

Democracy and Good Governance: The Missing Link in Nigeria

Lysias Dodd Gilbert, Ph.D

*Senior Lecturer, Department of Political Science, Ignatius Ajuru
University of Education, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
Email: lysiasg@yahoo.com*

Fidelis Allen, Ph.D

*Senior Lecturer, Department of Political and Administrative Studies
University of Port Harcourt, Choba, Nigeria.
Email: allfidelis@yahoo.com*

Doi:10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n16p524

Abstract

At the minimum, democracy refers to a political system that guarantees opportunities for citizens to choose and replace their leaders or representatives via free and fair elections; that respects and protects socio-economic, political and cultural rights of citizens as well as guarantee acceptable level of active involvement of citizens in decision-making. In any good sense of the word, in terms of its ability to bring changes to the living conditions of citizens, it is a form of governance that holds this truth that the people are the most that matter. This implies that both civic engagement of citizens and responsiveness of the state to citizens' promptings and demands are key ingredients of democratic governance. However, except in very few countries such as Botswana, Ghana, Mauritius, Senegal, South Africa and Tanzania, democracy appears to be rare for most of Africa. Against this backdrop therefore, this paper seeks to examine based on direct observation and grand narratives found in literature, the missing link in the actualization of citizens' aspirations in the supposed democratic states of Africa, focusing on Nigeria. It argues that good governance is virtually, the missing link in Nigeria's democratic experience since 1999. Furthermore, it posits that the institutionalization and realistic intensification of the crusade against corruption remains the basis of ensuring good governance only if the anti-corruption institutions will themselves be subject to democratic governance and the oversight powers of responsible civil society.

Keywords: Africa, Democracy, good governance, Nigeria, welfare.

1. Introduction

Nigeria became a democracy again in 1999 after several years of military dictatorship. Expectations were high from citizens at the beginning but about fifteen years after, both scholars and citizens are questioning the validity of claims of democratic success in the face of flawed processes and policies. Although certain level of macro-economic achievements appear to have been made, it seems that crisis in citizens' welfare and insecurity in the country, especially in the Niger Delta, North Central and the North-Eastern regions of the country have thrown up issues of the quality of democracy where good governance, accountability and transparency count. In short, poverty, unemployment, insurgency, killings, kidnapping of expatriate workers, intercommunity violence and general state of insecurity have gradually become the conspicuous features of Nigeria.

It then appears that democracy is rare for most of Africa, especially Nigeria. In any good sense of the word, in terms of its ability to bring changes to the living conditions of citizens, it is a form of governance that holds this truth that the people are the most that matter. This implies that both civic engagement of citizens and responsiveness of the state to citizens' promptings and demands are key ingredients in any democratic setting. This paper seeks to examine, based on direct observation and grand narratives found in literature, the missing link in the actualization of citizens' aspirations in the claimed democratic states of Africa, focusing on Nigeria. The question is, why is democracy often seen as a rare practice in Africa? Furthermore, it posits that the institutionalization and realistic intensification of the crusade against corruption remains the basis of ensuring good governance only if the anti-corruption institutions will themselves be subject to democratic governance and the oversight powers of responsible civil society.

2. Conceptual Explications

This section sketches a few lines of thought on the concepts: democracy and good governance.

2.1 Democracy

Democracy as a concept is certainly not amenable to a single definition by scholars. In fact, it is remarkable that as a discursive category, democracy has attracted massive scholarly works due mainly to the diverse experiences of countries and the different stories following from these experiences (Kothari, 2007; Lumumba-Kasongo, 2005). It would appear that on a general note democracy is an idea and a political system that guarantees a role or participation of citizens in political processes. As an idea, it seems that democracy has remained an ideal worth striving for even amidst frustrating experiences of many societies where the social character of democratic institutions are questionable. In any case, as an idea, democracy is inherently protective of human rights, freedoms and liberties. In reality, scholarly works in the field in the case of Africa have been highly pessimistic about progress in realizing democratic ideals. The experience seems to have prompted a rethinking of democracy within the context of what is, against what ought to be.

