

State Legislature and Democratic Governance in Nigeria: A Case Study of Enugu State House of Assembly 2015-2018

¹Chibuikwe E Madubuegwu, ²Obiageli Otiji, PhD, ³Vincent Onyia, O, ⁴Ejeji-Ezeibe Peace Ijeoma

¹Department of Political Science, Nnamdi Azikwe University, Awka
totlechi@gmail.com

²Department of Political Science, Enugu State College of Education, (Technical), Enugu

³Department of Political Science, Nnamdi Azikwe University, Awka

⁴Department of Public Administration, Federal Polytechnic Nekede Owerri.

Abstract: Democratic governance is a popular expectation within developing and advanced democracies. In developing federating polity like Nigeria, it becomes expedient in view of failed governance, dysfunctional state structures, recessive economy, widespread public distrust, centrifugal tendencies and docility of the masses. The empirical study therefore examines critically the failures of decentralized legislative structure, Enugu state house of assembly in upholding values of democratic governance in deference to public anxieties and expectations. The methodology of this study is survey design where the researchers explored the import of secondary (text books, journal articles, magazines, government bulletins) and primary (questionnaire) instruments of data collection. The population size of the case study (Enugu state) is 800 where the researchers adopted Taro Yamini formula to reach the sample size of 400. In reference to the method of data analysis, the researchers used likert mean scale with a calculated mean of 3.5 to elicits and validate responses from the returned questionnaire of 389. Furthermore, the study revealed that there are obvious failures bedeviling Enugu state house of assembly towards democratic governance. The work therefore recommend advocacy, compelling legislations, effective opposition process, public enthusiasm amid other fundamentals towards democratic governance that is prudently driven by state legislature.

Keywords: Legislature, democracy, good governance

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Basically, democracy is beyond elections. Although, the centrality of elections to democratic process cannot be over-emphasized, democracy is not wholly centered on election, however for democracy to evolve good governance, it must be liberal and participatory. In this sense, liberal democracy entails not only free and fair elections in terms of voting administration, it requires a more comprehensive fairness of political competition embodied in the concept of a just and open competition (Arowolo and Aluko, 2012 :789). Again, democracy is not only driven by the political process but strengthen by institutions. Thus, the legislature represents one of the institutions advancing the process of democratic governance. Invariably, in the 21st century, there is growing interest more than ever before the issues related to democracy and good governance around the world. This is a reflection of increasing acceptance of the fact that democracy and good governance are not luxury, but a fundamental requirement to achieve sustainable development, parliament as one of the key state institution in a democratic system of governance have a critical role to play in promoting democracy and good governance. As the democratically elected representatives of the people, parliaments have the honorable task to ensure government by the people and for the people. In the performance of their key functions of legislations, representation and oversight, parliament can actively engage in the development and implementation of laws, policies, and practices that promote democracy and good governance (Report of Economic Commission for Africa, 2018, p.3).

To this extent, the existence of a parliament is not synonymous with democracy, but democracy cannot exist without a parliament (UNDP/IPU Global Parliamentary Report, 2012). Democracy, in its various manifestations over the countries, is by far the most coveted political system that serves to link government to the people. A democratically elected parliament is only true voice of the people and accountability to the people it serves is the basic plank of democratic system and one of its core principles is possible among the people. This principle is captured by the adage: government of the people by the people and for the people (Lincoln Gettysburg address delivered in 1864 at the height of American Civil war) cited in Economic Commission for Africa(2018,p.2).

Nigeria is a federal democracy with decentralized structures of governance and administration. It is a multi-ethnic polity made up 36 state-structure and 774 local government areas. Enugu state is one of the federating states of Nigeria. In a topographical description, the state is a highland area (with reference to Awgu, Udi and Nsukka hills) which lends credence to its etymological appellation of 'e`nugwu` (top of the hill). Similarly, the landmass area of Enugu state reflects on 2, 942, 97 square miles and 7,534 square kilometers (Office of the Surveyor General of the Federation, 2012, p.91). In the same vein, Enugu state share common borders with Kogi and Benue states in the North, Abia state in the South, Anambra state in the West and Ebonyi state in the East. Demographically, Enugu state has a population of 3,267,837 (1,596,042 male and 1,671,795 female) in reference to Report of 2006 National Population Census. Enugu is homogenous state of Igbo ethnic nationality (the third largest ethnic group in Nigeria's over

350 tribes). Furthermore, the indigenous population of the Enugu state is linguistically and socio-culturally referred to as “Wawa people” which accentuate the affinity of tradition and dialect. The state is administrated at two levels of governance – the state and local municipal levels of administration. Hence, the state’s three structures of governance – the Enugu State Executive Council, Enugu State House of Assembly and Enugu State High Court were constitutionally entrusted with the roles of policy formulation and administration, legislation and representation and adjudication. The Enugu state house of assembly serves as a platform to represent the interests, challenges and expectations of seventeen (17) local government areas sub-divided into twenty-four (24) single-member electoral constituencies.

