

FUNDAMENTALS OF GOOD GOVERNANCE: THE PANACEA FOR DEVELOPMENT PERFORMANCE IN NIGERIA

<https://doi.org/10.47743/jopaf1-2021-22-02>

Francis Ayegbunam IKENGA

Department of Political Science, Delta State University,
Abraka, Nigeria
faikenga@gmail.com

Obinna CHIMA

Department of Policy and Strategic Studies, Covenant University,
Ota, Nigeria
obstan@yahoo.com

Abstract: *A system of governance is good when it is legitimate, participatory, transparent and accountable, operates by the rule of law, efficient and effective in the use of resources, responsive to the needs of the people and promotes equity and equality. In Nigeria, years of economic exploitation, mal-development and bad governance have continued to fan the ember of conflicts and crisis in the country. A failed, corrupt and inept leadership coupled with inclement domestic socio-political environment have plunged development performance into the abyss. To progress from bad to good governance and from weak to strong development performance, Nigerian political leaders must adhere to the core fundamentals of good governance without which socio-economic and political development will continue to be an illusion. The cardinal objective of this study is to demonstrate that core fundamentals of good governance impact significantly on development performance. This study adopted qualitative research design as data were collected from secondary sources. The technique of content analysis was applied to analyze the data collected which helped us to make interpretations coherently. The study revealed among other things that governance issues are the bane of development performance in Nigeria. The study therefore, recommends among others that for good governance and strong development performance to be feasible in Nigeria, transparency and accountability, rule of law, electoral legitimacy, efficient and effective service delivery, administrative competence, civil liberties and participation must be guaranteed.*

Keywords: *Good governance, development, performance, fundamentals, political stability, democracy*

Introduction

In modern day governance globally, the issue of good governance has assumed the front burner as an indispensable requirement for social, economic and political development, yet good governance continues to be a source of worry and a big challenge to most countries including Nigeria. Democratic governance with the underlying emphasis on the activation of citizenry to realize the common good' has not taken root in the popular consciousness of Nigerians. Everyone appears to be for himself, in Nigeria, it would seem that democracy has increased the culture of impunity in some people while political difference are believed to have fuelled some of the violence that have erupted. Generally, governance, according to the World Bank (1989) is the exercise of political power in the management of a nation's affairs. This definition thus implies that governance encompasses the state's institutional and cultural arrangements, decision-making processes and implementation capacity, and the relationship between the governing apparatus and

the governed. By governance therefore, we mean the manner in which power is exercised by governments in the management and distribution of a country's social and economic resources. The nature and manner of this distribution makes governance a bad or a good one. It is significant to note however, that good governance as a norm cannot make sense unless it is predicated on the presupposition that the experience and knowledge of bad governance is possible and real (Ogundiya, 2010). This suggests that governance can be good or bad depending on the method of the management of a country's social and economic resources. In a democratic state, election plays wider roles such as instruments of accountability, mobilization of the people and promotion of legitimacy among other functions. In short, credible elections produce security, development and political stability. It is not an overstatement to contend that the return of the country to electoral democracy in 1999, it has not made significant impact on the economic, political and social well-being of the people. Despite all economic and social policies that have been implemented by successive administrations, Nigeria remained a laggard in economic, political and social developments. Subsequently, political instability, abject poverty, acute youth unemployment, heightened crime rate, poor health prospects, widespread malnourishment have been the main features of Nigeria's political economy (Ogundiya, 2010). The Nigerian state is a victim of brazen corruption, bad governance, a cyclical legitimacy crisis, political instability, disregard for due process and the rule of law and abuse of the electoral processes. All these retard development performance in Nigeria.

Fundamentals of good governance have become a mighty beacon where there are high-level corruption, insecurity, political instability, abuse of law, public service failure, abject poverty, acute youth unemployment, inequality and the weakening of institutions. Due to this intuitive appeal, good governance has grown rapidly to become a major ingredient in analysis of what is missing in countries struggling for economic and political development. As such, nations (Nigeria inclusive) wishing to realize, promote or maintain economic, political and social strands should strive to embrace the core fundamentals of good governance such as transparency and accountability, adherence to the rule of law, electoral legitimacy, efficient and effective service delivery, administrative competence, civil liberties and citizens' participation in development process. Thus, this study accounts for how to progress from bad to good governance and from weak to strong development performance in Nigeria.

Methodology

This study adopted qualitative research design as it relies on secondary data collected from documentations through published and unpublished books, journal articles and internet sources, and were content analyzed in relation to the scope of the study. That is, a systematic review of extant literature on significant impact of good governance fundamentals on development performance.

Conceptual Analysis

A study of this nature requires the clarification of certain concepts considered fundamental based on the opinions of notable authorities. This will go a long way in familiarizing readers with the subject matters of the study. Therefore, the following concepts are accorded priority in this study:

Good Governance

The World Bank has provided two definitions of governance that are widely cited in the literature: The use of power to manage a nation's affair (World Bank, 1989) and the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country's economic and social resources for development (World Bank, 1992). Variations on these definitions include specific mentioning of the exercise of administrative, economic and political authority to manage a country's affairs, separation of political governance from economic governance (with administration subsumed under each category) and separation of governance at the national level from governance at the sub-national level. A distinction is also made between public governance (covering government at all levels) and corporate or business governance (Isham, Kaufmann & Pritchett, 1997). According to Hyden and Court (2002: 19), governance is "the formation and stewardship of the formal and informal rules that regulate the public realm, the arena in which state as well as economic and social actors interact to make decisions. Here, governance refers to the quality of the political system rather than technical capacities or distributive aspects, which they argue are a function of policy. In the view of Ogundiya (2010:202), governance is "the process that is employed to achieve the noble end of the state. Thus, governance simply implies the art of governing a people within a given territory or a state. It consists of two essential elements of the state, namely the structure of the state and the procedures of the legislative, judicial and those of the executive and administrative bodies at all the tiers of government". Governance according to Fagbadebo (2007), referred to the development and implementation of public policy through a broader range of private and public agencies than those traditionally associated with government. Because government increasingly characterized by diversity, power interdependence and policy networks, governance stresses the complexity of policy – making, implementation and accountability relationships between a variety of state and societal actors at all levels, globally and regionally, and at national government level as well as in local administration. In governance theory, the relationship between state and non - state actors become less hierarchical and more interactive. In this way, governance denotes "a highly fluid institutional and policy matrix in which the powers and responsibilities of different actors and tiers of government are in flux" (Wohlmuth, 1999:7). In the context of this study, governance is conceived as the manner in which power is exercised to manage a country's economic, political and social affair at both the national and sub-national levels.