Kothari (2007) after reflecting intellectually and politically on the structure and processes of democracy in India and on strategies for social and political change in several societies and political systems for several decades concludes that he has been disappointed with his initial expectation that democracy is a system of government that serves as means towards creating a caring society. His expectation that democracy would create a just social order has indeed been dashed. He further expressed deep concern with the failure of democracy, as a political system and idea in addressing basic social problems, especially with those at the lowest rung of society. Rather than use democracy to drive change that benefits the plurality of the Indian society, Kothari lamented that representative democracy in India has divided the people into factions of interests. If this is a major flaw with modern representative democracies as Kothari claims, it is because his understanding of democracy fits with the sense that democracy should have a social character and not merely be a system of politics that divide people into competitive and conflictive spaces on the basis of political interest as is now seemingly common with modern liberal multiparty democracies in many countries across the continents.

Schumpeter's (1976) definition of democracy as elites' struggle for votes from citizens speak volumes about democracy being a political system characterized by regular elections by which citizens participate in the political process. This minimalist understanding of democracy involves regular elections that are free, fair, inclusive and credible in the determination of succession. In a similar vein, Lansford (2010: 391-392) argues that modern or full democracies: are those systems in which there are universal suffrage, regular elections, an independent judiciary, relatively equal access to power for all groups, and extensive civil liberties that are combined with protection for minorities and disadvantaged groups.

Robert Dahl is perhaps the most celebrated scholar on procedural notions of democracy on which modern representative democracy rests. In his famous book of many years ago, *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*, Dahl explains that there are two characteristic aspects of modern democratic practice namely, public contestation and participation (Dahl, 1971). Following from Dahl's seminal contributions to the debate on modern democracy, it seems clear that democracy can partly be measured by the extent of freedom and liberty which groups or individuals are allowed in engaging competitively with rival political forces for power through the electoral process.

Similarly, Leininger (2010) argued that besides procedural features of democracy such as the existence of civil and political rights, democracy requires substantive values or features of economic, social and cultural rights. This is noteworthy since the practice of democracy even in the so called advanced world has revealed that political elites driving representative democracies undermine substantive values of democracy.

Furthermore, according to Stokes (2002), the key concern of developmentalist democracy is the common good. It emphasizes the importance of citizens' rights to social justice as a resource for enhancing political participation. This means that citizens in developmental democracy have a wide assortment of rights which they are entitled to, ranging from political and civil to economic, social, security and cultural rights or welfare of citizens. This means that developmentalist democracy enhances citizens' exercise of their natural rights — civil and political and economic, social and security rights. An important supposition of this theory of democracy is the acknowledgement of formal methods of citizen political participation such as elections along with the participation of citizens in the informal, non-governmental, group or associational life of citizens in society as part of their political participation. After all, some of these groups can provide education in their organizations and serve as relevant sites for democratic processes. For this reason, developmentalists recommend the democratization of business.

2.2 Governance and Good Governance

Generally, governance refers to the manner in which power is exercised (Amoako, 2003). Sometimes, such responsibility may be secured through elections, appointments and so on. On the other, governance is viewed as the steering or controlling of state affairs (Dwivedi, 2010: 683). Fundamentally, governance is the process of decision making or procedure by which decision is taken by those who govern and are willing to improve the living conditions of citizens. Governance is distinguished from government, which means an institution made up of instruments through which the state governs itself by means of laws, rules and regulations implemented by the state apparatus. The quality of life of people in a democracy depends on the nature of governance in terms of how political and administrative arrangements accommodate or permit diversity of groups to participate in public decision making.

As a subset of governance, good governance depends on the basic values of accountability, transparency, justice, fairness and equity as common in the more advanced democracies. Good governance should be the goal of any government interested in improving the quality of life of its people. Obadan (1998: 24) argued that

"good governance consists of five fundamental elements" namely:

- ❖ Accountability of public office holders with regards to public funds.
- ❖ Transparency in public policy and decision making processes.
- ❖ Predictability in government behavior.
- ❖ Openness in government dealings and effective communication flow between government and the governed.
- ❖ Adherence to the rule of law.