Notably, Enugu State House of Assembly between, 2015-2018 is the unit of the empirical analysis of this discourse in cognizance of the expedience of the legislative process to democratic governance. Ideally, democratic governance operates with democratic institutions like political parties, the judiciary and the legislature (Lafenwa, 2009, p.6). This assertion is further illuminated in the conventional and constitutional responsibilities of modern legislature as embellished by Eja (2014): that legislature is that branch of government responsible essentially for making statutory laws and over sighting the activities the functions of the executive branch of government. Accordingly, the legislative powers of the federal, state and local government are vested in the legislature.

Modern legislature is arguably one of the pillars of democratic governance. Its structure, process and dynamics are reflection of popular sovereignty. The functional process of a democratic legislature is enormously determined by popular interests and expectations in deference to democratic values of inclusiveness, participation, alternative views and responsiveness. In this discourse, the researchers therefore explored the challenges militating against the Enugu state house of assembly towards democratic governance in Enugu state within the period under study.

1.1 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Modern parliament is inextricably synonymous with representative democracy. This is further illuminated in the fundamental attributes and roles of democratic parliament which accords relevance to popular sovereignty. Thus, democratic governance is a function of legislative structure which is representative in character and roles that are constitutional. Adversely, Nigeria’s governance is bedeviled with irregularities and infractions which emanate enormously from its political structures and processes. Accordingly, Ibeanu and Egwu (2007) take a cursory look on the challenges of Nigeria’s governance which reflects in authoritarian rule, the systematic closure of political space, extreme personalization of power and corruption, gross human rights abuses, political exclusion of women, ethnic minority groups and youths among other political vices.

Similarly, Omoju and Udefuna (2012), also noted that a decade and three years after, three different civilian regimes have emerged and there have been three successive transition from one civilian regime to another. Despite these seeming successes in democratic consolidation, governance in Nigeria especially in the fourth Republic has been confronted by a myriad of challenges namely electoral malpractice, inter and intra ethnic rivalries, religious crises and insecurity, inadequate and weak democratic institutions, poverty and institutionalized corruption, among others. Beyond these irregularities, it is however established that modern legislature play vital roles in sustaining institutional and procedural democracy. Aloba (2014) further explored that democracy is based on the notion that a people should be self-governing and that the representatives of the people should be held accountable for their actions. The legislature which represents the people and act as their agent is therefore at the core of the western democratic tradition. However, these expectations in Nigeria’s fledgling democracy are elusive. In other words, Nigeria’s legislative institutions (at the level of federal and state) are fraught with scandals, dysfunctions and corrupt practices which had over the years undermined the democratic values and process in Nigeria. In this regard, it is argued that there are negative connotation of the legislature as rump assemblies, theatres, illusions, or even mere rubber-stamp chambers. It is assumed that most of these challenges facing democratic experiment in Africa particularly in Nigeria have their root in weak legislative institutions. (Lafenwa 2009, p.4)

More illustratively, Akinitide(2009) embellished the endemic limitations of Nigeria’s legislative process to indicate that Nigeria highest legislative bodies (the House of Representatives and Senate) now constitute the greatest problem and security threat to Nigeria given their general behaviour and total disregard for the ultimate interest of the country as a whole and interest of their constituents in general. However, where legislators and senators once elected could care less about the issues, interests and expectations of others and their constituency. All they care about is using their new position of power to feather their own nests by becoming millionaires and multi-millionaires in a country where the great majority of their constituents can hardly afford three square meal in a day where unemployment has reached double digits and where minimum wage for workers are so criminally low and grossly inadequate to support their family. Invariably, state legislative assemblies like the national legislative institutions are constrained with the crises of unaccountable representation, one-party dictatorship, weak oversighting roles, political skulduggery and executive encroachments in defiance to constitutional provisions and democratic procedure with pernicious effects on the plight and expectations of the masses. In this sense, Eze and Odo (2016), remarked that Enugu state legislature like other state

legislative arms is failing to meet with the yearnings and interests of Enugu people. This view is collaborated by Ugochime (2016) and Eneh (2017) who argued that the deplorable state of development in the state constituencies shown abysmal failure of representation and governance. On this premise, the researchers examines critically the failures constraining state legislature towards democratic governance in reference to Enugu state house of assembly within the period under review (2015-2018) which undoubtedly raised certain fundamental questions that form the thrust of this analysis.

1.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. In what ways has Enugu State House of Assembly failed to promote democratic governance in the state?
2. What are the factors responsible for the failure of Enugu State House of Assembly towards democratic governance in the state?
3. What are the effects of these failures on governance and state?

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The research questions underscored the following objectives of this study:

1. To establish the failures of the Enugu State House of Assembly towards democratic governance.
2. To identify the factors responsible for the failure of Enugu State House of Assembly towards democratic governance in the state.
3. To analyze the effects of the failure of the state legislative assembly towards democratic governance in Enugu state.
4. To make appropriate recommendations on plausible measures to ensure democratic governance that is driven by a functional state legislature.

