JOURNAL OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE
ISSN Print: 2992-2763 – ISSN Online: 2992-4618 | Vol. 3, Issue 1, No. 1 / March 2025
https://www.jopd.com.ng

THE ROLE OF LEGISLATIVE CONSTITUENCY OFFICES AND PROJECTS IN THE CONSOLIDATION OF DEMOCRACY IN JIGAWA STATE, NIGERIA

Yusuf Abdullahi Manu
Department of Political Science, Federal University Dutse, Jigawa State-Nigeria.
ymanugella@gmail.com

Abstract
The role of constituency offices and projects in any liberal democracy globally cannot be overemphasized. It is against this backdrop that the paper examined the role of the legislature in the consolidation of democracy in Jigawa State. Data for the survey were collected through Mixed method of data collection. The primary data were generated using three different instruments namely; questionnaire, structured interview and Focus Group Discussion. Whereas, secondary data were generated through textbooks, journals, conference papers etc. The findings of the study reveal that the Senator, Members of the House of Representative as well as the Member House of Assembly Dutse constituency in the Jigawa State House of Assembly have no officially designated constituency offices in their respective constituencies and that to a large extent affected effective communication and good representation of the constituents thereby denying them genuine channels of contacting their representatives. Furthermore, the finding reveals that the Senator, Member House of Representative and the Member State House of Assembly provided some of the constituents with constituency projects like boreholes, drainages, school buildings and albeit insufficient and that most of the allocated projects are dilapidated and not sustainable and largely in the form of gifts or donations. The study recommends that the community/constituents must take ownership of the allocated constituency projects in their respective constituencies by ensuring that they are deeply involved in the continuous maintenance of projects such as boreholes and desilting of the drainages to ensure long term sustainability of the projects for the overall benefit of the constituent.
Keywords: Constituents,Constituency Projects, Constituency Office, Democracy, Good Governance

Introduction

Authoritarian regimes have been on the retreat on the African continent since the end of the Cold War era in the late 1980's. The transition to democracy and democratic consolidation has undeniably not been easy. Indeed, civilian regimes, which replaced authoritarian ones, are faced with the challenges of imbibing the ideals of liberal democracy that fosters sustainable development and security. This is essentially so because of the role of authoritarian regimes, especially the role the military played in governance since the 1960's which gave rise to so many complex and interrelated processes, most of which have significant negative consequences on national development. The impact of authoritarian rule on transition to democracy and the quest for good governance in the current trend of democratization in the African continent are profound for all countries.

The process of change from military to civilian government has received popular endorsement. People are no longer interested in military regimes, because of the limited freedom of expression and the right to participate actively in governance. General Abdul-Salami Abubakar spearheaded a transition between 1998-1999 that ended military rule and ushered in a new civilian administration on May 29th 1999. The swearing in of Chief Olusegun Obasanjo as the

President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria and the swearing in of Governors and Chairpersons of both state and local government councils, and the subsequent inauguration of the Members of the legislature at both federal, state and local government levels signaled the commencement of the democratic journey into the Fourth Republic.

The role of the legislature in any political dispensation especially in a democracy cannot be over-emphasized. The legislature as an arm of government has major role to play in the consolidation of democracy through the entrenchment of good governance, probity and accountability toward the provision of democratic dividends to the general populace. The major responsibilities of the legislature include law-making, endorsement of public officials, approval of the budget, impeachment of the members of the executive if they err, oversight into the activities of public agencies, representation as well as checks and balances makes it the repository of the socio-economic and political stability of the society which are vital in bringing positive changes to the nation. Consequently, Members at the State Assembly and Members of the National Assembly have enormous role to play in engendering positive change in the lives of the people they represent in their various constituencies.

The function of the Jigawa State legislators at the State and Federal levels can be better appreciated by the electorate if they engage in constructive interactions periodically with their electorates in their respective constituencies. This interaction will give the Honorable Members the opportunity to fully grasp the developmental needs of their people. The major forum that provides an opportunity for such an interaction is the constituency offices put in place by the legislators through which the yearnings and aspiration of their constituencies are communicated to them for further action. More so, the members can also utilize their powers to influence developmental projects to their respective constituencies through lobbying the executive arm of government.

This research therefore explores the usefulness and utility of the legislators in Jigawa State in transforming the lives of their constituents through the provision of constituency projects and constructive engagement with them. The thrust of this research is to unveil the potentiality of the legislators and the legislative arm of government in the consolidation of democracy and good governance in Jigawa State with particular reference to the National Assembly representative only. This research is a survey to ascertain the contributions of Jigawa State legislators at state levels through the provision of dividends of democracy in the form of portable water, access roads, medical care and so on. The study is also aimed at examining the constituency projects undertaken by the legislators in Jigawa State within the period 2015-2023, so as to ascertain whether such projects are executed and sustained toward serving the needs of the electorates.

The general objective of this study is to identify the contributions of the Jigawa State legislators towards the transformation of the life and livelihood condition of the people through the provision of constituency projects and the utilization of their constituency offices toward democratic consolidation. The specific objective also includes;

i. To assess whether the legislators utilize constituency projects and offices as a means of providing democratic dividends to the electorates in Jigawa State.
ii. To examine the impact of constituency projects in improving the livelihood condition of the people of Jigawa State.
iii. To identify the constituency projects executed by the legislators in Jigawa State within the period 2015 – 2023.

iv. To ascertain if the constituency projects are sustained overtime for the overall benefit of the constituents in Jigawa State.

Conceptual Clarification

According to Barkan (2009) the concept of the "legislature" is utilized inversely in numerous nation-states. In the United Kingdom (UK) the legislature is called the "Parliament", in Nigeria, is regarded as the "National Assembly" whereas in the United States of America (USA) it is regarded as the "Congress". This differences in terminology, nonetheless, it is regarded as the collection of the voted people saddled with the primary mandate of law making, representation and oversighting the executive (Abegunde, 2016). Stapenhurst&Pelizzo (2004), considered the legislature as a symbol of authority and legality since it is comprising chosen representatives from a demarcated constituency. These definitions above suggest that for one to be a legislator he has to secure the mandate from his constituents through legal highest votes. In this regard, the legislature is a legal body recognized by law comprising of men and women that are empowered with the task of making laws and oversighting the executive in order to ensure good governance and the provisioning of the dividends of democracy to the teeming electorates that voted for them into the assembly. The legislature in a liberal democracy is sine qua non as it serves as the fulcrum of democracy and representation which are major distinction with military regimes.

On the other hand, constituency according to Federico (2011) is a geographical part where a representative is elected into the legislature. Constituency servants are indeed elected officials that dedicate themselves and are dedicated to their voters through noticeable performances (Federico, 2011). That means that a constituency is a mapped setting that produces a representative duly elected by the electorates to represent them in the parliament. Therefore, a constituency office is regarded as a building/structure where the legislators interact with their respective citizens toward facilitating the delivery of their wants during legislative business.

Gatherings may find it advantageous to suggest encouragements and recompences for electorates service if they have the conviction that that will assist him/her success during elections; put differently, parties may act as intermediaries between the electorates and activists' favorites and the performance of lawmakers (Marangoni &Tronconi, 2011). To Udefuna, Jumare, & Adebayo (2013) constituency offices serve as a channel between the congresspersons and citizens, hence, guaranteeing the unbiassed and equitable allocation of infrastructure and other developmental activities. Constituency office(s) can be regarded as built structures or hired buildings by a parliamentarian in a constituency that serve as a medium for interfacing directly or indirectly through a legislative aid with his constituents for further necessary action at the parliament or by the executive. It serves as a platform or a liaison office between the electorates and their elected representatives.

According to Udefuna, Jamare & Adebayo (2013) constituency projects are fashioned toward ensuring the existence of government presence in each constituency by having some grassroots projects situated in each constituency, during the budgeting procedure. Legislators were simply required to earmark projects to be inserted in their respective constituencies in the budget, which has a budget cap provision for such projects identified by the legislator. A legislative constituency project is a project that is initiated, premeditated or implemented within a constituency with the partnership, input or influence of the legislator(s) representing a specific constituency in the parliament (Micah, 2015). In the words of Yusuf, Yusof &TapiwaZengeni, (2018) constituency projects are those works, or projects provided by either the federal government or state in exchange for the legislative member for house support on issues that are imperative. In this regard, it can be referred to as projects that are aimed toward addressing the

ISSN Print: 2992-2763 – ISSN Online: 2992-4618 | Vol. 3, Issue 1, No. 1 / March 2025
https://www.jopd.com.ng

most pressing needs of the constituents that are largely determined by the legislator(s) or in consultation with his/her constituents so as to provide them good life. This implies that constituency projects are targeted toward improving the livelihood condition of the constituents that are being represented by an elected representative that is a legislator.

