

GOVERNANCE AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA

BY

IDRIS, MUSA
08034772717
midris@abu.edu.ng

AND

SALISU SHEHU JAFARU
08037867746
shehusalisu@yahoo.com

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
FACULTY OF ADMINISTRATION
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA

ABSTRACT

Development research, policy and practice has of recent been human-centred both at global, continental and national levels. There has also been an increasing reliance on government as an institution of the state for accelerated human development especially in developing countries and Nigeria in particular. In spite of government efforts over the years, the desired objectives seem not to have been achieved in view of the increasing rate of child and maternal mortality, illiteracy and poverty. The objectives of this paper are to determine the quality of governance and the level of human development in Nigeria and also examine the relationship between them. Others are to identify the problems of governance and human development in Nigeria with a view to making suggestions towards improving them. The source of data was secondary. These were presented in tables and percentages using Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient in testing the hypothesis. The study revealed that the quality of governance was poor while the level of human development in Nigeria was low. It was recommended that the Nigerian government need to do more in creating an enabling environment such as safety and security, maintenance of law and order, provision of basic infrastructure and as well engage the citizens and communities to elicit their participation. There is also the need for public administration reform to enhance capacity in implementing human development policies and strategies efficiently, effectively, and equitably

Key Words: Governance, Human Development

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The centrality of human development as a necessary pre-condition for overall

Department of Public Administration, University of Abuja, Nigeria

development cannot be overemphasised. It is in view of this that of recent, development research, policy and practice tends to be human centred. Both global, continental and national development strategies gives the burning issues of human development priority attention as part of the broader good governance agenda. This has been enunciated by the United Nations (UNs). Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) of the African Union (AU) FRN (2008) and the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategies (NEEDS) of the Federal Government of Nigeria (2004 and 2008).

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the MO Ibrahim Foundation (2007) among others also emphasises the primacy of human development for good governance and overall development. The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria in Chapter II, containing the Fundamental Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy in sections 14 – 18 in particular stresses the role of the state in human development. Pursuant to this, the Federal Government of Nigeria has over the years enacted policies and embarked on programmes aimed at improving education and health care delivery as well as reducing poverty. Such policies and programmes include the Universal Basic Education, Primary Health Care and National Poverty Alleviation Programmes. In spite of all these efforts, the rate life expectancy at birth was 48.4, mean schooling was only 5.0 while the Gross National Income Per Capital was only 2,156 dollar (UNDP 2010). Why is the rate of Human Development still low in Nigeria?

The objectives of this paper are to determine the quality of governance and the level of human development in Nigeria, and examine the relationship between the two variables. Other are to identify the problems associated with governance and human development in Nigeria with a view to making recommendations for improvement. The hypothesis postulated for the study is stated in both the Null (H_0) and alternate (H_1) in order to avoid bias thus; H_0 ; There is no significant relationship between quality of governance and the level of human development in Nigeria. H_1 ; There is a significant relationship between the quality of governance and the level of human development in Nigeria.

This study will be great importance to Development, Researchers, Policy Makers, Administrators, Civil Society Organisations and International Assistance Agencies. The rich and current literature as well as the current and reliable data will provide vital information to researchers. The identification of gaps between development theory and practice will enable policy makers and administrators fine tune their development policies and strategies. Civil Society Organisations and International Assistance Agencies will also find the findings of the study relevant in assessing country performance for possible intervention.

The time frame for the study is 2002 – 2010. This is largely determined by the availability of data on the variables. The choice of the period is also justified by being a period of return to sustainable democracy. Democratic governance is expected to be more development oriented than military regime. In addition, there has been an increasing emphasis on human development especially in the beginning of the 21st century. The major limitation is

that data on HDI values for three years out of the nine years covered were not available and so not captured in the analysis. This is however inadequate to affect the overall result.

The research design for the study is content analysis. The data to be analysed is obtained from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDPs) Human Development Index (HDI) Reports and MO Ibrahim Index of African Governance for Nigeria. The data is presented in tables and percentages and analysed using Inferential Statistical method and Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient to test the hypothesis.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The concepts of Governance and Human Development have of recent gained much currency in development literature. Scholars, practitioners and concerned organisations advanced different definitions of the concepts. Governance according to Adamolekun (2002) is the exercise of political authority in managing the affairs of the state. This presupposes that, governance as used here refers to the legitimate use of governmental powers in discharging the responsibilities of the state. It is against this background that Ezeife (2002) sees good governance as the careful and guided application of government resources in the upliftment of standard of living of the citizenry.