2.0 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

It is important to thematically examine terms that are germane to the analysis of this discourse.

i) State legislature

The concept of legislature elicits the importance of two terms- “institution” and “process”. As an institution, it is a law-making organ of government. As a process, it reflects in the procedures, rules and conventions that facilitate the enactment of laws as a specialized role of a modern government. Hence, the organic unity of specialized institution and process accentuate the importance of a legislature in a modern democratic government. In a generic sense, state legislature depicts a legislative institution and process at the state, provincial and territorial level of governance as obtained mostly in countries that practice federalism.

Basically, state legislature represents a decentralized, independent and democratic institution entrusted with the power to enact laws for governance, security and socio-economic development of the state. The authority of the legislature is derived from the constitution and, the people through the process of elections as seen in advanced democracies.

Nigeria as a federation has a unicameral state legislative system as explicitly provided by the 1999 Federal Republic Constitution (amended) in section 90 which states:

“There shall be a house of assembly for each of the states of the federation”

Subsequently, section 91, 92, 98, 100, 103, 106, 109, and 112 provided for the composition, leadership, voting pattern, powers, committees, membership qualification, tenure and state constituencies of the state houses of assembly in Nigeria. It is also instructive to note that the state legislative assemblies perform crucial roles in the concurrent and residual lists.

Enugu state house of assembly is therefore one of the 36 (thirty-six) state legislative assemblies in Nigeria. Thus, the Wawa state legislature otherwise known as the Enugu state house of assembly came into existence in 1992 a year after the creation of Enugu state on 27th August 1991. Hence, Enugu state house of assembly is made up of twenty-four (24) elected members who represent 24 state single-member constituencies that are drawn from the 17 local government areas of Enugu. Furthermore, Enugu state house of assembly since its inception in 1992 had worked collaboratively with four State Chief Executives under two party affiliations-the National Republican Convention, NRC and People’s Democratic Party, PDP.

Table 2.1: Names of Enugu State Governors, Period of Governance and Party Affiliation.

Names of Governors	Period	Party Affiliation
Dr Okwesilieze Nwodo	1992-1993	National Republican Convention, NRC.
Dr Chimaroke Nnamani	1999-2007	Peoples Democratic Party, PDP.
Barr Sullivan Chime	2007-2015	Peoples Democratic Party, PDP.
Hon Ifeanyi Ugwuanyi	2015-	Peoples Democratic Party, PDP.

Source: Author’s compilation.

In reference to Nigeria's presidential democracy, the principle of separation of power is fully entrenched at every level of governance. In addition, the powers of the Enugu state house of assembly extends beyond law-making to representation, judicial, investigative, constitutional roles etc. Thus, it is from these myriads of responsibilities that the researchers assess critically the roles and limitations of Enugu state house of assembly towards democratic governance.

In Enugu state governance, the cordiality that existed in the relation between the legislature and executive were often intermittently interrupted by the clash of personality interests as aptly remarked that conflicts between the executive and the legislature have been noted more for intrigues of interests and personality clashes than conflict of principles and programme. Thus, the relationship between the executive and legislature has been fraught with series of crises between 1999 and 2003. There have been sharp conflicts in 1999, 2000, 2001 and 2002 between the house of assembly and Governor Chimaroke over the passage of the appropriation bill. There was also disagreement between the house and the governor over appointment of commissioners, impeachment of the governor among others (Mba 2011, p.4).

Again, the cohesion and synergy which existed between the Enugu state legislature and executive was also undermined at the twilight of Barr Chime's administration in May 2015. The political impasse was between the Governor, Barr Sullivan Chime and Speaker of the state legislature, Barr Eugene Odo and some members of the house of assembly who felt that their interests were excluded in the gubernatorial and state assembly primary elections of People's Democratic Party, PDP for the April 11th election of 2015. Adversely, the political discordance led to the reluctance of the state assembly to approve the governor's request of 11 billion naira loan (not appropriated in the 2015 budget) to pay contractors occasioned with deliberate withheld of statutory allocations for the house members by the Executive, issuance of warrant of arrest against the Account-General of the state, served impeachment notice on the state governor and, subsequent alleged impeachment of the speaker by a fraction of the assembly led by deputy speaker, Chime Orji (Governor's nephew) and other members (loyal to the state chief executive) and police lockdown of the state assembly complex.

The trajectory of these travails is not only a reflection of divisive interest within the party politics of the state but also illuminate the routinely and unrestrained impunity of self-political motives that thrive in the Enugu state government at the expense of public interest.

ii) Democratic Governance and Legislature

The term "democratic governance" arguably indicates the relevance of democratic principles in governmental process driven by structures and roles. In other words, governance as a process reflects in the institutions and processes of the government and obligations of the citizens (Okafor and Madubuegwu, 2015, p.91). In credence to this, the UNDP report on governance for sustainable human development (1997, p.2) defined governance as:

The exercise of economic, political and administrative authority to manage a country's affairs at all levels. It comprises mechanisms, processes and institutions, through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise legal rights, meet their obligations and mediate their differences.