Democracy on the other hand, is derived from the Greek words Demos and Kratos. With Demos simply meaning the people while Kratos (rule) simply denoting people's rule. In this regards, Adeyemo (2009) defined democracy as the means of authority toward meeting the yearnings and desires of the voting public and their involvement in policy and decision-making affairs of their country. In his own submission Oche (2004:10), highlighted basically three present-day usage of the term: as a form of governance whereby the right to undertake political decisions are utilized directly by the entire populace, acting under mandate of majority rule, generally referred to as direct democracy; a form of governance whereby the electorates utilize the same right not personally but indirectly through their representatives; and a form of government, generally a representative democracy, whereby the powers of the majority are exercised within a constitutional framework that limits power and guarantees the entire citizens satisfaction and their collective rights like freedom of speech and religion, recognized as liberal or constitutional democracy.

Methodology

Data for this study were collected through both primary and secondary sources. The primary data generation were generated using three different instruments namely; questionnaire, structured interview and Focus Group Discussion. While secondary data were generated through textbooks, journals, conference papers etc. Jigawa State has three Senatorial District comprising Twenty-Seven (27) local government areas. The study therefore covers only Southern Senatorial District with Dutse as sample. The sampled local government area is selected purposively. The selected councils are Dutse Local Government Area (South-West Senatorial District) with a population of 431,800. Consequently, the sample size is 400 and it shall be administered based on proportionate representation. However, relevant secondary data were sourced from Center for Legislative Studies and Institute of Legislative Studies Abuja, Nigeria.

In undertaking this research, simple random sampling was utilized in selecting the respondents, both questionnaire and the interview questions were designed in such a way that an uneducated person can conveniently respond through an interpreter. The assistance of a local guide was utilized in order to have easy access to the study sites to observe certain projects that are central to the research. The data gathered were limited to the electorates and party officials in the South West Senatorial Districts and limited to only the Senate and House of Representative. In the final analysis, the data obtained were analysed through the use of statistical tables of analysis involving and descriptive explanation of the data obtained.

Data Presentation and Analysis

In the Southern Senatorial District (Dutse Local Government Area in Jigawa State) a total of 400 questionnaires were administered, 140 questionnaires were administered for the Senator, 130 for Member House of Representative, 130 for Member State House of Assembly. However, questionnaires were retrieved out of 140 for the Senators, 133 were retrieved out of 130 administered for the Member House of Representatives, 115 were also retrieved. Also, 93 for Member State House of Assembly were retrieved out of 130 administered.

SENATOR
Constituents Responses on Constituency Offices

Table 1.1 Gender distribution of the Respondents in Dutse

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	113	84.96
Female	20	15.04
Total	**133**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey 2025

Table 1.1 above shows the distribution of the gender of the respondents in the focal area. It depicts that 84.96% of them are male, even though the females that participated in the survey are 15.04%. This wide gap implies that the females are less in comparison to the males that are dominant in the surveyed area. The high number of male respondents as against female ones may not be unconnected with the easily reach of men in the focal area and this can largely be attributable to sociocultural and socioreligious factors and belief system inherent in the area.

Table 1.2 Respondents Age Distribution

Respondents	Frequency	Percentages (%)
18-25	40	30.08
26-35	35	26.31
36-55	40	30.08
56-70	18	13.53
Total	**133**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey 2025

Table 1.2 demonstrates the respondents age distribution showing that 30.08% of them are between the age of 18–25 years. While 26.31% of them are between the ages of 26–35. Moreso, 30.08% of the respondents are between the ages of 36–55. Meanwhile, 13.53% of them are within the ages of 56–70 years.

The above data depicts that most of the respondents 87.9% collectively merged together are between the ages of 26 and 55 years. This population is very important because they constitute the most active population. This category of population represents their ability to give positive conclusion toward the realization of the goals of the study.

Table 1.3 Respondents Ward/Constituencies

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Abaya	17	12.78
Chamo	17	12.78
Dundubus	17	12.78
Karnaya	15	11.29
Kudai	17	12.78
Limawa	16	12.03
Madobi	17	12.78
Sakwaya	17	12.78
Total	**133**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey 2025

Table 1.3 shows the respondents ward/constituencies based on their political wards of affiliation. The respondents were selected purposefully and targeted toward ensuring equal representation among the wards. The respondents were driven from eight distinct political wards: Abaya, Chamo, Dundubus, Karnaya, Kudai, Limawa, Madobi, and Sakwaya.

Table 1.4 Respondents Party Affiliations

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
APC	98	73.68
PDP	35	26.32
Total	**133**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey 2025

The above table depicts that 73.68% of the respondents are of the APC extraction. 26.32% of them are of the PDP extraction. Hence, depicting that the study area is heavily populated by members of the APC. This may not be unconnected with the fact that Jigawa State is predominantly an APC controlled state.

Part B

Table 1.5: Is there the presence of a constituency office in your area?

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	13	9.77
No	120	90.23
Total	**133**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey 2025

The table above shows that 9.77% of the respondents indicated that the Senator has no constituency office in the senatorial District. While 90.23% of them declared that the Senator has no constituency office in the Senatorial District. Thus, inferring that a sizable chunk of the respondents were of the believe that the Senator has no constituency office in the Senatorial District.

Table 1.6 Is the Member Visiting Your Constituency Regularly?

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Weekly	-	-
Monthly	13	9.77
Quarterly	50	37.59
Yearly	40	30.08
During Election	30	22.56
Total	**133**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The above table explains that 9.77% of the respondents noted that the Senator only pay them visits monthly. Moreso, 37.59% of them affirmed that the Senator only visits his constituency on a quarterly basis. 30.08% of them asserted that the Senator only visits them annually. 22.56% acknowledge that they only see their Senator during election circle. One can infer that the Senator does not regularly visit his constituents and is not well connected with them.

Table 1.7 The Member Representing your Constituency Usually Consults with the Community to Present to their Case to the Senate

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	10	7.52
Agree	08	6.02
Uncertain	-	-
Disagree	50	37.59
Strongly Disagree	65	48.87
Total	**133**	**100.00**

Source: Field survey 2025

Table 1.7 illustrates that 7.52% and additional 6.02% of the respondents strongly agreed and agree that the Senator is always in consultation with his constituents and always takes their matter to the floor of the Senate. Additionally, 37.59% and another 48.87% of them disagree and strongly disagreed that the Senator is always in consultation with his constituents and takes their matter to the Senate. It can be inferred that a sizable chunk of the respondents asserted that the Senator is not constantly in consultation with his constituents and does not adequately air their matter at the floor of the National Assembly.

Table 1.8 The Senator Implements Projects at his/her own wish in the provision of democratic dividends.

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	12	9.02
Agree	15	11.28
Uncertain	10	7.52
Disagree	50	37.59
Strongly Disagree	46	34.59
Total	**133**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey 2025

The above table suggests that 9.02% and additional 11.28% strongly agrees and agreed that their Senator embarks on the provision of democratic dividends to them. While 7.52% were uncertain. However, 37.59% and additional 34.59% do not agree that the Senator provides them with projects so as to enjoy democratic dividends in their area. It can be inferred from the above statistics that most of the constituents are of the believe that the Senator does not democratic dividends to them.

Table 1.9 The Constituents Usually Demand and Exert Pressure on the Member to Implement Projects

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	10	7.52
Agree	10	7.52
Uncertain	-	-
Disagree	53	39.85
Strongly Disagree	60	45.11
Total	**133**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 1.9 illustrates that 7.52% and 7.52% strongly agrees and agreed that the constituents compel the Senator to attract projects in their areas. However, 39.85% and another 45.11% disagree and strongly disagreed that the electorates compel the Senator to provide them with constituency project. It can be deduced that a sizable chunk of the respondents asserted that the constituents do not exert pressure on their Senator to provide them with constituency projects toward improving their livelihood condition. This inability to take up on their Senator may be attributable to the simple reason that it is not their mandate provide such projects for them.

