

Governance and provision of public goods in Gombe state: evidence from citizens' perceptions

Abdullahi Buba*¹, Gafar T. Ijaiya², Farida Bello³

^{1&2} Assistant Lecturer, Department of Economics, Gombe State University, P. M. B. 127, Tudun Wada, Gombe – Nigeria

³ Professor, Department of Economics, University of Ilorin, P. M. B. 1515, Ilorin – Nigeria

abdulmaikano85@gmail.com¹, gtijaiya@gmail.com², farimo15@gmail.com³

Abstract

Background/Objectives: This study was underpinned to empirically examine the effect of governance indicators (public participation in decision-making, enforcement of rules and regulations, transparency and accountability, equitable and fair resource control, and pro poor policies) on the likelihood of provision of public goods in Gombe state, Nigeria.

Methods/Statistical analysis: Qualitative research design was adopted in the study. Also, multi-stage sampling technique was used in the study in which the study area was divided in to three (3) senatorial districts. One local government area was latter chosen from each senatorial district. The chosen local government area was then divided in to two State House of Assembly (SHA) constituencies, and the questionnaire was randomly distributed to members of the public in one ward each from SHA. Finally, the data generated was analyzed using ordered discrete choice model.

Findings: The results obtained indicated that corruption perception, public participation in decision-making and inclusiveness were relatively less influential than political stability in the likelihood of providing public goods. The study concluded by recommending among other measures the engagement of members of the public in the articulation, formulation and implementation of public policies that have to do with the provision of public goods in the state.

Improvements/Applications: This study is one of the first of its own kinds that attempt to empirically investigate public perception on issues of governance in the study area.

Keywords: Good Governance, Public Goods, Perceptions, Public Participation, Inclusiveness, Gombe State.

1. Introduction

Good governance is critical to effective management of scarce resources and provision of basic services that would improve living conditions of the people in a country. Attainment of good governance is a function of vibrant and effective institutions. Poor governance on the other hand, not only impairs delivery of basic services but also leads to misappropriation of limited resources of the society by opportunistic leaders [1]. Therefore, consolidation of good governance is a prerequisite condition that influenced quality of social amenities provided by the state to its citizens. In Nigeria, however, there were high expectations from the people as regard the quality of governance in the country precedent by the return to democracy in the Fourth Republic in 1999. There were hopes that leadership in the country would pay more attention to the developmental needs and challenges bedeviling the country. Stakeholders seem to have more faith in democratic rule than military rule. Unfortunately, anticipated developmental outcomes have not been fully realized as a result of bad governance [2] [3]. In Gombe state, the yearnings and aspirations of the people are also similar to that of Nigerians. Especially, as the current political dispensation is the first time that the state experienced democratic leadership since its creation in 1st October, 1996. Electorates in the state considered the return of democracy as a turning point not only because of promising dividends of democracy but also for being an opportunity to actualize motives behind their move for the creation of the state. This was not to be because of some constraints that include the quality of governance, injustice and political and bureaucratic corruption. These constraints also led to the displacement of priority and negligence of the agricultural sector (the primary sector of the state's

economy), the non-completion of projects and designing of over-ambitious projects. As observed the failure to address some of these constraints had not only resulted to bad governance, but rather degenerate to poor service delivery [3]. The celebrated quality of governance in the state has been questioned base on over ambitious of its public programmes. Public projects in the state seem to be conceptualized to merely make the resent stewardship different from the past regimes as can be observe by any critique of public policies in the state. Over ambitious of policies as asserted are not borne out of sincere effort to bring about radical development but just to boast the ego of the political leaders. Related to over ambitious is widespread non-completion of public projects by the Dankwambo's led administration. There are "countless impressive projects" started by this regime in critical sectors but are yet to be completed over the period of four years in office. For instance, some of these projects include provision of potable water (Gombe water reticulation and expansion program, Gombe South Regional Water Supply Project, and channelization of River Gongola along Gombe-Abba axis to cater for Gombe North Senatorial District with safe drinking water); human capital development (constructions of state college of education, state poly technique, college of legal and Islamic studies, most of Model schools, and permanent site for school of nursing and midwifery); power generation (40mw hydro electricity power from Dadin Kowa dam and mini power project from Balanga dam to supply power to Tangale-Waja water project); transport (Ultra-Modern Mega Motor Park); infrastructure (international Conference Centre); and roads construction (prominent among them is Kanawa-Deba-Jagali-Kwage-Jauro Gotel road, Talasse township roads, Ture-Sabon Layi Awak-Dogon Ruwa-Gelengu). Though, all of the above mentioned projects are plausible programs but are yet to be fully constructed or accomplished. The scenario clearly supports critiques of over ambitious programs of the incumbent government [4].