Hence, the entrenchment of democratic values in the processes and mechanisms of articulating public plight and expectations, activating institutional roles in response to public demands and ensuring their social security and rights are appropriately regarded as good governance. In this vein, Okeke (2010) cited by Okafor and Madubuegwu (2015) enumerates the indices of good governance to include:

1. Accountability
2. Inclusiveness
3. Observance of rule of law and due process
4. Effective institutions
5. Purposeful leadership
6. Security and order

Similarly, Awah (2013) defined good governance as the kind of governance that adheres to the following characteristics:

- a) It is participatory by allowing the masses to be part of the decision making process.
- b) It is consensus orientated as it seeks for broad consensus in society rather than permitting minority view to override all other views.
- c) It is accountable since leadership at national or local government level as well as in the private and public spheres will have to answer to the masses.
- d) It is transparent in that decisions are taken and enforced in a manner that conforms to the rules and regulations of a given community.

e)

Invariably, democratic governance is a kind of governance that upholds, and promotes basic tenants of democracy which reflects in popular sovereignty, civil liberty, equality, inclusiveness, transparency and rule of law. However, cursory analysis of the extant literature revealed that the concept of “democratic governance” is polemical with reference to the divergent conceptualizations among political science scholars.

Apparently, some scholars analyzed the plausibility of democratic governance from institutional perspective with reference to the roles of democratic structures of Nigeria’s political system such as legislature, political parties etc. (Ozor 2006, Zwingina 2010, Ebyitoye 2011 and Bankole, 2010). On the other hand, other scholars argued that democratic governance is driven by institutional procedure and legal norms as seen in democratic political systems. (Okafor 2012, Nduka, 2011 and Adewale, 2009). Subsequently, some scholars also viewed democratic governance from the perspective of comparative analysis exploring the institutional and procedural similarities and disparities as obtained in different democratic systems and establishing reasons, constraints and prospect for democratic governance. (Omeiza, 2010, Odumeze, 2011).

Furthermore, Ebyitoye (2011), Ogundiya (2010), Best (2001), Nduka (2011), Duruyi (2010) and Omodia (2005) considered weak institutions, corruption, murky party politics, class dialectics and elite dynamics, electoral crises, uncivil political culture, sectarian crises, ethnic-centrifugal tendencies as among the factors that militate against democratic governance in Nigeria. It is therefore germane to note that these irregularities bedeviled the process of democratic consolidation in Nigeria.

However, the fundamental issue not raised in the above extant literature is the nexus of the legislative role to democratic governance. In this regard, Awah (2013) explicated the following attributes of modern parliament fundamental to democratic governance:

1. A representative which means that it reflects as closely as possible, the social and political diversity of the population encourages the full participation of women, and ensures equal rights and protection for all its members so that they can freely exercise their mandate.
2. Transparent which means that works in a way that the public can see either directly or through communication media such as print or electronic news organization.
3. Accessible which means that the public including associations and movement of the civil society, can be involved in its work.
4. Effective which means that parliament’s work which encompasses, not only domestic law making and oversight but also the increasingly important realm of international relations must be well organized to ensure that it serves the needs of the whole population.
5. Accountable which also means that there are opportunities for voters to hold members of parliament to account for their performance in office and integrity of conduct?

The institutional and procedural process of democratic consolidation is a function of an efficient, democratic and transparent legislature at every level of governance (from federal to state and local). And, the indispensability of this development is significantly assessed from three fundamental roles of legislation, representation and oversight which symbolized the hallmark of a democratic parliament. However, the gap in the extant analysis is the factors militating against the roles of the state legislature in Nigeria towards democratic governance as referenced to Enugu state house of assembly under this study.

2.1 Theoretical Discourse

Basically, Enugu state legislative assembly and democratic governance are variables of empirical analysis to justify the imperative of a conceptual framework. In this regard, this study adopted Role Theory to analyze, interpret and generalize the criticality of the state legislature in ensuring democratic governance in Nigeria.

In a conceptual sense, Role Theory posits that human behaviour is influenced by expectation held by both the individual and the public. Hence, these expectations determine different roles individuals and groups perform within the context of social structures. In other words, role theory conceived social and political structures as institutions whose viability and deficiencies are assessed from the peculiarity, intensity and dynamics of its roles.

Invariably, the development of role theory as model of empirical analysis was inspired by the import of sociological and social-psychological theories on the roles of individuals in social groups as espoused in the treaties of George, H Mead, an exponent of role theory and renowned sociologist of University of Chicago in the early 1920’s (Bright, 1978, p.562, and Elim etal 1989, p.462).

