters population of Zone A constituencies stands at374,403, Zone B constituencies remain at 399,084 and Zone C was 562, 725, which sums up to 1,336,212 Registered Voters population size within the range suggested above. Therefore, the sample registered voters population size of 386 were divided proportionally between the three stations in 40% and 30% and 30% respectively. Using the formula %xP/100 where % = percentage

proportion, P = total sample size according to Kothari (2004). Therefore, the sample registered voters size for Zone A was 115, Zone B was 115 and Zone C was 154.

3.5 Instrument of Data Collection

Basically the instrument used in this study was the questionnaire to investigate the phenomenon quantitatively, and in-depth or key informant interview to review the participatory communication process between the Constituents and their elected Representative, and development intervention qualitatively**.**

3.6 Questionnaire

A questionnaire's design must always reflect the basic purpose of the research (Kothari, 2004). The questionnaire in the study was structured into four sections. Section A consisted of the bio-data of respondents, Section B consisted of questions aimed at answering the first research question while Section C was made up of questions set up to answer the second research question. Similarly, Section D was constructs of questions targeted at answering research question three while the last section E focused on eliciting data that would answer research question 4 and 5. The questionnaire was designed in close ended questions format and given to respondents in order to form the basis for the primary findings of this research to elicit response from them. Since sections of the questionnaire are structured like Likert scales comprise five-response ratings of Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree and Undecided as well as Very Effective, Effective, Fairly effective, Ineffective and Very Ineffective for section B to E.

A theoretical mean of 3.0 according to Davies (2005) was taken as a criterion to judge the means for the items in the structured questionnaire having five Likert rated format. Therefore any item in sections of the instruments which have a mean equal to or higher than 3.0 are regarded to be significant and agreeable or effective while items with less than 2.5 was regarded as not significant and disagreeable or ineffective. The theoretical mean will be derived using formula [1+2+3+4+5/5] = 3.0.

The questionnaire was administered among 12 Constituents area from the constituency identified from the sample size.

3.7 In-depth Interviews

In-depth interviews are interviews in which participants are encouraged and prompted to talk in depth about the topic under investigation without the researchers' use of predetermined, focused, short answer questions. The use of in-depth interview in this regard was geared at validating and adding credence to results that would be collated through the structured questionnaire as a way of making the Interviewee to explicate further on questions that would be raised about the variables in this study. The structured interview was conducted among 15 members of Kaduna State House of Assembly at least five (5) representatives from each Zones in the State House Assemblies as key informant.

3.8 Validity

Triangulation is a method used by researchers to check and establish the validity of a research study (Osuala, 2002). The study used methodological triangulation which involves questionnaire, observation, interview and documents analysis. Yates (2005) posited that triangulation is typically a test for improving the validity and reliability of research or evaluation of findings. Similarly, Richard (2002) suggested that triangulation could be used to establish validity because data items could be corroborated from at least one other source and by another method of data collection (Kothari, 2004). If the conclusions from all methods are the same, then validity is established. The use of the instruments of observation, interviews and examining documents were needed to establish the validity of the study.

3.9 Method of Data Collection

The collection of data was from secondary and primary sources. The major means of gathering data through the secondary sources was document analysis obtained from published and unpublished works on Participatory Development Communications, Parliamentary Practice and Procedures,

International Development related literature, online resources, journals and newspapers publication as well as books and reports. The primary sources were obtained through the administration of structured instruments that is the questionnaire and IDI or KII from the sampled population and interviewees from among the selected Members of the Kaduna State House of Assembly.

3.10 Method of Data Analysis

Data analysis refers to the strategies and effort to categorize, summarize and seek patterns and relationships within the relevant information gathered (Wimmer and Dominick, 2011).Data analysis for this research was descriptive or inferential. Descriptive statistics deals with methods and techniques of summarizing and describing data while the inferential analysis deals with the statistical results for the parametric test of hypothesis and model formulated in this study. It applies mostly in qualitative data analysis. On the other hand, inferential statistics is concerned with gaining knowledge of population (Kothari, 2004). It is mostly adopted in quantitative data analysis. The descriptive method was used in analyzing data in the study for easy comprehension. In analyzing the data the SPSS version 20 analytical tools was used to establish the nexus between variables and test the research questions/hypotheses posed in chapter one. The narrative approach was used to transcribe the responses from the interviewees (Richard, 2002) and their information used to corroborate the result of the quantitative data that was analyzed descriptively.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS OF DATA, PRESENTATIONAND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presented the analysis of data gathered from the twelve (12) constituent units in the three (3) senatorial zones in Kaduna State. The data gathered was obtained from 350 respondents who were administered 384 copies of the questionnaire. The total response rate from the returned, completed and coded copies of the questionnaire was 91.2%. A further breakdown of the constituents unit in each senatorial zones shows that 109 copies of the questionnaire was returned, completely filled and coded accounting for 94.8% response rate for the instrument administered in zone A.

Furthermore, 100 out 115 copies of questionnaire were obtained from zone B representing approximately 87.0% while 141 out of 154 copies of questionnaire were collated from zone C accounting for 91.6% response rate. In the overall analysis of the administration and national (response) rate of the instrument, the score of 91.2% response rate was considered as statistically significant and thereby used for the interpretation of data and subsequent interpretation of this research.

4.2 Interpretation of Data

The interpretation of data presented in the descriptive simple statistical table with frequencies and percentages would be largely based on the theoretical mean value of 3.0 where the agreement of respondents falls below the mean value of 3.0, the overall interpretation of the data would be considered as disagreed and it is above 3.0, the overall interpretation of the data would be viewed as agreed in like manner. Each table would be presented in cognizance of the research objective and further supported with information

obtained from the in-depth interview conducted on the Kaduna House of Assembly members from Zone A- Sabon-Gari and Zaria; Zone B, MagajinGari and Doka and Zone C, Chikun and Kagarko.

Table 4.1 Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

S/N		Characteristics	Zone A Frequency	Percentage (%)	Zone B Frequency	Percentage (%)	Zone C Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	**Age**	18-25 years	36	33.0	52	52.0	36	25.5
		26-35 years	58	53.2	21	21.0	90	63.8
		36 years and above	15	13.8	27	27.0	15	10.6
		Total	**109**	**100.0**	**100**	**100.0**	**141**	**100.0**
2.	**Gender**	Male	93	85.3	72	72.0	125	88.7
		Female	16	14.7	28	28.0	16	11.3
		Total	**109**	**100.0**	**100**	**100.0**	**141**	**100.0**
3.	**Occupation**	Students	25	22.9	21	21.0	57	40.4
		Civil servants	30	27.5	-	-	30	21.3
		Self employed	36	33.0	49	49.0	36	25.5
		Unemployed	18	16.5	30	30.0	18	12.8
		Total	**109**	**99.9**	**100**	**100.0**	**141**	**100.0**

Source: Researcher's field survey, 2015

S/No	Residence	Constituency	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	**Zone A**	**Doka**	7	6.4
		MagajinGari	10	9.2
		UgwanSanusi	9	8.3
		Makera	38	34.9
		Tudun Wada	45	41.3
		Total	**109**	**100.1**
2.	**Zone B**	Basawa	14	14.0
		Sabon-Gari	15	15.0
		Makarfi	21	21.0
		Zaria	41	41.0
		No response	9	9.0
		Total	**100**	**100.0**
3.	**Zone C**	Chikun	77	54.6
		Jema'a	10	7.1
		Kachia	9	6.4
		Kagarko	38	27.0
		No response	7	5.0
		Total	**109**	**100.0**

Source: Researcher's field survey, 2015

In this table, majority of the respondents from zone A and zone C were between the ages of 26-35 years, 18-25 years while the rest were between the ages of 36 years and above. The demographic characteristics here imply that most of the respondents were young adult who are well above the mandatory age required for political participation in Nigeria.

