N i g e r i a n   J o u r n a l   o f   S o c i a l   D e v e l o p m e n t

ARABIAN GROUP OF JOURNALS

NGJSD

NIGERIAN POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT: THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL NEXUS

Chibuike E Madubuegwu
Department of Political Science, Nnamdi Azikwe University, Awka Anambra State, Nigeria
Groupson Paul Okechukwu PhD
Department of Political Science, Alex Ekwueme University, Ikwo, Ebonyi State, Nigeria.
Onyejegbu Emeka Dominic
Department of Political Science, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Enugu State, Nigeria.

A B S T R A C T

Political development is a concept that stem from Western scholarship of Modernization theory. This discourse reexamined concept and theory of political development particularly the models advanced by Almond and Powell and Lucian Pye. Beside its critique, this paper argued that the perspectives advanced remain empirically plausible to the crises and prospects of Nigerian political development. In reference to the methodology, the design is qualitative exploring the import of documentary sources of data collection and textual method of analysis. The discourse also advanced perspectives in modern view of political development and concludes by illuminating the limitations of Modernization theory amid the significance of models of political development to intractable challenges of governance and politics.

1. INTRODUCTION

Development in whatever form and context is an expectation of a state and people. This is premised on the fact that it offers opportunities for growth, wellbeing and advancement. This ostensibly underscores the reason why nation-states were in fervent struggle to attain conditions of development. However, these conditions of development over the decades have become polemical issues among scholars and practitioners across nationalities, regions and ideological divide. Most importantly, development as a social reality and process is dimensioned in various strands and significance. Hence, references were often made to economic, political and social development. This indication further entrench complexity and vague in the indicators and variables of measuring and scaling conditions advancing the process of development. Assertively, the criticality of political development embellishes as a viable condition to stimulate and sustain forms of development (economic, social, cultural, environmental). For instance, an assumption may indicate that countries under stable governance and politics may also experience stable growth in the economy and reasonable extent of social integration and harmony etc.

Arguably, political development is a western-centric concept replete with diverse perspectives and interpretations. Thus, myriad indicators and variables have been advanced by Western scholars to underline what constitute political development? A lot of scholarly perspectives have emerged in the 60's and 70's to offer depth analysis on what political development represents particularly in credence to ideological inclinations and peculiarity of environmental context. However, the critique of these models of political development stem from the Marxian scholarship particularly in the treatise of Latin American intellectuals and African scholars. One of the most outstanding was Ake's *Social Science as Imperialism: The Theory of Political Development* which incisively illustrated the methodological and ideological limitations summarized in Eurocentric teleologism, equation of ideal to reality and capitalist bias of western models of political development. Beside this critique, the fundamental question remains, *how does developing economies assess and measure the sequence of political development? And, what are the indicators for these assessment and measurement?*

Nigeria is African largest democracy grappling with numerous challenges of national development. Significantly, the ascendance to current socio-economic recession, security challenges, crisis of national integration and social deprivation in Nigeria emanate from failure of political leadership. Undoubtedly, failures of governance, state institutions and political process have over the decades enormously undermined lofty ideals of national development. Expectedly, social science scholarship has illuminated extensively on crises of Nigerian political development and proffered plausible

measures. However, there are limited scholarly submissions on indicators and measurement of Nigerian political development. This limitation invariably evinced the thrust of this discourse which intends to examine the conceptual/theoretical analysis of models of political development and establish its relevance in response to intractable challenges of Nigerian governance and politics. The discourse is streamlined in three sections: this introduction, conceptual analysis, perspectives of political development and crises of Nigerian governance and politics and conclusion.

2. CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

Basically, the term, "development" is a multi-disciplinary concept replete with diverse perspectives and interpretations that stem from ideological inclinations. This indication underscored ambiguity in definition and interpretation of the concept which crystallized in traditional and modern views of development. In this vein, Gauba,(2003) stressed that the concept of development was evolved in the sphere of social sciences for guidance of new nations who won their independence after the second world war(1939-1945). Indeed, the idea of development itself was not new. Early indications of this idea are found in the social thought of nineteenth century and early twentieth century. It was largely expressed in the theory of social change. The change could be conceived as a transition from simple to complex forms, from less efficient to more efficient forms, or from ordinary to better forms. Succinctly, the polemics of traditional view of development (as earlier noted) has over the five decades thrown up ideological perspectives as embellished in Liberal and Marxian views of development. Accordingly, the liberal perspective conceived development as process of growth facilitated by foreign capital investment and industrialization. And, national per capita income represents a viable indicator of assessment and measurement of the growth trends. On other hand, the Marxian view conceptualized development as process observed in social well being of nationals facilitated through agricultural productivity, industrialization, import-substitution strategy etc. Thus, human development index represents a viable indicator of assessment of Marxian development trends.

