ISSN 0970-9274 ONLINE: ISSN 2456-6608
J Hum Ecol, 50(2): 143-151 (2015)
DOI: 10.31901/24566608.2015/50.2.06

Participatory Budgeting in Nigeria: An Anthropology

Sulaimon Adigun Muse and Sagie Narsiah

University of KwaZulu-Natal, College of Humanities, School of Social Sciences, Durban, South Africa

KEYWORDS Public Participation. Urban Governance. Accountability

ABSTRACT Following the success of participatory budgeting in Latin America, it has become a popular tool for promoting fundamental principles of qualitative urban governance. In Brazil, participatory budgeting was implemented at national, regional, and local level. The participatory budgeting mechanism is meant to deliver products that can achieve the ultimate goal of building inclusive cities. But, in concept and practice, participatory budgeting as it is, cannot fit into a single model because the practice represents a range of initiatives with their own peculiar characteristics which is constantly evolving and changing. It is in view of this that the paper aims to examine the concept of participatory budgeting, within the context of urban governance in Nigeria.

INTRODUCTION

According to Martin (2014) public participation, mobile media and political participation are mutually inclusive. Termel et al. (2014) is of the opinion that public participation that does not take into consideration the issue of consultation with local inhabitants cannot be said to be functional public participation. In essence the main concern of public participation is the constant deliberation, consultation and discussion with local people. The ultimate goal of course is citizen empowerment and citizen control of governance systems.

Oyediran et al. (2002) view public participation as activities which involve citizens in the day to day operation of government. These activities have been referred to in the literature in different ways as: public participation, citizen advisory committees (CACs), community action agencies (CAAs), neighborhood councils, neighborhood advisory groups and voters' participation (as a form of representative democracy) among others (Arnstein 1969; Bierle and Cayford 2002; Karp and Banducci 2008).

These various strategies include, but are not limited to, normative theories of public participation that focuses on the issues of competence and fairness. Among these are: citizen advisory councils, citizens panels, public surveys and public forums (Hendricks 2002). Others include contemporary systems, such as innovative citizen participation strategies, participatory budgeting processes, community conversations, community dinners and deliberative democracy forums, e-government initiatives, participatory democratic models, representative democracy, empowered participatory governance, empowered deliberative democracy, village development committees, district development plans countervailing power, participatory publics and fourth power (Carr and Halvorsen 2001; Leighninger 2002; Cuthill 2003; Fung and Wright 2003; Kroning 2004; Shah 2007; Aragon and Sanchez 2008; Sintomer et al. 2008). They all relate to those activities through which political parties, civil society, labour unions, traditional leaders, academics, religious groups, student associations, community based organizations and others participate in the selection of public office holders or leaders directly or indirectly, and in the formation of public policy for good governance.

According to Gaventa and Valderrama (1999: 2-3), "public participation may be classified into political participation and community/social project participation". Political participation refers the traditional form of political involvement such as voting, political parties, lobbying and related activities. The community/social project participation perspective represents an attempt to look at public participation from the point of view of development. These include the participation of civil society groups in which citizens have been beneficiaries of government programs.

Address for correspondence:
Sulaimon Adigun Muse
University of Kwazulu-Natal,
Howard College Campus, Durban,
Department of Political Science, South Africa
E-mail: muse1428@yahoo.com

Gaventa and Valderrama (1999) looked at the changing phases, shifts and dynamics in public participation in the 21st century. They identified: beneficiary to citizens; project to policy; consultation to decision making; appraisal to implementation; and micro to macro as key issues. In essence, public participation is an ever evolving and dynamic concept that remains active as long as there is a need for governance and citizens' participation in governance. Participatory budgeting is one of the models or strategies of public participation in democratic governance that was first developed in 1989 and implemented in the municipality of Porto Alegre, the capital city of Grande do Sul, Brazil (Fung and Wright 2003: 3-44). In this paper the researchers investigate how participatory budgeting has unfolded in Nigeria.