Governance embraces all "the methods (good and bad) that societies use to distribute power and manage public resources and problems" (UNDP, 1997:19). Good and bad governance is therefore subsets of governance, depending on whether public resources and problems are managed effectively, efficiently and in response to the critical needs of all members of the society. According to UNDP (1997:19), "a system of governance is good when it satisfies these conditions. It is participatory, meaning it allows both men and women a voice in decision-making, either directly or indirectly. It is legitimate and acceptable to the people, transparent and accountable, promotes equity and equality, operates by the rule of law which means legal frameworks are fairly and impartially enforced, responsive to the needs of the people and efficient and effective in the use of resources". In the view of Oluwa, 2012 cited in Nwanegbo, Umara and Ikyase (2017:214), good governance is "a function of effective, visionary, transparent, trustworthy and credible political leadership whose driving force is an improvement in the collective well-

being of the citizens through well conceived, effectively implemented economic policies and human development programmes”.

Sharman, Sadana and Kaur (2013:64) affirm that good governance “established the rule of law, enforces contracts and agreement between the individuals, maintain law and order, guarantees security to the people, economizes on cost and resources, protects the government and properly delivers services to the society. It also determines an optimal size of the government and makes best possible use of government resources”. In the opinion of Fagbadebo (2007:32), good governance could be “accomplished when the operation of governance is in line with the prevailing legal and ethical principles of the political community. When this is the situation, system affect will be high, and the people would collectively aspire to participate in the activities of the state, knowing full well that adherence to the rules and procedures would serve the interest of the greatest number of the population. Deprivation of benefits and selective justice would not be encouraged, as individuals’ rights would be protected within the ambit of the law. Political leaders would hold dear the watchwords: transparency and accountability in governance”. Similarly, Onichakwe (2016) posits that the formulation and implementation of friendly policies will attract and encourage the citizenry to participate both in economic and political activities freely within the confines of the state’s policies. The underlying principles of good governance are the focus on people as the ultimate objective of governance. Notwithstanding the variations in the definitions, there is broad consensus in the literature on the subject on its core fundamentals: transparency and accountability, rule of law, electoral legitimacy, efficient and effective service delivery, administrative competence, civil liberties and participation and consensus- orientation.

Transparency and Accountability

Transparency refers to an environment in which government policies and actions and the information relating to them are provided to the public on an understandable, accessible and timely basis. Transparency could be accomplished when decisions made and their enforcement is achieved in a manner that is in conformity with the rules and regulations. To guarantee good governance practice, “government policies are to openly disseminated to the entire citizens can easily develop confidence in their intentions”. In short, the processes of decision-making, the ultimate decisions reached and government actions taken are expected to be made open and subject to check by other organs of government and non-governmental organization (Apaza, 2009; Gisselquist, 2012; Addink, 2017). Thus, transparency makes open government possible and increases the demand for accountability. Closely linked to transparency is the concept of accountability. It refers to the degree by which political actors have the ability and willingness to demonstrate consistency between their activities and the constitution (Gisselquist, 2012). A government is accountable when its leaders (both elected and appointed) are responsive to the demands of the governed. Respect for the rule of law and an independent judiciary constitute key mechanisms for enforcing accountability. Elected legislatures (a key component of electoral legitimacy) also constitute mechanisms for enforcing accountability through their oversight function. The institution of ombudsman where it exists is yet another instrument for enforcing accountability. An Ombudsman is commonly referred to as the ‘citizen’s defender’. Also, citizens can seek redress in the courts for acts of omission or commission by a government and its officials. Accountability emphasizes that all actors particularly

those in government, business, voluntary agencies, civil societies, among others are to be made answerable to the public (Rotberg, 2004).

Rule of Law

The rule of law emphasizes that it is the law that rules not man. Thus, there must be emphasis on fairness to all as well as impartial enforcement of laws and rights. Rule of law, underpinned by an independent court system implies a predictable legal framework that helps to ensure settlement of conflicts between the state and individuals on the one hand and among individuals or groups on the other. It also helps to protect and enforce property and contract rights. In almost every modern state, the supreme law of the land (or the fundamental law) is the constitution. Woleola (2017) posits that the rule of law guarantee equity, fairness and justice in the society. It is also the impartial enforcement of transparent laws, regulations and codes, and the full protection of human rights, particularly those of minorities in the society.

Electoral Legitimacy

Electoral legitimacy is derived from periodic, open, competitive, free and fair elections that provide to the elected political executive a mandate to govern. The legitimacy of the political leadership is a function of the extent to which the elections are free and credible. Also, there is the legitimacy of the legislative body (parliament) whose members emerge from periodic elections that are sometimes the same as those that produce the leadership of the executive and sometimes the elections are separate. Free, fair and credible elections are essential because they help ensure that every citizen participates in the government of his or her own country. In the view of Ighodalo (2012:167), election is “part of the democratic framework in the society that if properly put to use, will produce socio-economic and political development. Credible elections put the right people in government, manage conflict effectively and allocate resources efficiently”. Thus, credible elections are necessary to stem the tide of political decay and renewal in the country. This is because in the view of apologists of liberal democracy, once elections are gotten right, democracy is on its way to being consolidated and in consequence enduring peace and security and development and political stability will be instituted in the country. Therefore, periodic, credible and genuine elections are a necessary and indispensable element of sustained efforts to protect the rights and interests of the governed and that as a matter of practical experience, the right of everyone to take part in the government of his or her own country is a crucial factor in the effective enforcement by all in a wide range of other human rights and fundamental freedoms, embracing political, economic, social and cultural rights (United Nations General Assembly, 1992).

Efficient and Effective Service Delivery

Efficiency is primarily the process of doing things right while effectiveness is the process of doing the right things (Cole & Kelly, 2011). Thus, the principle as it applies to good governance means doing things right and doing the right things within the society by the government, using the resources available. Efficiency embraces the long-lasting use of God-given resources of the society and most especially environmental protection while the principles of effectiveness emphasizes the good use of the natural resources of the society by the government (Rotberg, 2004; Nanda, 2006; Rothstein & Teorell, 2008, Oluwa, 2012).

The primary purpose of a public service in a modern state is the delivery of quality public goods and services to the citizens.

Administrative Competence

Administrative competence can be conceived as the capacity of a state administration to perform the core functions of a modern state as well as create an enabling environment for different actors in promoting development in a state. Two of the factors widely acknowledged as assuring a competent administration are merit-based recruitment and promotion and an emphasis on professionalism and continuous learning. A competent administration would be expected to ensure the continuity of the state, provide or facilitate the provision of quality service delivery and be accountable to both the political leadership of successive elected governments and the general public. The critical importance of a competent administration in the discussion of the governance of a modern state can be illustrated by the fact that almost without exception, the incapacity of a state administration to assure the continuity of the state is a strong evidence of a failed or failing state (United Nations General Assembly, 1993).