In addition, upon resumption/assumption of the regime expectations heighten that it will correct one of the "mistakes" made by Goje led administration of constructing airport (which effect on livelihood of the masses is least) rather than actualization of an over 30 years 40MW hydro power generation from Dadin Kowa which can meet both domestic and industrial demand in the state and that of north eastern states as documented [5]. This highlighted the problem of displacement of priority in managing limited resources in the state. This is because realization of the power project has more direct impact on living condition of the masses for being pro-poor policy which enhance equitable resource distribution and greater access to basic services [6]. Therefore, this study was conducted to empirically examine quality of governance in Gombe state and the effects of governance indicators on public goods provision. Governance quality is measured against governance indicators like corruption perception, public participation in decision making, inclusiveness of public programs, and political stability (proxy by government effort in curbing violence). Thus, the study sought to answer the following research questions: (i) have return to democratic rule brought good governance in Gombe state? (ii) Which indicator(s) of governance is more important for the provision of public goods in the state?

The remaining part of the paper is organized in the following sequence. Section two is the review of literature which comprises a review of the concept of governance and the theoretical framework. Materials and methods adopted for the study are in section three. Presentation and discussion of results are in section four. Conclusion and recommendations are contained in the last section.

2. Review of the concept of governance

2.1. Meaning of governance and good governance

There is no single agreed definition of good governance just like other concepts in social sciences. The definition of good governance differed across organizations and greatly influenced by its usage. This section considered some of these definitions. But before attempting a definition of good governance, first is the definition of governance. Governance is seen as: "The traditions and institutions by which authority in a country is exercised for the common good. This include the process by which those in authority are selected, monitored, and replaced (political dimension), the government capacity to effectively manage its resources and implement sound policies (economic dimension), and the respect of citizens and the state for country's institutions (institutional respect dimension" [7]. This means that governance involves the art of chosen people to hold various responsibilities (not necessarily through election), efficient utilization of scarce resources in an economy, and protection of individuals' rights.

On the other hand, good governance is seen as the exercise of authority through political and institutional processes that are transparent and accountable, and encourage public participation. In the view of [9] good governance refers to securing justice, empowerment, employment, and efficient delivery of service. However, in the context of this paper, we view good governance as government's commitment in relation to the equitable provision of public goods to its citizens [8].

2.2. Emergence of good governance agenda

The emergence of good governance agenda can be traced back to the failure of certain policies to induce desired level growth in developing countries. This is because failure of economic policy-based conditionality and effects of fungibility as a result of its inherent defects gave birth to crusade for political conditionality, and ultimately, when political conditionality suffered major setbacks led to the advocacy for good governance agenda [9]. To sum it up, the concept of good governance evolved due to ineffectiveness of economic and political conditionality's as well in extending financial grants to underdeveloped countries in the world. Failure of these policies led to eventual adoption of selectivity with reference to accountable and transparent public practices in developing countries like Nigeria. One major challenge with this principle or practice is that donor organizations can use their aid as a tool for coercing African countries especially when they fall apart with the central authority [10].

2.3. Principles of good governance

Good governance as a concept is based on certain assumptions, principles, or tenets which shape and direct the pattern of managing organizations or institutions in a more responsive ways. Therefore, stakeholders in organizational setting should ensure public participation in decision making, impartial enforcement of rules and regulations, transparency and accountability, equitable and fair resource control, and effective and efficient utilization of economy's scarce resources as argued by United Nations Development Programme [11-13].

2.4. Significance of good governance

There are certain theoretical propositions that amplified significance of good governance on economic growth. Some of the theoretical propositions on the significance of good governance include that it:

1. Enhances participatory development: good governance is a yard stick for measuring participatory development as it provides platform that promote participation and create environment in which participatory process take place [13];
2. Minimizes risk of fraud: effective system of governance lead to an improvement in accountability and thereby minimizing the tendencies for fraudulent practice among public officers [14]; and
3. Protects human rights: good governance reinforces protection of fundamental human rights and provides playing ground that shape government's action and other political and social actors in the society [15]. Hence, good governance is critical to the attainment of individual right to education, and access to health care services [8] [15].