Objectives

The main objective of the paper is to examine participatory budgeting within the context of urban governance vis-à-vis the real goals and operationalization of the concept and its actual practice and implementation in Nigeria as a nation-state. Furthermore, it is aimed at revealing those challenges that would have made participatory budgeting more functional and concrete beyond the actual rhetoric in Nigeria.

MATERIAL AND METHODOLOGY

Materials for this paper were mainly based on secondary data. The secondary data was collected from published literature that was relevant to the topic such as books, journal articles, newspapers, magazines and internet sources as well as other library materials.

The paper analyzes materials collected using a qualitative methodological approach in line with the explorative nature of the paper. The adoption of this model of data analysis makes the paper easy to appreciate and understand. In essence, no primary data such as that derived from questionnaires or oral interviews was used.

OBSERVATIONS

Deliberative Democracy, Public Participation and Participatory Budgeting

Deliberative democracy is a form of democracy in which deliberation is central to decision making. "Deliberative democracy differs from traditional democratic theory in that authentic deliberation, not mere voting, is the primary source of legitimacy in the law-making processes. Some practitioners and theorists use the term to encompass representative bodies whose members authentically deliberate on legislation without equal distribution of power, while others use the term exclusively to refer to decision-making directly by the ordinary citizens in direct democracy" (Fung and Warren 2011: 341-362).

According to Bassette (1980: 102), "in elitist deliberative democracy, the principle of deliberative democracy applies to elite societal decision-making bodies, such as legislatures and the courts." In populist deliberative democracy, the principle of deliberative democracy applies to groups of ordinary citizens who are empowered to make decisions (Bassette 1980: 103). Deliberative democracy is premised on the need to justify the decisions made by the public and their elected representatives. It is a form of democracy in which effective and exhaustive thorough discussion is central to decision making. It embraces the qualities of both decision making and majority rule. "It is quite different from traditional democracy, because it is based on authentic deliberation not merely voting at a meeting" (Fishkin 1991: 133).

"Deliberative democracy serves a complementary role with both direct and representative democracy, in the sense that representatives in parliament, congress or legislature actually and genuinely make exhaustive deliberation on legislation, although without unequal distribution of power" (Gutmann and Thompson 2009: 25).

The theory is relevant because, it is about the popular participation of the public in democratic governance. For popular participation of the people in democratic governance to be achieved, deliberation becomes a *sine qua non* for this to happen at various levels of the democratic process.

Furthermore, the theory also plays a complementary role with both direct and representative democracy. The theory also applies adequately to the participatory budgeting model because, some of the fundamental ingredients of participatory budgeting also include: direct democracy, representative democracy and deliberation. In essence, the deliberative theory of democracy and participatory budgeting model could be said to be two sides of the same coin as they both enable participation, not just at the elitist level, but more importantly at the level of the masses and vulnerable members of society.

Arnstein (1969) proposed the ladder of citizen participation. She classified public participation as follows: manipulation, therapy, informing, consultation, placation, partnership, delegated power and citizen control. She suggested that at the level of manipulation and therapy, citizens are non-participant; the power holder only educate or cure participants or citizens from ignorance and lack of adequate knowledge on governance, citizenship education and participation.

The work of Arnstein (1969) has been criticized, however, for ignoring among other issues: the sensitive issues of racism, paternalism and resistance to power redistribution, the inadequacies of the poor community's social, political and economic levels, the level of infrastructure and knowledge-base and difficulties of organizing a representative and accountable citizens' group in the face of futility, alienation and distrust (Silverman 2005). For scholars such as Silverman (2005), the ladder of citizen participation may not actually exist in the real world.

Arnstein's ladder of citizen participation was improved with the introduction of what is known as the "citizen participation continuum". This suggests that more recognition ought to and must be accorded to people and groups who drive participation, not only focusing on the power brokers. It was an attempt to distinguish between grassroots participation and instrumental participation (Silverman 2005: 35-51).