Table 1.10 In an Event the Member is Not Performing Up to Your Expectation, What Steps Will You Prefer to Take:

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Recall	30	22.56
No Re-election	103	77.44
Total	**133**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 1.10 demonstrates that 22.56% of the respondents preferred to recall the Senator in case he does not live up to their expectations. 77.44% of them asserted that they will prefer to vote him out of office should in case he isn't performing. This preference of voting him out as against recalling the Senator may be attributable to the difficulty associated with the process of recalling an elected representative.

Qualitative data obtained from interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) participants in Jigawa South-West Senatorial District, suggest that most of the respondents identified that the Senator provided tube wells on their farms, water pumping machine, boreholes and drainages. Many of them did not state or are not familiar with or are not aware of projects. The unawareness depicts low presence of such projects provided by the Senators. On the issue of functional projects in the constituencies, many respondents noted the existence of drainages and boreholes with many of them noting that majority of the boreholes are dysfunctional.

A sizable chunk of the respondents noted that the Senator made a lot of non-physical contributions to his constituents. He was engaged in the sharing of cloths, Sugar and Rice as well as learning materials and the provision of medical outreach most specifically eye care. Notwithstanding the donations, most of the respondents voiced displeasure, with the way the Senator impacted on them. Few of the respondents noted that the senator should focus more on the provision of public goods to the electorates.

With regards to initiating bills in the Chamber, only a few of them could affirm his contribution in that regard. While many of them did not answer the question. This may not be unconnected with the fact that the constituents are unaware or the Senators action in that regard. On how the Senators constituency office can be enhanced, most of the respondents noted that the Senator needs to establish an office that will serve as a contact between them and the Senator. The constituency office will bring about synergy and constant consultations among them.

Data from the interviews and FGD participants revealed noteworthy gaps in the conspicuousness and availability of constituency projects and representation within Jigawa South-West Senatorial District. Even though the Senator contributed immensely to his constituents, the inability of the Senator to have a designated constituency offices in the Senatorial District affected the quality of representation because it hindered access to him as

they are deprived channel of reaching out to him to present their challenges. The respondents call on the Senator to as a matter of urgency establish his constituency office in Dutse Local Government Area. As this will enhance good representation and contact between them and the Senator.

Discussion

From the data obtained, it revealed that the constituents are displeased with the Senator because of his isolation from them, inadequate communication channels, as well as his palpable contributions to them. On the issue of accessibility to constituency office, an overwhelming number of (90.23%) of respondents affirmed that the Senator has no constituency office in his constituency. A few of the respondents constituting only 9.77% asserted that the Senator has a constituency office. Observations by the researcher in the constituency also confirms that the Senator has no constituency office in Dutse.

On the issue of the Senator visiting his constituents, some of the respondents (37.59%) noted that the Senator visits his constituents on quarterly basis. 30.08% of them asserted that the Senator visits his constituency annually. While a few of them asserted that (22.56%) the Senator only visits them during election time, thus, inferring a detachment with his constituents. On the issue of the Senator consulting his constituents, a sizable chunk of the respondents representing (86.46%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that the Senator often consults his constituents before presenting their matter at the floor of the Senate. Hence, indicating little consultation by the Senator with his constituent.

Furthermore, with regards to the execution of projects by the Senator, it appearsthat the constituents are unaware of the presence of constituency projects executed by the Senator. Most of the respondents (72.18%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that the Senator executed constituency projects aimed at providing them with public goods. Hence, indicating that most the constituents have not felt the impact of such projects on their livelihood due to absence of such projects in their respective communities.

On the constituents pressurizing their Senator to execute projects, majority of the respondents representing (84.96%) asserted that the constituents do not exerts a lot of pressure on their Senator to provide them with projects that will have direct bearing on their lives this may be as a result of the fact that the constituents are aware that it’s not the mandate of the Senator to provide them with projects.

Moreso, on the issue of electoral accountability, most of the respondents representing an overwhelming (77.44%) preferred to vote their Senator out. Only a few of them (22.56%) are predisposed toward embarking on recalling their Senator. This mirrors disappointment with the performance of the Senator and the cumbersome nature of the process involved in the recall process. On the issue of unawareness and impact of the Senator, FGD and interviews showcased unawareness concerning definite executed projects by their Senator as some of them identified that the Senator provided boreholes and drainages for the electorates but several of them observed that the infrastructure are no longer in usage.

On the Senators contributions on legislative contributions, most of the respondents were basically uninformed of the legislative contributions or bills initiated by the Senator. Hence, indicating a disconnect or showing communication gap between the Senator and the constituents. Furthermore, on the issue of the desire of improving constituencyoffice, most of

the respondents highlighted on the need for the Senator to establish a functional office in Dutse so as to bridge the gap between them and offer robust and constructive engagement with the people for better representation and good governance.

Summary of Major Findings

Findings from the study revealed a detachment of the Senator and the constituents, hence, highlighting a high concern over representation and communication, contact and being in touch with the electorates as well as effective service delivery to the constituents. Thus, depicting a disconnection.

On the issue of constituency offices,the inability of the Senator to establish a constituency office with an overwhelming 90.23% of the respondents, signifies a lack of an official communication channel and inaccessibility to the Senator by his constituents. This finding corroborates with the findings of Ezike (2022) where he asserted that constituency offices serve as a bridge through which the constituents channel their appeals to their voted representatives (Ezike, 2022). The inability of the Senator to provide an operational constituency office in Dutse depicts poor representation and exclusion of the electorates from participating actively in governance and decision making.

On the Senator's frequency of visits, the irregularity of visiting his constituent's majority (37.59%) of respondents affirmed that the Senator only visits them quarterly. 30.08% affirmed that he visits them annually. While few of the respondents (22.56%) stated that the Senator visits them only during election circle, signifying a divide and unfavorable representation between them and the Senate. Constituency offices, in essence, represent the legislative representation demand of bringing representation to the constituencies as well as bringing the parliament nearer to the electorates aimed at addressing their concerns and desires (Benjamin, 2022). With only 20.83% of the respondents affirming that the Senator visits his constituency suggests an accidental contact with their Senators instead of constant connection.

On the issue of consulting with the community (86.46%) of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that the Senator frequently consults with them. Hence, suggesting alienation of the constituents from actively participating in governance. Fenno (2000) argued that constituency offices are vital avenues for the representatives to discuss with their constituencies on the awareness of government policies, lobby toward resource allocation to their voters/districts, and to offer other constituency-related amenities. The inability of the Senator to consult the electorates depicts that the approach to governance is not bottom top and projects and programs may not reflect the yearnings and aspiration of the constituents.

Furthermore, on the issue of projects execution an overwhelming percentage of the respondents expressed dismay. 72.18% strongly disagreed and simply disagreed. Dan-Azumi (2018) beforehand revealed that representative view of their constituents or districts inspires their sensibility and representation

Moreso, on the issue of community advocacy for projects 84.96% of the respondents specified that they don't exert pressure on the Senator. One can infer may be the constituents are not predisposed toward the commitment of the Senator to be committed to addressing their plight. When communities lose fate in their representatives, they are less likely to advocate for change or hold them accountable (Wollack, Powers and Hubli, 2012)

On the issue of underperformance majority of the (77.44%) of respondents preferred voting out the Senator, whereas on a negligible few (22.56%) were predisposed toward invoking the recall procedure aimed at removing him. Additionally, voters' knowledge of constituency offices, in addition to the interface between them and their representatives, is commonly near to the ground, with several citizens voicing displeasure with the way constituency offices are utilized (Ezike, 2022).

On non-physical contributions many of the respondents affirmed that that the Senator provided them with gifts during festive periods, sponsored some students in furthering their education among others. The intervention in that regard is grossly inadequate.

On the need for the Senator to have a functional constituency office, most of the respondents' demanded for the establishment of a constituency office in Dutse so as to ensure robust representation and the easy channeling of their demand to the Senator. This does not align with (Simmons) view where expressed the constituents vote their representatives with the view that they will represent varied sections of the society as this accord the constituents the ability to speak and offer recommendations plainly and succinctly (Witner, 2014).