Similarly, Dwivedi (ibid) contended that good governance is governing well. In other words, the essence of good governance is in the involvement of governmental and nongovernmental groups in decision making process of the government. Dwivedi has listed ten values on which good governance is based, namely:

- ❖ cultural pluralism. This points to the need to be sensitive to the cultural diversity of a democratic state in public decision making.
- ❖ legitimacy. The government must be seen to be legitimate in the context of what is constitutional or acceptable by natural and positive law. consensus.
- ❖ Consensus in public decision making is required among those competing for power in a democratic state.
- ❖ public participation in decision making or policy formulation.
- ❖ rule of law to guarantee fairness and eschew partisanship.
- ❖ responsiveness of government to the needs of divers stakeholders or groups in the society.
- ❖ efficiency and effective accountability of institutions of governance is necessary.
- ❖ transparency to construct faith in the state to deliver services to the people.
- ❖ transparency in action to build faith in others.
- ❖ moral governance. This means public service and ethics in public decision process.

From the forgoing, the nexus between democracy and good governance cannot be overemphasized. In fact, it would appear that good governance is an all-embracing concept that incorporates several democratic values including representation and effectiveness (Colomer, 2010). Modern representative democracies require representatives that are effective at public decision making, without which, the ensuing crisis of legitimacy and worsening social conditions of citizens will often result in conflicts involving groups and the state or groups against groups that could have been avoided. By simple logical extension, good governance refers to the effective, transparent and accountable way in which such responsibility is carried out. Conversely, bad governance refers to misrule or maladministration in the discharge of responsibility.

2.3 Democracy and Good Governance

The performance and measurement of democracy no longer stand differently from good governance. The connection between both concepts and in short, success in the practice of democracy lies strongly in the understanding that democracy, understood as good governance carries with it the capacity for improving society and welfare of its citizens. This thinking is appreciable if we reflect on how every country in Africa today claims to be democratic or at least practicing democracy with increasing outcomes of poverty and decadence in the political and socio-economic health of citizens.

Addressing this question in practical governance and in ways that match reality with theory must begin with the

seeming indeterminate nature of the concept of democracy which appears to have remained essentially insurmountable. For scholars, its definition defies consensus, especially in relation to its operation (Akindele & Ajila, 1992: 85-86; Akindele & Obiyan, 1996: 84). Hence, Olowu (1995) posited that democracy as a "concept of governance has become all things to all men". This explains why politicians in different countries of Africa would label every political system a democracy to suit their predilections. It has been a case of gross abuse and misinterpretation of the concept. Strangely, during the days of military regime under General Ibrahim Babangida, one heard of "military democracy." In the 1980s scholars simply linked democratic politics with development without any insistence or inclusion of the aspect of good governance. Linz and Lipset at least drew this connection so sharply, incurring the wrath of *Africanist* radical scholars who began to question the basis of such connection in the circumstances of absence of tangible development (Southall, 2003).

Notwithstanding the spurious claims by several African states to the status of being democratic, Akindele (2002) empirically proved the linkage between democracy and governance. He further contended that "it was analytically discovered that, practically, political animals, all over the world and, particularly in Nigeria attach serious importance to democracy as a mechanism of political governance" (Akindele, 2002: 185). Apparently, this is the missing link in the case of African countries like Nigeria.

3. Democratic Scenarios in Africa

Two types of scenarios are easily discernible in most of Africa where democracy is claimed to be in practice. The one, where politicians are insensitive to the needs of citizens, irresponsible and disrespectful of the rule of law. Besides, politicians devise and use violence to shoot themselves to power. Thereafter, they use such power as a means for the brazen acquisition of wealth and the perpetration of an assortment of unconstitutionality. Citizens and their welfare are neglected with impunity. Political killings, witch-hunting, insecurity and fraudulent electoral practices characterize such states.

Apparently, in such African states, there is a semblance of democracy but what exists in actuality is the flagrant disenfranchisement of voters and the disempowerment of citizens in the process of decision-making. Corruption is endemic, unemployment and underemployment are rife, majority of the citizens are poor and unable to access the wealth of the state; while the bulk of the state's wealth are appropriated by a few number of persons who are either public office holders or their cronies. There is a zero-sum approach to the struggle for political power and public office by politicians. In addition, public office is privatized and state power used with impunity due to the non-consolidation of public institutions. Political parties take on the shape of cultic organizations and are glaringly, deficient of the liberal color upon which free citizens should seek to control state power for the benefit of the entire citizenry.