Civil Liberties

Civil liberties refer to freedom of expression, association and assembly. Freedom of expression referred to as freedom of the press (print and electronic and freedom of association is concern with political associations (political parties), civil society groups (for example, trade unions, community –based and faith-based organizations). The definition of civil liberties is most often extended to cover human rights such as the right to life and property for all citizens and specific concern with rights of children, women, the disabled and their marginalized groups in the society. The constitutions of many modern states have provisions on respect for civil liberties and the protection of human rights. Civil liberties also guarantee equity and inclusiveness. It covers the dignity of the human person, equal rights and freedom from any discrimination. This therefore, ensures that every citizen is given equal access to better his or her lot and also to enhance his or her well-being in the society (Harrison, 2005). In modern state, the enforcement of respect, for civil liberties and human rights is normally a key responsibility of the judiciary. Some countries, commissions or councils have been established for the protection of human right (for example, Ghana, Malawi, Benin, Nigeria, Kenya, etc) More so, in many countries, civil society groups serve as agencies that help ensure respect for citizens’ basic freedom. Therefore, a society’s well-being depends on ensuring that all its members feel that have a stake in it and do not feel excluded from the mainstream of society.

Participation and Consensus – Orientation

Participation refers to the involvement of every adult in the politics of his or her society. It could be either direct participation by individual citizens or indirect participation by their accredited representatives. According to Kaufman, Kraay and Mastruzzi, 2006 cited in Woleola (2017:156), participation is “the degree of involvement of the citizens of a country in the election of their political leaders and ultimately their representatives in government”. Thus, participation is a cornerstone of good governance and needs to be informed and organized, which requires freedom of association and expression and organized civil society groups, while consensus – orientation on the other hand requires

mediation of the different interest in society to reach a broad consensus on what is the best interest of the whole society and how this can be achieved. It also requires a broad and long-term perspective on what is needed for sustainable human development and how to achieve such development (Whohlmuth, 1999).

Bad Governance

Bad governance is “the absence of good governance and may not necessarily mean the absence of democracy. It is evident in the inability of a state to achieve or realize the essence of the state at a particular time” (Ogundiya, 2010: 204). In Owoye and Bissessar, 2009, cited in Coker and George-Genyi (2014: 1125), bad governance is “a symptom of institutional and leadership failures, explicitly manifested by its long list of dictatorial leaders, not free media and undemocratic elections”. World Bank (1992) posits that bad governance has many features, among which are failure to make a clear separation between what is public and what is private, hence a tendency to divert public resources for private gain; failure to establish a predictable framework for law and government behavior in a manner that is conducive to development, or arbitrariness in the application of rules and laws; excessive rules, regulations, licensing, requirements, etc. which impede the functioning of markets and encourage rent-seeking; priorities that are inconsistent with development thus resulting in a misallocation of resources and excessively narrow base for or non-transparencies, decision-making. According to Obadan, 1998 cited in Ogundiya (2010), when these features occur together they create an environment that is hostile to development, the authority of governments over their peoples tends to be progressively eroded, the economic cost tends to be high including a diversion of resources to internal security and escalating corruption. Thus, bad governance is contrapuntal to a nation’s socio-economic and political development. However, bad governance is more pronounced when a state fails (abysmally) to meet the needs of the society even though it makes use of the best of all the resources at her disposal. Wael (2013) posits that factors such as acute corruption and absence of accountability, the lack of effective institutional control, predatory coalition between the ruling party and business sector, lack of transparency of rules, laws and processes and lack of leadership by example are the major features of bad governance.

Democracy

Democracy is “a broad model of government that is epitomized by good governance, the rule of law, security, and protection of individual rights, vibrant civil society and shared economic prosperity”. Based on this postulation, it becomes practically difficulties if not impossible for democracy to be sustained in the absence of any or all of the above specific attributes. In other words, it requires an adherence to rule of law, constitutional practices, press freedom and judicial independence for the spirit of democracy to be sustained (Gambari, 2001; Omemma, 2017). Similarly, Oluwole, 2003 cited in Ogundiya (2010), posits that democracy is a theory that sets some basic principles according to which a good government, whatever its form, must be run. Such principles include justice, equity, freedom, liberty, accountability, openness and transparency in government. Indeed, effective democratic forms of governance rely on public participation,

consensus-orientation, transparency and accountability, equity and inclusiveness, the rule of law and constitutionalism and strategic vision. The symbiotic relationship between democracy and good governance is globally acclaimed. This is borne out of the belief that democracy premised on the principle of the rule of law and constitutionalism is capable of ushering good governance and societal development. It is equally believed that democracy conforms to the principle of justice, equity and fair-play as a democratic state is based on consent and popular participation (Oke, 2010). He further posits that governance in Nigeria is such that has portrayed and presented a mockery of the widely acclaimed symptom of good governance, democracy the official governmental practice has been hijacked by military apologies to the extent that Nigerian citizens now experience despair instead of hope, insecurity instead security, tragic and untimely death instead of long life and high life expectancy, illusion instead of expectation, deficits instead of dividends, militarization instead of civility, dictatorship instead of rule law, political selection instead of election, etc. Thus, the Nigerian political landscape seems headed for disaster. Some of the country's political leaders have stripped naked the rule of civil engagement, jettisoned the constitution and have allowed cacophony to hold sway. Thus argument is still plausible today in the Nigerian polity.

Development Performance

Development and performance are two concepts that are of significance to all modern societies. Development is a complex and highly contested concept that does not lend itself to any generally acceptable definition due to the multidimensional nature and multidisciplinary approach to it and the value laden attached to it. This may be the reason for Idode (1989) to described development as a problematic concept. He further posited that development has been used in many different ways including political, economic and social. In other words, development is a construct of many applications. Okobiah (1984) sees development to involve a process of economic, political and social change in a direction towards a better social well-being for the members of the society. Similarly, World Bank (1992) holds that the concept of development has both socio-economic and political attributes such as sustainable increase in living standards including consumption, education, health and environmental protection, equality of opportunity and liberties and political freedom. In the view of Oladosu (2015:145), no country can be described developed except that which enjoys remarkable calm, harmony, tranquility and whatever it takes genuine peace to reign. A good percentage of its citizens must be economically buoyant, socially amiable and culturally well exposed. They must have a sound educational background, acceptable political system, increased industrial output, a democratically elected government and a very high standard of living. A developed nation would have minimal cases of poverty, ignorance, diseases, accidents and all forms of artificial mishaps and abnormal behaviors have zero tolerance for corruption and all forms of abominable acts”.