2.5. Empirical discourse on the significance of good governance

There are diverse studies on the effect of governance on public projects by different authors at different time across economies. Some of these studies include:

1. Elections

Elected leaders provide more public projects or public goods to their respective community or constituencies [16-18]. This implies that, the shift toward democracy resulted in the implementation of policies that maximized wellbeing of the electorates (general public) and that democratization of public offices in contemporary world improved transparency and efficiency in the provision of public goods.

2. Political will

Government efforts and commitments do influence the quality of public service delivery. Political will is necessary for the sustenance and development of policy and programme which determines the success or otherwise of a policy in given economy [19]. Therefore, stakeholders' nonchalant attitude in policies promotion inform of delay in terms of budget implementation impaired effective inspection and supervision of public projects in Nigeria, consequently, effective provision of public goods become difficult in the country [20].

3. Democracy

Inclusive regimes (democratically elected officers) paid more attention in channeling societal resources toward public projects. Although, often a times priorities are given to the programmes that were perceived to be more of political coloration [21,22]. By implication the principles of devolution and decentralization of power to lower levels in order to improve the efficiency of service delivery tend to be over look [22]. Therefore, non-implementation of the doctrine of devolution of power to its entirety particularly at lower level institutions accounted for the negligence of some key sectors of an economy with respect to public goods provisions. This literature review has highlighted the existing frontier of knowledge and the ongoing debate related to governance and services delivery. There are several lessons and conclusions that can be drawn from these studies. Firstly, most of these studies are conducted at macro (national) or regional levels with little or no focus on micro level analysis. Secondly, most of the documented studies used secondary data to establish the relationship between these key concepts and the reliability of such secondary data especially in developing economies cannot be guarantee. Also, most of the studies negate to seek for opinions of the people on fundamental issues or problems associated with governance and service delivery.

Therefore, further in-depth work is required to highlight more on these key concepts. Specifically, this study is unique by departure in both philosophical and methodological context from the previous works. Philosophically, the study seeks public perceptions on government's effort in providing public goods amidst increasing dwindling resources in the state. However, methodologically the study focused on micro level (or sub-national) analysis which makes it possible by the devolution of power which is expected to have more insights on public goods users' preferences. Since the study sought for qualitative responses from the principals or electorates in the state, discrete choice models (unlike previous studies) was employed to achieve its preoccupation. The appropriateness of the chosen method is discussed in the methodology used in the study. Conclusively, the difference between this study and the previous works as highlighted is mainly shift in both philosophical and methodological analysis and it is one of the first of its kind in the study area.

2.6. Theoretical framework

This study adapted the theory of principal-agent. The theory examined relationship between two actors within an organizational setting. It is contended that, in a principal-agent models, some actors (or group of actors) called an agent undertakes an action on behalf of another actor (or group of actors) called principal. The principal can exert power to induce actions of the agent to act in such a way that maximizes the welfare or wellbeing of the principal. This implies that there is a social contract that connects or serves as an interface between the agent and the principal and there also exist agreements guiding their relationship. The theory provided a platform for modeling diverse variations in institutional arrangements and how such platforms induced desirable outcomes that satisfied principal expectations [23]. In this regard, the state executive council is referred to as the agent, while the electorates are the principal whose mandate are sought by the agent to provide services that will improve the general wellbeing of the people in Gombe state. In a democratic polity, thus the ultimate principals were the citizens who were the consumers of specific services provided by the government and the politicians seek mandate to act as the representatives of the people [24].

Furthermore, the electorates also have advantage over the executive and other political office holders by invoking the weapon of election to sanction wayward politicians and elect only those that have desirable manifesto [25] as cited in [23]. Hence, electorates can control actions or behaviours of politicians, especially those seeking for re-election given their preferences. Therefore, agency theory is an indispensable tool for examining or evaluating the relationship between the general public and the state in a democratic society by ensuring that only those politicians that shown their willingness and/or worthiness to provide effective services

that can transform or impact the living standard of the electorates positively are entrusted with managing public affairs in the state. For this theory to be applicable to the situation in Gombe state, the following assumptions as slightly modified from [26] must be fulfilled:

1. The agent (state executive) must take actions (i.e. public policies) that determine a pay-off (democratic dividend) to the principal (electorates);
2. The electorates must have perfect information on actions of the executive;
3. The executive's preferences must not differ from that of the electorates;
4. The electorates must offer social contract at the end of each regime or tenure of political offices to the possible contenders; and
5. The electorates in the state must decide (through election) the best candidate that offered them with best policies.