Conclusively, on the matter of the Senators legislative Contributions, most of the respondents, expressed unawareness about the contributions of the Senator in the hallowed chamber. Thus, reflecting inadequate contact with constituents. This depicts alienation of the constituents from the act of governance and decision making that involves their livelihood, hence poor representation.

Member Federal House of Representatives, Dutse/Kiyawa Constituency
Constituents Responses on Constituency Offices

Table 2.1 Gender distribution of the Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	101	87.83
Female	14	12.17
Total	**115**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey 2025

Table 2.1 demonstrates that that 87.83% of the respondents are males nevertheless 12.17% of them are females. Thus, suggesting that most of those that participated in the survey are males. The high number of male respondents as against the female ones may not be unconnected with the easily reachable of men in the focal area largely attributable to sociocultural and socioreligious factors and belief system inherent in the area.

Table 2.2 Respondents Age Distribution

Respondents	Frequency	Percentages (%)
18-25	20	17.39
26-35	35	30.43
36-55	50	43.48
56-70	10	8.70
Total	**115**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey 2025

The data in table 2.2 illustrates that, 17.39% of the respondents were between the ages of 18-25; 30.43% of them are within 26-35 years of age whereas 43.48% of them within 36-55 years of age. Though, 8.70% of them as well are within 56-70 years of age. One can deduce that most of the respondents are aged between 26-55, hence, denoting their activeness in comparison with other age categories that participated in the survey.

Table 2.3 Respondents Ward/Constituencies

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Abaya	10	8.70
Chamo	10	8.70
Dundubus	10	8.70
Karnaya	15	13.04
Kudai	15	13.04
Limawa	15	13.04
Madobi	20	17.39
Sakwaya	20	17.39
Total	**115**	**100.00**

Source: Field survey 2025

Table 2.3 recapitulates the responses of the respondents on political wards in the study area. They were selected purposively, so as to ensure adequate representation from different political wards in the constituency. They were selected from eight different political wards. These are, Abaya, Chamo, Dundubus, Karnaya, Kudai, Limawa, Madobi, and Sakwaya. The method was cautiously premeditated so as to accomplish an unbiased selection of the respondents with knowledge of comprehending the research intent.

Table 2.4 Respondents Party Affiliations

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
APC	85	73.91
PDP	30	26.09
Total	**115**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey 2025.

Table 2.4 above explains that 73.91% of the respondents are members of the All-Progressive Congress (APC) in the area. 26.09% of them are of the Peoples' Democratic Party (PDP) extraction. One can deduce that the area is populated with more APC supporters and this may not be unconnected with the fact that the state is predominantly an APC state.

Part B

Table 2.5: Is there the presence of a constituency office in your area?

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	28	24.65
No	87	75.65
Total	**115**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey 2025

The above table 2.5 indicates that 24.65% of the respondents affirmed that the Member of House of Representatives have a constituency in his constituencies. 75.65% representing an

overwhelming number of the respondents debunk that he has a constituency office in his constituencies. This implies that most of the respondents are not aware of him establishing a constituency office in their locality.

Table 2.6 Is the Member Visiting Your Constituency Regularly?

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Weekly	04	3.48
Monthly	06	5.22
Quarterly	55	47.82
Yearly	30	26.09
During Election	20	17.39
Total	**115**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 2.6 depicts that only 3.48% of the respondents affirmed that the Member; Federal House of Representatives pays them visit on a weekly basis. 5.22% of them noted that he pays them vit evey month. 47.82% of them says that he visits them quarterly. Additionally, 26.09% of them noted that he only visits them annually. Furthermore, 17.39% of them indicated that he only visits them during election time. The display of data above is an indication that the Member; Federal House of Representatives does not visit his constituency regularly, thus, signifying a disconnect between him and his constituents.

Table 2.7 The Member Representing your Constituency Usually Consults with the Community to Present to their Case to the House of Representative

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	15	13.04
Agree	10	8.70
Uncertain	-	-
Disagree	40	34.78
Strongly Disagree	50	43.48
Total	**115**	**100.00**

Source: Field survey 2025

Table 2.7 suggests that 13.04% and 8.70% of the respondents strongly agree and agree that the Member; Federal House of Representatives is in consultation with his constituents before he makes presentations on their behalf in the House. 34.78% and 43.48 of them disagree and strongly disagreed that he makes consultation with them before any action in the parliament. Suggesting that most of the respondents are inclined toward the Member; Federal House of Representatives is not in constant consultation with his electorates before he forwards their matter to the parliament.

Table 2.8 The Member House of Representatives Implement Projects at his/her own wish in the Provision of Democratic Dividends.

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	15	13.04
Agree	10	8.70
Uncertain	05	4.35
Disagree	40	34.78

Strongly Disagree	45	39.13
Total	**115**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey 2025

Table 2.8 shows that 13.04% as well as 8.70% of the respondents strongly agree and agreed that the Member; Federal House of Representatives provide projects to them. While 4.35% of them were uncertain. However, 34.78% in addition to 39.13% of them disprove that he provides them with projects that touches their lives positively. Hence, inferring that most of them have not felt the impact of the projects provided by the Member; Federal House of Representatives in their respective constituencies.

Table 2.9 The Constituents Usually Demand and Exert Pressure on the Member to Implement Projects

Respondents	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Strongly Agree	05	4.35
Agree	15	13.04
Uncertain	-	-
Disagree	45	39.13
Strongly Disagree	50	43.48
Total	**115**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 2.9 depicts that 4.35% in addition to 13.04% of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed that constituents pressurize the Member; Federal House of Representatives to provide them with e projects in their respective areas. More so, 39.13% as well as 43.48% of them disagree and strongly disagreed that they do exert pressure on him to provide them with projects in their respective constituencies. This may partly be attributable to the fact that it's not the responsibility of the parliamentarians to execute projects but that of the executive arm of government.

Table 2.10 In an Event the Member is Not Performing to Your Expectation, What Steps Will You Take:

Respondents	**Frequency**	**Percentage (%)**
Recall	20	17.39
No Re-election	85	73.91
Total	**115**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 2.10 shows the view of the respondents concerning measures that they are likely to take should in case the Member; Federal House of Representatives is not performing up to their expectations. 17.39% of the respondents choose to recall him as their option. Whereas 73.91% of them indicated that they will vote him out of office should he perform below their expectations. Their preference of voting him out may be attributable to the burdensome process involved with the recall procedure.

Data obtained from the qualitative data (interview/FGD) suggest that the Member representing Dutse/Kiyawa Federal Constituency. Few respondents stated that the member of House of Representative provided them with drainages, wells and boreholes. Most of the participants were unable to recollect the citing of projects in their area or lack information or knowledge of

where such projects were executed probably due to lack of sufficiency of the projects. Few respondents from Dundubus and Dutse ward noted of hearing of the allocation of constituency projects in other wards represented by the member.

On the issue of projects executed by the member, many participants declared the presence of culverts, drainages but decried lack of sustainability of the cited projects overtime due to many of them not functional. With regards to non-physical contributions by the Member, many participants revealed that that he has distributed several gifts items particularly the Sallah periods, in addition to learning materials for schools, medical outreach to many visually impaired persons and sending people to perform pilgrimages. Despite these efforts some participants decried that such gesture does not go round and as such the provision of public goods should be accorded utmost priority.

On the contributions of the member in the legislative chamber, most of the respondents noted that they are not conversant with any bills or motion spearheaded by the member at National Assembly and cannot simply understand what the member has achieved in the past almost two years.

With regards to the issue of improvement, majority of the respondents harped on the desire for the member to put in place a viable constituency office even if it is in Dutse alone as this they suggest will enhance contact and quality representation that will have direct bearing on them.

On the whole, qualitative data reveals that there is a disconnection in the presence and availability of projects in Dutse/Kiyawa Federal Constituency. Notwithstanding the noteworthy donations, the lack of a constituency project in the two constituencies hampered connection and good representation. The electorates demanded for the establishment of a constituency office or Kiyawa so as to accord them easy accessibility to their representative.

Summary of Major Findings

The findings of the research reveal that:

On the issue of the member House of Representative having a constituency office, a high number of the respondents representing 75.65% noted that the Member House of Representative has no constituency office in their constituency while only a few (24.35%) noted that the Member House of Representative have a constituency office in their locality their area.