The United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) (2010:1) sees governance as "the process of decision making and the process by which decisions are implemented or not implemented" and identified eight components of good governance. These are; participatory, consensus oriented, accountable and transparent governance. Others are; responsiveness, equity, efficiency and effectiveness is the use of resources as well as adherence to the rule of law. That is, the quality or goodness of governance is determined by the extend to which it is participatory, consensus oriented as well as transparent and accountable to the citizenry. Other qualities include the level of responsiveness to the needs of the citizenry, the extend of equity in the distribution of social and welfare services, the extend of efficiency in the use of resources and effectiveness of service delivery as well as adherence to the rule of law.

The MO Ibrahim Foundation (2007) defines governance as the supply of key political goods. These were classified into five categories between 2000-2005 thus; safety and security, rule of law and transparency, participation sustainable economic opportunity and human development. These were later reduced into four categories thus; safety and rule of law, participation and human rights, sustainable economic opportunity, and human development. The indices of good governance as identified by the MO Ibrahim Foundations are in many respects similar to those of UNESCAP (2010). Both are also in conformity with the provisions of Part II, pertaining to the Fundamental Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy as enshrined in the 1999 constitution (FRN, 1999). The indicators of good governance identified by the MO Ibrahim Foundation are applied in this study.

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) which is globally acknowledged as the most reputable organisation in human development has defined human

development with changing emphases from 1990-2009. These varies from enlarging people's choices, creating environment in which all people can expand their capabilities, expanding people's choices to lead lives they value and expanding people's choices, freedom and dignity (Alkire, 2010). In all the definitions advanced by the UNDP from 1990-2009, the issue of long healthy life, knowledge and resources for decent standard of life appeared dominant. This forms the nucleus of human development. Others are include political freedom and human rights.

Development Scholars Jhingan (2007) Martinussen (nd), Neumayer (2010) and Todaro and Smith (2009), define the concept of human development using the view of the UNDP (1990) as a process of enlarging people's choices. The scholars and the UNDP contrasted economic growth with and human development. They asserts that, while economic growth focuses on the expansion of one choice (income), human development embraces the enlargement of all human choices whether economic, social, cultural or political.

Reiterating the views of Haq (1995) Martinussen (nd) argues that a link between income growth and human welfare has to be created consciously through public policies which aim at providing services and opportunities as equitable as possible to all citizens. Jhingan (2007) asserts that economic growth is essential to human development as no country has been able to sustain the well being of its citizens without continuous growth. He however, adds that only healthy and educated people who contribute more to economic growth.

Operationally, human development is determined by the extend of the level of literacy, life expectancy and income of the citizens. These are measured using an index (Human Development Index) which varies from 0-1 and it is calculated as; $HDI = 1/3 (\text{Income Index} + \text{Longevity Index} + \text{Education Index})$ (Neumayer, 2010). These indicators of human development according to MO Ibrahim foundation are health care delivery, education and poverty reduction. These are similar to those of the UNDP.

From the review of the concepts of governance and human development, we can say that the concept of good governance is wider than human development. Human development is one of the indicators of governance. The other indicators of good governance viz: safety and rule of law, participation and human rights, and sustainable economic opportunity could facilitate human development by providing the enabling environment.

The theoretical framework for the study is the Developmentalist Paradigms of Institutions. Its proponents are Armsden (1989) Chang (2002) and Evans (1995) (Jayadev, 2010). It was used by Jayadev (2010) as a framework in his study; *Global Governance and Human Development; Promoting Democratic Accountability and Institutional Experimentation* and published by the UNDP. The theory presents evidence of the crucial role of the activist state institutions in producing developmental success. According to this viewpoint, only robust public institutions are important in promoting improvements in the welfare of their populations through the public provision of collective goods such as education or healthcare which are crucial to the expansion in capabilities experienced by those states. According to the theory, a central function of developmental state is to provide means whereby

the poorest and most vulnerable can enhance and invest in their own capacities. In relation to this study, the institution of the state represents the Government Ministries Department and Agencies (MDAS) that are created to play a central role in governance to ensure human development. To achieve this, they must be robust, vibrant and effective.

3.0 SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS AND FINDINGS

The independent and dependent variables in this study are governance and human development respectively. Data on governance is obtained from the MO Ibrahim Index of African Governance while of human development is obtained from the UNDP HDI for the period under study. The Ibrahim Index of African Governance is unique in a number of ways. It is one of the few to measure governance in broader sense as comprising of; Safety and Rule of Law, Participation and Human Rights, Sustainable Economic Opportunity and Human Development (Ibrahim Index of African Governance, 2009) as presented in appendix 'A.' the governance index is measured in percentage.