In short, Goulet, 1985 cited in Jacob (2017) opined that the objectives of development are concerned with life sustenance, self-esteem or respect and freedom. Life sustenance is concerned with access to basic human needs without which life would be impossible. These things include food, shelter, healthcare, electricity and protection. The second feature of development is self-esteem and self-respect. It is the wish of every society

to be respected. To this end, most societies pursue those things that would give them the necessary respect. These things include wealth and technological development. Lastly, freedom as used in this context means emancipation from alienating material conditions of life and from the servitude of men and nature, ignorance or misery, institution and dogmatic belief. Similarly, See (1969:22) posed the basic question about the meaning of development by commenting that:

“The question to ask about a country’s development is therefore: what has been happening to poverty? What has been happening to unemployment? What has been happening to inequality? If all three of these have declined from high level, then beyond doubt, this has been a period of development for the country concerned. If one or two of these central problems have been growing worse, especially of all the three, it would be strange to call the result development, even if per capital income doubled”.

Development can be broadly defined in a manner applicable to all societies’ at all historical periods as an upward ascending movement featuring greater levels of energy, efficiency, quality, productivity, complexity, comprehension, creativity, mastery, enjoyment and accomplishment. (Aver, Nnorom & Targba, 2013). Therefore, development is a process of economic, political and social change not merely a set of policies and programmes instituted for some specific results and it must bring about qualitative improvement in the standard of living of the citizens in the society. In the context of this study, development is therefore conceived as the creating of an economy with relevant economic, political, social and physical infrastructure for business operations and industrial growth, to provide gainful employment, high level education facilities and medical care for the citizenry. While performance on the other hand refers to how an institution uses governance arrangements to contribute to its overall performance and the effective delivery of goods and services to meet the needs of the society.

Development performance therefore refers to the capacity to cope with new and continuous changes towards the achievement of progressive economic, political and social objectives. It emphasizes economic, political and social development across the length and breadth of the country. Economic development refers to “a sustainable increase in living standard that encompasses material consumption, education, health and environmental protection” (Sapru, 197:7). Increase in their capital income, reduction in poverty and more equitable distribution of wealth are the basic tenets of economic development. Similarly, Black (1966:56) conceived economic development as “the attainment of ideals of modernization such as rise in productivity, industrialization, social and economic equalization, development of modern knowledge, improved institution and attitude and a rationality coordinated system of policy measures that may on the other hand remove the host of undesirable conditions in the social system that have perpetuated a state of underdevelopment while on the other promote better nourishment, better health, better education and better living conditions”. Political development means the increased differentiation and specialization of political structures and the increased secularization of political culture (Nwagwu, 2018). According to Kakuba (2016), political development is seen in the perspective of having a self –reliant, rule of law, free and fair periodic elections and respect for human rights among other tenets, in that regard, citizens are given full opportunities to participate in the political affairs of the country. Social development refers to “the process by which people interact with others around them. As they develop and perceive their own individuality within their community, they also gain skills to

communicate with other people and process their action” (Aver et al., 2013:262). Therefore, social development denotes people, community and the factors that influence quality of life. It is an attempt to explain qualitative changes in the structure and framework of society that help the society to better realize its aims and objectives.

Good Governance in Nigeria: Discussing the Paradox

Nigeria is one of the most blessed countries in the world with abundant human and natural resources. But fifty nine (59) years after political independence and twenty (20) years of uninterrupted civilian regimes, the country remains grossly undeveloped and occupied a strategic position in the poverty, acute unemployment and inequality index in the world. Everyone expected that the return of Nigeria to democratic rule would bring the desired change it needs for the polity. On the contrary, Nigeria is still behind this sphere of human development. This has made many people still hold doubts on whether development is achievable under the present democratic dispensation due to growing insecurity, poverty, corruption, political instability, unemployment, widespread malnourishment and poor health prospects to mention but few, despite the growing oil revenue and economic potentials. The Nigeria’s economic and political landscape is pervaded by corruption and abuse of office. Corruption, bad governance and low level of transparency and accountability have been major sources of development failure in Nigeria. Corruption is viewed by Nwangegbo et al (2017), as the cog in the Nigerian wheel of progress and development, as the both social and economic monster and the cause of inequality and inequitable distribution of the nation’s wealth among its citizens, a situation that is the root cause of disaffection among Nigerians.

It is worrisome however; that decades after the ‘third wave’ of democracy have blown across the continent of Africa, democratization in Nigeria has not produced the expected result. Rather than engender development and good governance, it has led to anarchy, civil wars, genocide, terrorism, political assassinations, ethno-religious conflicts and political instability. Omede and Ngwube (2017) affirm that the problem of instability exists and persists when the political system fails to engender, maintain and sustain the belief in its constituent members and its citizenry that which the regime defined as a constitutional order. The prevalence of political violence and gross instability in Nigeria is an empirical indicator of the low level of political legitimacy. Thus, legitimacy crisis is one of the most pernicious endemic and the most challenging problems confronting the Nigerian State and its leaders. It has manifested in different ways such ethnic and religious crisis, political disturbance, civil disobedience, e.t.c. Also, Fagbodebo (2007) has rightly noted that one of the major factors responsible for political instability in Nigeria is the failure of the political class to sufficiently adhere to the basic tenets of democracy and constitutionalism. In short, the failure of governance could expressly mean failure of political leadership. This support the assertion of Achebe (1984) who posited that political leadership has been one of the main obstacles to democracy and development in Africa. Post-independence political leadership has been everything but not productive they have been distributive rather than productive in orientation, wasteful and corrupt in political and economic management. The problem with Nigeria has been described simply as that of leadership. Given the character of the country’s leaders today, it is not surprising that there are threats to human security. This is not unrelated to the schism in the ranks of the political

leaders who lack the hegemony and discipline to engender socio-economic and political stability. Indeed, the best governments are those who met their society in a condition of socio-economic and political nadir and are able to save the society or lift it up from doldrums to the position of fame and prosperity.