Beyond the divergences on what development represents, it may be identified as a process in which a system or institution is transformed into stronger, more organized, more efficient and more effective form and prove to be more satisfying in terms of human wants and aspirations. It may be distinguished from progress as development subject to measurement on empirical scale whereas progress is concerned with moral judgment for which it applies normative criterion (Gauba, 2003:476). This conception obviously underlines the essentials of modern view of development. In this regard, Todaro and Smith (2011) documents that there are three basic components or core values which serve as a conceptual basis and practical guideline for understanding the inner meaning of development. These core values represent common goals sought by all individuals and societies because they relate to fundamental human needs that found expression in almost all societies and cultures at all time. These core values are;

i. *Sustenance*: The ability to meet basic needs. All people have certain basic needs including food, shelter, health and protection. When any of these is absent or in critically short supply, a condition of ''absolute underdevelopment'' exist.

ii *Self-Esteem*: To be a person. A second universal component of the good life is self-esteem. A sense of worth-and self-respect, of not being used as a tool by others for their own ends. All peoples and societies seek some basic form of self-esteem, although they may call it authenticity, identity, dignity, respect, honor, or recognition. The nature and form of this self-esteem may vary from society to society and from culture to culture. However, with the proliferation of the ''modernizing values'' of developed nations, many societies in developing countries that have had a profound sense of their own worth suffer from serious cultural confusion when they come in contact with economically and technologically advanced societies.

iii. *Freedom from Servitude*: To be able to choose. The third and final universal value of development is the concept of human freedom. Freedom as a core value of development entails sense of emancipation from alienating material conditions of life, and from servitude to nature, other people, misery, oppressive institutions, and dogmatic beliefs, especially that poverty is predestination.

It is therefore concluded that development is both physical reality and state of mind in which society has, through some combination of social, economic, and institutional processes, secured the means of life. Whatever the specific components of this better life, development in all societies must have at least the following objectives:

1. To increase the availability and widen the distribution of basic life-sustaining goods such as food, shelter, health and protection.

2. To raise levels of living, including in addition to higher incomes, the provision of more jobs, better education, and greater attention to cultural and human values, all of which will serve not only to enhance materials well-being but also to generate greater individual and national self-esteem.

3. To expand the range of economic and social choices available to individuals and nations by freeing them from servitude and dependence not only in relation to other people and nation-states but also to the forces of ignorance and human misery (Todaro and Smith, 2011: 22).

Perhaps, it was in cognizance of this modern view of development beyond the symbolism of ideologies or ideological perspectives that United Nations popularized a global targets of development as embellished in Millennium Development Goals and Targets.

Table 1.

Millennium Development Goals and Targets for 2015

S/N	Goals	Targets
1.	Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger.	i. Reduce by half the proportion of people living on less than $ 1 a day. ii. Reduce by half the proportion of people who suffers from hunger.
2.	Achieve universal primary education.	Ensure that all boys and girls complete a full course of primary schooling.
3.	Promote gender equality and empower women.	Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably 2005 and at all levels by 2015.
4.	Reduce child mortality.	Reduce by two-thirds the mortality rate among children under 5.
5.	Improve maternal health.	Reduce by three-quarter the maternal mortality ratio. i. Halt and begin to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS.
6.	Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other disease	ii. Halt and begin to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases.
7	Ensure environmental sustainability	i. Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programs; reverse loss of environmental resources. ii. Reduce by half the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water. iii. Achieve significant improvement in lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers by 2020.
8.	Develop a global partnership for development.	i. Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, nondiscriminatory trading and financial system; includes a commitment to good governance, development, and poverty reduction-both nationally and internationally. ii. Address the special needs of the least developed countries, includes tariff and quota free access for least developed countries' exports; enhanced program of debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries (HIPCs) and cancellation of official bilateral debt; and more generous official development assistance, (ODA) for countries committed to poverty reduction. iii. Address the special needs of landlocked countries and small island developing states. iv. Deal comprehensively with debt problems of developing countries through national and international measures in order to make debt sustainable in the long term. v. In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries. vi. In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communication.

Source: United Nations (2015), Millennium Development Goals.