Thus, the theory was used to examine the role of the Gombe state government in the provision of public goods that improved or impacted positively on the well-being of the citizens in the state.

3. Materials and methods

3.1. Variables and sources of data

The variables considered for this study are the quality of governance measured against governance indicators like corruption perception, public participation in decision making, inclusiveness of public programs, political stability (proxy by government effort in curbing violence) and public goods made up of infrastructural facilities such as road networks, health care services and safe water. This study used cross sectional data which were sourced through a survey during the month of August, 2015 in Gombe state. The data were collected using multi-stage sampling strategy in the three Senatorial Districts. One Local Government Area (LGA) was chosen from each of the Senatorial districts. Each of the chosen LGA was further divided into State House of Assembly Constituencies (SHACs) from which a Ward was selected from each (SHACs). From the Wards, simple random sampling techniques was used in administering copies of the questionnaire to 400 eligible voters (that were chosen as respondents) in the state out of which 367 copies of the questionnaire (i.e. 91.75 percent of the sample size) were valid and hence processed for this study. The issues raised in the questionnaire include the following: people's perception on government's performance in relation to the provision of basic social amenities, people's perception on the level of diversion of funds meant for public projects into personal gains among government officials, public participation in decision-making, the inclusiveness of public projects and people's acceptance on whether government is taking pro-active measures in curving violent conflict in the state.

3.2. Model specification

Following [27] that measured good governance in terms of the provision of public goods and [28] that chooses outcome-based indicators of governance rather than rules-based indicators of governance in measuring the quality of governance, the model was specified as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Definition of variables

Variable	Definition
Gov_i	Good governance measuring people's opinion on government's performance in relation to the provision of public goods in the state. Excellent = 5; Very Good = 4; Good = 3; Fair; 2 or Poor = 1
$Curp_i$	Corruption perception measures people's perception on the level of diversion of funds meant for public projects into personal gains among government officials in the state. Very high = 5; Fairly high = 4; Fairly low = 3; Very low = 2; or Zero = 1
$Partic_i$	Public participation in decision making measures the rate at which a member at the State House of Assembly seeks people's opinion on public policy in the state. Not at all = 1; Once in a while = 2; Sometimes = 3; Fairly often = 4; or Frequently = 5.
$Inclus_i$	Inclusiveness of public projects which measure the effect of public projects executed in the state on living condition in the state. Strongly positive = 5; relatively positive = 4; Unaffected = 3; Relatively negative = 2; or Strongly negative = 1.
$Abviol_i$	Absence of violence measuring people's acceptance on whether government is taking pro-active measures in curving violent conflict among thugs in the state. Strongly agree = 5; Agree = 4; Indifference = 3; Disagree = 2; or Strongly disagree = 1.

Source: Authors' designed, (2015)

$$Prob(Gov_i = j) = \frac{\exp(X^1_{ij} \beta_1)}{\sum_{j=1}^5 \exp(X^1_{ij} \beta_1)} \quad j = 1,2,3,4,5. \quad X_i = Curp_i, Partic_i, Inclus_i, Abviol_i \quad (1)$$

When transformed into a linear regression model, equation (1) thus becomes:

$$Prob(Gov_i = j) = \alpha + \beta_1 Curp_i + \beta_2 Partic_i + \beta_3 Inclus_i + \beta_4 Abviol_i + \mu_i \quad (2)$$

Where:

Gov_i = respondents' opinion on quality of governance in terms of the provision of Public projects in the state; 5 – 1.

α = constant term

$Curp_i$ = respondents' corruption perception in the state; 5 – 1.

$Partic_i$ = respondents' participation in decision making in the state; 1 – 5.

$Inclus_i$ = respondents' perception on inclusiveness in public projects executed in the state; 5 – 1.

$Abviol_i$ = respondents' perception on absence of violence or on government effort in curbing violence in the state; 5 – 1.

β_{is} = parameters.