Fung (2006: 66) came up with another "ladder of citizen participation" based on three critical questions: Who is allowed to participate, and are they representative of the population? What is the method of communication or decision-making? How much influence or authority is granted to the participation?

According to Cornwall and Coelho (2006), there is a need for new mechanisms and methods of public participation. Cornwall and Coelho (2006) are of the opinion that these new methods of public participation are creating new forms of citizenship and contributing to tangible developmental outcomes. However, they warn that one should not just assume that, the new methods of public participation are creating new forms of citizenship and contributing to tangible developmental outcomes. Furthermore, they warn that one should not just assume that the new institutionalized space will automatically be created for change. They submitted that the new space for change may be distorted by history, culture and governmental power. This is in view of the fact that, most detailed history is told by very old members of society, who may not be in total control of their memory. This has the potential of producing a radically different outcome across various settings, in the form of direct violent and non-violent action.

The United Nations (UN) and its agencies have always been in the forefront of the shift towards decentralization and democratization of local governance. "This shift towards participation is significant in deepening democratic governance and is not only advocated by the development mainstream, but is also confirmed by the left-wing political movement as well. The examples of participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre in Brazil and Panchayat Development Planning in Kerala, India are the most well-known of many of such cases" (Piper 2012: 1-17).

According to Akindele et al. (2012: 85) "the rationality of the budgetary process and its political utility has been taken for granted in Nigeria by successive governments over the years, particularly the military regimes". This has been largely due to unreasonable and sentimental extra-budgeting spending which has become entrenched.

Akindele et al. (2012) are of the opinion that it is a fact of history that most of the leaders in Nigeria, are internationally acclaimed as "Father Christmas" in terms of emotional or primordial extra-budgetary spending. This becomes even more pronounced as a result of non-participation of people in the budgetary process. In many cases, public funds have been donated to questionable and non-existent organizations and persons. This is one of the major reasons for the ineffectiveness of participatory budgeting in Nigeria.

Furthermore, Popoola (2013: 102-103) insisted that "the functions of local government are also concerned with strengthening of grassroots democracy, empowering citizens, communities and other organizations such as the Community Based Organizations (CBOs) and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) to participate as equal partners in local governance and the local development process". He submitted that what he has attempted to describe above is still a mirage in Nigeria. The central government has continuously failed to involve the local people in budget planning and implementation. For Akindele et al. (2012) extra-budgeting by successive governments in the country still continues unabated.

According to Smith (2006) (see also Santos 1998; Aragon and Sanchez 2008; Sintomer et al. 2008) decision making concerning government budgets is of significant public interest since these decisions determine how state resources are allocated and whether the needs and interest of the poorest and the most marginalized members of the public are prioritized and addressed.

Government budgets, in this case the local government, are thus a focal point where the various competing demands on the state are contested, negotiated and renegotiated. In essence, the bottom line is the protection of the most vulnerable members of the public, through a conscious re-ordering of priorities and needs.

There has been no agreement as to what participatory budgeting really means. Basically, it is an umbrella term that is used to describe a variety of mechanisms through which power or influence over public service investment priorities and economic spending can be delegated to the "common man". Adamolekun (2008: 11) simply defined participatory budgeting as the direct involvement of citizens/communities in making decisions on the spending and priorities in the budget of a local-state or national government. It is aimed at ensuring that budget allocations respond to citizens' needs. Shah (2007: 1-2) described participatory budgeting as representing a direct-democracy approach to budgeting that offers citizens at large an opportunity to learn about governance and government operations and to deliberate, debate, and influence the allocation of public resources.