In retrospect, Gauba's assertion that notion of *development* was conceptualized as a new concept-guidelines for new nation-states that emerged from Euro-colonialism is further dissected in Okoli's observation. Accordingly, Okoli (2003), stressed that western scholars argued that in order for third world countries to develop, they must ''modernize ''. That is these countries must abandon their traditionalism and embrace ''modernity''. In practical terms, this means they must become westernized in political, economic, social, organizational and cultural domains. Measurement of the degree of development of the third world turns out to be the extent to which they have metamorphosed from tradition to modernity. The process of development, thus takes form of an evolutionary, liner progression from tradition to modernity for the society and the degree of cultural apostasy'' for the individual. Indeed, Okoli's remarks accentuate the need to examine what Modernization represents?

In a historic perspective to modernization, it is stressed that decades after World War II, as the demise of European colonialism produced a host of newly independent nations in Africa and Asia, Western social scientists formulated an understanding of underdevelopment known as Modernization theory. Modernization theorists were optimistic about their prospects for development. They expected that most developing nations could follow a path of economic and political modernization roughly parallel to that which had earlier traveled by Western industrial democracies. The LDCs merely needed to promote modern cultural values and to create appropriate economic and political institutions. Transforming the culture of developing nations was considered the key to modernization. Thus, modernization theory focused on the diffusion of modern ideas from the developed world to the developing world and, within the Third World, from city to countryside. Western foreign aid, trade, and institutions such as the Peace Corps may help speed the process since modern

values are generally associated with the West. Along with modern values, modernizationists argue that LDCs need to develop more specialized and complex political and economic institutions. This includes creating more skilled, professionally trained, and honest bureaucracies, developing a modern legal system that operates fairly and honestly; and establishing political parties that effectively channel citizens' demands and aspirations to the government (Ethridge, and Handleman, 2013:407).

Subsequently, Audu (2013) noted that Modernization generally implies a process of change towards those types of social, economic and political system which had developed in Western Europe and North America from the 17th Century and had then spread to other European countries in the 19th and 20th centuries in South America, Asia and African Continents. Modernization represents a change in values, behaviour or attitude of a society towards the direction of developed societies. Modernization is multidisciplinary in structure and content. At the level of sociology, it maintains that change and transition from traditionalism to modernity is gradual and achieved through structural differentiation as seen in the works of Talcott Parsons, Neil Smelser, etc. At the level of economics, its emphasis is on the increase in production and capital investments. This is indicated in the works of W.W. Rostow's Stages of Economic Growths: A Non Communist Manifesto published in 1960. At the level of Political Science, it emphasizes, the need to enhance the capacity of the political system as is reflected in the works of Gabriel Almond, James Coleman, Samuel, Huntington. This is indicated in the theory of political development where some of the scholars are primarily concerned with the absence or weakness of political culture and institutions as reasons for Third World backwardness.

Succinctly, the concept of political development logically evolved from the Modernization theory. Hence, Almond and Powell's work, *Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach,* 1966 and Almond and Coleman's work, *The Politics of Developing Area,* watershed the modern literature of political development. Similarly, Johari (1982) noted that the leading scholars in the literature of political development are Almond Gabriel, James Coleman, David Apter, Karl Deutsch, Talcott Parsons. Lucian Pye should be regarded as the leading light of the earlier batch of writers to analyze the concept of development in depth and has kept on evolving his idea on the subject and has left abiding impression on the entire literature of political development.

Emphatically, the concept and theory of political development evolved from historical phases, Verma (1975), documents that the rise of a large number of new states in Asia, Africa and Latin America in the wake of the Second World War opened new dimension in the discipline of political science. Anthropologists, ethnographers, historians and orientalists had already been carrying on some studies on these countries, but they were studies of societies rather than states. When several of these old societies began to take shape of new states, the attention of political scientists was inevitably drawn towards them. Western political science was at that time deeply under the influence of the system theorists who had tried to point out that the political system was by, and large, a subsystem of the social system. It was also admitted that non-western political processes were different from the Western political processes, the general model of the systems approach was adopted. It was also generally assumed by writers who developed this particular field of knowledge in the late fifties and early sixties that non-western political processes even though they were different from Western political processes could be successfully studied by them against the socio-economic, cultural background these countries had inherited through centuries from the West and under the influence of which they had been operating. In reference to the phases or stages in the development of theories of political development, Lucian Pye was among the earliest batch of writers to analyze the concept of political development in depth, and keep on evolving his ideas on the subject. He has left a biding impression on the entire literature of political development. In his earlier writings, Pye thought of political development in terms of cultural diffusion, and adapting, fusing, and adjusting old patterns of life to new demands. The first step towards political development was evolution of the nation-state system, which he treated as basic concept. Basically, the first phase which began in 1965 was referenced in his volume on *Political Culture and Development*, Pye was able to evolve what he regarded as ''the key elements of political development'' The signs of political development could be traced according to Pye, are at three different levels-

i. With respect to the population as a whole. The basic change in the character of the population was that citizen behaved, no longer like subjects passively receiving orders from higher authorities but as one carrying them out as an active participant who contributed to the shaping of political decisions.