From the table also, majority of the respondents were while the least number of respondents in this study were female. This shows that there is the tendency that the male gender responded more to the instruments as distributed across the zone. The table also show the occupation of the respondents across the zones. Here is the table, most of the respondents were self-employed, and an appreciable numbers were civil servants and students the least representation is that of unemployed persons. This equally shows that representation as shown in this table cuts across those occupational status which are also very prevalent in the society.

Table 4.2 **The Nature of Communication and Democracy, the Relationship between them in terms of their interdependence**

			Zone A			Zone B			Zone C		
S/N	**Statement**	**Agreement**	**Frequency (%)**	**Mn**	**Rmk**	**Frequency (%)**	**Mn**	**Rmk**	**Frequency (%)**	**Mn**	**Rmk**
1.	Democracy and Communication are two sides of the same coin.	Agreed	93 (85.3)	4.3	Agreed	79 (79.0)	4.5	Agreed	93 (66.0)	3.8	Agreed
		Disagreed	14 (12.8)			19 (19.0)			42 (29.8)		
		Undecided	2 (1.8)			2 (2.0)			6 (4.3)		
		Total	**109 (99.9)**			100 (100.0)			**141 (100.1)**		
2.	Communication facilitates Democracy	Agreed	69 (63.3)	3.6	Agreed	79 (79.0)	3.9	Agreed	69 (48.9)	3.0	Agreed
		Disagreed	27 (24.8)			6.0 (6.0)			33 (23.4)		
		Undecided	13 (11.9)			15.0 (15.0)			39 (27.7)		
		Total	**109 (100.0)**			100 (100.0)			**141 (100.0)**		
3.	Democracy is participation of citizens in Public decision making and that cannot happen without communication	Agreed	83 (76.2)	3.9	Agreed	62 (62.0)	3.4	Agreed	115 (81.6)	4.2	Agreed
		Disagreed	19 (17.5)			24 (24.0)			19 (13.5)		
		Undecided	7 (6.4)			14 (14.0)			7 (5.0)		
		Total	**109 (100.1)**			100 (100.0)			**141 (100.0)**		
4	Communication aids democratic interactions	Agreed	71 (65.2)		Agreed	79 (79.0)	3.8	Agreed	71 (50.4)	3.1	Agreed
		Disagreed	30 (27.5)	3.6		13 (13.0)			46 (32.6)		
		Undecided	8 (7.3)			8 (8.0)			24 (17.0)		
		Total	**109 (100.0)**			100 (100.0)			**141 (100.0)**		
5.	Democracy can function without communication	Agreed	22 (20.2)	2.8	Disagreed	21 (21.0)	2.4	Disagreed	54 (38.3)	2.9	Disagreed
		Disagreed	73 (67.0)			53 (53.0)			73 (51.8)		
		Undecided	14 (12.8)			26 (26.0)			14 (9.9)		
		Total	**109 (100.0)**			100 (100.0)			**141 (100.0)**		
6.	Communication doesn't support democracy	Agreed	25 (22.9)	2.6	Disagreed	24 (24.0)	2.8	Disagreed	39 (27.7)	2.7	Disagreed
		Disagreed	77 (70.6)			69 (69.0)			81 (57.4)		
		Undecided	7 (6.4)			7 (7.0)			21 (14.9)		
		Total	**109 (99.9)**			100 (100.0)			**141 (100.0)**		

Several views where expressed on the nature of participatory communication, democracy and the relationship between them in terms of their independence in today's political participatory process and acts of representative governance. From the table above, 85.35, 79.0% and 66.0% of the respondents from the Zone A, zone B and Zone C agreed that democracy and communication operate synonymously. This view had a theoretical mean score of 4.3, 4.5 and 3.8 for their agreements. Thus, from the analysis of the data and the theoretical, it could be said that respondents agreed with the expressed views. This implies that democracy and communication are real concepts that are significantly prevalent in representation and governance.

A further look at how these two concepts operates and perceived as shown in this table where 63.3%, 79% and 48.9% of the respondents from zone A, B and C agreed that with the view that communication facilitates democracy. With the score of 3.6, 3.9 and 3.0 obtained for their agreements across the zones, it could be said that communication to a large extent facilitates democratic principles and governance. Furthermore, 76.2%, 62.0% and 81.6% of the respondents agreed with the view that democracy allows the public to participate in decision making.

Their ability to participate is further enhanced through the participatory communication process. A look at the theoretical mean value shares a score of 3.9, 3.4 and 4.2 which implies a strong agreement on the respondents' views. In this regard, 65.2%, 79.0% and 50.4 of the respondents across the zones agreed that deploying participatory communication processes has the tendency to aid democratic interaction between the constituencies and their representatives. The view obtained the mean score of 3.6, 3.8 and 3.1 across the zones respectively.

Having upheld this, 67.0%, 53.05 and 51.8% of the respondents disagreed with the expression that democracy can however function without communication. Their disagreements

in this regard was upheld following the result of the mean score of 2.8, 2.4 and 2.9% obtained for the three zones which fall below the acceptable level of 3.0. Another set of 70.6%, 69.0% and 57.4% also disagreed that participatory communication in today's legislative process doesn't support democracy. Their disagreement was further consolidated by the mean score of 2.6, 2.8 and 2.7 obtained for the zones respectively. In-depth interview information from the interview conducted with Kaduna State House of Assembly member representing Sabon-Gari constituency was in support of the analysis where he said that:

> As a representative of the people, I interact and communicate with my constituency through several participatory communication process such as Town Hall/village meeting at weekends, public Holidays as well as during recession period.

Also, the Kaduna State House of Assembly member representing Doka Constituency in Zone A buttress this view by stating that:

> Active participatory communication is used in such a way that the people are encouraged to ask questions on how they expect their representative to work in the Assembly as well as championed their needs and aspirations to the government. Through this process of participatory communication a formidable rapport has been created between the people and their representative and this is equally good for democracy and social progress.

Table 4.3: The Models and Types of Participatory Communication Used for Representative Democracy

S/N	Model/Type	Agreement	Zone A Frequency (%)	Mn	Rmk	Zone B Frequency (%)	Mn	Rmk	Zone C Frequency (%)	Mn	Rmk
1.	Face-to-face discussion	Agreed	71 (65.2)	3.7	Agreed	38 (38.0)	3.2	Agreed	103 (63.1)	4.0	Agreed
		Disagreed	35 (32.1)			36 (36.0)			35 (24.8)		
		Undecided	3 (2.8)			6 (6.0)			3 (2.1)		
		Total	**109 (100.1)**			**100 (100.0)**			**141 (100.1)**		
2.	Discussion through TV, Radio, Newspapers and newsletters	Agreed	47 (43.1)	3.1	Agreed	75 (75.0)	3.7	Agreed	47 (33.3)	2.6	Disagreed
		Disagreed	42 (38.5)			4 (4.0)			42 (29.8)		
		Undecided	20 (18.3)			21 (21.0)			52 (36.9_		
		Total	**109 (100.0)**			**100 (100.0)**			**141 (100.0)**		
3.	Discussion and feedback through the internet (websites), emails and social media	Agreed	52 (47.7)	3.4	Agreed	21 (21.0)	2.8	Disagreed	84 (49.5	3.7	Agreed
		Disagreed	47 (43.1)			59 (59.0)			47 (33.3)		
		Undecided	10 (9.2)			20 (20.0)			10 (7.1)		
		Total	**109 (100.0)**			100 (100.0)			**141 (99.9)**		
4	Discussion through Town hall and Village square meetings	Agreed	71 (65.2)	3.5	Agreed	79 (79.0)	3.9	Agreed	71 (50.4)	3.1	Agreed
		Disagreed	31 (28.4)			14 (14.0)			49 (34.8)		
		Undecided	7 (6.4)			7 (7.0)			21 (14.9)		
		Total	**109 (100.0)**			100 (100.0)			**141 (100.1)**		
5.	Discussion between community members through personal letter writing	Agreed	54 (49.6)	3.5	Agreed	79 (79.0)	3.9	Agreed	54 (38.3)	3.0	Agreed
		Disagreed	46 (42.2)			12 (12.0)			60 (42.5)		
		Undecided	9 (8.3)			9 (9.0)			27 (19.1)		
		Total	**109 (99.9)**			100 (100.0)			**141 (99.9)**		
6.	Communication with community members through traditional rulers, songs and dances etc	Agreed	77 (70.6)	3.8	Agreed	50 (50.0)	3.3	Agreed	109 (77.3) 28 (19.8)	4.1	Agreed
		Disagreed	28 (25.7)			41 (41.0)			4 (2.8)		
		Undecided	4 (4.7)			8 (8.0)					
		Total	**109 (99.9)**			100 (100.0)			**141 (99.9)**		