Participatory budgeting is a process by which citizens, either as individuals or through civic associations, can voluntarily and regularly contribute to decision making over at least part of a public budget through an annual series of scheduled meetings with government authorities (Chavez and Goldfrank 2004). Wampler (2007) defined participatory budgeting as a decision-making process through which citizens deliberate and negotiate over the distribution of public resources. Furthermore, Wampler (2007) added that participatory budgeting programs are implemented at the behest of governments, citizens, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and civil society organizations (CSOs) to allow citizens to play a direct role in deciding how and where resources should be spent.

"The proponents of participatory budgeting view it as a means of infusing the values of citizen involvement into the most basic and formal procedure of governance, especially the distribution of resources through budgeting, all in the name of fostering probity, accountability, transparency and effective distribution of resources" (Moynihan 2007: 57). Wampler (2007: 21) maintained that "participatory budgeting opens up obscure budgetary procedures to ordinary citizens and helps create a broader public forum in which citizens and governments discuss spending, taxation, and implementation". It is simultaneously a policy process that focuses on the distribution of resources and democratic institutions which enhance accountability, transfers decision-making authority to citizens, and empowers citizens.

"The participatory budgeting program confronts social and political legacies of clientelism, social exclusion, and corruption by making the budgetary process transparent and public. Social and political exclusion are challenged, as low-income and traditionally excluded political actors are given the opportunity to make policy decisions, by moving the locus of decision making from the private offices of politicians and technocrats to public forums" (Wampler 2007: 24)

"Participatory budgeting is a form of community participation in democratic governance that engenders the redistribution of resources in favour of more vulnerable social groups by means of participatory democracy. It is a means of reducing the predominant nature of the state over civil society, through the redistribution of resources and the definition of investment priorities" (Aragon and Sanchez 2008: 164). "Participatory budgeting often results in more equitable public spending, accountability and, greater government transparency. Furthermore, it has also increased the level of public participation, particularly among the marginalized or poor residents, and has also increased the level of democratic citizenship learning and education" (Sintomer et al. 2008: 165-166). Government policies and programs are well implemented with little or no resistance from the citizens, since it was mutually agreed both procedurally and in implementation.

Adesopo (2011: 117) is of the opinion that "participatory budgeting is basically an umbrella term that is used to describe a variety of mechanisms through which power or influence over public service investment priorities and economic spending can be delegated to citizens. In carrying out a very sound and sustainable participatory budgeting model, some basic and fundamental steps are involved". The four basic steps that are involved in the participatory budgeting process are: "community members identify spending priorities and select budget delegations to represent their interests. Secondly, budget delegations develop specific spending proposals, with help from experts. Thirdly, community members vote on which proposal to fund. Fourthly, the appropriate or relevant city or institution implements the top priority proposals" (Santos 1998: 468).

The emergence of participatory budgeting is to make government more transparent, accountable and also to enhance the public participation of the local people in democratic governance (Santos 1998; Sintomer et al. 2008; Aragon and Sanchez 2008). According to Fung and Wright (2003), Empowered Deliberative Democracy, a form of participatory budgeting, differs from each other in their ambition, scope and concrete aims. Nonetheless, they still share similarities in their motivating principles and institutional design features.

Fung and Wright (2003) identify three main principles upon which Empowered Deliberative Democracy is built on: focus on specific, tangible problems to be solved. Secondly, the involvement of ordinary citizens who are affected by these problems. Thirdly, deliberative development of solutions to these problems. In essence, "the aim of Empowered Deliberative Democracy is to first identify a real problem and attempt to find a lasting solution to it, such as access to food, water, quality education, employment, accommodation, good roads and so on" Fung and Wright (2003: 14) also identified the following as institutionalized structures aimed at providing application to Empowerment Deliberative Democracy as follows: the devolution of public decision making authority to empowered local units. And, the use and generation of new state institutions to support and guide these decentered problems solving efforts rather than leaving them as informal or voluntary affairs.