In some countries today such as South Africa, Zambia, Sierra Leone, Botswana, Tanzania, Ghana, e.t.c. progress has been visible with the conduct of credible elections, alternation of power among political parties, expansion of the political and civil space with better observance of human rights and the rule of law, nourishing media and modest economic progress. Regrettably Nigeria today there is neck-deep in a crisis of transition, in which there is large scale election rigging, the trend towards a one party state, marked inter-ethnic electoral conflicts and political violence, the concentration and personalization of power and a new phenomenon of political dynasty in which leaders stage-manage power transfer to their children – all constituting ominous signs of a downward political slope in Nigeria's democratization effort. There is a huge gap between the demand and the supply of democracy and good governance in Nigeria, while the people yearn for and prefer democratic governance as the most viable alternative for constructing a decent society and assuring a better future, the supply of it by the political leaders is very limited, incongruent with the expectations of the Nigeria. This is why Osaghae (1999) and Fagbadebo (2007) contend that given the depth of the decay and destruction of the political infrastructure and democratic culture of the society, entrenched dominant interest will not likely give way easily and the process of transition to genuine democracy and good governance will be in two phases: first when civilian rule is consummated with the conduct of credible elections and second when democratic culture reigns. Current evidence suggests that these is a long and tortuous route to achieving democracy and good governance in Nigeria, and the process of democratic consolidation will be long haul (Omede & Ngwube, 2017).

In short, Nigeria's 1999 transition to civilian government was a product of long, turbulent period of military rule and failed democratic experiments. At the time of the political handover, many Nigerians expressed hopes for a democratic dividend that would expand political liberties, prove the performance of government, encourage transparency and accountability among leaders and revive the ailing economy. The anticipated benefits of democratic governance have been slow to emerge and the new dispensation has failed to fulfill the expectation of many Nigerians. Today, Analyst, commentators, academic scholars and average citizens in Nigeria express deep concerns about political violence high court level of corruption, bad governance leadership failure and economic deprivation. All these suggest absence of democratic governance. Indeed, Diamond (2008) avers that in real terms, there is no democracy to all in Nigeria. For Agbaja, 2004 cited in Lindberg (2009:86), Nigeria is "a mere showcase of electoralism, a caricature of electoral democracy on what some others referred to as electoral authoritarian regime". In a similar vein, Nwigwe, 2003 cited in Ogundiya (2010:205) contends that it would constitute a very difficult problem for political theorists to determine the classification of Nigeria's type of government. It is not a monarchy, even though there are so many monarchs in the polity-making positions. It is definitely not an aristocracy, because by its very definition, aristocracy means government by the best. It is of course not democracy, because at least in its modern understanding, democracy is government of the people by the people and for the people. What then is it? It we go by St. Augustine's definition – government that Nigeria ever had could qualify as 'Mafia Government'. The word 'Mafia' means

government infested with power drunken, less operatives; usually selected by their kind and of course scarcely ever selected by the people. Even in the guise of multi-party election, those to rule are clearly predetermined and chosen even before elections takes place”.

The above assertion is still forceful today; the reason for Nwigue’s (2003) conclusion is not far-fetched. In terms of outcome, Nigerians have not significantly reaped the dividends of democracy. Secondly, Nigeria’s democracy has been violent ridden characterized with Wanton destruction of lives and properties. Thirdly, and most importantly, the peoples’ vote seems not to count in determining who governs as elections are rigged or its outcome determined before the poll (Ogundiya, 2010). Therefore, procedurally, democracy in Nigeria is lamed and in terms of its conceptual outcome, it has failed to meet the expectations of the people. More so,, Nigeria’s democracy (if it could be so described) has tended to promote inequality rather than equality. Toyo’s (1994) comment is also instructive; there can be no genuine democracy in a country where citizens are grossly unequal in wealth and the poor who are invariably the majority are dependent on the wealth. Due to the fact that wealth is power, where such a cleavage and dependency exist, political power is inevitably in the hands of the wealthy. In this scenario, democracy ceases to be democracy in reality; in effect it is a plutocracy. In essence, a responsible and accountable leadership that would characterize good governance in Nigeria is patently absent. In Nigeria today, what we have is democracy without economic, political and social development. Therefore, democracy cannot engender good governance in a state like Nigeria where it is yet to make sense of, most especially the contending political leaders.

Fundamentals of Good Governance and Development Performance

The analysis below lays out the linkage of each of the fundamental of good governance to development performance:

Transparency and Accountability

Transparency and accountability in governance will increase the sense of national community as well as the level of system affect. Regarding transparency, one good illustration is in respect of fiscal policy for which the “Code of Good Practice of Fiscal Transparency’ prepared by the International Monetary Fund (1997), is the widely accepted yardstick in both developing and developed countries. The code was prepared after the collapse of East Asian economies in the late 1990s – an illustration of the linkage of transparency to better economic performance. The main points in the code are: clarity of roles and responsibilities for fiscal policy; public availability of information; open budget preparation, execution and reporting; and independent assurance of integrity. Also, accountability of a government to the governed requires that the government is answerable to its citizens and responsive to their needs. In almost every case, citizens’ needs are conterminous with the promotion of development. Mechanisms for enforcing accountability include the court system, the oversight role of legislative bodies, ombudsman institutions and the media and civil society groups through their watchdog role. For the different mechanism for enforcing accountability to function properly, it is important that government policies and actions and the ‘information relating to them are provided to the public on an understandable, accessible and time basis. Access to government information has increased significantly since the 1990s even though only a

few countries have adopted a freedom of information law/act (for example, Botswana, Cape Verde, Namibia,, South Africa and Mauritius). Nigeria is among the laggards (Economic Commission for Africa, 2004).

A widely acknowledged index of lack of transparency and weak accountability is the root cause of the problem of corruption in the development literature. The extensive research work on the subject in the 1990s led to a worldwide shared view of it as a ‘cancer’ to be combated in both developing and developed nations. With specific reference to developing countries, there is strong evidence that corruption undermine development efforts, distorts the composition of government expenditure, reduces expenditure on operations and maintenance, lowers the quality of public infrastructure and services, lowers incentives to private investment, undermines legitimacy and credibility of the state, influences outcomes of the legal and regulatory processes, violates the social and economic rights of the poor and the vulnerable and erodes the moral fabric of society (Kofi, 1999). In short, an unaccountable government would tend to be corrupt and be a drag on development while an accountable government would tend to be relatively honest and development-oriented. In Nigeria today, the immunity from transparency and accountability, accentuated by the enormous oil revenues, further impoverished the people especially the inhabitants of the oil producing area. Thus, the underdevelopment or no development syndrome became cyclical. In order to break this cycle, transparency and accountability have to be guaranteed and the people have to be involved in issues the affect their lives and tier immediate environment.