Subsequently, role theory gained relevance in the field of psychology as exemplified in Moreno's psychotherapy (1934) and Sarbin's hypnotic behaviour (1943) and, later in political science particularly among behavioral scholars in promoting the relevance of inter-disciplinary research and analysis (Zelin, etal 2003, p.231). Role theory in political analysis represents a conceptual framework which systematically explains the rationale and outcome of behavioural disposition and social interaction from the perspective of positions and roles. Therefore, it attempt to explain, analyze, interpret and predict individual and group behaviour in relation to roles and role expectation within the context of the political system. Hence, role theorist argued that role behaviour is a function of role expectations for appropriate or inappropriate behaviour in the positions occupied by individuals and groups. More succinctly, the basic assumptions of role theoretical framework are expressed below:

1. The role expectation is a basic concept and independent variable of role theory. It is consist of norms, values, beliefs and preferences concerning performance of individuals occupying positions (Sarbin and Allen 1998, Briddle 1956). The role expectation is expressed through established precedents, legal framework, personal prejudices, etc. Hence, it provides empirical insight on the affinity between the individual and social structure. It further revealed the disparity between appropriate conception of role and inappropriate knowledge of role which stimulates functionality or dysfunctionality of the performer.
2. Role demand is another basic concept of Role theory. It is the choice of a role in a particular situation or context (Sarbin and Allen, 1968). Hence, it influences specific or peculiar role enactment in a particular situation. For instance, unpleasant situation may call for a reversed, enhanced nor intervening role from the performer (an individual or group).
3. Role conception (an independent variable of role theory) illuminates the process that defines and shape the role of the performer. Thus, it represents the interactional process where individual or group discharge roles in conformity to established precedents and norms of a political structure.
4. Multiplicity of sub-roles as noted by role theorists ostensibly showed the significance of role theory as a conceptual framework that deals with complex social dynamics (Isaak, 1985). It is therefore important to note that a political actor may have two or more roles to perform in meeting with the myriad of role expectations. As aptly illustrates, "a legislator" is a colleague to his fellow legislators, "representative" to his constituents "friend" (or enemy) to lobbyists, and "fellow" to his party leaders (Eulau, 1963,p.41).
5. Role conflict is a corollary of multiplicity and clash of roles. Hence, it rises when the myriad of roles clash or conflict to the dilemma of the role performer.
6. Role theorists further argued that in order to change behavioural tendencies, it is necessary to reverse role that influence or determine the behavioural disposition. In other words, roles correspond to behaviour and vice versa.

Impliedly, role theory is a framework that establishes explanatory analysis of the occurrence, rationale, trends, dynamics, dialectics and outcome of political behaviour with reference to role expectations, role demands, role diversity and role conflict. Similarly, role framework also viewed political structure or institution as a context for the occurrence of specialized and interrelated roles in credence to role location. To this extent, Enugu state house of assembly is a political structure that is driven by conventional roles of law-making, representation, oversight etc. Besides these established responsibilities, the institution is a platform of political actors (law-makers) whose orientation, attitude and disposition are influenced by the multiplicity of roles that emanate from established precedents (constitution and convention), personal prejudices, partisan affiliations and expectations from the constituents. Significantly, the strained relation between the Enugu state legislature and the executive, intra-house dissensions and failed responsibilities as regarding the expectations of the constituents are function of role misconception and conflict which are exacerbated by the intense competition of cluster of roles in response to myriad of role expectations. In other words, role theory is an appropriate conceptual framework to assess and analyze the tendencies of Enugu legislative assembly (from the perspective of individual and group disposition) towards democratic governance.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

The design of this research is a survey design. Hence, the design is structured in a manner to enable the researchers draw inferences from causal relationship between independent and dependent variables under study. The design also illuminates the imperatives of population, sample and sampling techniques, instruments for data collection and analysis.

3.1 Population

The population of the study is projected to over 4 million indigenes and residents of Enugu state. However, the researchers target sizable population of 800 adult indigenes (male and female) drawn from 12 selected local councils of the 17 local government areas of Enugu state.

3.2 Determination of Sample size

On sample, once the decision to study the sample has been taken, the researcher must determine the appropriate sample size. (Nnabugwu, 2008, p.147). To achieve this, the researchers adopted Taro Yamane’s formula.

$$n = \frac{N}{1+(Ne^2)}$$

Where n = Sample Size
 N = Population Size
 e = Error Limit
 ξ = Margin of error
 e = 0.05.

Applying it

$$n = \frac{800}{1+800(0.05^2)}$$

$$n = \frac{800}{1+800(0.25)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{800}{1+1} = \frac{800}{2}$$

$$= 400$$

Therefore the sample size is 400.