Source: Researcher's field survey, 2015

Participatory communication models, especially in a democratic setting, are ones which encourages the use of both endogenous and exogenous mode of communication in order to achieve sustainable representation and governance. In this table, 65.2%, 38.05 and 63.1% of the respondents agreed with the view that using face-to-face interaction is one such ways. With the mean score of 3.7, 3.2 and 4.0 from the data collected across the zones respectively, it could be said that there is a significant agreement with the view.

Here also, 43.1% and 75.0% of the respondents from both zone A and B agreed while 33.3% of the respondents agreed from zone C. Observing the mean result for each zone, one would see that zone A and B had 3.7 and 3.2 mean scores while zone C had 2.6. This implies that only respondents from zone A and B had significant agreement on the view that exogenous mode of communication such as TV, Radio and Newspapers are models that fit the purpose of being based on communicative tools for representative democracy.

Again, 47.75 and 49.5% of the respondents from zone A and C agreed that interaction and feedback through the internet, emails and social media were communicative platforms needed for representative democracy. This view was disagreed by 59.0% of respondents from zone C. In a similar way, the mean score of 3.4 and 3.7 obtained from zone A and C upheld this agreement while the mean score of 2.8 supports the disagreement observed for respondents for zone C. This implies that although there is the show of 7 disagreements, there exist a significant level of agreement that exogenous process of adopting the internet, emails and social media which are all exogenous communication tools have a place in today's representative democracy.

A further look into other participatory communication process in this table shows that 65.2%, 79.0% and 50.4% of the respondents from Zone A, B and C all agreed that interaction and discussion through Town Halls, Village Square and gatherings are common endogenous

process that are fit for the purpose of representative democracy. The mean scores of 3.5, 3.9 and 3.1 for these agreement further supports these processes.

Another process which was agreed to by 49.6%, 79.05 and 38.3% of the respondents from zone A, B and C is that of writing and exchange of letters between constituency members and their representative. Accordingly, they agreed that using this medium could further enhance their communication. The mean scores of 3.5, 3.9 and 3.0 obtained for the agreements from zone A, B and C further supports the view that exogenous tool like letters is also fit as a communicative tool for representative democracy.

Finally in this table, 70.6%, 50.0% and 77.3% of the respondents from Zone A, B and C respectively all agreed that using traditional rulers and other folkloric tools of communication such as songs and dances are participatory models fit for representative democracy. From the mean score of 3.8, 3.3 and 4.1 obtained for their agreements, it could be said that there exist a significantly strong agreement that this process has the tendency to enhance participatory communication in democratic and representative governance.

In support of the data and analysis above, in-depth interview was conducted on the representative from MagajinGari on what his thought is about the participatory communication tools used to facilitate representative democracy, he replied thus:

> The participatory communication tools both endogenous and exogenous being used in the act of communication and interaction between us (representative) and the people in our constituency. The combination of all these tools bring about effective and quality representation in the constituency as its aid not only the decision making process but aids quality legislation that would lead to efficient social development and the delivery of the sustainable democratic dividends in the consistency in particular and the state in general.

Table 4.4: Communication Mechanism in Parliament and its usage in Enhancing Representation between Representative and their constituency.

			Zone A			Zone B			Zone C		
S/N	**Communication mechanism**	**Agreement**	**Frequency (%)**	**Mn**	**Rmk**	**Frequency (%)**	**Mn**	**Rmk**	**Frequency (%)**	**Mn**	**Rmk**
1.	Standing orders	Agreed	79 (72.5)	3.9	Agreed	54 (54.0)	3.3	Agreed	111 (78.8)	4.1	Agreed
		Disagreed	23 (21.1)			32 (32.0)			23 (16.3)		
		Undecided	7 (6.4)			14 (14.0)			7 (5.0)		
		Total	**109 (100.0)**			**100 (100.0)**			**141 (100.1)**		
2.	Public gallery	Agreed	79 (72.5)	3.8	Agreed	79 (79.0)	4.2	Agreed	79 (56.0)	3.2	Agreed
		Disagreed	18 (16.5)			8 (8.0)			26 (28.4)		
		Undecided	12 (11.0)			13 (13.0)			36 (25.5)		
		Total	**109 (100.0)**			**100 (100.0)**			**141 (100.0)**		
3.	Committee public hearing	Agreed	72 (66.0)	3.7	Agreed	40 (40.0)	3.1	Agreed	104 (73.7)	4.0	Agreed
		Disagreed	32 (29.3)			50 (50.0)			32 (22.7)		
		Undecided	5 (4.6)			10 (10.0)			5 (3.5)		
		Total	**109 (99.9**			**100 (100.0)**			**141 (99.9)**		
4	Publications of decisions in gazettes and journals for the purpose of making its decision public	Agreed	72 (66.0)	3.1	Agreed	78 (78.0)	3.7	Agreed	50 (35.5)	4.0	Agreed
		Disagreed	32 (29.3)			1 (1.0)			43 (30.5)		
		Undecided	5 (4.6)			21 (21.0)			48 (34.0)		
		Total	**109 (99.9**			**100 (100.0)**			**141 (100.1)**		
5.	Interactive websites and emails	Agreed	50 (45.9)	3.7	Agreed	40 (40.0)	3.1	Agreed	104 (73.7)	4.0	Agreed
		Disagreed	43 (39.4)			50 (50.0)			32 (22.7)		
		Undecided	16 (14.7)			10 (10.0)			5 (3.5)		
		Total	**109 (100.0)**			**100 (100.0)**			**141 (99.9)**		
6.	Public petition	Agreed	67 (61.5)	3.6	Agreed	30 (30.0)	2.9		99 (70.3)	3.9	Agreed
		Disagreed	30 (27.5)			52 (52.0)			33 (23.4)		
		Undecided	12 (11.0)			18 (18.0)			9 (6.4)		
		Total	**109 (99.9)**			**100 (100.0**)			**141 (99.9)**		

Source: Researcher's field survey, 2015

The extent of the use of the in-built democratic parliamentary communication channel/processes and avenue that makes legislative process participatory was investigated in this research. In this table, 72.5%, 54.0% and 78.8% of the respondents across the zones all agreed that one of such mechanism or process is the House Standing Order, which stipulates and spell out how the business of the House will be conducted, how Members should interact amongst themselves and how Representative could bring their constituency needs to the floor of the House for legislative consideration which in turn improves communication in a participatory way. The computational score obtained for their agreements shows mean scores of 3.9, 3.3 and 4.1 for the zones altogether. This implies that there is a very significant level of agreement that standing orders is a mechanism that makes communication participatory in the parliamentary business and render representative democracy effective.

Furthermore, 72.5%, 79.0% and 56.0% of the respondents from zone A,B and C all agreed that another communicative mechanism in the parliament that to some extent present the public with a form of participation although passively is the public gallery. Although the public gallery does not allow for interaction, however, from the mean scores of 3.8, 4.2 and 3.2 obtained for their agreements, it could be said that there is significant level of agreement that the public gallery platform is a communication mechanism.