On the issue of the member House of Representatives paying visits frequently to his constituents, 47.82% of respondents believes that the Member only pay them visitation on quarterly basis, meanwhile 26.09% believes that he visits them annually. A few of the respondents (3.48%) believes that he visits them every week. Whereas, 17.39% noted that he only visits them during election circle. Hence, signifying low visitation and less consultation with the constituents.

On the issue of the member House of Representatives with the constituents, an overwhelming number of the respondents (78.26%) believes that the Member House of Representatives disagrees that he is in consultation with members of his constituency before he forwards their matter to the parliament. Thus, depicting a detachment of the member and his constituents hence, affecting the quality of representation.

On the issue of the member House of Representatives executing projects to improve the livelihood of his constituents, a sizable chunk of the respondents representing 73.91% disagreed or strongly disagreed that the Member House of Representative implements projects in order to offer them with democratic dividend. Therefore, implying lack of knowledge or the constituents are displeased with the projects provided by the member House of Representative.

On the issue of the constituents exerting pressure on the member House of Representative to allocate and implement laudable projects, majority of the respondents representing (82.61%) disagreed that the constituents mount pressure on their representative to implement projects. Hence, depicting that the electorates are unaware of how to channel their demand or they are of the believe that it is not the core mandate of the member to provide such projects.

On the issue regarding underperformance and what option to take should in case the member House of Representative performs abysmally low, most of the respondents (73.91%) are more inclined toward voting out the Member House of Representation should in case he is not performing up to their expectation. A negligible few (17.39%) prefer to recall the Member House of Representative in case he underperforms. The majority inclination toward not voting him as against recalling him may be attributable to the difficulties involved in recalling a representative.

On the issue of knowledge of constituency projects provided by the member House of Representative,Data collected from qualitative data (Interviews and FGDs) reveals that majority of the respondents identified the hiring of houses as hostels for students, provided boreholes and drainages, building as well renovation of Mosques. While few of the respondents were unable to identify projects provided by the Member. The respondents decried the lack of sustainability of the projects as most of them are unviable.

On the issue of non-physical contributions by the member House of Representative**,** most of the respondents recognized the delivery of several gifts to them most specifically in festive occasions. They acknowledge the donations of learning materials, some of them noted the provision of tricycles, motorcycles, medical outreach and renting of hostel for students. Many of them as well noted contributions during naming and wedding ceremony in both cash and kind. Some of them have a feeling that the donations and interventions by the member is not enough and preferred the provision of sustainable projects that will have more bearing on their lives.

On the issues of Lack of Communication on Legislative performance of the Member House of Representative, a sizable chunk of the respondents did not know of bills or motions initiated by the Member. Thus, inferring a disconnect and lack of open communication by the member and his constituents.

On the issue of the need for improved engagement with the constituents,almost all the constituents demanded the immediate opening of a constituency office and be made operational in the state capital (Dutse) aimed at creating an open access to the member and establishing an avenue to channel their challenges. The non availability of a constituency by the Member of House of Representative stalls effective communication and accessibility hence hampering on governance and community meeting.

ISSN Print: 2992-2763 – ISSN Online: 2992-4618 | Vol. 3, Issue 1, No. 1 / March 2025
https://www.jopd.com.ng

Summary of Major Findings

This section discusses the findings of the research:
On the presence of constituency office for the Member House of Representative, an overwhelming majority of the respondents representing 75.65% observed that the member has no any functional constituency office in their constituency. This is not in tandem with global best practices that recognizes the important role that accessibility to constituency offices offers in enhancing effective communication between the representative and the constituents (Toksoz, 2008).

On the issue of visitation by the Member House of Representatives to his constituency, majority of the respondents representing 47.82% affirmed that he visits them on a quarterly basis. 26.09% of the respondents noted that the member visits them annually. A few of the respondents representing a negligible percentage (3.48%) observed that he visits them every week. 17.39% affirms that he visits them only when the election cycle is on. This corroborates the findings of () where he noted that lack of contact through constant visitation weakens the quality of representation and the provision of public good to the constituents hence, diminishing participation and representative governance (Macleod, 2006).

On the issue of consulting with his community, a sizable chunk of the constituents representing 78.26% of them disagreed and strongly disagreed that the Member House of Representative is in consultation with his constituents initially before he presents them to the parliament. Partaking in the democratic process is essential and indispensable for actual governance and representation (Jimoh, A. (2019). The inability of the member to consult with his constituents depicts alienation of the electorates in governance by excluding them from participating on matters that affects their lives.

On the matter of project execution by the Member of the House of Representation, 73.91% of the respondents are displeased with the level of project execution by the member. Hence, inferring the non-conspicuousness of projects in their constituency. Hence, underpinning the electorates dissatisfaction. Equitable project allocation and consultation in citing such projects will create awareness, ownership and support (Ezenyili, 2012).

On the issue of the constituents exerting pressure on the Member of the House of Representative, a sizable chunk of the population representing 82.61% affirmed that the constituents do not mount pressure on their representatives toward him executing projects for them that will positively affect their livelihood condition. Hence, depicting low participation in the act of governance and public policy making (Dan-Azumi, 2018).

On the issue of the fate of the Member of House of Representative should in case he performs abysmally below their expectation, majority of the constituents representing 73.91% are predisposed toward not reelecting the member. Few of the respondents representing 17.39% of them preferred initiating a recall process aimed at recalling their member in the House of Representative. The preference for not reelecting the member instead of recalling him is as a result of the cumbersome process involved in the recall process.

On the issue of constituency projects and contributions, most of the constituents noted the provision of boreholes and drainages as the most prominent donations. They however, decried the lack of availability of such projects across different constituency and inability to sustain the

allocated project. This finding aligns with that of (Toksoz, 2008). the non-provision of constituency or poor execution of the projects diminishes confidence and trust.

On the issue of physical contributions, an overwhelming constituents acknowledge the donation of teaching aid as well as the provision of medical outreach support to many constituents. They however, decried that such gifts or donations does not go round as it is grossly insufficient and not sustaining.

On the issue of contributing toward initiation bills or motion on the floor of the house, majority of the constituents noted that they lack knowledge of bills or motion directly sponsored by the Member House of Representative. Thus, depicting a disconnect and wide communication gap between the member and his constituents. Enhanced and open communication is indispensable panacea for engendering legislative accountability (Friedberg, 2011).

Almost all the constituents highlighted the desire of a functional constituency office in the state capital (Dutse) so as to allow room for robust constructive engagement aimed at promoting good governance and representation. The yearning for the provision of constituency offices is in line with global best practices encouraging open and reachable avenue of communication between the representatives and their electorates (Kurtz, 1991).

Member State House of Assembly
Constituents Responses on Constituency Offices
Table 3.1 Gender distribution of the Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	83	89.25
Female	10	10.75
Total	**93**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey 2025

Table 2.1 highlights that a noteworthy percentage of the respondents, 89.25%, are male, while 10.75% are female. This outstanding gender difference suggests that males constitute the majority of the participants in the study area. One reasonable clarification for this disproportion is the comparatively larger approachability of men in the study area in comparison with women. This accessibility gap may be as a result of different socio-cultural and religious factors inherent in the state as there are restrictions on the female gender and that may restrict their public involvement in the survey. Hence, the limited number of female respondents in the survey.

Table 3.2 Respondents age Distribution

Respondents	Frequency	Percentages (%)
18-25	26	27.96
26-35	25	26.88
36-55	30	32.26
56-70	12	12.90
Total	**93**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey 2025

Table 3.2 shows the age distribution of respondents in the focal area. It depicts that 27.96% within ranges between 8–25 years. Correspondingly, 26.88% of them are between 26–35 years, whereas 32.26% of them are 36–55 years. Lastly, 12.90% of the respondents are between 56–70

years. This above data illustrates that most of the respondents, 59.14% ranges between 26–55 years. This demography is mainly substantial, as persons in this category of age are mostly considered as the most agile and productive. This highlights their likelihood of stimulating the research results and depicts their significance toward accomplishing the study's aims.