μ_i = error term

3.3. Method of data analysis

Both descriptive and econometric methods of analysis were used in analyzing the data. Descriptive statistic was used to explain people's opinion on government's performance in the provision of public goods in Gombe state, while econometric analysis was used to examine the relative effect of governance indicators on the likelihood of a sufficient provision of public goods in Gombe state. For the purpose of accuracy and consistency, linear probability model (LPM), probit and logistic regression tools were specifically used in estimating model (1). The model was estimated using the ordered discrete choice model [29-32].

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Socio economic characteristics of the respondents in Gombe state

Table 2 presents summarized age distribution of the respondents. The table shows that age of youngest and oldest respondent (s) were 18 years and 61 years respectively. On average the respondents were within the age of 32 years. This indicates that most of the respondents are at their youthful age and can actively engage in issues of governance with ease in the state.

Table 2. Summary statistic of age of the respondents in Gombestate

Variable	No. of Observation	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Age in Years	362	32.07182	9.734158	18	61

Source: Authors' survey data 2015

They are also at the pole position to subject into acid test the pattern of distributing social amenities as provided by their agents. Also, most of the respondents interviewed for this study were male as indicated by 70.84 percent against female respondents as portrayed in Table 3. This high proportion of male relative to female respondents can be linked to socio-cultural orientation of the study area that discourages female's contact or meeting with an unknown visitor without a prior knowledge of her guardian. Also, almost each of the households visited were headed by a male and in a situation where the head of the household was indisposed during the interview the eldest male child was made available for the interview. Married respondents constituted 59.56 percent compared to any category of marital status as presented in Table 3. This means that majority of the respondents have either a child or dependent(s). As such, high dominant of married respondents serves as a good basis for the analysis and discussion of the specific objectives of this study. In addition, the result shows that respondents who have completed tertiary education accounted for 40.55 percent. This implies that higher proportion of the respondents obtained postsecondary school education. Consequently, it reflects the fact that (at least theoretically) most of the respondents possess cognitive political orientation and are expected to objectively assess issues of interest for this study. Looking through Table 3 it displays that 26.48

percent of the respondents were not employed. While 31.27 percent were self-employed and 42.25 percent were employed. This implies that about 73 percent were gainfully engaged in economic activities in the state.

Table 3. Socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents in Gombestate

Gender	Freq.	Percent
Female	107	29.16
Male	260	70.84
Marital status		
Single	136	37.16
Married	218	59.56
Divorced	4	1.09
Widowed/Widower	8	2.19
Education qualification		
Non-Formal Education	12	3.29
Primary Education Not Completed	5	1.37
Primary Education Completed	15	4.11
Secondary Education Not Completed	31	8.49
Secondary Education Completed	104	28.49
Tertiary Education Not Completed	50	13.70
Tertiary Education Completed	148	40.55
Occupation		
Unemployed	94	26.48
Self Employed	111	31.27
Employed	150	42.25
L. G. A		
Balanga	121	32.97
Gombe	124	33.79
YamaltuDeba	122	33.24
Ward		
Bambam	56	15.26
Dawaki	57	15.53
Deba	63	17.17
Kwadon/Liji/Kurba	59	16.08
Pantami	67	18.26
Talasse/Dong/Reme	65	17.71

Source: Authors' survey data 2015

However, majority of the respondents were drawn from Gombe local government area (Gombe North Senatorial District) which accounted for 33.79 percent of the entire respondents that were interviewed as depicted in Table 3. This reflects the fact that a part from being the state capital comprising individuals with diverse socio-cultural, economic and political background, Gombe local government is one of the local government areas that have highest number of registered voters for 2015 general elections conducted in the state [33]. Therefore, it is more likely to have more electorates that are willing to partake in the interview as the focus on governance. The distribution of respondents based on the six chosen enumeration areas was presented in Table 3. The result shows that only 15.26 percent of the respondents were from Bambam ward. This can be attributed to not only being located at the periphery or rural area. But, also the residents of the locality have perception that they have been politically marginalized in terms of public goods provision. Hence, it was difficult to solicit for their willingness to participate in the interview as they considered research of such nature as politically oriented. Thus, this accounted for limited or low response as only the few respondents that were convinced that the study is purely for academic purpose were interviewed.

4.2. People's perception on government's performance in providing public goods in Gombe state

The peoples' perception on the performance of the government of Gombe state in the provision of public goods, especially infrastructural facilities as presented in Table 4 showed that 34.5 percent of them considered the state's performance in terms of public projects execution across the state good (i.e. average). This means that the peoples' perceptions on performance of governance relative to provision of developmental projects

was positive as only less than 30 percent of the people considered the state executive council to have underperformed in response to fulfillment of the binding social contract between them.