Here in this table also, 66.0% of respondents from zone A, 40.0% of respondents from zone B and 73.7% of respondents from zone C all agreed that committee public hearing, where issues are put out for the public to contribute before the representatives legislate on it, is also a participatory communication mechanism. This form of practice in the parliament based on the mean scores of 3.7, 3..1 and 4.0 obtained for the agreements across the zone affirmed that public hearing is a form of participatory communication in the parliament. The gazetting and

publication of parliamentary decisions in legislative journals and newsletters for the purpose of the public access to inform according to 66.0%, 78.0% and 35.5% of all respondents from across the zones agreed is a communicative mechanism.

According to 45.9%, 40.0% and 73.75 of all respondents across the three zones agreed that having an interactive websites that engenders interactivity and feedback in today's democratic process is another form of communicative mechanism with the theoretical mean of scores of 3.7, 3.1 and 4.0 obtained for their agreements. It could be said that respondents agreed that this is a new form in the communicative process being used in today's legislative representation.

Finally in this table, 61.5% of respondents from zone A and 70.3% of respondents from zone C agreed that the presentation of public petition in public discourse from the areas to the house of Assembly is another mechanism that enhances representative democracy. Notwithstanding, these agreement, 52.0% of the respondents from zone B disagreed, a disagreement supported by a mean score of 2.9. The representative representing Doka Consistency from zone A has this to say about the communicative mechanism that were being used in enhancing representation between representative and their constituency.

> The use of several communication mechanisms in the legislative process and act of turning a bill into an act of the State Assembly is one of the most modest way that allows for participation. Although, sense of the mechanisms like standing orders, public gallery and publication of decision does not grant the people direct participation in the legislative process, they make them to indirectly understand the intrigues of legislation. So far mechanism which impact more on decision and consideration in sponsoring of bills, motions and resolutions through the collection of inputs, suggestions and development plans etc are communication mechanism facilitated by public hearing, interactive media. These communication mechanisms, directly allows the members of the constituency to participate in some of the vital stages of legislation. Therefore, these later mechanism were seen to be more participatory than the formers ones.

Table 4.5:Improving constituents/Representative Relationship through more participatory communication Tools.

S/N	Communication mechanism	Agreement	Zone A Frequency (%)	Mn	Rmk	Zone B Frequency (%)	Mn	Rmk	Zone C Frequency (%)	Mn	Rmk
1.	The Public and Constituents are aware and have been making use of these mechanisms and systems of participatory communication in the Legislature to interact	Agreed	67 (61.5)	3.6	Agreed	56 (56.0)	3.4	Agreed	35 (18.8)	2.6	Disagreed
		Disagreed	33 (30.2)			33 (33.0)			73 (51.8)		
		Undecided	9 (8.3)			11 (11.0)			33 (23.4)		
		Total	**109 (100.0)**			**100 (100.0)**			**141 (100.1)**		
2.	These Mechanisms and systems of participatory communication in the legislature are enough and they don't need participatory communication mechanisms like Town Hall meetings/Village square Constituency meetings, Participatory Theatre etc	Agreed	35 (32.1)	2.9	Disagreed	58 (58.0)	3.0	Agreed	79 (63.2)	3.8	Agreed
		Disagreed	53 (57.8)			17 (17.0)			39 (27.6)		
		Undecided	11 (10.1)			25 (25.0)			13 (9.2)		
		Total	**109 (100.0)**			**100 (100.0)**			**141 (100.0)**		
3.	The combination of endogenous and exogenous communication mechanism could enhance constituency and Legislature interactions	Agreed	57 (52.3)	3.4	Agreed	78 (78.0)	3.6	Agreed	89 (63.2)	3.7	Agreed
		Disagreed	39 (35.8)			10 (10.0)			40 (28.4)		
		Undecided	13 (11.9)			11 (11.0)			12 (8.5)		
		Total	**109 (99.9**			**100 (100.0)**			**141 (99.9)**		

Source: Researcher's field survey, 2015

This table shows participatory communication models that have the tendency to improve constituency and representatives' relationship. The need to encourage more public participation in the legislative process so as to engender more people oriented legislation that would lead to sustainable democracy. In this table, 61.5% and 56.0% from zone A and B of the respondents agreed that awareness of these mechanisms are on the rise and this have the tendency to significantly enhance relationship. From the mean score of 3.6 and 3.4 obtained from zone A and B Constituencies, it could be said that their agreement is valid notwithstanding this disagreement from 57.8% of the respondents from zone C with a mean score of 2.6.

The agreements that these participatory communication mechanisms, would enhance the relationship between constituents and representatives was further put to the respondents. However, their agreements, 58% and 63.2% of respondents from zone B and C agreed that these mechanisms are still not enough so far. Their agreement had a score of 3.0 and 3.8 for the zones respectively thereby making their agreement valid notwithstanding the disagreement by 57.85 of the respondents from Zone A obtaining a mean score of 2.9.

Finally in this table, 52.3%, 78.05 and 63.2% from zone A, B and C all agreed that there is the need for the combination of both endogenous and exogenous tools of participatory convenience and that would go a long way in improving parliamentary and constituencies' relationship. Their agreements were further made valid by the mean scores of 3.4, 3.6 and 3.7 obtained for the zones collectively.

In support of these agreements was the information gotten from the in-depth interview conducted on the state House of Assembly member representing Chikun, a constituency in zone C. The interviewee has this to say about how to improve representative and constituent member's relationships that would engender sustainable democratic legislation.

> Participatory communication process and tools have helped me to interact with my constituency. Using these mechanisms like face-to-face and town hall meetings, I often invite members of my constituency for consultation and input on salient legislation that concerns the area in particular and the state in general. Also, sometime I invite them too to witness and observe legislative proceeding from the public gallery and committee public hearings.

In addition to the information provided above, the Member representing Kagarko constituency in the Kaduna State House of Assembly further corroborated the influence that participatory communication has on sustainable legislation and democratic governance. He said:

> Through the mechanism created, Members of the constituency were able to send their delegation to contribute or petition the House on salient issue relating to them. More so, they also send consensus memoranda and petition for the deliberation of the parliament with their representative sponsoring such as bills. Of course, participatory parliamentary communication creates, stimulates and provoke representative democracy and accountability. This also brings about good relationship; the building of trust that would lead to better representation and possibly the legislation of bills that would benefit the constituency as a whole.

4.3 Discussion of Findings

The discussion of the findings in this research was done in line with the research objectives drawn from the beginning of this research in chapter one, empirical review as well as the theoretical framework which underpin this work.

With the return of democratic rule in Nigeria in 1999 after over three decade of military rule, the need to ensure that democratic civil rule differs from the military rule, which has dominated every aspect of society become an imperative, the concept of freedom of speech, participation and other fundamental human rights guaranteed by the constitution were emphasized to make the difference. Consequently as the nascent democracy began to take root in the country, the call for practices, processes and tools that would engendered its sustainability became the more necessary. One of such processes which hold the ability to transform democratic relationship between the elected representatives and constituent units, which they

represent, becomes the communication process and approach.It has been established in the research that previous style of ruler-ship especially the military leadership completely relied on the top-down of communication approach in disseminating relevant information about the progress and development of the country without asking for inputs or consulting the people. This has led to the neglect of the people who are by themselves the subsidiary of the legislation which comes inform of degrees and edicts. The consequence of this form of communication process is the outright rejection of legislation which until the exit of the military ruler-ship affects its legitimacy.