DISCUSSION

Participatory Budgeting and Urban Governance in Nigeria

In Nigeria there has been a concerted effort to promote participatory budgeting. Participatory budgeting was formally launched by former President Olusegun Obasanjo in 2001(UN-Global Campaign on Urban Governance 2002). Its' aims were to acquaint citizens with new thinking on fiscal management and to also raise the general awareness of citizens regarding their right to a better life. These new initiatives have given the citizens more opportunities to better understand their obligations towards the government particularly in the years between 2005 and 2008. Furthermore, there is also a structured framework of inter-dependence between the executive, legislature and the judicial system of government aimed at driving citizens in the form of participatory budgeting through the Community Development Associations (CDAs) and civil society's participation in budgetary engagement and processes (UN-HABITAT 2009).

According to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (1997) Urban Governance Indicators, several things must be put in place for governance to be considered effective. They have been generally referred to as the elements of good governance which include include: legitimacy; social inclusion; respect for human rights; the rule of law and the division of powers; responsiveness; accountability and transparency; conflict resolution; and state building. These broadly relate to the key components of urban governance namely, institutions, participation and accountability.

Institutions

According to Landell-Mills (1992: 12), "urban governance depends on the extent to which a government is perceived and accepted by the general citizenry to be legitimate, committed to improving general public welfare and responsive to the needs of the citizenry, competent in assuring law and order and in delivering public services, able to create an enabling policy environment for productive activities and equitable in its conduct, favouring no special interests or groups. Institutions are one of the indices of good urban governance and emphasize inclusivity. In other words, it emphasizes participatory governance or simply put public participation whereby everyone regardless of wealth, gender, age, race or religion, is given the opportunity to productively and positively participate in public decision making and administration."

Institutions have been recognized globally as preconditions for sustainable global development particularly by the World Summit on Sustainable Development. This premise has also been upheld as one of the targets of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). In Nigeria The failure of institutions to respond to the need of the people, particularly the vulnerable groups have made the realization of participatory budgeting a mirage.

Accountability

Accountability is no doubt one of the cornerstones and core elements of urban governance. It is a means for communities to hold public authorities accountable for service delivery. Accountability is an offshoot of inclusion in governance. The two reinforce each other. Accountability is an amorphous concept that is somehow difficult to define. However, Adamolekun (2008: 3) described it basically as "holding public officials responsible for their actions". Olowu (1993: 221-237) specifically defined public accountability as "the requirement from those who hold public trust to account for the use of that trust to citizens or their representatives. It signifies the superiority of the public will over private interests and tries to ensure that the former is supreme in every activity and conduct of public officials".

Accountability is a cardinal principle in urban governance and in rural communities. This is in view of the fact that budgeting has gone beyond just being an annual ritual. It is the essence of governance. It is through the instrument of budgeting that priority projects are identified and implemented for development. Furthermore, civil society, the press, the labour unions and other stakeholders who are supposed to hold the government to account on behalf of the people and their organization are perceived by the government as enemies and are treated as such. The effects are glaring as it has also aided in condemning participatory budgeting to more of a theoretical proposition than a reality in Nigeria.

Participation

According to Adamolekun (2008: 3) "a good budget must put in place a process that effectively involves all stakeholders, such as elected officials, government administrators, employees and their representatives, citizen groups, and business leaders". It must reflect their needs and priorities. It will serve as a positive force in maintaining good public relations and enhancing citizens' and other stakeholders' overall impression about government.

Participation implies not just the periodical ritual of voting at elections or taking part in communal efforts. It is the degree of freedom that citizens enjoy in holding the government accountable. It includes the existing level of participatory process, access to information, civil freedom, the involvement of the civil society in public participation and access to basic needs of the citizens. When these are present in urban governance, it is a sign of positive development, but if it is absent, the government and the citizens must work together to provide an enabling environment for this to happen (Adamolekun 2008).