Rule of Law

There is a growing literature on how judicial independence and efficiency contribute to improved development performance. The main points highlighted are as follows: judicial inefficiency is bad for litigants and for economic prosperity; inability to enforce and protect legal rights (especially property and contractual rights) undermines economic growth and harts the poor; good judiciaries enhance economic development. A good illustration of the negative consequences of the lack of judicial independence for economic development is provided by the Republic of Guinea after the collapse of the country’s one-party government in 1984. Because the single party had usurped judicial functions, the collapse of the party created a virtual legal vacuum. The absence of any legal framework hindered the establishment of both new governance structures and new market-oriented economic policies. Consequently, building judicial institutions was a priority of the successor government, with the help of multilateral and bilateral donors who had been invited by the government to provide development assistance. In rehabilitating the court system, attention was focused on the protection of property rights and the development commercial law, with particular reference to the enforcement of contracts. According to Olson (1993), it is the same legal system that enforces property rights and contracts that also helps to ensure respect for individual rights. He adds that an economy in which people have rights is more sustainable than one in which individual rights are denied. A counterfactual is the evidence of good economic performance linked to enforcement of property rights and contracts while there is a good record in respect of human rights. Thus, a good legal system simultaneously enforces property and contracts rights and ensures respect for individual rights and good economic performance.

Electoral Legitimacy

The legitimacy of governments, derived from free and transparent periodic elections is crucial for the mobilization of public support for government policies. It requires a government to focus on implementing policies for which it has a mandate and it ensures good for domestic and foreign investors and contributes to economic development. When the legitimacy of the political leadership of the executive arm of government is 'contested' (for example, through public perception of rigged elections), the positive linkage to stable policies and economic development could be lost. Similarly, while the legitimacy of the legislative body (parliament) ensures that it is able to effectively perform its legislative, representation and oversight functions (with positive consequences for development performance), contested legitimacy at that level would also impact negatively on the development performance. Also, the linkage of electoral legitimacy to development performance is through citizens' participation in governance that is fostered by the organization of periodic elections. Thus, free, credible elections allow the governed to elect their leaders including throwing out non-performing governor and president while re-electing good performers who would contribute more to socio-economic development. At this point, it is important to acknowledge the good development performance of some Asian and Latin American countries that lacked electoral legitimacy in the 1970s and 1980s (for example, Chile, Indonesia, Taiwan and South Korea) and recorded impressive development performance, measured by the significant proportion of their populations that 'graduated' from poverty. It was also the case in some African countries that lacked electoral legitimacy recorded poor development performance at about the same time (for example, Guinea and Benin). Significantly, since the mid-1990s, electoral legitimacy in the sense of reliance on establishing governments through elections has become widely accepted across developing and transition countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America and Central and Eastern Europe as a crucial factor in achieving good development performance (UNDP, 2002).

Efficient and Effective Service Delivery

Despite efforts to improve service delivery, criticisms and complaints toward public service remain to be heard. The public sector in Nigeria continues to face criticism for its inefficiency, lack of flexibility, ineffective accountability, red tape and poor performance. Thus, the administrative machinery of the state is expected to provide some services directly, others through partnerships with the private sector, non-governmental organizations or communities. There is also increasing emphasis on the need for the administration of a modern state to provide an enabling environment for private sector and civil society organizations that seek to provide quality services to the public. Notwithstanding the role of the actors in service delivery, the role of the governmental administration is crucial. There is a strong evidence that it is when a state administration is able to deliver quality services, serve as an enabler and credible partner of other actors that development performance is enhanced. To improve the quality of service delivery, a state administration could use a combination of the following methods: surveys of selected public services, citizen charters and programme evaluation (World Bank, 2004).

Administrative Competence

Drawing on existing public administration literature, there are five key issues that deserve to be addressed in discussing administrative competence: matching the role of the state to its capability, merit-based recruitment and promotion, centrality of budget management importance of decentralization and devolution and achieving administrative accountability. These features of a competent administration contribute individually and in combination in varying degrees, to the promotion of social and economic development. It follows that increase in the number of salient features found in a country's administrative system would result in corresponding enhancement of its impact on development performance. Administrative accountability is the most salient features of administrative competence in modern state. In the context of this study, administrative accountability refers to the responsiveness of appointed public officials to the (elected) political executive as well as to the general public. Because of their permanency of tenure and expertise (acquired in order to cope with the explosion in scientific and technological knowledge), appointed officials are in a position of power vis-à-vis the laymen politicians (for the most part) in the executive and legislative branches. The officials are also in a position of power vis-à-vis the citizens they are expected to serve; their activities cover a very large area of the citizen's life from cradle to the grave. And it is also the case that some of these officials could abuse their office for selfish ends (for example, for personal and family enrichment). To deal with these serious problems, some accountability or control measures are used (for example, measures focused on financial management and procurement) and others are external such as legislative oversight, judicial control and the watchdog role of the media and civil society organizations. It is widely accepted that officials who are held accountable would tend to be more efficient, productive and development-oriented than those who are not.

Civil Liberties

According to Isham, Kaufmann and Pritchett (1997), countries with the stronger civil liberties have development projects with an economic rate of return 8 – 22 percentage points higher than countries with the weak civil liberties. The authors use four measures to explain the linkage of civil liberties to development performance:

- Freedom House Civil Liberties: Check list of 14 civil liberties such as media free of censorship, open public discussion, freedom of assembly and demonstration, freedom of political organization, non-discriminatory rule of law in politically relevant cases, freedom from unjustified political terror, free trade unions and peasant organizations, free businesses and cooperatives, free professional and other private organizations, free religious institutions, personal social rights (for example, the right to own property and to travel internally and externally), socio-economic rights, freedom from gross socio-economic inequality and freedom from gross government indifference or corruption.
- The Humana Index that include: right of peaceful assembly, freedom of opinion and expression, the right and opportunity to take part in the conduct of public affairs and the right to form trade unions.
- Freedom to organize
- Media pluralism

Regarding the freedom of the press, Sen (1994) asserts as follows: 'There has never been a famine in any country that has been a democracy with a relatively free press ... I

know of no exception'. The two widespread famines in the world were the 1984 Ethiopian famine during Mengitsu's iron rule and the 1997 North Korea's iron curtain. Wolfensohn (1999) provides a complimentary viewpoint: 'If you do not have the right to voice and the ability to expose issues, which is of course so tied to the freedom of the press, you remove the right to equitable development performance'. Thus, civil liberties promote socio-economic and political developments.

Participation and Consensus-Orientation

Participation is a cornerstone of development performance. Citizens' participation increase government accountability, effectiveness and performance management systems. It emphasizes benefits to individuals, communities, organizations and the society, including increased knowledge, authority, power and problem-solving ability. Participation leads to faster and more equitable development. In contemporary development practice, there is a general feeling that the process of development through the implementation of projects and programmes will only acquire full meaning if the citizen's participate fully in their planning and implementation. Thus, the notion of citizen's participation in development practices that affect their lives has been gaining momentum in the process of human empowerment and development (Mubita, Libati & Mulonda, 2017). The ultimate goal of participation is to ensure that citizens have the power to determine and influence development outcome and increase project effectiveness (Oakley, 1991). Consensus-orientation on the other hand emphasizes mediation among the contending groups in the society in order to reach a general agreement that will completely and satisfactorily accommodate the differing interests and views of the various groups, and where possible, on policies and procedures. Thus, it emphasizes general agreement on socio-economic and political issues which are the underlying determinants of the long-run development performance (Sheng, 2012). The ultimate goal of participation is increased accountability, transparency and efficiency of governance structures in promoting development and reducing poverty.