However, at the beginning of the civil democracy with President OlusegunObasanjo(a retire military General) at the helm of affair, the country experienced a leader who found it difficult to adhere to the communication process and rule of law. The inability of this transition to fully tap into the communication process that allows for public participation in the legislative process consequently limits the benefits derived thereof from it. Having experienced uninterrupted civil rule for the past sixteen (16) years, participatory democratic process has become a significant part of legislative representation at the national, states and local council legislatures. In this study, as revealed in table 2, participatory democratic communication was agreed to be the life blood and artery through which sustaining inputs, consultation and contribution is made that engenders, representativeness of the democratic process. Accordingly, respondent from all the zones in table 2 equally agreed that participatory communication facilitate the growth and sustenance of democracy. They also all agreed that with the inclusion of the participatory democratic communication practices now in the legislature, public contribution to the decision making process is further increased. This, they significantly agreed would aid democratic interaction as they revealed that without participatory communication

process being used now, democracy would not function nor survive in the country. This findings as discussed here is supported by Romarheim (2005); Arnold and Garcia, (2011) where they observed and stated that democracy without the communication process is like having blood without the heart, veins and arteries. They further opine that communication enhances democracy. The interactive, inclusiveness, participatory and consultative process which makes the people have a say in how they are governed and thereby legitimized decision taken on their behalf.

Participatory development and democratic communication is all about evolving ways in which communication in the legislature and even in governance could involve the people through several endogenous and exogenous processes, mechanisms and tools. The foundational and fundamental reasons for the adoption and acceptance of this perspective into our today's world of development practices in all its ramification is to achieve not only inclusiveness but sustainability and the recognition that the process is theirs. The belief of ownership alone, in the case of democratic governance not only legitimizes the government but ensure that the people accept legislation that they understand and weigh the implication altogether. This perspective was also investigated in this study and it was revealed that the endogenous communication model such as the interpersonal that is face-to-face interactions and deliberations is a good participatory development communication tool across the zones as shown in Table 4.3.

Furthermore, respondents also agreed significantly that endogenous process such as the use of Town Halls/Village Square meetings goes a long way in ensuring participation and inclusion in the legislative process. This study also identified that beside the use of endogenous communication tools, exogenous tools such as the mass media could be used to reach out to the public thereby enlightening and sensitizing them about the legislative process. Similarly,

respondents in this study also agreed to, a large extent that deploying the internet platform for political discussion alongside the interactive nature of social media were tools that goes a long way too in encouraging representative democracy. This finding as discussed was supported by Servae (2003), Bessette (2004) where they both opined that participatory process in a representative democracy is further enhanced with the exogenous media and endogenous mode of communication. These tools according to them, makes the micro level of legislature that is, community or constituent level contribution finds its way to the macro level (state House of Assembly). This fact was also corroborated by Hacker (2000), Rosengren (2006), Gastil, (2009) and Decaro (2013).

The essence of participatory democratic or development communication in a legislative process or democratic governance is that it enhances the communication structure to go beyond mere notion that legislative process is only meant for the few representatives in the parliament. Democratic communication mechanisms where fully deployed and effectively used, here it ability to engender inclusiveness of both the legislators and their constituencies in the legislative processes is acknowledged and eventually result in popular and sustainable legislation.

Furthermore, the call for the deployment of these mechanisms, from the development perspective, into democratic processes of legislation and governance might not be unconnected with shallow and unpopular legislation which the legislature has produced over the years thereby leading to its misinterpretation, misapplication and unsustainability, when and where the people are involved in the legislative practices and process, then democracy fulfil one of its definition, that is, governance by the people. It was in this regard that respondents in this research as shown in table 4.4 agreed that with such direct and indirect participatory communication platform such as standing orders, public gallery, public hearing, petitioning, and the gazetting of legislative

decisions, processes and procedures would go a long way in engendering and enhancing representativeness. This finding is in line with Middleton (2007), Gallegher*et al* (2011) and Bierbaum (2013) where they stress that communication mechanism are very vital aspect of parliamentary processes that lead to inclusion and openness of the legislative process in modern time. The fact that the world embraces such tools means that Nigeria as a whole and Kaduna State House of Assembly members should not be left out. True, that these mechanisms exist but the level of implementation is the issue. There is selective application of Standing Orders, committee hearings, and making accessible the public gallery etc. This is mostly due to the Legislature's level of development and capacity, including the politics of alienation since information is power. This confirms the assertion that Nigeria is one of the exclusive democracies in the world. (NED report, 2014).

It is no longer a hidden reality and fact that legislative process that was hitherto once benefit of inclusiveness, interactivity and participation of the public is now seeing the adoption and acceptance of the participatory paradigm the world over. Noting the importance attached and derivable from the use of this participatory democratic communication strategies and how it engenders the necessary consultation, input and contribution to making of popular legislation, the embrace by the representatives in the Kaduna State House of Assembly is a welcome development that need be fully entrenched and sustained. In this regard, the study observed that there is the need for the creation of more awareness in this regard on how these mechanisms could be fully utilized to achieve participatory representation. Also as observed by respondents in Table 4.5 was that the combination of both endogenous and exogenous participatory communication mechanism would go a long way in enhancing and improving the relationship between representatives and their constituencies.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the concluding part of this research which studied the "Participatory Communication in Parliament/Constituents Relations: A Study of the Voice and Accountability Mechanism in Kaduna State House of Assembly". The chapter presented the summary of the research findings, theoretical implications, conclusion, and contribution to knowledge. Finally in this chapter, the research made some recommendations drawn largely from the findings from the data and information got from the instruments used in this study that is the questionnaire and in-depth interview guide.

5.2 Summary of the Study

With the emergence of participatory development communication and its essence in engendering sustainable approach to planning and decision making and taking process comes the need to see how it best fit into democratic legislative communication process. The study understands that the participatory development communication approach being adopted and used to enhance representations and constituency relationship and communication is still at its infancy.

However, being at this level, appreciable gains have been made in the adoption of several parliamentary communication mechanisms to warrant this research that examined its extent and effectiveness as well as suggest ways in which it would be improved upon. In line with this, the study set out the following objectives, (i) to investigate the nature of participatory democratic communication mechanism in representative democracy (ii) identify the types of participatory

communication fit for representative democracy (iii) examine the extent of usage of the available participatory communication mechanism and (iv) to proffer ways that would ensure the sustainable use of participatory communication mechanism enhances representative and legislative constituency relationship. Bearing this in mind, the study which was a quantitative and qualitative research design made use of 384 persons as the sampled population from across the three (3) electoral zones in Kaduna State. The research instruments used in gathering data and information from the sampled population which was further distributed proportionally across the three (3) electoral zones were the questionnaire and in-depth interview guide.

From the data and information analyzed and interpreted, the following findings were made.

1. Participatory development communication mechanisms and tools are formidable that could lead to effective communication process in a parliamentary representatives and their constituencies.
2. Participatory development communication tools such as face-to-face, interpersonal interaction, Village/Town Halls meetings, the use of traditional rules and opinion leaders as well as other exogenous modes such as the mass media, internet, emails, letters, memoranda etc are partially used for the purpose of communication between the parliamentarian and their constituencies.
3. There is also significant parliamentary communication mechanisms and procedures that would engender parliamentary and constituency development communication. These mechanisms are standing orders, public gallery, public hearing, petition, publications in gazettes and journals etc.

4. The combination of the endogenous, exogenous alongside the parliamentary communication mechanisms, would go a long way in engendering sustainable development communication practices that would enhance parliament/members/constituency relationship and interaction.

5.2 Conclusion

The communication process in a modern state is one which is said to be encouraging the involvement of citizens in all the stages and level of development. As was argued by Servaes (2003), active and not passive participation in the development process holds the key for and to sustainable development. Letting the people participate, to a large extent, in taking decisions that directly or indirectly affects them, would lead to ownership of such decision. This paradigm is now more than feasible in our democratic society. It is one which can encourage the voices of citizens in governance and that ensures accountable representation.