Furthermore, such African 'democratic states' are characterized by acute shortage of social infrastructure and basic amenities of life such as good roads, good public transport system, electricity, water, schools and hospitals. More often than not, they are predatory rentier states typified by clientelism, patrimonialism and repression (Gilbert, 2010). Public policies and decisions of public office holders reflects the interest of the ruling few and always flow from top to bottom. Politicians impose laws, public policies and decisions that have no bearing with the real needs of citizens. Even so, implementation of laws, public policies or decisions are selective, often in accordance with the interests and intentions of corrupt politicians. Some scholars classify such societies as transitional democracies, perhaps as an escapist attempt to be able to still wear the label of democracies. But in actuality, they could be described as muddled and undemocratic democracies. Of course the new wave of democratization affects all of these states but without substance when it comes to positively affecting welfare of citizens, consolidation of democracy, respect for human rights and political stability. Countries such as Benin Republic, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Gambia, Niger, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Togo and Zimbabwe fall in this category.

The second scenario presents a situation where deep respect for democratic principles and rights offer opportunities for individual and collective welfare. In such society, politics has redeeming values, especially in relation to its responsiveness to the demands of citizens. This implies that both civic engagement of citizens and responsiveness of the state to citizens' promptings and demands are key ingredients. The processes of determining succession are transparent and guided by democratic principles.

What happens thereafter, in respect to post election activities of both politicians and citizens presents the active involvement of citizens in major public policy making. Indeed, citizens occupy decisive position in politics and governance and are able to articulate issues and grievances through nonviolent legitimate avenues to provide the oversight over government activities. In most cases, the outcome of the political process in such societies is that of responsive, accountable and transparent democracy where the living conditions of citizens is the priority for governance. Such states have been inadvertently referred to as operating working democracies. In the African context, Botswana, Ghana,

Mauritius, Senegal, South Africa and Tanzania are the relevant examples of this group.

Cognizant of the size, resources and supposed "historic mission and manifest destiny of Nigeria on the African continent" (Azikiwe, 1960: 71), one would have expected that she should have conspicuously stood out in the second category as one of the countries in which democracy is working in Africa. However, sadly enough, the reverse is the case. Why? What is the missing link in Nigeria's democratic practice since 1999? What matters is finding a basis to interrogate the gap and what accounts for the difference in both societies. In doing so, two propositions will suffice: that good governance determines the effective performance of democracy in contemporary societies; and, that democracy devoid of good governance is a harbinger for the collapse of democratic institutions in any society, including Nigeria.

4. Good Governance: The Missing Link in Nigeria

Good governance is the missing link in the case of Nigeria's democracy. In short, Nigeria is faced with the following challenges:

1. Rigging of elections
2. Lack of effective participation of citizens in the political process
3. Poor management of elections
4. Culture of impunity
5. Political violence
6. Guided nature of democracy
7. Lack of independent election management institutions
8. Lack of neutrality of external and internal monitors
9. Insecurity - terrorism
10. Ineffectiveness of the Nigerian Police force
11. Weakness of political parties
12. Lack of credible opposition to challenge incumbent political party
13. Corruption and lack of accountability
14. Overbearing influence of the executive over other organs of government.

Simply, and logically too, it is the question of why democracy is rare in Nigeria. It is clear that democracy in Nigeria, even if one limits it to the period between 1999 and now yields the traditional gap between what is expected in terms of socio-economic and economic benefits to citizens and what is in reality. The above diagnoses, fits neatly into the common arguments of democracy and good governance issues already found in literature that connect to democracy in the developing South.

Three areas of emphasis in discussing the missing link in Nigeria's democracy are discernible here. They are welfare and succession.

4.1 Welfare

The issue of welfare of citizens, of course points to the idea of good governance. Good governance in Africa has been rare, but, conceptually it is directly connected to social, political and economic progress and outcome. Democracy in Nigeria clearly neglects the welfare of citizens. Nothing else best explains this situation than the issues of governance. Essentially, politicians have conducted themselves in manners that are devoid of accountability, transparency and responsiveness. Apparently, only good governance can assure citizens of equal access to opportunities that guarantee citizens self-actualization. This absence of welfare, for which politicians have at best become rhetorical about, is a deficit in Nigeria's democracy (Okeke-Uzodike and Allen, 2005). If democracy promises accountable government, it is only logical that such accountability will translate into good governance.