Theoretical Framework

While there are several theories which might prove appropriate for a discourse of this nature, the good governance theory present us with a heuristic tool for interrogating the central issues of this study. Good governance theory sets some basic principles according to which a good government, whatever its form, must be run. Such principles include transparency and accountability, public participation, economy, efficiency, rule of law, electoral legitimacy, etc. (Minogue, Polidano & Hulme, 1998). In line with the World Bank principles and policy interventions in the third world countries, good governance theory emphasizes on efficient public service, an independent judicial system and legal framework to enforce contracts and responsible for administration of public fund, respect for the rule of law and human rights at all level of government and a pluralistic institutional structure. Apart from the foregoing, good governance theory is predicated on three segments of the society which have direct effect on governance: the type of political regime, the process by which authority is exercised in the management of the economic and social resources with a view to development and the capacity of government to formulate policies and have them effectively implemented (World Bank, 1992). Therefore, good governance theory is aimed at achieving efficiency in public service delivery,

encouraging competition, privatization, civil service reforms decentralization, out-sourcing of services to key private suppliers among others (Williams & Young, 1994). Furthermore, it will be duly emphasized that good governance theory is geared towards enhancing ways and means by which state bureaucracies carry-out state activities and utilize state resources so as to protect individual liberties and promote development (Sheng, 2012). In addition, Idada and Uhunwuangho (2012) argued that while theory of good governance seeks to promote effectiveness and efficiency as well as stable and predictable economic growth through public service institutions, the theory of democracy deals with political freedom, equal right and justice as main focus. Nevertheless, democracy is the philosophical foundation of good governance and they are therefore synonymous.

In the final analysis, the relevance of the good governance theory is based on its ability to justify that development performance must go hand-in-hand with a public service that is efficient, judicial system that is reliable and an administration that is transparent and accountable to its citizens.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Good governance is about performance and conformance. Good governance and development performance are indivisible. Without the core fundamentals of good governance – without transparency and accountability, the rule of law, electoral legitimacy, efficient and effective service delivery, predictable administration, civil liberties and participation and consensus-orientation, no amount of funding and charity will set a country on the path to prosperity. In Nigeria, the root cause of weak economic performance has been the failure of public institutions. The deteriorating quality of government, epitomized by bureaucratic obstruction, pervasive rent-seeking, weak judicial systems and arbitrary decision-making have seriously hampers socio-economic and political development in the country. These conditions are derive from increasing incidence of massive corruption among government officials and ‘money-bag’ politicians, flagrant misuse of executive powers, lack of transparency and accountability, absence of openness in policy formulation, absence of people’s participation in issues that directly impact on their well-being. To progress from bad to good governance and from weak to strong development performance, Nigeria political elites must adhere to the core fundamentals of good governance without which socio-economic and political development will continue to be an illusion. Therefore, democratic governance thrives where there are periodic elections based on universal suffrage; elections conducted are free, fair and credible; where freedom of speech, association and publication is allowed, where there is acceptance of opposing views; where majority rule is maintained; where government and its agents adhere to the rule of law, where the process of elections is competitive among political parties; where individuals is allowed to freely make his or her choice and where succession process is smooth and not problematic. For good governance and development performance to be feasible in Nigeria, the following recommendations were made:

- For Nigeria to move out of the cocoon of underdevelopment she is presently entangled in, transparency and accountability, rule of law, electoral legitimacy, efficient and effective service delivery, administrative competence, civil liberties and participation and consensus-oriented must be guaranteed.

- There is urgent need for good leadership, one that is honest, development-oriented and capable of creating and nurturing institutions. This will go along way to promote good governance and strong development performance.
- For better government responsiveness, civil society actors who have all the capacity to compel the Nigerian elites to be accountable should brace up for the challenge as agencies of accountability and engine of economic growth and development.
- There is need for a good legal framework and sound anti-corruption policies free from impressive language in Nigeria. This will go a long way in reducing the perception of government as the instrument of the elites to acquire and retain power expense of the people. Also, a culture of tolerance and accommodation should be embraced by stakeholders in the political system.
- Nigerian government should intensify effort to address the interests of the poor across the country. This is because poor people who lack education, good health, good and shelter might not be interested in voting in elections or in bothering about whether or not a government is transparent and accountable.

References

1. Achebe, C. (1984). *The trouble with Nigeria*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.
2. Addink, G.H. (2017). Good governance: Importance in practice, theories and definitions. *Halu Oleo Law Review*, 1 (1), 1- 32. <http://ojs.uho.ac.id/index.php/holrev/>
3. Apaza, C. (2009). Measuring governance and corruption through the worldwide governance indicators: Critiques, responses and ongoing scholarly discussion. *Political Science and Politics*, 42 (1), 139 – 143. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090106>
4. Asandului, M., Lupu, D., Maha, L. G., & Viorică, D. (2021). The asymmetric effects of fiscal policy on inflation and economic activity in post-communist European countries. *Post-Communist Economies*. 899-919 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14631377.2020.1867430>
5. Aver, T.T., Nnorom, K.C. & Targba, A. (2013). Political violence and its effects on social development in Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3 (17), 261 – 266. http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_3_No_17_September_2013/27.pdf
6. Black, C.E. (1996). *Dynamics of modernization*. New York: McGraw Hill.
7. Coker, M.A. & George-Genyi, M.E. (2014). Bad governance: The bane of peace, security and sustainable development of Nigeria. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, 3 (5), 1121 – 1146. <https://isdsnet.com/ijds-v3n5-16.pdf>
8. Cole, G.A. & Kelly, P. (2011). *Management: Theory and practice*. Singapore: Cengage Learning.
9. Diamond, L. (2008). *The spirit of democracy: The struggle to build free societies throughout the world*. New York: Times Books.
10. Economic Commission for Africa (2004). *Striving for good governance*. Addis Ababa: ECA Publications.
11. Fagbadebo, O. (2007). Corruption, governance and political instability in Nigeria. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 1 (2), 28 – 37. <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/epr/article/view/39291>
12. Gambari, I. (2001). *Celebrating the rebirth and organizing to meet the challenges of democracy: The Nigeria and African experience*. Chicago. Chicago University Press.
13. Gisselquist, R.M. (2012). *Good governance as a concept and why this matters for development policy*. Finland: The World Institute for Development Economic Research.
14. Harrison, G. (2005). The world bank, governance and theories of political action in Africa. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 7 (2), 240 – 260. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-856X.2005.00175.x>