ii. With respect to the level of the governmental and general systemic performance. Political development indicates a greater capacity in the political system to manage public affairs, control controversy or cope with popular demands.

iii. With respect to the organization of the polity or political system. A developing political system implied greater structural differentiation, functional specificity and integration of the participating institutions. Lucian Pye's advice was to search for the characteristics of equality, capacity and differentiation in a developing system and determine the degree of their advancement-characteristics which were subsequently described by Coleman as a ''developmental syndrome'' The early writers on political development were mere concerned with identifying the characteristics which distinguished the developing societies of the Third World from developed societies of the West than with a study of the stages through which societies moved towards development, or of focuses which induced and accelerated the process of development.

The second phase began in the late sixties, however, the focus in political development studies was clearly shifting from the infrastructure studies to an analysis of the will and capacity of the political actors and institutions. It was being realized that while massive socio-economic and psychological forces did play a role, and could not be left out of political analysis, it was ultimately the will and capacity of the political leaders which determine how issues, demands and needs of the society thrown up by force of modernization which perhaps could be treated as part of history were to shape the character and direction of political development. Political development in other words, was not an end-product but a continuing process. The Search for a theory marked the third phase in the development of political development. A number of other social scientists, starting with Daniel Lerner and Karl Deutsch, developed what is known as theory of social process. They tried to understand political development from the point of view of the study of social processes (like industrialization, urbanization, commercialization, literacy expansion, etc). The group includes Raymond Tanter, Martin Needler, Philips Cutright, Hayward Alker etc. The emphasis of this group of writers being more on relating political behaviour and processes to social processes than on the system, they have been able to adopt methodologically a more behaviourally and empirically-oriented approach than the systems approach, with the result that they have sucessed in the accumulation, through surveys etc of substantial amounts of data, quantitative in nature, about the social processes.

Basically, the trajectory of concept and theory of political development was indeed a reflection of paradigm shifts in conceptualization, perspectives and interpretation to dissect peculiarities and viability of structures and processes of the political system across industrialized democracies and democratizing states. This indication inextricably stimulated polemics and divergences in the definitions, perspectives and assess indicators of political development. Acknowledging this factuality, Johari (2005), indicated that political development lacks a precise and standard definition. The reason of which should be traced in abundant studies made from inter-disciplinary point of view of all impinging on the subject of growth, modernization and development of new states of the third world. A new generation of political scientists came to realize that non-western political process even though they were different from the western political processes could be successfully studied by them inspite of the difference in socio-economic and cultural background.

As related to the concept of political development, some definitions from leading proponents are useful. Almond and Powell (1966) defined political development from the perspective of political culture and political structure. Hence, political development is referenced to two related changes in political culture and political structure. The developmental aspect of political culture is cultural secularization. ''Secularization'' is the process whereby men become increasingly rational, analytical and empirical in their political action. A secularized political culture is characterized by the 'emergence of pragmatic, empirical orientation''. Political development also entails structural differentiation or role differentiation. Thus, 'differentiation' refers to the processes whereby roles change and become more specialized or more autonomous, or whereby new types of roles are established or new structures and subsystems emerge or created. It is however important to note that structural differentiation does not only refer to the development of new types of roles and transformation of older ones but also refer to changes which may take place in the relationship between roles, between structures, or between subsystems. The extent to which a political system is structurally differentiated and relative autonomy of its roles and subsystems will affect the performance, or capability patterns, of the political system. Thus, a political system which has specialized roles for the extraction of the resources will be able to extract resources more efficiently than one which lacks these specialized roles.

Almond and Powell's political culture and political structure centric-view is narrow as related to political process and enabling fundamentals to rational, analytical and empirical political culture (secularization) and differentiation of political structures. Although, it may be argued that the nature of the political process is a reflection of attitudinal orientation and values (political culture). However, it is pertinent to establish the disparity between the precedents of the political process and attitudinal disposition as observed in events of election, party politics whose tendencies may be significant or insignificant to political development. For instance, realities in developing democracies have shown the precedents of crucial events of the political process such as election do not reflect in the attitudinal orientation and values of politicians. Thus, critical examination of the political process could have offered useful plausibility for more civic attitudinal orientation of national culture. In the same vein, structural differentiation which is preceded by specialization and autonomy, there is gap as regards the expedient process for its viability and functionality. Subsequently, Ake (1982) remarked that Almond and Powell classified the challenges which the political system has to cope with perhaps what is referred as crisis of political development. These crises include:

i. State Building: This is the problem of establishing or maintaining authority of participation and control. The problem of state building may be externally generated, or it might arise internally as determined demands for radical change which might endanger the survival of the status quo. More specifically, the state building problem ''occurs when the political elite creates new structures and organizations designed to penetrate the society in order to regulate behaviour in it and draw a large volume of resources from it''.