It was against this important backdrop of the role of participatory development communication in democracy that gave rise to the need of this research to have been undertaken. Having discovered from the research findings that the democratic (development) communication practices is now being entrenched in the parliamentary and constituency communication relationship in Kaduna State House of Assembly. The study concludes that evolving all the communication mechanisms and involving the constituency in the processes and act of legislation has the tendency to make the public contribute, own and accept legislation that affects them directly and indirectly. This in turn does not only legitimized the legislative process, it engenders voice and accountability but also lead to sustainable democratic development in the long run.

5.3 Contributions to Knowledge:

The following were the contributions to knowledge from thesis entitled "Participatory Communication in Parliament-Constituents Relations: A study of the Voice and Accountability Mechanisms in the Kaduna State House of Assembly."

1. The study has been to establish that participatory communication process is relevant to representative governance and democracy in Kaduna State House of Assembly in particular and Nigerian in general.
2. The study was able to advance the use of participatory communication tools like face-to-face, village town hall meeting, community peer groups and traditional councils as appropriate ways of engendering democratic inclusion and participation in a representative legislative process.
3. The study was able to find that there was an evident lack of the use and integration of democratic participatory communication tools by representatives resulting in the exclusions of constituent members from the process of representative legislations.
4. The study was able to empirically advocate for the need for the use of the participatory communication paradigm as the alternative development process from the data and information analyzed

5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings in the research, the following recommendations are, therefore, made:

1. It is agreed that communication is one of the major ingredient that facilitate the growth of democracy anywhere in the world. Based on this, the Kaduna State House of Assembly representatives should ensure that they sees and seizes this process of communication in

ensuring the active participation of their constituency members. In doing so, Constituents from such constituency would not only hear the voice of their Representatives but hold them accountable for the decision they make on their behalf.

2. To neglect one form of communication even in modern time could lead to misunderstanding, misinterpretation and misrepresentation of the people in parliamentary decision making and representation. As found in this research, the various endogenous communication being used for voice accountability and parliamentary/constituents communication like the face-to-face interaction, Village/Town Halls meeting or deliberation and as consultations with opinion leaders and traditional rulers, should be sustained as these makes the Representative to be felt close home and has the tendency to engender ownership and legitimization of political decision taking on their behalf either directly or indirectly.
3. Availability of communication mechanism in the parliament especially public hearing, the submission of petitions and memoranda from constituents' members should not be done in shrouded secrecy. The public need to be actively made to participates in all these processes so that they are made aware of the input and outcomes of the entire process, it could further enhances the credibility, objectivity, voice and accountability of parliamentary decision in the eye of the people whom they represent.
4. Effective participatory development communication in regards to parliamentary or democratic governance is made possible as found in this research through the synthesis of endogenous and exogenous communication process. In this regard, therefore, parliamentarian should not be too over dependent on the exogenous process to the detriment of the endogenous process. A careful use and balancing of both communication

processes could greatly lead to an improvement, acceptance and sustenance of parliamentary/constituents-relationship

References

Adolf, G. (1947). GemeindefreiheitAlsRettungEuropas. GrundlinienEinerEthischenGeschichtsauffassung. VerlagBücherfreunde, Basel 1947.

Angus, S., and Lindberg, C. A. (Eds), (2010).*Dictionary of American English*, 3rd Edition, Oxford University Press, UK.

Arnold, A. K., and Garcia H. (2011), *Accountability through Communications*, World Bank.Washington Dc 20433, USA.

Benjamin S. A. (2010) "An Appraisal of the Functions of the Federal Legislature Constituency Offices in Nigeria: A Study of Nasarawa, Niger, Kogi, Kaduna States and FCT Abuja", Policy Analysis and Research Project, National Assembly, Abuja, Nigeria.

Bessette G. (2004), "Involving the Community: A Guide to Participatory Development Communication". *International Development Research Centre*. Ontario, Canada.

Bessette G. (Ed.). (2006), "People, Land and Water: Participatory Development Communication for Natural Resource Management". Earthscan and the International Development Research Centre (Idrc), UK,.

Bierbaum, M.E. (2013) Robert W. English Lecture, *Parliamentary Journal,* 45 (1) January, American Institute Of Parliamentarians, USA.

Calhoun C. (2011), "Communication As Social Sciences", *International Journal of Communication*, Feature 1479 – 1496.

Crick (1982), *Introduction To Political Theory*. 2nd Edition, Pearson Longman, UK.

Davis, R. S. (2005) *Designing a Useful Likert Scale to Measure Average Group Response*. Retrieved from http://statistika21.files.wordpress.com/2013/03/6-useful-likert-scale.pdf

Decaro P. A. (2013), *Origins of Public Speaking*. Fair Banks, Ak: University Of Alaska.

Dunn J, (1979) *Introduction To Political Theory*, 2nd Edition, Pearson Longman, UK

Encarta Dictionaries Microsoft® Encarta® 2009. © 1993-2008 Microsoft Corporation. All Rights Reserved (2009).

Federal Government of Nigerian (1999), Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999. Abuja: Federal Government Press.

Federalist Papers No. 10, 62 & 63 in Mckey, 2012: Parliament and Congress.

Federalist Papers No. 48 & 51 in Michael A. G. And Lori C. H. (2009), Encyclopedia of American Government and Civics, USA

Freire P. (1970), "Cultural Action for Freedom". Cambridge, M.A *Harvard Educational Review*.

Freire P. (1998), *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Continuum. (Original Work Published In 1970).

Gallagher M. Laver M., Mair P., (2011), *Representative Government In Modern Europe*; Fifth Edition, McGraw-Hill Berkshire, UK.

Gastil J. (2008), *Political Communication and Deliberation*, Thousand Oaks, Ca, Sage.UK

Goetz, A. M. And J. Gaventa (2001).*Bringing Citizen Voice And Client Focus Into Service Delivery*. IDS Working Paper No. 138, Brighton, Institute For Development Studies.

Goetz, A. M. And R. Jenkins (2002) 'Voice, Accountability and Human Development: The Emergence of A New Agenda', Background Paper for UNDP, Human Development Report 2002: Deepening Democracy, New York, UNDP. Publication, France.

Goetz, A. M., and R. Jenkins (2004) 'Voice and Accountability in Service Delivery', *Development Outreach 6 (1): March*.

Goetz, A. M. And R. Jenkins (2005) 'Introduction', In Goetz and Jenkins, *Re-Inventing Accountability: Making Democracy Work for Human Development*, International Political Economy Series, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

Goetz, A. M., and R. Jenkins, R (2001). 'Hybrid Forms Of Accountability: Citizen Engagement in Institutions of Public-Sector Oversight', *Public Management Review,* 3 (3): 363-84.

Governance and Social Development Resource Centre (GSDRC), (2009), Helpdesk Research Report: Voice And Accountability Indexes, Department For International Development (DFID), United Kingdom.

Habermas, J. (1984). The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and the Rationalization of Society. Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1987). The Theory of Communicative Action: A Critique of Functionalist Reason. Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1979. Communication and the Evolution of Society. Boston: Beacon Press.

Hacker K And Van J. D. (2000), Models Of Democracy And Concepts Of Communications, Sage Publication. London.

Hoffman, J., and Graham P. (2009), Introduction to Political Theory, Second Edition, Pearson Longman, UK.

Jacaranda Project, (2013), Representative Democracy.Retrieved from http://www.jaconline.com.au Retrieved on the 10/9/2013.

Jacobson, T. L., and Servaes, J. (Eds).(1999). Theoretical Approaches to Participatory Communication. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

John, K., (2013), The Future of Representative Democracy. Retrieved On The 10-9-13.Www.Thefutureofrepresentativedemocracy.Org

Kidd N. (2012), Communication as an Academic Discipline. National Communication Association, Washington, D.C. USA. Retrieved On The 3/5/2014 from www.http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/national_communication_association

Kothari, C. R. (2004) *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques. 2nd Revised Edition.* New Age International (P) Limited, Publishers. New Delhi.