The UNDP is globally acclaimed as the most authoritative source in determining human development through its Human Development Index (HDI). The HDI was initiated by Mohbub ul-Haq in 1990 and adopted by the UNDP since then. It is now published annually. The components of human development are; longevity as measured by life expectancy at birth, educational attainment as measured by a combination of adult literacy ($\frac{2}{3}$ weight) and combined primary, secondary and tertiary enrolment ratio ($\frac{1}{3}$ weight). The other indicator is decent standard of living as measured by real Gross Domestic Product Per Capita based on Purchasing Power Parity in terms of Dollaar (PPP). The HDI varies from zero (0) to one (1). Countries with an HDI value below 0.5 are considered to have a low level of human development, those between 0.5 to 0.8 a medium level and those above 0.8 a high level of HDI (Jhingan, 2007). The HDI values in this study are converted to percentage in order to tally with the index of governance. Nigeria's scores in governance by the Ibrahim Index of African Governance and HDI values by the UNDP are presented in the tables below.

3.1 The Quality of Governance in Nigeria

The data relating to Nigeria's scores and rankings in governance from 2002 - 2010 by the Ibrahim Index of African Governance is presented in table 1 below.

Table 1: Nigeria's scores and rankings in governance from 2002 - 2010 by the Ibrahim Index of African Governance. (Note: The content of this table is illegible due to extreme blurring in the original image.)

Table 1: Nigeria's Scores and Rankings in Governance; 2002 2010

Criteria	Safety and Rule of Law		Participation & Human Rights		Sustainable Economic Opportunity		Human Dev.		Overall Score & Ranking	
	Score(%)	Ranking	Score(%)	Ranking	Score(%)	Ranking	Score(%)	Ranking	Score(%)	Ranking
2002	42.7	43	46.4	25	36.7	34	46.0	23	43.0	35
2003	42.3	43	43.3	27	35.7	38	46.2	25	41.89	36
2004	42.2	43	43.1	27	36.5	36	46.1	24	41.96	37
2005	40.5	45	43.0	27	37.3	36	47.6	23	42.08	36
2006	42.6	43	44.0	28	37.7	34	48.5	22	43.19	36
2007	43.8	44	42.9	30	40.3	33	49.9	22	44.21	36
2008	44.8	43	44.2	31	43.3	34	50.4	24	45.66	35
2009	50.6	46	41.8	33	42.6	34	50.8	25	46.46	35
2010	48	na	38	na	43	na	43	na	43	37

Source: Ibrahim Index of African Governance Ranks and Scores 2002 2010 Editions.
www.moibrahimfoundatoion.org

Key: na Not available

The data in table 1 above indicates that Nigeria's scores and ranking in each of the indicators of governance; safety and rule of law, participation and human rights, sustainable economic opportunity and human development are not encouraging. The country could not earn up to 50% in any of the nine years (2002 2010) and category except for safety and rule of law in 2009 and for human development in 2008 and 2009. These poor scores and ranking are reflected in the country's overall scores and ratings. The highest overall scores within the nine years were 46.5% in 2009 only to slip back to 43% in 2010. The country's overall best ranking was 35 out of 53 countries covered. The quality of governance was 43.5% for the nine years on the average. These poor scores and rankings indicate that the quality of governance was not good enough in Nigeria for the period 2002 2010

3.2 The Level of Human Development in Nigeria (2002 2010)

The level of human development in Nigeria is determined using UNDP's HDI which is presented in percentages in order to conform with the figures of the independent variable 1.

Table 2; Nigeria's Human Development Index (HDI) for 2002 2010

Year	HDI	HDI (%)
2002	0.466	46.6
2003	-	-
2004	0.448	44.8
2005	0.497	49.9
2006	0.506	50.6
2007	0.511	51.1
2008	-	-
2009	0.419	41.9
2010	0.423	42.3

Source: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Human Development Index 2002 2011 Editions.

The data in table 2 above indicates that Nigeria's HDI value for the period between 2002 and 2010 ranges from the lowest of 42.3 (42.3%) in 2010 to the highest of 0.511 (51.1%) in 2007. In four out of the six years for which data was available had HDI value of less than 0.5 (50%) and classified low. It was only in 2006 and 2007 that the country's HDI values were 0.506 and 0.511 respectively and rated medium. On the average, the Nigeria's HDI value was 0.467 (46.7%) using the six years for which data available. This on HDI value scale is low.

3.3 Test of Hypothesis

In determining the relationship between governance and human development, the Spearman's Rank correlation coefficient (R) was applied using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) with the aid of computer.

The values of the independent and dependent variables as in tables one (1) and two (2) respectively were used. The computer print-outs of the SPSS of these variables are presented in tables three (3), four (4) and five (5) below.