ii. Participation: The problem of coping with ''the pressure from groups in the society for having a part in decision-making of the system''.

iii. Distribution and Welfare: The pressure from the domestic society to employ the coercive power of the political system to redistribute income, wealth, opportunity and honor.

iv. Nation Building: This is the problem of winning for the political system, the loyalty and commitment of its subjects.

The relevance of Almond and Powell's definitional perspective on challenges of political development illuminate in the crises of governance and politics bedeviling developing nation-states in Africa.

Furthermore, Pye (1966), in defining political development stressed that the development of the political system is the extent to which it has three characteristics –equality, capacity and differentiation. These three elements constitute what Pye refers to as the development syndrome. The first element is *equality* which implied mass participation and popular involvement in political activities, universalistic and impersonal (impartial) laws and recruitment by achievement rather than by ascription. The second element is *capacity* which entailed ''an increase in the magnitude, scope and scale of governmental and political power to influence its subjects, effectiveness and efficiency in the execution of public policy and "a secular orientation towards policy'' that is, ''governmental actions are guided more by deliberations and justifications that seek to relate ends and means in a systematic manner. And, the third element is *differentiation and specialization* implied functional specificity and subsystem autonomy. More explicitly on Pye's three elements of political development:

i**.** Equality. The subject of political development does suggest mass participation and popular involvement in political activities. Participation may be either democratic or in a form of totalitarian mobilization but key consideration is that subjects should become active citizens.

ii. Capacity. It refers to a political system by which it can give outputs and extent to which it can affect the rest of the society and economy. It is also associated with government performance and conditions that affect such performance.

iii. Differentiation. It implies diffusion and specialization of structures. The office and agencies tends to have their distinct and limited functions and there is an equivalent of divisions of labour within the realm of government. It also involves the integration of complex structures and process (Johari, 1982:173). Pye's equality as one of the key element of political development is elusive in advanced and democratizing states. Rather, emphasis should have been placed on the content and value of participation or involvement of the masses in the political process.

In his foreword to the Crises and Sequences of Political Development (which is the seventh volume of the Princeton Series), Pye articulated five crises of political development embellished below:

i. Identity Crisis. This is the problem posed by the fact of having ''traditional forms of identity ranging from tribe or caste to ethnic and linguistic groups''. The problem is to shift identity from these levels to ecumenical level of the state.

ii. Legitimacy Crisis. This is the problem of achieving agreement regarding the legitimate nature of authority and proper responsibilities of government.

iii. The Penetration Crisis. Essentially, the problem of government ''in reaching down into the society and affecting basic policies''.

iv. Participation Crisis. The participation crisis occurs when there is uncertainty over the appropriate rate of expansion and when the influx of new participants creates serious strains on the existing institutions. The appearance of a participant crisis does not necessarily signal pressures for democratic processes. The participation crisis can be organized as the totalitarian to provide the basis for manipulated mass organizations and demonstrational politics.

iv. The Integration Crisis. The problem of integration ''deals with the extent to which the entire polity is organized as a system of interacting relationships, first among the offices and agencies of the government and then among the various groups and interests seeking to make demands upon the system, and finally, in the relationship between officials and articulating citizens.

v. Distribution Crisis: This is the problem of how governmental power is to be used to influence the distribution of goods, service and values throughout the society.

Pye's classification of crises of political development is empirically relevant in the context of developing democracy such as Nigeria. Hence, these challenges illuminate the travails constraining efforts towards democratization and democratic consolidation.