3.3 Instruments for Data Collection.

The researchers designed a structured questionnaire instrument titled, “STATE LEGISLATURE AND DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE IN ENUGU STATE, SLDGE” to gauge responses. The instrument for data collection consist of options or items articulated in accordance to the established research questions. The instrument was divided into two sections:

Section A: consists of personal bio data of the respondents

Section B: comprises of four research questions and items in a five cluster where the respondents were required to indicate their view.

3.4 Instruments for Data Analysis

Data was analyzed using the Likert Mean rating scale. It assigned numerical values according to the strength and weakness of the opinion of the respondents. In the following order; Strongly Agreed, SA (5 points), Strongly Disagreed, SD (4 points), Agreed (3points), Disagreed (2 points) and Undecided (1 point). Hence, the researchers used five (5) points rating scale (to determine the extent of acceptability or non-acceptability) along their respective numerical values. The researchers added the interval scale of 0.5 to bring the mean to 3.5. From this indication, the researchers established a decision rule of 3.5. Hence, any response receiving a mean score rating of 3.5 is regarded positive response less than 3.5 is regarded negative response. Also, the researchers equally employed the cumulative (grand mean) to determine the strength or weakness of the general opinion of the respondents

4.0 Data Presentation

From the 400-questionnaire distributed, 6 were not returned while 5 were incorrectly filled. In other words, 389 were correctly filled and returned. This figure represents 97.3%.

Section A: Social-demographic data of respondents

Table 4.1: Personal data of the respondents

S/N	FREQUENCY	VARIABLES	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
-----	-----------	-----------	-----------	------------

1.	Distribution of the respondents by sex	Male Female Total	217 172 389	55.8 44.2 100
2.	Distribution of the respondents by age bracket	18-28 yrs 29-38yrs 39-48yrs 49-58 59 and above Total	28 63 115 97 86 389	7.2 16.2 29.6 24.9 22.1 100
3.	Distribution of the respondents by marital status	Single Married Separated Divorced Widowed Total	138 227 02 09 13 389	35.5 58.4 0.5 2.3 3.3 100
4.	Distribution of the respondents by education qualification	Non-certification FSLC/INASC NCE/OND HND/B.Sc Others Total	96 103 72 97 21 389	24.7 26.5 18.5 24.9 5.4 100

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Table 2 shows the personal data of the respondents. The distribution of the respondents by sex shows that 217 (55.8%) are males while 172 (44.29%) are females. Distribution of the respondents age range shows that 28 (2.2%) fall with the age range 18 to 28 years, 63 (16.2%) fall within age of 29 + 38 years, 115 respondents (29.6%) fall within the age range 39 to 48 years, 97 respondents (24.92) fall within the age bracket 49 to 58 years while 86 (22.1%) fall within the age range of 59 years and above. Distribution of respondents by educational qualification 96 (24.7%) had no certificate, 103 (26.55) had FSLC/WASC, 72 (18.5%) had NCE/OND, 97 (24.99), had HND/1st degree while 21 (5.4%) had other degree.

Research Question 1: In what ways has Enugu State House of Assembly failed to promote democratic governance in the state?

Table 4.2: Responses on the failures of state legislature towards democratic governance in Enugu state.

S/N	Questionnaire Items	X	Decision
1	Enact laws with less impact on the social welfare and development of indigenes and residents in Enugu state	3.6	Positive
2	Most of Enugu law makers do not have functional constituent offices and care less on the challenges of their constituents.	3.8	Positive
3	Ineffective oversight functions on state Ministries, Departments and Agencies, MDAs.	3.8	Positive
4	Abuse of constitution and precedents in advancing inordinate ambitions in the legislative process.	2.8	Negative
5	Absence of constructive engagement with the Executive on priority issues of governance	4.3	Positive

Source: Field Survey, 2019.

$$\text{Grand Mean } \sum \frac{x}{n} = \frac{3.6+3.8+3.8+2.8+4.3}{5} = \frac{18.3}{5} = 3.6$$

Research Question 2: What are the factors responsible for the failure of Enugu State House of Assembly towards democratic governance in the state?

Table 4.3 Responses on the factors responsible for failure of the state legislature towards democratic governance.

S/N	Questionnaire Items	X	Decision
6	Enugu state legislature is made up of law makers from the ruling political party, PDP with no member or members from the opposition political parties.	3.9	Positive
7	Greed and ambition for self-aggrandizement.	4.6	Positive
8	Politicization of oversight roles to protect partisan interests of the PDP-led Executive administration.	3.5	positive
9	Redundancy and ineffectiveness of the opposition political parties in the state.	4.1	positive
10	Docility of Enugu residents and Civil Society Organizations to engage constructively with the state legislature.	3.4	negative

Source: Field Survey, 2019.

$$\text{Grand mean } \sum \frac{x}{n} = \frac{3.9+4.6+3.5+4.1+3.4}{5} = \frac{19.5}{5} = 3.9$$

Research Question 3: What are effects of these failures on governance and state?

Table 4.4: Responses on the implications of failed state legislative process towards democratic governance in Enugu.