Participation also includes the capacity of the government to provide safety and security to its citizens. If the numbers of safe places are on the increase we can conclude that the community is relatively peaceful, otherwise, plans have to be put in place to achieve this. According to Adamolekun (2008) political, economic and social development will thrive only where there is peace, safety and security. This is the main reason for the failure of participatory budgeting in Nigeria. Other indices of urban governance which could not be said to be in Nigeria are: electoral reforms, decentralization efforts- financial and political, encouragement of local government initiatives, structural and administrative reforms, regular feedback mechanisms and responsiveness. All these are visible and obvious in the way and manner day-to-day government activities are carried out in the country.

The above characteristics of institutions is largely absent in most modern democratic states. The sum total is usually universal suffrage where adults have the right to vote. This has been attested to by Koos and Pierskalla (2015) who are of the opinion that weak institutions such as in the judiciary has also weakened institutional legitimacy and capacity building and development in different countries of the world, as justice is always sold to the highest bidder. Furthermore, Shkaeva (2014) in a study of weak institutions involving the Federal States of Russia and Nigeria is also of the opinion that weak institutions are particularly synonymous with Federal states. Most governments today, particularly in Nigeria, vis-à-vis the federal, state and local government is in most cases not there for the people, but for the minority elite. This clearly militates against the tenets of participatory budgeting, which is meant to bridge the gap between the rich and the poor in the community by giving special attention to the needs of the less privileged and vulnerable members in the community. According to Lutz and Linder (2004), in reality, the direct link between the people and government at the local level is often absent, particularly where there are no local elections and the central or provincial government appoints representatives. In such cases, local representatives are directly responsible to the higher level of government and only indirectly to the local population. Representation and inclusiveness in decision-making at the local level is therefore, not guaranteed at the local level through state structures.

According to Simona and Augustina (2014), most of the problems bedeviling the educational sector in Nigeria could be traced to lack of accountability by government agencies and officials. Furthermore, Ibok (2014) is also of the opinion that it is well known in political discourse that weak accountability is a key explanatory factor for poor developmental performance of most public institutions. The performance here may be service delivery which is the primary purpose of governance. A government that is accountable will always commit itself to developing and nurturing the capability required to ensure efficient and effective performance of the task of service delivery. Akindele et al. (2012) submitted that there is little or no accountability in Nigeria. This is evidenced by the extravagant life style of the political elite in Nigeria and the failure of the government to adhere to fiscal policy as passed by the different legislative houses. Thus, the budget is merely paperwork, devoid of actual implementation and execution. This appalling state of affairs will not make participatory budgeting achieve its full potential in Nigeria.

According to All Africa (2014), the incessant and illegal takeover of power by the military in Nigeria is one of the major reasons responsible for the lack of public participation in the country. It is responsible for the shrinking space of public participation in Nigeria. This is due to the fact that the military by its establishment and training, rules by *fiat*, devoid of necessary consultation with citizens. This situation does not give adequate room for the involvement of citizens in governance. The situation actually affects the functional and efficient implementation of participatory budgeting in the country. This position has further been echoed by Craighton (2014) who is of the opinion that the lack of participation by the citizens has not allowed for the involvement of the citizens in community decision making. This lack of participation by citizens has also led to persistent lawlessness and the breakdown of law and order in the form of ethnic, religious crises, armed banditry and kidnapping for ransom due to the disconnect between the government and its' citizens.

CONCLUSION

The paper gave a brief introduction to participatory budgeting vis-à-vis public participation in Nigeria. It also provided a theoretical framework which was based on the theory of deliberative democracy. It considered the concept of participatory budgeting. Thereafter, it delved into the perceived promises of participatory budgeting in relation to urban governance in Nigeria. From the above, it is clear that participatory budgeting is not just a mere conceptual proposition in Nigeria, but that performance would have been better if Nigeria considered institutions, accountability and participation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Proceeding from the above, it is obvious that there is a contrast between the promises of participatory budgeting and it actual implementation in Nigeria. This paper does not assume that there are no gains at all, but the crux of the matter remains that more could have been achieved if perhaps the theory had been matched with more practical and pragmatic action. In essence the paper recommends that the Nigerian government should put in place policies and an institutional structure for participatory budgeting in the country. This will not only entail a conscious road map toward effective participatory budgeting in Nigeria by the various levels of government, but also the willingness on the part of citizens, civil society, community based organizations, non-governmental organizations, private business enterprises and others to make the program work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors of this paper acknowledge the use of the work of other authors materials as cited in the paper. The materials provided the needed pedestals on which the article was formulated.