Similarly, Choudhury (1997), remarked that the use of the term, "political development'' usually reflect a recognition of a major discontinuity in political structure. It implies systemic change, the alteration of a relatively fundamental nature in functioning of the political system. It is used to refer to a cluster of changes including:

i. the development of differentiated and functionally specific political structures. It implies emergence of differentiated political structures such as political parties, legislatures, associational interest groups, and specialized bureaucratic agencies.

ii. Changes in values and attitudes from the theistic, ascriptive and particularistic toward the scientific and secular, egalitarian and universalistic. It refers to attitudinal shifts such as declining confidence in magic and increasing reliance on rational and scientific techniques.

iii. The penetration of society by governmental agencies and activities. It implies effective extension of governmental authority throughout the territory and covering the entire population of a country.

iv. A broadening of participation in politics. It specifies the mobilization of an increasing number of persons from wider range of social strata and groups to the performance of political acts, from rioting to voting, membership in a trade union or other associational groups and a variety of other forms of behaviour with political consequence. Political development is therefore viewed as the growth of political institutions characterized by adaptability, complexity, autonomy and organizational coherence. Choudhury's idea like the preceding perspectives discusses more on attitudinal, participatory and institutional politics without emphasis on the reality and expedience of political process.

In Samuel Huntington's perspective to political development, Verma (1975) noted that one major concept which Huntington contributed to the literature on political development was that of political decay. Institutions decay and dissolve as well as grow and mature, as his main thesis. Huntington also questioned the linking up of political development with modernity and seriously objected to the prevalent tendency of linking up political development with modernization not only in political field but also in economic, social, and cultural fields. In other words, he did not treat modernization in itself as a criterion for political development but put greater emphasis on the reciprocal interaction between the on-going social process of modernization.

Samuel Huntington in his work, *Political Development and Political Decay*, (1965) identified and explained explicitly the indicators of political development and dysfunctional political development as shown below:

Table 2

Huntington's Classification of Political Development and Political Decay

S/N	Positive Indices (Development)	Negative Indices(Decay)
1	State-building or territorial integration	Electoral rigging and irregularities
2	Nation-building or national integration.	Protest demonstration by the use of violence.
3	Increasing franchise and free and fair elections with larger over turnout	Anomic disturbances underground activities and armed attacks.
4	Politicisation or Participation of more and more people in the political process.	Political defection for selfish gains.
5	Popular participation in decision-making bodies.	Fragmentation of political parties.
6	Growing interest articulation by autonomous groups	Suppression of dissent
7	Growing interest aggregation by stable political parties having democratic character	Idolization of rulers
8	Freedom of the Press and growth of the Mass Media	Glorification of Official Ideology
9	Political and administrative decentralization	Political Assassination
10	Authority of the units of local /local self-government	Politicization of the armed forces
11	Expansion of education facilities	Commitment of public services to the lines of ruling party
12	Effective role of legislative bodies and constituency service by the representative	Wide corruption and Maladministration
13	Effective role of quasi-governmental agencies like public undertaking	Concentration of powers
14	Role of powerful organizations to oversee the working of public servants (like Ombudsman) and redressal of public grievances	Mass arrest
15	Tolerance of dissent and control over anomic movements	Foreign interference in domestic matters
16	Broadening of the social base of political elites	
17	Openness in the workings of government and accountability of the rulers to the ruled	
18	Independence of judiciary and the existence of rule of law	
19	A political character of the armed forces	
20	Consensual politics implying use of constitutional methods	
21	Neutrality and independence of public service	
22	Secularization of political culture	

Source: Huntington, (1965:124).

Huntington's perspective of political development is broad in differentiating between what constitute indicators of political development and political decay. However, the perspective raised questions on methodological limitations as regard depth analysis on illustrative instances of political decay as differentiated from political development and what are expedient processes enabling political development?. Hence, these limitations justify the rationale for the search of modern view of political development.

In this regard, Okeke (2009) argued that most importantly, political development entails strong institutions that have legitimate authority to guarantee equilibrium in the system through proper management of identity crisis, political participation crisis, distribution of resources crisis and national integration. It involves optimum performance of the institutions of state such as the legislature, the executive, the judiciary, the police, the military, etc. In contemporary times, political development is equated with liberal democracy. Thus, countries with matured democratization processes are regarded as having political development. However, experiences have shown that there are countries that do not practice liberal democracy, yet, they have political development. For example, Russia and China have their own peculiar styles of leadership which the West often considers as undemocratic because they are not in consonance with the tenets of liberal democracy. Surprisingly, they have been able to use these leadership styles to achieve good governance which is the hallmark of political development. On the other hand, there are some nations that have been practicing liberal democracy for years, yet they lack political development. A typical example is Nigeria. What this shows is that it is more correct to associate political development with good governance than a particular ideology or form of government. Moreover, it is most unlikely that economic development can take place without political development first. This is because it is the political development that provides the needed leadership that would steer the ship of economic development. Political development is characterized by good leadership and political stability.