15. Idada, W. & Uhumwangho, S.O. (2012). Problems of democratic governance in Nigeria: The way forward. *Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, 3 (1), 49 – 54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09766634.2012.11885565>
16. Idode, J.B. (1997). *Rural development and bureaucracy in Nigeria*. Lagos: Longman Press.
17. Ighodalo, A. (2012). Election crisis, liberal democracy and national security in Nigeria's fourth republic. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 10 (2), 163 – 174. <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2012.v8n26p%25p>
18. IMF. (1997). *Good governance*. Washington. D.C. International Monetary Fund.
19. Isham, J., Kaufmann, D., & Pritchett, L. (1997). Civil liberties, democracy and the performance of government projects. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 11 (2), 219-242. <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/330321468327562718/pdf/772440JRN0WBER0Box0377301B00PUBLIC0.pdf>
20. Jacob, J. (2018). *Globalization and development in Africa: Myth and Reality*. Enugu: The Nigerian Political Science Association.
21. Kofi, A. (1999). While corruption is a serious world-wide phenomenon: it as critically hobbled and skewed Africa's development. A paper Delivered at an Anti-Corruption Conference held in Durban.
22. Lindbery, S. (2009). *Democratization by election: A new mode of transition*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
23. Lupu, D. (2019). Cost-benefit analysis for transport infrastructure projects: Eastern european cases. *Journal of Public Administration, Finance and Law*, (15), 107-123.
24. Minogue, M. Polidano, C. & Hulme, D. (1998). *The analysis of public management and governance*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishers.
25. Mubita, A. Libati, M. & Mulonda, M. (2017). The importance and limitations of participation in development projects and programme. *European Scientific Journal*, 13 (5), 238 – 251. <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2017.v13n5p238>
26. Nnada, V. (2006). The good governance: Concept revisited. *Annals of the America Academy of Political and Social Science*, 603, 269 – 283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716205282847>
27. Nwagwu, E.J. (2018). *Development: Theories and applications*. Enugu: The Nigerian Political Science Association.
28. Nwanegbo, C.J., Umara, I. & Ikyase, J.T. (2017). Security and the challenges of securing Nigerian State: Appraising the activities of Fulani herdsmen in north central Nigeria. *Studies in Politics and Society*, 5 (1), 203 – 217.
29. Nwigwe, B.E. (2003). Origin and limits of state authority. In J. Oguejiofor (ed.) *Philosophy, democracy and responsible governance in Africa*. London: Transaction Publishers.
30. Oakley, P. (1991). *Projects with people: The practice of participation in rural development*. Geneva: ILO Publications.
31. Ogundiya, I.S. (2010). Democracy and good governance: Nigeria's dilemma. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 4(6), 201 – 208. https://academicjournals.org/article/article1381834964_Ogundiya.pdf
32. Oke, L. (2010). Democracy and governance in Nigeria's Fourth republic. *African Research Review*, 4 (3a), 31 – 40. <https://doi.org/10.4314/afrev.v4i3.60142>
33. Okobiah, O.S. (1984). *The nature and element of national development and integration*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books.
34. Oladosu, A.G.A.S. (2015). Nigeria, national development and the relevance of the Shariah. *Journal of Islam in Nigeria*, 1 (1), 141 – 155. https://iwf.com.ng/journal/vol_1_no_1/nigeria_national_development_relevance_shariah.pdf
35. Olson, M. (1993). Dictatorship, democracy and development. *American Political Science Review*, 87 (3), 567 – 576. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2938736>
36. Oluwa, K. (2012). Fixing Nigeria: Good governance as missing link. Retrieved from <http://newsbreakingnigeria.com/fixing+Nigeria-goodgovernance>.
37. Omede, J. & Ngwube, A. (2017). Managing change: The struggle of government to retain legitimacy in Nigeria's post-military era. *Studies in Politics and Society*, 5 (1), 164 – 176.
38. Omemma, D.A. (2017). Security challenges and democratic consolidation in Nigeria: An exploration. *Studies in Politics and Society*, 5 (1), 126 – 140.

38. Onichakwe, C.C. (2016). The role of good governance and development administration in national development. *International Journal of Development and Management Review*, 11, 176 - 186. <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/ijdmr/article/view/137835>
39. Osaghae, E. (1999). Democratization in sub-sahara African. *Altering prospects, new hopes*. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 17 (1), 86 – 108.
40. Rotbery, R.I (2004). *Strengthening governance*. *Washington Quarterly*, 38, 71 – 81.
41. Rothstein, B. & Teorell, J. (2008). What is quality of government: A theory of impartial political institutions. *International Journal of Policy and Administration*, 21, 165 – 190. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2008.00391.x>
42. Sapru, R.K. (1997). *Development administration*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers.
43. Seers, D. (1979). The meaning of development in D. Lehmann (ed.) *Development theory: four critical studies*. New York: Routledge.
44. Sen, A. (1994). *Freedom and needs*. *New Republic*, 31, 10 – 17.
45. Sharman, M.P., Sadana, B.L. & Kaur, H. (2013). *Public administration: Theory and practice*. Kitab Mahal: Marg Allahabad Publications.
46. Sheng, Y.K. (2012). *What is good governance?* New York: UNESCAP Publications.
47. Toyo, E. (1994). *Crisis and democracy in Nigeria: Comments on the transition from the Banagida regime*. Zaria: Ahmadu Bello University Press.
48. UNDP (1997). *Human development to eradicate poverty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
49. UNDP (2002). *Human development report 2002*. New York: Oxford University Press.
50. United Nations General Assembly (1993). *Enhancing the effectiveness of the principle of periodic and genuine elections*. United States: United Nations General Assembly Resolution.
51. Wael, O.A. (2013). Bad governance and failure of development progress in Egypt. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 3 (4), 39 – 60. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jpag.v3i4.4340>
52. Williams, D. & Young, T. (1994). Governance, the world bank and liberal theory. *Political Studies*, 42, 87 – 96.
53. Woleola, J.E. (2017). Good governance theory and the quest for good governance in Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 7 (5), 154 – 161. <https://www.ijhssnet.com/journal/index/3856>
54. Wolfensohn, J. (1999). *Voices for the poor*. *Washington Post*, November 10.
55. World Bank (1989). *Sub-sahara Africa: from crisis to sustainable growth*. Washington, D.C. The World Bank.
56. World Bank (1992). *Governance and development*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
57. World Bank (2004). *Making services work for poor people*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.



This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution - Non Commercial - No Derivatives 4.0 International License.