S/N	Questionnaire Items	X	Decision
11	Resentment of legislative institution and roles towards public plights and expectations.	4.4	positive
12	Widespread poverty and social deviancies in the state constituencies.	4.7	positive
13	Flagrant violation of laws, procedures and corruption practices in the state Ministries, Departments and Agencies, MDAs.	3.9	positive
14	Public discontent on governance and administration of the homogeneous state.	3.6	Positive
15	Proliferation of dissent alliances within the PDP and state.	3.9	Positive

Source: Field Survey, 2019.

$$\text{Grand mean } \sum \frac{x}{n} = \frac{4.4+4.7+3.9+3.6+3.9}{5} = \frac{20.5}{5} = 4.1$$

5.0. DATA ANALYSIS

The index of figure 1 showed responses on ways Enugu state house of assembly has failed to promote democratic governance within the period under review. Data elicited from the cluster of five questionnaire options as seen in 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 illuminate the views of the respondents on the failures of Enugu state house of assembly towards democratic governance. Five questionnaire items as contained in items 1, 2, 3 and 5 recorded mean above the 3.5 mean bar while option 4 recorded mean bar below 3.5. The analysis of data elicited from the respondents (Enugu indigenes and residents) stressed that most of the laws enacted by the state assembly had not improved the quality of public welfare as regarding security, adequacy of essential services etc. Again, most of the law-makers do not operate functional constituency offices to effectively engage on plights and expectations of the represented indigenes occasioned with weak oversighting roles and institutional failure of collaboration with the PDP-led Executive on priorities of governance and public anxieties. However, the view of the respondents on flagrant abuse of laws and precedents in desperation to protect or promote inordinate ambitions was not conceived as incidence of failures of state legislature towards democratic governance. The calculated 3.6 grand mean underscores the cumulative opinion of the respondents.

Furthermore, figure 2 illuminate the views of the respondents on the factors responsible for the failure of the state house of assembly towards democratic governance. From the data elicited from the cluster of five questionnaire options as seen in 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10. Five questionnaire items as contained in items 6, 7, 8 and 9 recorded mean above and within the 3.5 mean bar while option 10 recorded mean bar below 3.5. Analysis of the elicited data ostensibly indicates that the occurrence and perpetuation of defective variables of the failure of the state legislature towards democratic governance is a function of myriad of factors. Most of the respondents argued that when the 24- members of the state legislature are from the same ruling political party, PDP then democratic governance may be impeded because in the absence of constructive alternative views from the members of minority political party or parties. In the same sense, respondents also stressed that greed or ambition of self – aggrandizement (which is reflective character of Nigerian political class) is one of the factors undermining the role of the state assembly towards democratic governance. Furthermore, it is also viewed that politicization of constitutional and conventional roles particularly in the oversight

function constitute fundamental impediment against democratic governance. It is also observed that redundancy of the opposition political parties (who were alleged to be lobbied to work covertly with the ruling political party) is among the factors responsible for failure of the state legislature toward democratic governance while most of the respondents held that the docility of Enugu residents and civil society organizations to engage constructively with the law makers may not necessarily be held responsible for dysfunctionality that impede the process of democratic governance. The calculated 3.9 grand mean also underscores the cumulative opinion of the respondents.

The figure 3 showed responses on effects of these failures on governance and state within the period under review. Data elicited from the cluster of five questionnaire options as seen in 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 illuminate the views of the respondents on the effects of these failures towards democratic governance. Five questionnaire options as contained in items 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 recorded mean above the 3.5 mean bar. In Enugu, there is widespread disillusionment as regarding the abysmal failure of performance of the state legislature towards public anxieties and expectations as aptly illuminated in the responses on the questionnaire items of the third research questions. And, the calculated grand mean of 4.1 represents strong indication of the view expressed.

6.0. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The existence of legislative institution does not necessarily promote democratic governance. It is therefore apparent that modern parliament can ensure democratic governance through entrenchment of germane democratic principles in its constitutional roles and processes. Obviously, this is the nightmare of Nigeria's legislative institution at national and decentralized levels of governance.

The research survey showed that Enugu state house of assembly within the period (2015-2018) under empirical study was constrained with challenges to stimulate and advance democratic governance in Enugu state. And, these impediments has led to the violation of constitutional provisions, abuse of established precedents, public discontent etc. Against this backdrop, the following plausible measures are essential for the present 9th state assembly of Enugu state nay Nigeria's legislative governance.