Both institutional designs and behavioral elements account for this. The later, here, will help to answer questions on how politicians are constitutive of failed democracies with regards to the improvement of the welfare of citizens. Current politicians appear to be *predators* who have hindered responsibilities of democracies towards citizens (Sindzingre, 2006). This is making many doubt the ability of liberal democracy to improve the living conditions of citizens (Drury, Kriekhaas & Luszitg, 2006).

From the experiences of countries with oil deposits, apparently, the source of revenue and funding of the state in democracies affect the quality of governance, and in turn, performance of democracy. Where the state depends on the tax payers' money, accountability is more easily demanded by citizens. This of course can translate into good governance capable of improving the living conditions of citizens. Rent seeking states that depend for revenue and

funding of the state, unearned money, on natural resources such as oil, have more tendencies to be reckless with public funds. Citizens also lack the courage and will to demand accountability from the government in such states (Jega, 2003: 53; Gilbert, 2010: 115).

Apparently the welfare effects of undemocratic democracies have been negative on citizens. Indeed, one of the expectations of many Nigerians when elected political leaders emerged in 1999 in sixteen years after military dictatorship was the improvement of their already worsening economic and social conditions. Personal economic circumstances of unemployment, shortage of food, public safety, lack of clean water, inadequate health care, poor income level, and more, were on the sky high and negative on citizens (Lewis, Bratton & Alemika, 2001). Fifteen years today, many are wondering how the governments have addressed basic national and personal economic problems in the country with poverty still very much prevalent. Incidentally, performance of politicians within the period is being questioned over their role in improving the welfare of citizens, and poor performance of democracy linked to their predatory disposition. There is no allusion in these arguments that present civil regime has achieved nothing, but the facts remain that populist programs are still lacking.

4.2 Succession

Orderly process of succession in liberal democracies is usually expected since democracy itself is accorded high regards for its supposed capacity for peaceful resolution of conflicts. This calls for credible good electoral governance. By electoral governance, we refer to the general manner in which those saddled with the management of elections discharge their responsibilities at the three levels of rule making, rule application and rule adjudication (Mozaffar, 2002). These three levels of electoral governance are fundamental to democracy and constitute important aspects of elections, with large-scale implications for their outcomes. Indeed, elections are considered important aspects of democracy. This is not only because of their role in determining succession but as a basis for legitimacy and ensuring accountability and good governance from political parties that form the government (Allen, 2005).

Unfortunately, Nigeria, as with many other countries in Africa has had sad experiences and stories of badly managed elections with outcomes that have made nonsense of democracy. The use of election as an instrument of succession in Nigeria have always been fraught with litanies of woes. Defeating an incumbent government is a tall dream and has never occurred at the Federal level in Nigeria's democratic experience since independence. In the current Fourth Republic for example, the ruling Peoples Democratic Party (PDP) has practically won all the presidential elections conducted so far. In fact, shortly before the presidential elections in 2007, the then president of Nigeria, Olusegun Obasanjo declared the election as a do or die affair. Of course, notwithstanding the condemnations that trailed the conduct of the elections, it was predictably won by the PDP candidate, late Alhaji Umaru Musa Yaradua, Obasanjo's immediate successor. But this was not the case in Senegal in 2012, where the incumbent president Macky Sall defeated his immediate predecessor, Abdoulaye Wade in a free and fair election; and the succession was relatively smooth. Similar events occurred in Ghana in 2000 and 2012.

Although Marxist scholars in Africa degrade the role of elections in liberal democracies, elections have come to stay in the democratic progress of nations in Africa. Originally, a colonial creation for determining or legitimating forms of state power through the processes of decolonization (Cohen, 1983), elections in postcolonial Nigeria have taken the shape of state-regulated noncompetitive model (Adejumobi, 2000). From the level of formulating rules to that of post-election adjudication, the process in Nigeria has nearly always been characterized by massive rigging by both incumbents and the opposition alike. And it now seems fashionable for *civil autocrats* in the guise of democracy to engage elections as mere formalities to attract international endorsement and aid without any substance of influence or role of citizens in determining who rules. Post-election adjudications are influenced by political forces of interest in ways that remove objectivity. This lack of good electoral governance almost withered all vestiges of popular sovereignty in the political system. Both the 2003 and 2007 elections in Nigeria were virtually characterized by situations that confirmed the notion of lack of autonomy for the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) and the thirty-six states Independent Electoral Commission.