2.1   Perspectives of Political Development and Crises of Nigerian Governance and Politics

After extensive analysis of these preceding perspectives on political development, it is instructive to note that political development is contextually relevant in credence to the peculiarities and priorities of political systems across regions. Thus, it may be difficult to universalize the definition of political development. However, political development represents reasonable level of civility and state consciousness among the civilian populace and responsiveness of the government to the expectations of the state. Again, the significance of political development also embellishes in policy responses to stimulate growth in the economy, improve social welfare of the citizens through availability and affordability of essential services and mitigate conditions that advances social unrest and centrifugal tendencies. In other words, political development is not an isolated phenomenon from social and economic realities. Pertinently, political development thrives in the prevailing situation of the following fundamentals:

i. Industrialized economy with exponential growth and improved human development index.
ii. Effective or uncompromised social justice system, high reverence to national ethics and efficient reward system for diligence and patriotism.
iii. Culture of compliance to rule of law and high premium on the effectiveness of state institutions.
iv. Reasonable scale of harmonious social relation and interaction among people inspite of cleavage identity.
vii. Passionate reverence to nationalism, merit and competence against nepotism, favourtism and sectionalism.

As earlier indicated, Nigeria polity is grappling with enormous challenges of governance and politics which has over the decades constrained genuine efforts towards democratic consolidation and national development. To reexamine the daunting challenges of Nigeria political development, the following becomes imperative:
a. Governance dividends do not reflect the plights and expectations of the masses. It implied widen gap between what government does and public anxiety which pervade every strata of governance from federal to municipal authorities. To this extent, "participation and inclusiveness'' becomes expedient value of political development. Hence, Nigerian government at every level of social engagement should prioritize in public plight and expectation through enhanced avenues of mass participation and inclusion in public policies and legislations.

b. Abysmal failure of accountability and transparency in state administration. This is has been perennial challenge of Nigeria governance which can be effectively mitigated through secularization of political culture and differentiation of political structures as advocated by Almond and Powell occasioned by capacity as related to system performance as advanced by Lucian Pye. Again, significance to national ethics becomes strategically relevant in this vein.
c. State institutions are weak and deficient. Almond and Powell's and Pye's structural or institutional differentiation becomes instructive to advance efficiency and responsiveness in Nigerian political system.
d. Election and Legitimacy crises. This is a perennial problem in Nigerian political development. And, the process of election can be strengthen through differentiation of political structures, secularization of political culture, effective judicial system, reverence to rule of law and compliance to precedents of the political development.
e. Absence of ideological inclination and precedents in party politics. Advocacy for ideological politics, differentiation of political structure and secularization of political culture becomes instructive for stable party politics.

f. National integration crisis and security challenge. Almond and Powell's system performance on distribution of social welfare and nation-building measures occasioned identity and integration prospects advocated by Lucian Pye is fundamental for social cohesion and security against secessions.

The process and substance of political development begins with visionary political leadership. This is because, political governance is pivotal for differentiated structures, secularized political culture and civilized political process. For the indicators of political development, the following are instructive:

a. Accountability and openness of governance.

b. Rule of Law.

c. Participation and inclusiveness.

d. Equity and social justice.

e. Credibility of election.

f. Civilized attitude and citizen's enthusiasm in state affairs.

g. Effectiveness of state institutions in deference to precedents and responsibility.

h. Stability of the political process.

3.   CONCLUSION

The discourse extensively dissects the models of political development in credence to methodological bend of modernization amid limitations. In this sense, Okeke (2009), argued that critical examination of Modernization theory will reveal that it is not only deficient and conjectural, but also myopic and misleading. Modernization theory is ethnocentric, euro-centric and teleological. It regards western culture and institutions as the best and superior to other nations' cultures. It presents western values as progressive and amenable to development, while others are not. In essence, it regards development as a unilinear process which can only be achieved by imbibing western culture and adopting its institutions. In this way, development becomes synonymous with "trying to be like the West" or Westernization. Therefore, it has an end in view. But history has shown that other societies without Western culture and institutions can develop. A typical example is China. In fact, every society (both western and non-western) has a capacity to develop, and all societies had developed in one way or another, though some have developed more than others, like Ancient Egypt was once leading in Africa and was known to be the cradle of civilization. Britain once led in Europe. China once led in Asia. Therefore, no culture is superior to another culture development wise. What matters most is the ability of the people of any nation to transform their culture to trigger off development in order to meet their immediate and future needs. That is to say that development cannot be "Westernization". Even the West is a new comer when it comes to the origin of development. It has been anthropologically proven that Africa is the cradle of human civilization. Another misleading argument of Modernization School of Thought is that the Third World can develop by acquiring the artifacts of Western civilization, or better put, western technology.