Table 3.3 Respondents Ward/Constituencies

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Abaya	12	12.90
Chamo	12	12.90
Dundubus	12	12.90
Karnaya	11	11.83
Kudai	11	11.83
Limawa	12	12.90
Madobi	12	12.90
Sakwaya	11	11.83
Total	**93**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey 2025

Table 3.3 Demonstrates the constituencies of the respondents that filled the questionnaire during the research. The Respondents are from the from eight wards: Abaya, Chamo, Dundubus, Karnaya, Kudai, Limawa, Madobi, and Sakwaya. This method was carefully designed to achieve a balanced distribution of participants, enabling comprehensive insights into the research topic. A total of 93 respondents participated in the study, with equal representation from each ward—11 or 12 respondents per ward (11.83% or 12.50%).

Table 3.4 Respondents Party Affiliations

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
APC	65	69.89
PDP	28	30.11
Total	**93**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey 2025

Table 3.4 shows that 69.89% of the respondents are of the All-Progressive Congress (APC) extraction. 30.11% of them belong to the People's Democratic Party (PDP). This depicts that APC is dominant in the study area. This may not be unconnected with the fact that the state is governed by the APC for the past almost 13 years.

Part B

Table 3.5: Is there the Presence of a Constituency Office in your Area?

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	13	13.98
No	80	86.02
Total	**93**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey 2025

Table 3.5 illustrates that 13.98% of the respondents noted the presence of a constituency office for the member of House of Assembly in their constituency while 86.02% of them observe that the member has no constituency office in their constituency. This means that a sizable chunk of them responded by saying that the member has no office in their area.

Table 3.6 Is the Member Visiting Your Constituency Regularly?

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Weekly	05	5.38
Monthly	06	6.45
Quarterly	35	37.63
Yearly	30	32.26
During Election	17	18.28
Total	**93**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 3.6 demonstrates 5.38% of the respondents noted that the member frequently visits his constituents on a weekly basis, 6.45% affirms that the member visits them monthly. 37.63% of them said that he visits them quarterly even though 32.26% of them noted that he only visits them annually. Additionally, 18.28% of them declare that the Member is reachable during election time. It can be inferred that the Member does not visit his constituents regularly and detached from them.

Table 3.7 The Member Representing your Constituency Usually Consults with the Community to Present to their Case to the House of Assembly

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	05	5.38
Agree	05	5.38
Uncertain	01	1.08
Disagree	32	34.40
Strongly Disagree	50	53.76
Total	**93**	**100.00**

Source: Field survey 2025

Table 3.7 illustrates that 5.38% as well as 5.38% strongly declared that the Member consults with them and air their challenges to the Member. Though, 1.08% respondent was uncertain on that. 34.40% and 53.76% of them strongly disagreed that the Member consults with them before presenting their issues to the Member. This depicts that most of them declared that the Member occasionally consults with them.

Table 3.8 The Member State House of Assembly Implements Projects at his/her own wish in the provision of democratic dividends.

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	15	16.13
Agree	10	10.75
Uncertain	05	5.38
Disagree	30	32.26
Strongly Disagree	33	35.48
Total	**93**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey 2025

Table 3.8 shows that 16.13% and 10.75% of the respondents strongly agree and agreed that the Member implements projects toward the provisioning of democratic dividends. 5.38% of them were uncertain. Conversely, 32.26% and 35.48% of the respondents disprove that the Member

implements projects in that regard. It can be inferred that most of the constituents are uninformed of projects carried out by the Member.

Table 3.9 The Constituents Usually Demand and Exert Pressure on the Member to Implement Projects

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	05	5.38
Agree	04	4.30
Uncertain	01	1.08
Disagree	33	35.48
Strongly Disagree	50	53.76
Total	**93**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 3.9 depicts that 5.38% and 4.30% of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed that they do mount enormous pressure on their member to implement projects for them. 1.08% were undecided. On the other hand, 35.48% and 53.76% of the respondents strongly disagreed and agreed that they exert pressure on their member to deliver. This is likely not unconnected with the fact the electorates have the understanding that the legislator's primary obligation is law making and oversighting the executive as project execution is not their mandate.

Table 3.10 In an Event the Member is Not Performing to Your Expectation, What Steps Will You prefer to Take:

Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Recall	19	20.43
No Re-election	74	79.57
Total	**93**	**100.00**

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 3.10 shows that 20.43% of the respondents chose recalling their member if he is not performing up to their expectations. While 79.57% of them are of the view of not electing their member as a better option should in case he is performing below their expectations. The desire by most of the respondents to vote their member out of office may be attributable to the difficult process of recall system in the polity and the acceptance of election as a viable means of reelection or rejection of their member in a democratic setting.

From the Interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with participants in Dutse State Assembly provided by the lawmakers from 2015-2023. Majority of the respondents observed that the lawmakers provided them with boreholes and drainage systems, in addition to building mosques and Holy Quran, some of them were unable to recollect definite projects or they are uninformed of one. Their inability to mention any project depicts the low visibility or insufficient communication about the projects.

One FGD participant from Dundubus ward observed that the use to hear about projects executed by their member but it is yet to be cited in their area." Follow-up discussions encouraged participants to identify handy projects in their wards. Though many recognized the presence of boreholes and drainage systems, several participants revealed that they are not functioning at the moment. A Limawa ward participant observed that several boreholes are not functional because of breakdown and out of usage for a very long time and there was no attempt aimed at fixing

ISSN Print: 2992-2763 – ISSN Online: 2992-4618 | Vol. 3, Issue 1, No. 1 / March 2025
https://www.jopd.com.ng

them. Many of the FGD respondents gave account of the functional ones and the locations of mainly functional boreholes, schools and predominantly mosques in their communities.

Apart from physical projects, a sizable chunk of the respondents noted the provision of series of contributions by the member which includes, the donation of cloths, rams and cows during festive period like Sallah and Maulud. Medical outreach campaigns and teaching aids to schools and the donation of motorcycles among others. Notwithstanding these concerted contributions, majority of the participants voiced displeasure, stating that the member did not touch on their lives positively. An FGD respondent from Kudai ward noted that while gifts during festive period are commendable, they prefer projects to be cited in their communities as projects are public goods.

With regards to the member contributions in the sponsorship of bills in the member, none of the respondents said that they are aware of any bill or motion sponsored at the floor by the member while some respondent's decline commenting in that regard. This may not be unconnected with the fact that they may not have followed through the proceedings in the member floor or have no access to communication network that covers the member proceedings.

On the issue of how constituency offices can be enhanced, participants constantly underscored the desire to have a devoted and wholly active office in Dutse where they can liaise with the member and lodge their demands.

From the FGDs and interviews, it reveals that there exists a noteworthy gap in the conspicuousness and availability of constituency projects and representation within Dutse. While the member has made some remarkable gains, the lack of a viable constituency office in the constituencies he represents have to a large extent hampered real contact and effective service delivery required of him. The provisioning of constituency offices will further boost confidence and make meaningful impact on governance and democratic consolidation.

Discussion

On the issue of an operational constituency, an overwhelming majority (86.02%) of respondents affirmed the nonexistence of constituency offices for the member in their local government arear. Hence, suggesting that there is no means of engaging the constituents in the locality. Observation from the researcher did not as well suggest the presence of a constituency office for the member.

On the issue of the Member House of Assembly's (Dutse) frequent visitation to his constituency, majority of the respondents constituting (69.89%) suggests that Member representing Dutse in the House of Assembly visits his constituents on a quarterly basis, annually, or during elections only. Hence, inferring uncommon connections. The irregular visits indicate disconnection of the member and his electorates.

On the matter of Member House of Assembly's (Dutse) consultation with his constituents, a sizable chunk constituting (88.16%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that Member State House of Assembly is not in consultation with his constituents and channel their demands to the House of Assembly. This illustrates a disconnection and poor inclusion and communication.

On the issue of the Member House of Assembly's (Dutse) executing projects for his constituents, majority of the respondents (67.74%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that Member of State House of Assembly representing Dutse constituency does not implements projects in a

bid to offer his constituents with dividends of democracy. It can be deduced that there is feelings of disappointment with his provision of physical development.

On the issue of the constituents mounting pressure on the Member House of Assembly's (Dutse), most of the respondents constituting 89.24% disagreed or strongly disagreed that electorates exert pressure on their member to provide them with projects. This suggest that the constituents appreciates that it is not the mandate of the member to provide them constituency projects.