Kurtz K. T. (1997), Legislatures and Citizens: Communication between Representatives and Their Constituents. Trust for Representative Democracy, National Conference of State Legislature, NCSL, USA.

Laver M. (2013), Legislatures and Parliaments in Comparative Context, in Oxford Handbook of Political Economy, Weingast And Wittman (Eds.), Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Livy, 2002, In Gallagher Et Al, 2011,: Representative Government In Modern Europe; Fifth Edition.

Macbride, (1980) Many Voices One World. UNESCO, Anchor Press, Essex, London.

Macey, J. R. (1993), Representative Democracy, Faculty Scholarship Series, Papers, 1651. Retrieved On The 5/6/2013 Fromhttp://www.Digitalcommons.Law.Yale.Edu/Fss_Papers/1651

Manson P., (2010), Manson's Manual of Legislative Procedure, National Conference of State Legislature, Eagan, Minnesota. USA.

McKey W., Johnson C. W, (2012), Parliament and Congress, Representation and Scrutiny in the Twenty-First Century, Oxford University Press, New York, USA.

Mcquail D., (1994), Mass Communication Thoery, Sage Publication, London, UK.

Michael A. G. And Lori C. H. (2009), Encyclopedia of American Government and Civics, USA.

Middleton M. K. (2007), Participation for All: A Guide to Legislative Debate, International Debate Education Association, New York, USA.

Nanzli P., (2013), A Guide To Parliamentary Procedure For NYC Community Boards Mayor's Community Affairs Unit, New York, USA

O'neill, T., Foresti, M.And Hudson, A. (2007) *Evaluation of Citizens' Voice and Accountability: Review of the Literature and Donor Approaches*. London: Dfid.

O'sullivan T., Hartley J., Saunders D., Montgomery M., Fiske J. (1994), Key Concepts in Communications And Cultural Studies, Second Edition, Routledge, London.

Ojogwu, E. U., Wakawa J. (Eds.),2011, A Handbook on Legislative Practice and Procedures of the National Assembly, National Secretariat of Nigerian Legislatures, National Assembly of Nigeria, Abuja.

Osce Parliamentary Assembly's Declaration on Parliamentary Openness (2012), Open Parliament, http://www.openingparliament.org/declaration. Accessed 6/12/12.

Osuala, E. C. (2008). Introduction to Research, 5th Ed. Anambara: Rex Charles and Patrick Ltd.

Quebral N. C. (2006), Bessette G. (Eds), Participatory Development Communications: An Asian Perspective, In People, Land and Water: Participatory Development Communication For Natural Resource Management. Earthscan and the International Development Research Centre (Idrc), Uk, USA, Canada.

Rebecca B. R, Alan M. R, Paul H. (2010), Communication Research Strategies and Sources. 7 Edition. Wadsworth, Boston, USA.

Research Advisor, 2006, Sample Size Table based on Krejcie& Morgan in their 1970 article "Determining Sample Size for Research Activities" (Educational and Psychological Measurement, #30, pp. 607-610). Retrieved from http://research-advisors.com

Resengren K.E. (2006), Communication: An Introduction, Sage Publication, London.

Revenue, Mobilization, Allocation and Fiscal Commission Report, (2007), Remuneration Package for Political, Public and Judicial Office Holders in Nigeria, Volume II, Abuja, Nigeria.

Richard, H. J (2002). Learning' Lives: A Narrative Analysis. T*he Quantitative Report, 7:3)*. Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR7-3/Richmond

Rogers, E. (1976), Quoted In ServaesEds, 2003/08; Communication for Development and Social Change.United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), 7, Place De Fontenoy, Saga Publication, France.

Romarheim A. G. (2005), Definitions of Strategic Political Communication, 689 Paper, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, Norway.

Rousseau (1968) in Hoffman J., And Graham P. (2009), Introduction to Political Theory, Second Edition, Pearson Longman, UK.

Santucci F. M. (2005) Strategic Communication for Rural Development, Development Communication Division, World Bank. Washington DC 20433, USA.

Servaes J. And Malikhao P. (2005), Participatory Communication: The New Paradigm? In Media and Global Change: Rethinking Communication for Development. Accessed On 14/5/2014 Http://Bibbliotecavirtual.Clacso.Org.Ar/Clacso/Coediliones/20100824064944/09chapter5.Pdf

Servaes J. And Melkote, P. (2005), Development Communication Approaches in an International Perspective. In: Servaes, J. (Ed.), Approaches To Development Communication, Paris: UNESCO.

Servaes J. Eds, 2003/08; Communication for Development and Social Change.United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (Unesco), 7, Place De Fontenoy, Saga

Servaes, J., &Malikhao, P. (2002).Chapter 7. Development Communication Approaches in an International Perspective. In: Servaes, J. (Ed.), Approaches To Development Communication, Paris: UNESCO.

Setala M. (2006), Representative Democracy in the Problem of Responsibility and Accountability in Referendum. European Journal of Political Research, 45(5):701-725.

Sina O. (2008), Public Opinion, The Public Sphere, And Quality Of Governance: An Exploration In Governance Reform Under Real-World Conditions: Citizens, Stakeholders, And Voice in Sina O., and Thomas Jacobson (Eds.) (2008), World Bank, Washington Dc, USA.

Sina, O., and Taeku, L. (Eds.) (2011) Accountability ThroughPublic OpinionFrom Inertia To Public Action, The International Bank For Reconstruction And Development / The World Bank, Washington Dc 20433, USA.

Sina, O., and Thomas, J. (2008), World Bank, Washington Dc, USA.

Standing Orders of the House of Representatives of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2011.

Standing Orders of the Kaduna State House of Assembly, 2007.

Standing Orders of the Senate of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2011.

Stiglitz, J. (2001). "Participation and Development: Perspectives from the Comprehensive Development Paradigm." In Stiglitz, J., and the World Bank: The Rebel Within, Ed. H. J. Chang, 220–49. Anthem Press. London.

Thomas T. And Paulo M. (2009), Participatory Communication: A Practical Guide, World Bank Working Paper No. 170. Washington D. C., USA: The World Bank,

Thorn, S. (2000).Data Analysis in Qualitative Research.*Evidence Based on Nursing* 3(3):68-70.

Unesco Report, (1977). *Self-Management, Access And Participation", Unesco,* Belgrade, The Former Yugoslavia.

Watson, 2005, In Gallagher Et Al, 2011,: Representative Government In Modern Europe; Fifth Edition

Watzlawick, P., Beavin-Bavelas, J., Jackson, D. 1967.Some Tentative Axioms of Communication.In Pragmatics of Human Communication - A Study of Interactional Patterns, Pathologies and Paradoxes. W. W. Norton, New York.

Wikipedia, 2013, Human Communication.Retrieved from http://En.Wikipedia.org/Wiki/Communication#Human_Communication.

Wimmer, R.D., and Dominick, J.R. (2011).*Mass Media Research: An Introduction. 9th Edition*. Wadsworth Publishing Company: Belmont

Yates, D.S. (2005). *The Practice of Statistics 3rd Ed*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Appendix I

Department of Theater and Performing Arts
Faculty of Arts,
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria

Dear Respondent,

I am an M. A. Student of the above named Institution conducting a research on "Participatory Communication in Parliament-Constituents Relations: A Study of the Voice and Accountability Mechanisms in the Kaduna State House of Assembly".

Please, your response is very important to this research. Kindly assist by filling this Questionnaire correctly to the best of your knowledge. However, this is purely just an academic exercise.

Thank you.