For years now, underdeveloped states have been importing Western-made cars, electronics, textiles (suites, shoes etc), and even western type of buildings, yet the Third world is still not developed. Although few elites in the Third world drive the best of Western-made cars and build mansions as their houses, in most cases there are no good roads to drive those cars, and their mansions exist side-by side with slums. The Third world in some instances lack the technical-knowhow to operate and maintain these technologies, and thus depend on the West. Subsequently, Modernization theory is unscientific and imperialistic because it is both value-laden and ideology-bound. It tries to foist on the Third world countries western ideology of capitalism as the answer to their underdevelopment. In this regard, Claude Ake in his master piece titled "Social Science as Imperialism: the Theory of Political Development" argued that Western scholarship on development amounts to imperialism because it tries to impose capitalist values on the Third world. He further asserted that the two Western criteria for development–structural differentiation and cultural secularization are abstracted from familiar Political Science characterization of the distinctive features of the Western political systems. Based on this fact, development becomes synonymous with Westernization and the quest for development becomes a matter of making developing countries more like the West. That is to say the study of the Third world in the context of this theory of political development is to explore how it can be like the West.

Also, The exponents of Modernization theory have always argued that no other ideology apart from capitalism and its institutions can bring about development. But we have seen the communist Russia and China achieve development under socialism. Again, the Modernization School recommended capitalism (which is now in the guise of market economy or globalization) as the only therapy for development crisis in the Third World. Under globalization, the Third world countries are made to believe that they could achieve economic growth and development if they open up their economies and embrace liberalization, and allow the invisible hands of market forces to regulate their economies. Again, Modernization School of Thought has also been criticized for being ahistorical. In other words, the theory fails to take into cognizance the historical events that shaped and reshaped the cause of development around the world. It underplays the impact of slave trade on Africa's development. But it is a known fact that during slavery millions of able-bodied Africans were forcefully taken to Europe and America thereby denying Africa the needed man-power for development.

Also, Modernization theory de-emphasizes the impact of colonialism on development and how different types of colonialism affected different countries of the world differently. It is on record that Africa where Extractive Colonialism took place witnessed more exploitation than colonies in South America and Asia. In fact, from all indications, colonialism and neo-colonialism penetrated and disarticulated African economies and structured them in such a way that they would perpetually remain dependent and underdeveloped. This is partly the reason why Africa seems not to be succeeding where other colonized continents such as Asia, have succeeded. Finally, Modernization theory is riddled with fallacy of taxonomic dualism. Thus, it divided the entire world into two opposite societies – the rich nations in one side and the poor nations on the other side. The theory assigns development and everything good to the advanced nations, while it assigns backwardness and everything that is bad to the poor nations. Thus, the advanced capitalist Western nations are democratic, accountable and responsive to the needs of the people, stable, command loyalty from the citizens, progressive, creative, innovative and inventive. On the other hand, the poor nations are undemocratic, unaccountable, unstable, non-progressive, lack legitimacy, creativity, innovation and invention. However, the plausibility of models of political development as advanced by Almond and Powell and Lucian Pye remain significant and instructive to crises and expectations of Nigerian political development. This is because, its themes reflect the current realities of Africa most populous country in fervent search for national identity and genuine efforts towards democratic consolidation.

4. REFERENCES

Ake, C (1982), *Social Science as Imperialism: The Theory of Political Development*. Ibadan: University of Ibadan Press.

Almond, G and Powell, B (1966), *Comparative Politics: A Development Approach.* Boston: Little Brown and Co.

Audu, J (2013), *Third World and Dependency*. Abuja: National Open University.

Choudhury, B (1997), *Introduction to Political Sociology*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House PVT Ltd.

Ethridge, M and Handleman, H (2013), *Politics in Changing World: A Comparative Introduction to Political Science.* New York: WADSWORTH

Gauba, O (2003), *An Introduction to Political Theory*. Macmillan: New Delhi.

Johari, C (1982), *Comparative Politics*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishing Private Limited.

Lucian, Pye (1966), *Aspects of Political Development*. Boston: Little Brown and Co.

Okeke, M (2009), *Politics of Development and Underdevelopment*. Abuja: National Open University.

Okoli, F (2003), *Politics of Development and Underdevelopment: Theories of Development.* Nsukka: University of Nigeria Press.

Todaro, M and Smith, S (2011), *Economic Development*. London: Pearson Inc.

United Nations (2015), *Millennium Development Goals, MDGs*. Washington DC.

Verma, S (1975), *Modern Political Theory*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House PVT Limited.