On responses of underperformance by the Member House of Assembly's (Dutse) and preferable cause of action by the constituents, an overwhelming number of the respondents representing (79.57%) are more predisposed toward voting out the Member of the State House of Assembly should in case he is performing below their expectations. whereas 20.43% of them preferred to initiate a recall process aimed at recalling him from the assembly. Thus, indicating a displeasure with the quality of representation and appreciating the difficulty involved in recalling a representative.

On the issue of Awareness of Constituency Projects provided by the Member House of Assembly's (Dutse) Qualitative data from Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) participants reveals low cognizance and conspicuousness of constituency projects provided by the Member. Majority of the participants identified the provision of hostels for students, drainages as well as wells were provided by him. Few of participants were unable to identify any precise project provided by the Member.

On the issue of provision of non-physical contributions by the Member House of Assembly (Dutse), most of the respondents mentioned the provision of donations most specifically in festive periods, by the some of them noted the provision of medical outreach, and gifting them with motorcycles by the member.

On the issue of Legislative Contributions by the Member House of Assembly (Dutse),there was a lack of cognizance concerning legislative initiatives by the member of the State House of Assembly. Virtually no respondents were able to sanction the sponsorship of any bills or motion by their member, demonstrating poor contact and disconnect.

On the need for a functional constituency Office to be provided by the Member House of Assembly (Dutse) Respondents unanimously highlighted the desire of the have a functional constituency office so as to give the constituents a platform of lodging their demands, as well as enhance effective communication between the member and his constituents. The inability of the member to open a constituency hinders actual representation.

On the issue of Community Perceptions of Governance, findings revealed a wide-ranging displeasure with the effect of Member of the State House of Assembly representing the constituents. Largely as a result of low visibility of executed projects, sporadic visits, as well as lack of effective communication. The constituents prefer the allocation of supportable projects and dependable meeting rather than irregular and representational motions.

Summary of Major Findings

On the issue of the presence or availability of constituency office, an overwhelming number of the respondents (86.02%) affirmed that the Member of State Assembly representing Dutse Local

Government Area has no constituency office in their constituency. This finding aligns with assertions by Lafenwa (2009) that physical infrastructure for legislative engagement is a foundational component of participatory democracy. However, the effectiveness of these offices in fostering communication and addressing constituents' needs remains in question.

On the **Member House of Assembly's (Dutse)** frequent visit, the observed frequency is erratic, signifying that (69.89%) of the respondents suggesting that he visits them on quarterly basis, annually, or during election circle). Therefore, revealing a wide gap between the member and his electorates. This in line with the findings of Mobolaji (2014), where he observed that neglecting the constituents affects the confidence of the electorates and undermines governance and representation. Constant contact accords the legislator the opportunity to comprehend the challenges of his constituents for better representation.

On the matter of the member consulting with his constituents, it will be deduced that 88.16% disagreed that the member consults with his constituents. Hence, implying lack of inclusion of the electorates in governance. According to Okoosi-Simbine (2010), broad consultation is a recipe for robust engagement between the Member and his constituents. The inability of the legislator to constantly interface with the constituents weakens democracy and consultation.

On the issue of the member executing projects for the constituents, the respondents are to a large extent displeased with the level of project execution (67.74%). Thus, depicting the nonavailability or visibility of projects in their constituency. Scholars such as Nnorom, K. and Odigbo (2015) accentuated the position of constituency projects in offering public goods to the constituents. The low allocation of project is an indication of low performance by the member.

On the constituents exerting pressure on the member to allocate/implement projects, a remarkable number of the respondents (89.24%) noted that they do not exert pressure on the Member toward compelling him to allocate projects in their constituency. Hence, suggesting an understanding their it is not his mandate to provide them with projects. Nevertheless, as highlighted by Turaki (2010) the inability of the constituents to mount pressure on the member and demonstrates alienation of the constituents and not familiar with how to influence public policy in their favor.

On responses of should in case the member is underperforming,majority of the respondents (79.57%) prefer to vote the member out of office with only few of them opting for a recall (20.43%) of the member. Thus, revealing a feeling of disappointment with underachieving of the member as well as acknowledging the cumbersome nature of the recall procedures Udefuna, Jamare and Adebayo (2013) observed that the recall process is difficult hence, the preference for voting him out instead.

On the issue of the constituents aware of constituency projects provided by the member, there suggests to be low understanding of constituency projects hence, implying lack of constructive engagement in addition to communication gap as depicted by shown by revelations from FGD. Turaki (2010) contend that conspicuousness of constituency projects is vital in promoting fair sharing of resources to the constituents.

On the issue of non-physical contributions to the constituents by the member,constituents noted contributions in the form of donations, such as medical supplies and outreach, as well as other

charitable acts highlights contributions that are not enduring as these contributions are not public goods. Some of them noted cash donations by the member during events.

On the issue of the legislative Contributions by the member, the is unawareness of the such contributions in legislative affairs, hence, furthermore accentuating the challenge of communication between the Member and his electorates. Oni (2013) underscores the position of parliamentarians educating their voters on how to aggregate their demands.

On the need for a fully functional constituency office, the constituents demand for opening of a constituency cannot be overemphasized. If truly functional it will breach the gap between the member and his constituents. Hence, translating into projects and good representation and the provision of dividends of democracy in line with the yearnings and aspiration of the constituents. Rabinder (2015), argued that operational constituency offices serve as a vehicle for interaction aimed at receiving their demands and acting on them toward the providing them with good governance and projects that will impact their lives.

On Community Perceptions of Governance, in general, the findings reveal an over-all discontent with the performance of the member state House of Assembly. Largely, associated with low visible projects implemented by the member, irregular visitation, and lack of adequate communication between them. An overwhelming constituents showed preferences of viable enduring projects and robust meeting between them and the member. This is in line with the argument of Omenka (2008) that grassroots governance flourishes on self-assurances, openness, as well as positive effect on the constituents.

Conclusion

Representation is the cornerstone of liberal democracy the world over, one vehicle through which representation is enhanced is through the parliaments which is basically a conglomeration of elected representative. As representation of the people, they are expected to act in line with the yearnings and aspiration of the constituents. It is in this regard that the representative of the electorates is expected to open a constituency so as to serve as a liaison between the representatives and the constituents. In ensuring that the representative provide democratic dividends, constituency projects are provided to the legislators to allocate to their constituents aimed at improving the livelihood condition of the constituents.

The paper concludes that that the Senator, Member House of Representative as well as the Member representing Dutse constituency in the Jigawa State House of Assembly have no officially designated constituency offices in their respective constituencies and that to a large extent hampered effective communication and good representation of the constituents as they are denied channels of contacting their representatives to forward their demands. Furthermore, the finding revealed that the Senator, Member House of Representative and the Member State House of Assembly provided the constituents with constituency projects like boreholes, drainages, school buildings and albeit insufficient and that most of the allocated projects are dilapidated and not sustainable.

The study recommends that:

i. The representatives be mandated to open a well-equipped and functional constituency office in their respective constituencies. This will go a long way in ensuring good representation and allocation of projects in line with the yearning and aspiration of the electorates.

ii. A unit should be established to ensure compliance that each representative opens a constituency office in his constituency as money is allocated for the provision of such offices in their respective constituency nationwide as this will further deepen democracy and the provision of democratic dividends.

iii. The community/constituents must take ownership of the allocated constituency projects by ensuring that they are deeply involved in the continuous maintenance of projects such as boreholes and desilting of the drainages to ensure long term sustainability of the projects for the overall benefit of the constituent.

References

Abebe, G., & Daniels, P. (2023). *Community engagement in political representation*. Journal of Public Policy, 45(2), 345-368.

Abubakar, M., & Salisu, H. (2022). *Constituency representation and participatory democracy*. Journal of Legislative Studies, 18(3), 112-130.

Adeniyi, J., & James, F. (2023). *The impact of transparency in constituency projects*. Nigerian Political Review, 25(4), 56-72.

Adeyemi, M. (2022). *Bridging gaps in political accountability*. African Governance Studies, 12(1), 234-245.

Affairs, 3 (1and 2).

Adeyemo, A. (2009). Pairs, Gains of a Decade of Democracy, This Day News-Paper, May 29, p. 25.