Table 4. Peoples' perception on Government's performance in providing public goods in Gombe state

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Poor	33	9.0
Fair	73	20.0
Good	126	34.5
Very Good	90	24.6
Excellent	43	11.7

Source: Authors' computation, (2015)

4.3. Relative effect of governance indicators on likelihood of a sufficient provision of public goods in Gombe state

Governance proxy by quality of governance in relation to provision of public goods in Gombe state is presented in Table 5. The entire determinants of governance included in the model were found to have significant positive likelihood effect on the provision of public goods in the state thus conforming to the *a-prori* expectations. However, in specific terms and based on the values of their coefficient values, corruption perception, public participation in decision making and inclusiveness, although relatively less influential than political stability were statistically significant at 5 percent level. By implication, it means that political stability (proxied by the absence of violence) in the state is more likely to improve the provision of public goods in the state. These outcomes are also in conformity with the views of [28] [34] [35]. Furthermore are the results of the marginal effect of the indicators of governance on the likelihood of a sufficient provision of public goods in Gombe state. As indicated in Table 6, on a margin a better corruption perception in Gombe state has a 1.28 percent, 3.33 percent and 0.64 percent less likelihood of recording poor, fair and good performance respectively in the provision of sufficient public goods in the state. On the other hand, a better corruption perception has a 3.40 percent and 1.85 percent more likelihood of recording very good and excellent performance respectively in the provision of sufficient public goods in the state.

Table 5. Result of relative effect of governance indicators on likelihood of sufficient provision of public goods in Gombe state

Variable	LPM (OLS)	Ordered Probit	Ordered Log it
Curp _i	0.128**(0.0543)	0.138**(0.0594)	0.236**(0.108)
Partic _i	0.0959**(0.0405)	0.104** (0.0435)	0.176** (0.0753)
Inclus _i	0.126**(0.0573)	0.139**(0.0625)	0.241** (0.113)
Abviol _i	0.389*** (0.0550)	0.418*** (0.0648)	0.753*** (0.113)
Constant cut1		1.171*** (0.349)	2.075*** (0.624)
Constant cut2		2.152*** (0.360)	3.855*** (0.637)
Constant cut3		3.162*** (0.377)	5.553*** (0.675)
Constant cut4		4.131*** (0.392)	7.231*** (0.702)
Constant	0.549*		
Pseudo R-squared	0.235	0.0895	0.0908
No. of Observations	353	353	353

Source: Authors' computation, (2015)

Dependent Variable = Governance, Standard Errors in parentheses. LPM = Linear Probability Model, OLS = Ordinary Least Squares. ***, **, and * indicate significance at 1 percent, 5 percent, and 10 percent respectively.

An increased public participation in decision making also has a 0.96 percent, 2.49 percent and 0.48 percent less probability of recording poor, fair and good performance respectively in the provision of sufficient public goods in Gombe state respectively. Whereas, an increased involvement of members of the public in decision making has a 2.54 percent and 1.38 percent more tendencies of recording very good and excellent performance respectively in the provision of sufficient public goods in Gombe state. The study also indicated that an improved provision of pro-poor projects has a 1.31 percent, 3.40 percent and 0.65 percent less likelihood of recording poor, fair and good performance respectively in the provision of sufficient public goods in the state. Similarly, an increased provision of pro-poor projects have a 3.47 percent and 1.89 percent more likelihood of

consolidating very good and excellent performance respectively in the provision of sufficient public goods in Gombe state.

Table 6. Marginal effect of governance indicators on likelihood of sustainable public goods provision in Gombe state

Variable	Base Outcome (Poor) dy/dx	Base outcome (Fair) dy/dx	Base Outcome (Good)dy/dx	Base Outcome (Very Good) dy/dx	Base Outcome (Excellent) dy/dx
Curp _i	-0.0128**(0.00535)	-0.0333*(0.01301)	-0.0064**(0.00472)	0.0340**(0.01342)	0.0185**(0.00728)
Partic _i	-0.0096**(0.00445)	-0.0249**(0.01118)	-0.0048**(0.00363)	0.0254**(0.01134)	0.0138**(0.00626)
Inclus _i	-0.0131**(0.00563)	-0.0340**(0.01419)	-0.0065**(0.00482)	0.0347**(0.0143)	0.0189**(0.00793)
Abviol _i	-0.0410*(0.00828)	-0.1063*(0.01827)	-0.0204**(0.01332)	0.1085*** (0.01834)	0.0592*(0.01089)