REFERENCES

Adamolekun L 2008. *The Governors and the Governed: Towards Improved Accountability for Achieving Good Development Performance*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.

Adesopo AA 2011. Inventing participatory planning and budgeting for participatory local governance in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(7): 111-116.

Akindele ST, Afolabi YA, Ayeni OO 2012. Democratic governance and participatory budgeting: A theoretical discourse of Nigeria experience. *Review of Economics and Finance, Academic Research Centre of Canada*, 1: 85-96.

All Africa 2014. Nigeria: 365 Days of Military Rule: 1966-1978. From <Allafrica.com/stories/2014/060 60226> (Retrieved on 11 March 2015).

Aragon E, Sanchez SP 2008. Theory of Participatory Democracy Based on the Real Case of Porto Alegre. European Economic Review. <From Science Direct. www.elsevier.com/locate/eer> (Retrieved on 11 March 2015).

Arnstein SR 1969. A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of American Planning Association*, 35(4): 216-224.

Bassette J 1980. Deliberative democracy: The majority principle in republican government. In: R Goldwin, W Shambra (Eds.): *How Democratic is the Constitution?* Washington, D.C: American Enterprise Institute.

Beierle TC, Cayford J 2002. *Democracy in Practice: Public Corporation in Environmental Decisions*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future Press.

Burkhalter S, Gastil J, Kelshew T 2002. A conceptual definition and theoretical model of public deliberation in small face-to-face group. *Communication Theory*, 12(4): 394-442.

Carr D, Halvorsen K 2001. An evaluation of three democratic, community-based approaches to citizen participation: Surveys conversations with community groups, and community dinners. *Society and National Resources*, 14: 107-126.

Cornwall A, Coelho VPS 2006. *Spaces for Change? The Politics of Participation in New Democratic Arenas: Citizen, Participation and Accountability*. Sussex: Institute of Development Studies.

Creighton J 2014. Involving Citizens in Community Decision-Making. 2nd Edition. Washington, D.C. National Civil League. From <http: //www.nch.org> (Retrieved on 11 March 2015).

Cuthill M 2003. The contribution of human and social capital to building community well being: A research agenda relating to citizen participation in local governance in Australia. *Urban Policy and Research*, 21(4): 373-391.

Fishkin JS 1991. *Democracy and Deliberation: New Directives for Democratic Reform*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Fung A 2006.Varieties of participation in complex governance. *Public Administration Review*, 66: 66-75.

Fung A, Wright EO 2003. Thinking about empowered participatory governance. In: A Fung, EO Wright (Eds.): *Deepening Democracy*. London: Verso, pp. 3-44.

Gaventa J, Valderrama C 1999. *Participation, Citizenship and Local Governance*. Sussex: Institute of Development Studies.

Chavez D, Goldfrank B 2004. *The Left in the City Participatory Local Government in Latin America.* London: Latin America Bureau.

Gutmann A, Thompson D 2009. *Why Deliberative Democracy?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hendriks C 2002. Institutions of deliberative democratic processes and interest groups: Roles, tensions and incentives. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 61(1): 64 -75.

Ibok EE 2014. Local governance and service delivery in Nigeria. *Caribbean Journal of Science and Technology*, 2: 530-542.

Karp JA, Banducci SA 2008. Political efficacy and participation in twenty-seven democracies: how electoral system shape political behavior. *British Journal of Political Science*, 38(2): 311-334.