Paul Onwude
MA/ARTS/4906/2011-2012

Section A

1. Age 18 – 25(); 26 – 35(); 36 +( )
2. Gender: Male ( ) Female ()
3. Occupation: Student ( ) Civil Servant ( ) Self-employed ( )Unemployed ().
4. LGA/SHoA Constituency of Residence……
5. What is the name of your Member of the State House of Assembly?

Section B:

What is the nature of Communication and Democracy and the relationship between them in terms of their interdependence? Are they Separable?

6. Democracy and Communication are two sides of the same coin.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree
   Undecided
7. Communication facilitates Democracy.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree
   Undecided

8. Democracy is participation of citizens in Public decision making and that cannot happen without communication.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree
   Undecided
9. Communication aids interactions; whether Democratic or other forms of interactions
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree
   Undecided
10. Democracy can function without Communications;
    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Disagree
    Strongly disagree
    Undecided
11. Communication does not in any way support democracy;
    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Disagree
    Strongly disagree
    Undecided

Section C:

What are the appropriate models and types of communication fit for purpose in a representative democracy and between constituents and their representatives?

12. Face to Face discussions?
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
    e. Undecided.
13. Should discussion between you and your Member of Parliament be through TV, Radio, Newspaper, and Newsletter?
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly disagree
    e. Undecided
14. Should discussion of Constituency issues and government feedback through your Member of the House of Assembly be through the internet and social media?
    a. Strongly Agree

b. Agree
c. Disagree
d. Strongly disagree
e. Undecided

15. Do you prefer Town Hall/Village square Constituency meetings for you to discuss constituency issues and government responses with your Member of the House of Assembly?
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly disagree
    e. Undecided
16. Do you like your Member of the House of Assembly to write you a personal letter to brief you on what he/she is doing on your behalf without a constituency meeting/briefing?
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly disagree
    e. Undecided
17. Would you like your Member of the House of Assembly to communicate with you through the traditional system/way of Communication like Town Crier, Traditional Ruler, Dances and Songs etc.?
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly disagree
    e. Undecided

Section C:

Are there available Communication mechanisms, systems and procedures in Parliament and how has it been used by the Parliament and Member/Representative to enhance voice and accountability between Parliament/Representative and Constituents?

18. There are adequate Parliamentary Institutional mechanisms and systems to facilitate communication with the public/Constituents?
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly disagree
    e. Undecided
19. Standing Orders of the Legislature has been able to Communicate common meanings, promote common understanding of language and standard of acceptable behaviours that tells the public what to expect on the floor of the Legislature at plenary and the legislature at large which has promoted smooth deliberation and communicate the process of public decision making in the Legislature.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree

d. Strongly disagree
e. Undecided

20. Public Gallery in the Legislature is to enable the public or Constituents participate in the House proceedings through observation and listening to arguments for or against a public decisions, to understand the bases of a decision, legislation etc.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly disagree
    e. Undecided
21. Committee's Public Hearings are designed to enable the public participate in the proceedings of the Legislature and interrogate the issues in other to make informed input into the Legislative process of public decision making.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly disagree
    e. Undecided
22. The Legislature is expected to publish its decisions in a Journal for the purpose of making its decisions public to the Constituents.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly disagree
    e. Undecided
23. The Legislature is expected to have an interactive website that makes interaction with the Constituents possible.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly disagree
    e. Undecided
24. The Public Petition Committee of the Legislature is supposed to receive petitions and complaints from the public and Constituents and to hold public hearings where all citizens can attend; which facilitates a two way participatory Communication.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly disagree
    e. Undecided

Section D:

25. The Public and Constituents are aware and have been making use of these mechanisms and systems of participatory communication in the Legislature to interact.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly disagree
    e. Undecided
26. The Legislature has frequently and constantly used these mechanisms and systems of participatory communication in the legislature to share information and solicit the input of the public and constituents in the Legislative process.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly disagree
    e. Undecided
27. These Mechanisms and systems of participatory communication in the legislature are enough and they don't need additional mechanisms like Town Hall meetings/Village square Constituency meetings, Participatory Theatre, Dances and Songs, Town Criers and other local and traditional Communication channels at the Constituency level.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly disagree
    e. Undecided
28. There are challenges in the current communication mechanisms in the Legislature that need to be addressed.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly disagree
    e. Undecided
29. There are no challenges in the current communication mechanisms and systems in the Legislature.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly disagree
    e. Undecided
30. ICT and Social Media can help and do have a role in improving participatory communication in Parliament-Constituents Relations in the Governance process.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree

d. Strongly disagree
e. Undecided

Appendix II

IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW

Please **ANSWER** these questions objectively.

Objective One: The role of participatory communication in representative democracy

- As a representative of your people, how do you interact with your constituency?
- How participatory is your interaction with your constituency?
- Has the process of participatory communication enhanced representativeness in your constituency?

Objective Two: The role and tools of participatory communication, voice and accountability mechanisms.

- What would you say about tools of participatory communication being used in your constituency?
- What would you about the benefits of these tools of participatory communication in bringing representativeness in your constituency?

Objective Three: The extent and implications of the use of participatory communication, voice and accountability mechanisms?

- How regular or often do you interact with your constituency?
- What would say about the level of participation of your constituency members when you interact with them?
- Does the decision taking through their interactions taking into consideration in bills sponsorship in the assembly?

Objective Four: Strategies that would enhance representative democracy using participatory communication.

- Beyond the use of participatory communication interactive session with your constituency, do you invite them to contribute to issues raised at the floor of the house?
- Beside committees set up to deliberate on issues and bills, would you say about other form of contributing like the use of participatory communication tools?
- Would you affirm that participatory communication instructiveness engenders representative democracy and accountability mechanism in your constituency? If yes, why do you agree?

Appendix III

Required Sample Size†

Population Size	Confidence = 95% Margin of Error				Confidence = 99% Margin of Error			
	5.0%	3.5%	2.5%	1.0%	5.0%	3.5%	2.5%	1.0%
10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
20	19	20	20	20	19	20	20	20
30	28	29	29	30	29	29	30	30
50	44	47	48	50	47	48	49	50
75	63	69	72	74	67	71	73	75
100	80	89	94	99	87	93	96	99
150	108	126	137	148	122	135	142	149
200	132	160	177	196	154	174	186	198
250	152	190	215	244	182	211	229	246
300	169	217	251	291	207	246	270	295
400	196	265	318	384	250	309	348	391
500	217	306	377	475	285	365	421	485
600	234	340	432	565	315	416	490	579
700	248	370	481	653	341	462	554	672
800	260	396	526	739	363	503	615	763
1,000	278	440	606	906	399	575	727	943
1,200	291	474	674	1067	427	636	827	1119
1,500	306	515	759	1297	460	712	959	1376
2,000	322	563	869	1655	498	808	1141	1785
2,500	333	597	952	1984	524	879	1288	2173
3,500	346	641	1068	2565	558	977	1510	2890
5,000	357	678	1176	3288	586	1066	1734	3842
7,500	365	710	1275	4211	610	1147	1960	5165
10,000	370	727	1332	4899	622	1193	2098	6239
25,000	378	760	1448	6939	646	1285	2399	9972
50,000	381	772	1491	8056	655	1318	2520	12455
75,000	382	776	1506	8514	658	1330	2563	13583
100,000	383	778	1513	8762	659	1336	2585	14227
250,000	384	782	1527	9248	662	1347	2626	15555
500,000	384	783	1532	9423	663	1350	2640	16055
1,000,000	384	783	1534	9512	663	1352	2647	16317
2,500,000	384	784	1536	9567	663	1353	2651	16478
10,000,000	384	784	1536	9594	663	1354	2653	16560
100,000,000	384	784	1537	9603	663	1354	2654	16584
300,000,000	384	784	1537	9603	663	1354	2654	16586

† Copyright, The Research Advisors (2006). All rights reserved.