Source: Authors' computation, (2015)

Note: Dependent Variable = Governance, Standard Errors in parentheses. ***, **, and * indicate significance at 1 percent, 5 percent and 10 percent respectively

In respect to political stability (proxied by the absence of violent) the study indicated that there is likely a 4.10 percent, 10.63 percent and 2.04 percent less tendencies of recording poor, fair and good performance respectively in the provision of sufficient public goods in Gombe state as the government intensified its efforts in curbing violence. There is also a 10.85 percent and 5.92 percent tendency of recording very good and excellent performance respectively in the provision of sufficient public goods as the government explored more measures in maintaining peace and order in the state. Comparatively too and given the values of the coefficients of the indicators of governance, the absence of violence, even at a margin has more tendency in determining the provision of sufficient public goods in Gombe state. These outcomes when critically viewed are also in conformity with the views of scholars such as [36-38].

5. Conclusion and recommendations

This study examined the relative effect of some selected indicators of governance on the probability of sufficient provision of public goods in Gombe state. To achieve this, discrete choice model was used. Based on the values of the coefficients of the indicators of governance it was observed that corruption perception, public participation in decision-making and inclusiveness were relatively less influential than political stability in propelling the provision of public goods in the state. Given these outcome the study therefore recommends that:

1. The state executive council should engage the general public in articulating, formulating and implementing public policies through town hall meetings, public hearing and survey of public opinion at least once before appropriation and submission of annual budget Bill to the state legislature;
2. Members of the state legislature should commission offices at their various constituencies which could enable thorough and genuine mobilization of public preference on issues bothering on living conditions of the people in the state;
3. Priority should be given to public projects that have public appealing and capable of improving or relieving hardship of the people and are devoid of political propaganda with careful attention to balancing regional resource allocation;
4. Government, members of the public and all development agencies should devise more avenues for maintaining law and order across all parts of the state through the establishment and/or empowerment of Police Public Relationship Committee, and also members of the public should not hesitate to report attempts by any person that want to destroy any public good and disrupt the relative peace in the state;
5. Technocrats in the state should ensure prudence implementation of public projects in accordance with established rules and desist from misappropriation of public funds; and
6. Members of the public, especially organized civil society organizations should be abreast to report any public funds misappropriation by the bureaucrats to the anti-corruption agencies.