Traditional notions of liberal democracy exalts the role of elections in democracies but Nigerian politicians have continued to behave in ways that convey notions of irrelevance of voters in the process. This condition became worsened by the virtual absence of voters from the polling booths for fear of intimidation and violence during elections. Although rigging during elections begin from the pre-election periods of formulation of rules to the conduct of the elections, it extends to the post election adjudication process and management. Liberal democracy as a system of limiting the power of the state against the citizens makes sense when democratic governance implies citizens' participation in the political system beyond voting to regular consultations in matters of public policy and decision making. The Nigerian experience is

full of regrets, as the mass of qualified adult citizens neither get involved in voting nor are consulted on major policy issues. The 2003 and 2007 elections in Nigeria were widely condemned for their level of electoral irregularities. There were not elections in many states of the federation, yet the election management body endorsed the outcomes of those elections. However, it is worthy of mention that the performance of INEC in the 2011 elections was a lot better than in the three previous national elections (1999, 2003 and 2007) in this political dispensation. This gives some glimmer of hope that the credibility of elections in Nigeria would appreciate in the forthcoming elections in 2015.

5. Policy Implications and Concluding Remarks

We have argued that democracy and good governance are virtually intertwined. It therefore implies that if it is so understood and practiced there will be marked differences in current claims of democracy in Nigeria where basic principles of democracy are absent. Both the process and outcome of democracy in Nigeria are negative on citizens' welfare on whom is the essence of democracy. The answer lies in good governance, which involves assumption of equal responsibilities for both the ruled and the ruler. To improve the structure of power relations in favor of citizens, political consciousness and action in forms of civil society oversight over the political process and procedure in democratic institutions need to be dynamic. It needs networking organically in ways that can constitute a source of insecurity for twisted politicians who have depended on fraud as a means of securing and staying in power.

Negative outcomes of democracy such as poverty, unemployment, post-election violence, and insecurity in Africa due to bad governance requires the institutionalization of development oriented practices for change in the continent. The institutionalization of the crusade against corruption remains the basis of ensuring good governance only if the anti-corruption institutions will themselves be subject to democratic governance and the oversight powers of responsible civil society. Political corruption, which is the violation of democratic principles and procedures need to be viewed with seriousness and should be made to attract equal condemnation and punishment with other forms of corruption such as economic and financial crimes. Often, it is neglected because nearly the political elite in Nigeria is guilty of this. For example, the history of elections in Nigeria is filled with stories of rigging. The poor is manipulated by the political class. Post election adjudication should not only be concerned with determination of who did and did not win in those elections, but should punish with imprisonment and fines in cases where it was established beyond reasonable doubt that political elite or their agents have violated electoral rules. This is because free and fair elections remain the theoretical basis of legitimacy, transparency and means for making leaders accountable to citizens.

The African Union should expand its peer review mechanism to include the imposition of some economic, social and political sanctions on regimes that are clearly undemocratic in practice. The emphasis on transition from military to civilian regimes is commendable but not sufficient a measure for external pressure on African countries to democratize. While the pace of democratization cannot take a hard and fast posture, basic principles of respect for the rule of law, credible free and fair elections and the implementation of policies geared towards the practical qualitative improvement of citizens welfare by political elite should also receive adequate monitoring and review.