Table 3; Quality of Governance in Nigeria (2002-2010)

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 2002	44	11.3	11.3	11.3
2003	40	10.3	10.3	21.6
2004	41	10.6	10.6	32.2
2005	42	10.8	10.8	43.0
2006	43	11.1	11.1	54.1
2007	44	11.3	11.3	65.5
2008	45	11.6	11.6	77.1
2009	46	11.9	11.9	88.9
2010	43	11.1	11.1	100.0
Total	388	100.0	100.0	

Source; Computer Product of SPSS

Table 4: Nigeria's Human Development Index 2002 – 2010 (Dependent Variable)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2002	46	11.9	14.2	14.2
	2004	44	11.3	13.6	27.9
	2005	49	12.6	15.2	43.0
	2006	50	12.9	15.5	58.5
	2007	51	13.1	15.8	74.3
	2009	41	10.6	12.7	87.0
	2010	42	10.8	13.0	100.0
	Total	323	83.2	100.0	
Missing	System	65	16.8		
Total		388	100.0		

Source; Computer Product of SPSS

Table 5: Symmetric Measures

	Value	Asymp. Std. Error ^a	Approx. T ^b	Approx. Sig.
Interval by Interval Pearson's R	.972	.002	74.440	.000 ^c
Ordinal by Ordinal Spearman Correlation	.981	.002	89.601	.000 ^c
N of Valid Cases	323			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

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

c. Based on normal approximation.

Source: Computer Product of SPSS

12

From table 5 above, the calculated value of Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient is 0.981 while the critical value at 95% (0.05) is 0.600. The decision Rule in testing the hypothesis is, accept H_0 when calculated value is less than the critical value and reject the H_1 . Conversely, you accept H_1 when the calculated value is greater than the critical value and reject the H_0 . In this case, the calculated value of (0.981) is greater than the critical value of 0.600 thus, the H_1 which states that there is a significant relationship between the quality of governance and the level of human development in Nigeria is accepted and the H_0 rejected.

The study reveals that the both the quality of governance and the level of human development in Nigeria for the period 2002-2010 have been low. From the hypothesis tested, the poor quality of governance has been responsible for the low level of human development in Nigeria. In relation to the theoretical framework, it indicates that the institution of state (government) that is expected to ensure human development has not been effective. Thus, the low level of human development could be attributed to bad governance in Nigeria.

4.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

From the hypothesis tested, the study concludes that there is a significant relationship between the quality of governance and level of human development in Nigeria for the period 2002-2010. Hence, the level of human development in Nigeria can be improved through good governance.

In view of this, the study recommends that there is the need on the part of the government to create an enabling environment for human development by strengthening its security apparatus to ensure the security of lives and property of the citizens, maintain law and order and enforce the rule of law. There is also the need to revive basic infrastructure such as electricity, and road network. This will enable the citizens engage in sustainable economic activities and boost their income.

Good governance and human development can also be improved upon if there is higher degree of decentralisation not only within the tiers of government but also between the governments and the citizens in order to enable them actively participate in the management of their affairs. This requires mass mobilisation and integration.

A continuous reform of public administration with a view to enhancing government capacity to implement policies and strategies aimed at improving the health and educational standards of the citizens as well as promoting welfare, through efficient, equitable, and effective service delivery will go a long way in enhancing human development in Nigeria.

REFERENCES

- Adamolekun, L. (2002). *Governance Context and Re-Orientation of Government*. In Adamolekun, L. (ed) *Public Administration in Africa, Main Issues and Selected Country Studies* (3-16), Ibadan, Spectrum Books Limited.
- Alkire, S. (2010). *Human Development: Definitions, Critiques and Related Concepts*. UNDP Human Development Research Paper 2010/01, New York.
- Ezeife, C. (2002). *Leadership, Democracy and Good Governance*. In Crystal International Magazine, June, Abuja, Heritage Press Ltd.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2008). *African Peer Review Mechanism Country Review Report, No. 8*. Abuja, Good Print.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2007). *Second National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (2008-2011)*, Abuja, National Planning Commission.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004). *National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy*, National Planning Commission.

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

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

Ibrahim Index of African Governance, 2002-2010 Editions.

Jayadev, A. (2010). *Global Governance and Human Development; Promoting Democratic Accountability and Institutional Experimentation*. UNDP Human Development Reports. Research Paper 2010/06, New York.

Jhingan, M.L. (2007). *The Economics of Development and Planning*. Delhi, Vrinda Publications.

Martinussen, J. (nd). *Introduction to the Concept of Human Development*. International Development Studies, Roskilde University.

MO Ibrahim Foundation (2007). *Indices and Governance*. Accessed on November 12, 2008 from www.moibrahimfoundation.org

Neumayer, E. (2010). *Human Development and Sustainability*. UNDP Human Development Research Paper 2010/05, New York.

Todaro, M.P. and Smith, S.C. (2009). *Economic Development*. London, Addison, - Wesley.

UNDP (2010). *Human Development Index and its Components*. Human Development Report, New York.

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