1. Enthusiasm and consciousness of the Wawa indigenes or Ndi Enugu to make pertinent claims and demand for more accountability, inclusiveness and efficiency from the state legislators through public opinion and constituency channels of communications.
2. The public and private media in Enugu state should intensify more effort to provide platform for constructive engagement, critique and evaluation of state legislative roles as it concerns the plight and expectations of the people.
3. The Nigeria Labour Congress should synergize with Civil Society Organizations and Rights Advocacy Groups providing a platform and channel to check against the excesses of the state assembly through constructive engagement with the state legislators.
4. The Media, Community Based Organizations (CBOs) and National Orientation Agency should also provide platform for enlightenment and advocacy on the constitutional roles of the law makers and what is expected of them(the people) to demand for an inclusive and impactful representation from the law-makers.
5. The All Progressive Congress (APC) which is presently the ruling political party at the national level and minority party in Enugu state should awake from partisan slumber and activates its mobilization channels to provide a responsible and constructive oppositions in the state.
6. The leadership of the Enugu state house of assembly should entrench precedents and develop mechanisms to make its members to be more efficient, accessible and effective in their constitutional roles as it affects public interests and social welfare of Enugu people through laws and internal mechanism of checks.
7. The need for enlightenment, advocacy and attitudinal change of Enugu law-makers is very imperative to uphold and ensure democratic values in the legislative process.
8. The essence of legislative independence in strict compliance to the provisions of the 1999 constitution and conventions of Presidentialism is expedient to mitigate over-bearing influence of the Executive arm of government on the legislative process of Enugu state government. In other words, the financial autonomy of state legislature is very important in this regard.
9. Making the interest of the people a priority above partisan and individual interests is a virtue that should be internalized, shared and expressed by the Enugu state law-makers. In other words, the laws of the Enugu state house of assembly should be a reflection of yearnings and expectations of Enugu people.
10. The leadership of the house should also activate effective and participatory oversight roles to strengthen check against executive excesses and ensure efficient governance and service delivery.

REFERENCES

Awah, A (2013), "The Crucial Role of Legislature in the Promotion of Democratic Governance vis-à-vis the Diversified interest of the Electorates and the Need for a Cordial working Relationship between the Legislature and other Arms of

- Government*". A paper presented at the Pan African Parliamentary Conference on Capacity Building on the theme "Enhancing the Capacity of Leaders of African Parliaments for more Astute Legislation in Rabat Morocco, 20-22nd may, 2013.
- Alobo, E (2014), "Promoting the Culture of Democracy and Good Governance in Local government councils in Nigeria": The Role of the Legislature. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*. ISSN: 2046-9578.
- Adewale, Y (2009), "Ethnic Politics, Political Corruption and Poverty: Perspective on Contending Issues and Nigeria's Democratization process". *Ethnic Studies Review* 32(1).
- Bruce, B and Thomas, E (1966), "*Role Theory*": *Concepts and Research*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Best, S (2001), "Religion and Religious Conflicts in Northern Nigeria". *University of Jos Journal of Political Science*.
- Bankole, D. (2009), "The Role of the Legislature in the Consolidation of Democracy in Nigeria: The Nations, June 5, 2011.
- Duruyi, M (2010), Democracy and the Challenge of Ethno-nationalism in Nigeria's fourth Republic: Integrating institutional mechanism: *Journal of Peace, Conflict and Development*. (15)92-106.
- Eulau, H (1973), The Behavioural Movement in Political Science: A Personnel Document". *Social Science Research Review*. 24-21.
- Eulau, Buchanan and Ferguson (1962). *The Legislative System*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ibeanu, O. and Egwu, S (2007). Popular Perception of Democracy and Political Governance in Nigeria. Abuja: Centre for Democracy and Development.
- Issak, C (1985). *Scope and Methods of Political Science: An Innovation to Methodology of Political Inquiry*. California. The Dorsey Press.
- Lafenwa, S (2009). *The Legislature and Challenges of Democratic Governance in Africa: The Nigeria Case*. A paper presented at the Conference Organized by the Politics and International Studies (Polis), Centre for African Studies, University of Leeds with assistance from EADI Working Group on Governance and Development on Democratization in Africa: Retrospective and Future Prospects. December 4-5, 2009 at University of Leeds, United kingdom.
- Mbah, O (2009). *Appraising Executive-Legislative Relations: The case of Enugu state of Nigeria, 1999-2003 in "Issues in Politics and Government in Nigeria"*(ed) Onu, Umezuruike, Nnabugwu and Nwankwo. Enugu Quintagon Publishers.
- Madubuegwu, C (2010). *The Dynamics of Group Politics in Nigeria: Conceptual Approach on Political Parties, Pressure Groups, Elections, Public Opinion and Propaganda in the Political Process*. Enugu: Sky publishing press.
- Ogundiya, S (2010) Corruption: The Bane of Democratic Stability in Nigeria: *Research Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(4)233-241.
- Okafor, C and Madubuegwu, C (2015), Analysis of Good Governance and Crisis of Economic Development in Nigeria: A focus on the 2007-2015 Democratic Government. *International of Science and Allied Research*. ISSN: 2408-767.
- UNDP Report on Governance for Sustainable Human Development (1997)
- Zwingina, S. (2010). The role of legislature in democratic governance. The Nigeria experience. *The Nigeria Journal of Legislative Affairs*.