6. References

1. D. Acemoglu, J. A. Robinson. Why is Africa poor? *Economic History of Developing Region*. 2010; 25(1), 21-50.
2. S. Oguniye. Democracy and good governance: Nigeria's dilemma. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relation*. 2010; 4(6), 201-208.
3. A. Guga. Good governance: A key driver to sustainable development in Nigeria. *International Journal of Education and Research*. 2014; 2(1), 1-12.
4. B. I. Ugwuanyi, E. E. Chukwuemeka. The obstacles to effective policy implementation by the public bureaucracy in developing nations: The case of Nigeria. *Singaporean Journal of Business Economics, and Management Studies*. 2013; 1(8), 34-43.
5. Decades of uncertainty on 40mw Dadin Kowa power. <https://www.dailytrust.com.ng/.../43108-decades-of-uncertainty-on-40mw-dadin-kow>. Date accessed: 30/12/2014.
6. M. Abdu, A. Alhassan, A. Buba. Macroeconomic stability and economic inclusive growth in Nigeria: Co-integration approach. *Presented at the 55th Nigerian Economic Society (NES) Conference*. 2014.
7. D. Kaufmann. Myths and realities of governance and corruption. *Global Competitiveness Report 2005-06, World Economic Forum*. 2005; 1-18.
8. United Nations. *Good governance practices for the protection of human rights*. Geneva: UN. 2007.
9. B. P. Singh. The challenges of good governance in India: Need for innovative approaches. *Being a Paper Circulated at the Second International Conference of the Global Network of Global Innovators*. 2008; 1-25.
10. J. Aubut. The good governance agenda: Who wins and who loses. Some empiricalevidence for 2001. *Development Studies Institute Working Paper Series*. 2004; 1-48.
11. United Nations Development Programmes. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/United-Nations-Development-Programme>. Date accessed: 15/02/2018.
12. United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific [UNESCAP]. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Nations_Economic_and_Social_Commission_for_Asia_and_the_Pacific. Date accessed: 21/10/2017.
13. Biswas. Corruption, participatory development and good governance. *YOJANA*. 2013; 38-43.
14. D. L. Evans, J. D. Wolfensohn, P. L. Woicke. The importance of good corporate governance for Russia. *The Russia Corporate Governance Manual*. 2004; 1-2.
15. K. Saikia. Good governance and human rights: International and national perspective. *International Journal of Advancements in Research and Technology*. 2013; 2(7), 124-134.
16. R. Luo, L. Zhang, J. Huang, S. Rozelle. Village elections, public goods investment and pork Barrel politics, Chinesestyle. *International Association of Agricultural Economists Conference*. Beijing, China. 2009; 1-21.
17. X. Zhang, S. Fan, L. Zhang, J. Huang. Local governance and public goods provision in rural China. *Journal of Public Economics*. 2004; 88, 2857-2871.
18. X. Zhang, S. Fan, L. Zhang, J. Huang. Local governance and public goods provision. *Preseted at theannual meetingof the American Agricultural Economics Association*, Chicago. 2001; 1-17.
19. D. Abdullahi, M. S. J. Abdullah. The political will and quality basic education in Nigeria. *Journal of Power, Politicsand Governance*. 2014; 2(2), 75-100.
20. S. O. Oyedele. The Nigerian Public service and service delivery under civil rule. *Journal of Public Administration, Finance and Law*. 2015; 7, 33-43.
21. R. T. Deacon. Dictatorship, democracy, and the provision of public goods. California: University of California. 2003.
22. S. Ramachandram. Democracy and public goods provision: A study of spending patterns in health and ruraldevelopment in selected Indian states. *Development Studies Institute Working Paper Series*. 2013; 1-49.
23. S. Gailmard. Accountability and principal agent models. *Oxford Handbook of Public Accountability*. Oxford:Oxford University Press. 2012; 1-27.
24. Kayode, S. O. Adagba, S. F. Anyio. Corruption and service delivery: The case of Nigerian public service. *Wudpecker Journal of Public Administration*. 2013; 1(1), 001-006.
25. J. Fearon. Electoral accountability and the control of politicians. In S. Gailmard, In *Oxford Handbook of Public Accountability*; Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1999; 55-97.

26. G. J. Miller. The political evolution of principal-agent models. *Annual Review of Political Science*. 2005; 8, 203-225.
27. R. Alence. Political institutions and developmental governance in Sub Saharan Africa. *Journal of Modern African Studies*. 2004; 42(2), 163-187.
28. D. Kaufmann, A. Kraay. Governance indicators: Where are we, where should we be going? *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*. 2007; 1-43.
29. J. M. Wooldridge. *Econometric analysis of cross-section and panel data*. Cambridge: The MIT Press. 2002; 1-741.
30. C. F. Baum. An introduction to modern econometrics using Stata. *Business Economics*. Texas: Stata Corp LP. 2006; 1-341.
31. C. Cameron, P. K. Trivedi. *Microeconometrics using Stata*. Texas: Stata Corp LP. 2009.
32. W. H. Greene. *Econometric analysis, 5th Edition*. New York: *Pearson Education*. 2013.
33. Independent National Electoral Commission. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Independent_National_Electoral_Commission. Date 05/01/2018.
34. D. Kaufmann. A. Kraay, M. Mastruzzi. The worldwide governance indicators: methodology and analytical issues. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*. 2010; 1-31.
35. M. A. Thomas. What do worldwide governance indicators measure? *European Journal of Development Research*. 2010; 22 (1),31-54.
36. G. M. Ferreira. Good governance and the failed state. *The Comparative and International Law Journal of Southern Africa*. 2008; 41(3), 428-448.
37. K. R. Hope. Capacity development for good governance in developing societies:Lessons from the field. *Development in Practice*. 2009; 19(1), 79-86.
38. K. Sen. Governance and development outcomes in Asia. *ADB Economics Working Papers Series*. 2014; 1-25.

The Publication fee is defrayed by Indian Society for Education and Environment (www.iseeadyar.org)

Cite this article as:

Abdullahi Buba, Gafar T. Ijaiya, Farida Bello. Governance and provision of public goods in Gombe state: evidence from citizens' perceptions. *Indian Journal of Economics and Development*. Vol 6 (2), February 2018.