Koos C, Pierskalla, J 2015. The Effects of Oil Production and Ethnic Representation on Violent Conflict in Nigeria. A Mixed-Method Approach. Terrorism and Political Violence. From <www. tandfonline. com.doi/abs/10.1080/09546553.2014.962021> (Retrieved on 11 March 2015)

Kroning K 2004. Strengthening citizenship in Brazil's democracy: Local participatory governance in Porto Alegre. *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, 23(1): 79-99.

Landell-Mills P 1992. Governance, cultural change and empowerment. *Journal of Modern African Studies,* 3(4): 1-24

Leighninger M 2002. Shared governance in communities: Using study circles to put citizens at the centre of the system. *Public Organization Review*, 2: 267-283.

Lutz G, Linder W 2004. Traditional Structures in Local Governance for Local Development. From <www.ccsenel.org>. (Retrieved on 1 March 2015).

Martin JA 2014. Mobile media and political participation: Defining and developing an emerging field. *Journal of Mobile and Media Communication*, 2(2): 173-185.

Moynihan D P 2007. Citizen participation in budgeting: prospects for developing countries. In: A Shah (Ed.): *Participatory Budgeting*. Washington DC: The World Bank, pp. 55-81.

Olowu D 1993. Organizational and institutional mechanisms for enhancing accountability in anglophone Africa: A review. In: S Rasheed, D Olowu (Eds.): *Ethics and Accountability in African Public Services*. ICIPE Science Press, pp. 221-237.

Oyediran O, Nwosu H, Takaya B, Anifowoshe R, Badejo F, Ogboghodo K, Agbaje A 2002. *New Approach to Government*. Lagos: Longman.

Piper L 2012. Development Trustees, Not Rent- Seeking Deployees. Cape Town: African Centre for Citizenship and Democracy. *Working Paper* 11.

Popoola F 2013. Making governance more participatory at the local level in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development,* 6(9): 102-103.

Santos B de S 1998. Participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre: Towards a redistributive democracy. *Politics and Society*, 26(4): 461-510.

Shah A 2007. Participatory Budgeting: Public Sector. *Governance and Accountability Series.* World Bank.

Shkaeva N 2014. *The Resources Curse Magnitude in Federal States: A Study of Russia and Nigeria.* MSc Thesis, Unpublished. Budapest: Central European University.

Silverman RM 2005. Caught in the middle: Community development corporations (CDCs) and the conflict between grass root and instrumental forms of community participation. *Community Development*, 36(2): 35-51.

Smith T 2006. *The Potential for Participatory Budgeting in South Africa: A Case Study of the "People's Budget" in Ethekwini Municipality*. Centre for Civil Society (CCS). KwaZulu-Natal: University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN).

Simona G, Augustina L 2014. *Governance of Education in Nigeria*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. Canada: Rockslide University.

Sintomer Y, Herzberg C, Rocke A 2008. Participatory budgeting in Europe: Potentials and challenges. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 32(1): 164-166.

Termel BW, Kaudenburg FA, Mors E 2014. Public responses to community compensation: The importance of prior consultation with local residents. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 24(6): 479-490.

UN 2002. Progress Report of the Executive Director on Global Campaign on Urban Governance. HS/UF/11/13-*Dialogues* 1/Paper 7. New York: United Nations.

UNDP1997. Report on Reconceptualising Governance. New York: UNDP. From <http: //magnet.undp.org/policy/chapter1.htm>. (Retrieved on 11 March 2015).

UN-HABITAT 2009. *Draft Report on Selected Participatory Budgeting Best Practices, Peer to Peer Learning Pilot on Government Dialogue and Advocacy Across West, East, and Southern Africa*. New York: Un-Habitat.

Wampler B 2007. A Guide to Participatory Budgeting. From <www.internationalbudget.org/resources/library/GPB.pdf. 5-24-2014> (Retrieved on 11 June 2014).