References

- Adejumobi, S. (2000). Elections in Africa: A fading shadow of democracy? *International Political Science Review*, 21(1), 59-73.
- Akindele S.T. (2002). The concept of democracy and governance: A theoretical and empirical x-ray of their linkage and practical application within the Nigerian political landscape. *Journal of Social Science*, 6(3), 173-188.
- Akindele S.T. & Ajila, C.O.. (1992). Democratic transition in Africa: A psychological perspective. In B. Caron et al. (Eds.) *Democratic Transition in Africa* (pp. 83-100). Ibadan: Ceredu .
- Akindele S.T. and Obiyan., A.S. (1996). The thesis of liberal democracy: A revisitational review. *Ifa Social Sciences Review* 13(1 & 2), 84-95.
- Allen, F. (2006). *Democracy in Nigeria, neglecting citizens' welfare: Does it matter?* Paper presented at the 25th Annual Conference of the Nigerian Political Science Association, NPSA, Port Harcourt, August 2006.
- Allen, F. (2005). Electoral governance in Nigeria: Comparing the role of the civil society and incumbent political parties. In G. Onu and A. Momoh (Eds.) *Election and Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria* (pp.). Lagos: Nigerian Political Science Association.
- Allen, F. (2002). *Nigeria's democratic journey: The cultural factor*. Paper presented at the International Conference on an Assessment of Nigeria's Democratic Journey So Far, Abuja, February 2002.
- Amoako, K. Y. (2003). The UNECA and good governance in Africa. Paper presented at the Harvard International Development Conference on Governance and Development in a Dynamic Global Environment, Boston, Massachusetts, April 2003.
- Azikiwe, N. (1960). *ZIK*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, D.L. (1983). Elections and election study in Africa. In Y. Barango (Eds.). *Political Science in Africa: A Critical Review*(72-93). London: Zed Books.

- Colomer, M. J. (2010). Governance. *International Encyclopedia of Political Science* (pp. 687-690). Washington, D.C.: CQ Press..
- Dahl, R. A. (1971). *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Drury, A.C, and Kriekhaaus, J. and Luszitg, M.(2006). Corruption, democracy and economic growth. *International Political Science Review*, 27(2), 121-136.
- Dwivedi, I. O. (2010). Good Governance. *International Encyclopedia of Political Science*(.683-685). Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Gilbert, L.D (2010). *Ethnic Militias and Conflict in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria: The International Dimensions (1999-2009)*. Doctoral Thesis Submitted to University of KwaZulu-Natal, Howard College Campus, South Africa.
- Jega, A M. (2003). The state and identity transformation under structural adjustment. In A. Jega (Eds.). *Identity Transformation and Identity Politics under Structural Adjustment in Nigeria* (pp. 26-44). Uppsala: Nordiska Afrikainstitute and The Centre for Research and Documentation.
- Kothari, R. (2007). *Rethinking Democracy*. London: Zed Books.
- Lansford, T. (2010). Democracy, future of. In G. T. Kurian, *International Encyclopedia of Political Science* (pp.391-392). Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Leininger, J. (2010). Bringing the outside in: Illustrations from Haiti and Mali for the re-conceptualization of democracy promotion. *Contemporary Politics*, 16 (1), 63-80.
- Lewis, P. Bratton, M. and Alemika, E. (2001). *Down To Earth: Changes in Attitudes Towards Democracy and Markets in Nigeria*. Lagos: Afrobarometer
- Lumumba-Kasongo, T. (2005). The problematics of liberal democracy and democratic process: Lessons for deconstructing and building African democracies. In T. Lumumba-Kasongo, *Liberal Democracy and its Critic in Africa* (pp.1-25). Dakar: CODESRIA.
- Mozaffar, S. (2002). Patterns of electoral governance in Africa's emerging democracies. *International Political Science Review*, 23(1), 85-101.
- Obadan, M.I. (1998). *The state, leadership, governance and economic development*. Presidential Address Delivered at the Annual Conference of the Nigerian Economic Society, Kano, July 1998.
- Olowu, D. (1995). Transition to democratic governance in Africa. In D. Olowu, K. Soremekun & A. Williams (Eds.). *Governance and Democratisation in Nigeria* (pp 15-32). Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
- Okeke- Uzodike, U., and Allen, F. (2005). Making Nigerian federalism work: Fixing the democracy deficit. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Nigerian Political Science Association, University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus, Nigeria in July 2005.
- Schumpeter, J. (1976). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Southall, R. (2003). *Democracy in Africa: Moving Beyond the Difficult Legacy*. South Africa: Human Science Research Council.
- Sindzingre, A. (2006). A failure or a necessity? Assessing the contribution of the state to growth in developing countries. Paper presented at the 20th world congress of the International Political Science Association, IPSA in Fukuoka, July 2006.
- Stokes, G. (2002). Democracy and citizenship. In A. Carter and G. Stokes (Eds.). *Democratic theory today: challenges for the 21st century* (pp. 23-51). Blackwell Publishers Ltd: Malden, MA.