Ahmed, T., Bello, S., & Yusuf, R. (2022). *Engaging the grassroots: Frequency and impact of legislative visits*. African Journal of Governance, 20(2), 89-102.

Akech, M. (2022). *Participatory governance: Global perspectives*. Governance Review, 19(4), 456-472.

Barkan, J. D. (2009). African Legislatures and the "Third Wave" of Democratization. InLegislative Power in Emerging African Democracies. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner

Baskaran, T., & Biggs, D. (2020). *Electoral participation and democratic accountability in developing countries*. World Development, 132, 105027.

Benjamin (2010) in Yusuf, A.Y., Yusoff, K.Z. & Zengeni, K.T. (2018) The Legislature and between Constituents and Representatives. Washington, DC: National DemocraticInstitute.

Bovens, M., Schillemans, T., & 't Hart, P. (2014). *Public accountability*. Routledge.

Cox, S., & McCabe, T. (2023). *Constituency engagement in parliamentary systems*. Legislative Studies, 28(3), 678-694.

Dan-Azumi, J. (2018) Legislative Representation and Constituency Office Management in

Eze, K., & Musa, L. (2023). *Constituency projects as a tool for community development*.

Development and Policy Review, 19(1), 47-65.

Ezenyili, O.K. (2012) Democracy and Good Governance in Nigeria: A Survey of Indices of

Ezike (2022) Constituency Office and Effective Legislative Representation in Abakaliki/Izzi Federal Constituency.

Fenno, R.F. (2000). Congress at the Grassroots: RepresentationalChangeintheSouth,1770-

Friedberg, C. (2011). From a top-down to a bottom-up approach to legislative oversight. Journal

Fukuyama, F. (2013). *What is governance?* Governance, 26(3), 347-368.

Goetz, A. M. (2017). *Political accountability in developing countries*. Routledge.

Gordon, T., & Gendron, C. (2019). *Political representation in the age of information*. Cambridge University Press.

Ibrahim, Z., & Adeola, T. (2022). *Legislative communication and its impact on democratic trust*. African Governance Forum, 15(3), 78-93.

Jimoh, A. (2019) The 8th National Assembly from a Critical Assessment. Retrieved on 23 March 2024 from National-assembly-from a- critical assessment

Johnson, L. (2023). *Streamlining accountability mechanisms*. Policy Innovations, 22(3), 123-139.

Lafenwa S. A. (2009). The legislature and the challenges of democratic governance in Africa: The Nigerian Case. Seminar paper prepared for distribution at a conference organized by the Politics and International Studies (POLIS), Centre for African Studies, University of Leeds with assistance from EADI Working Group on Governance and Development on Democratization in Africa: Retrospective and Future Prospects, December 4-5, 2009, at University of Leeds, United Kingdom

Lafenwa, S. A. (2009). The Legislature and the challenges of democratic governance in Africa:

Macleod, P. (2006) How to Organize an Effective Constituency Office. Canadian Parliamentary Review, 4(Spring)

MacLeod, P. (2006). How to Organize an Effective Constituency Office. Canadian Parliamentary Review, Spring.

Mansbridge, J. (2014). *The role of consultation in representative democracy*. The Journal of Politics, 76(4), 964-977.

Micah, C. (2015) Constituency Development Funds, Transparency in Grassroots Development or Political Patronage at http://tilz.tearfund.org

Mobolaji, H (2014). Legislature, governance, and development in Nigeria. In Hamalai L. &Suberu R. (Eds,). The National Assembly and democratic governance in Nigeria. Publication. NILS

Muriuki, K. (2023). *Sustainable development through constituency projects*. African Journal of Development Studies, 14(2), 321-340.

Nabatchi, T., &Leighninger, M. (2015). *Public participation for 21st century democracy*. John Wiley & Sons.

Nguyen, T. (2023). *Transparency in legislative governance*. Asian Political Review, 18(2), 289-312.

Nigeria: An Assessment of Enugu-East Federal Constituencies/Districts 2011 to 2017. Nigerian Journal of Legislative Affairs, 8

Nnorom, K. &Odigbo J. (2015). Appraisal of legislative performance of the Anambra State House of Assembly in Nigeria (2003-2011). African Journal of Management, Social Sciences and Humanities, 4 (1), 70-86.

Norris, P. (2012). *Democratic deficit: Critical citizens revisited*. Cambridge University Press.

Nwosu, E., & Okafor, U. (2021). *Participatory representation in modern democracies*. Journal of Public Administration, 14(4), 101-119.

Obasi, I. N. (2012) *Research Methodology in Political Science*. Enugu: Academic Publishing Company.

of Legislative Studies 17 (4), 525–544

Ogundipe, A., & Adamu, K. (2023). *Symbolic gestures versus sustainable development in Nigerian politics*. Governance and Development Quarterly, 12(2), 34-49.

Ojo, F., & Aina, D. (2023). *The role of constituency offices in democratic engagement*. Nigerian Journal of Political Science, 21(2), 54-72.

Okechukwu, N., & Adebayo, M. (2023). *Grassroots governance and public trust in Nigeria*. Governance Review, 16(1), 23-45.

Okeke, P., & Nnamdi, L. (2023). *Electoral accountability and the challenges of recall processes*. Nigerian Electoral Studies, 9(4), 63-85.

Okonkwo, O., Bello, T., & Tunde, M. (2023). *Assessing constituency projects in Nigeria*. Nigerian Policy Journal, 15(1), 90-110.

Okoosi-Simbine, A. T. (2010). Understanding the Role and Challenges of the Legislature in the Fourth Republic: The Case of Oyo State House of Assembly. Nigeria *Journal of Legislative*

Omenka J. I. (2008). Legislative oversight and socio-economic development in Benue State. A Ph.D Thesis inthe Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences Submitted to the School of Post-Graduate Studies, University of Jos

Oni, S. (2013). The Legislature and Constituency Representation in the Fourth Republic of Nigeria's Democratic Governance. Ife Psychologia. 21 (2), 232-242.

Paper Series. Stock No. 37237. Retrieved on March 23, 2025 from http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/894431468323056040/text/33034a10ParliamentaryEthics1final.txt

Persson, H. (2014) "Nigeria, an Overview of Challenges to Peace and Security". Abuja Ministry of Defense.

Poteete, A. (2010). Renegotiation of Executive Powers and Executive-Legislative Relations in powers in Nigeran local government system: implications for rural development. Journal of Policy and Development Studies, 9(4), 161-171. Prentice-Hall Private Ltd.

Rabinder, M. (2015). Two concepts of constituency. The Journal of Politics 77 (2), 381-393

Resnik, D. B. (2015) "What is Ethics in Research & Why is it Important?" Retrieved on January 18, 2025 from https://www.niehs.nih.gov/research/resources/bioethics/whatis/

Schmitt, M., & Settle, R. (2022). *Public policy and local government performance*. Policy Studies, 45(2), 124-140.

Searing, D. D. (2017). *Representing the people: A pragmatic approach to political representation*. University of Chicago Press.

Smith, R., & Riley, P. (2022). *Representative accountability and public trust*. Governance and Democracy, 20(3), 350-365.

Stapenhurst, R. &Pelizzo, R. (2004). Legislative Ethics and Codes of Conduct. Series on Contemporary Issues in Parliamentary Development. World Bank Institute Working the Constituency Projects in Nigeria

Toksoz, F. (2008) Good Governance: Improving Quality of Life. Istanbul: TESEV Publications Transparency and Accountability. UK: Author House

Tunde, M., & Bello, T. (2022). *Challenges in project maintenance in developing countries*. African Development Insights, 10(2), 134-150.

Turaki H. (2010). National Assembly denies awarding constituency projects, Daily Trust Newspaper, December 6. UDN, Briefing Paper on the Constituency Development Fund, May

Udefuna, Jamare& Adebayo (2013). Legislative constituency project in Nigeria: Implication for National Development.

Wollack, Powers & Hubli (2012) Global Parliamentary Report Analyses: Changing Relationship

World Bank. (2023). *Enhancing constituency representation*. World Bank Publications.

Yusuf, Y.A., Yusoff, K.Z. TapiwaZengeni, K. (2018) The Legislature and the Constituency Projects in Nigeria. IJMRR/March 2018/ Volume 8/Issue 3/Article No-1/1-6