

Challenges Of Political Party Internal Democracy And Its Impact On Infrastructural Development In Kaduna State

By

Alabi Paul Oluwole

Department Of Political Science,
Oyo State College Of Education Lanlate
alabipauloluwole@gmail.com
08030661530

Dr. Alabi Abdullahi

Department Of Politics And Governance,
Kwara State University Malete
abdullahi.alabi@kwasu.edu.ng
08062075797

Dr. Ashiru Aliyu

Department Of Politics And Governance,
Kwara State University Malete
ashiru.aliy@kwasu.edu.ng
08062706989

Abstract

Political surrogates or political godfatherism has been the tradition of politics and invariably leads to political crisis such as godfather – godson conflict, corruption and internal political conflicts and this scenario greatly affecting infrastructural development such as roads construction and water supply.

The study examines the challenges of godfatherism and internal democracy on infrastructural development in Kaduna State. The target area of the study includes State Party Executive of All Progressive Congress (APC) and (PDP), Local Government Executive APC and PDP, Electorates APC and PDP, INEC, Academics in the State University and Civil Society. The study made use of

analytical and descriptive research type. The study accessed the effects of imposition of candidates/surrogates on infrastructural development in Kaduna State. Findings revealed that, financial difficulties reinforce the reliance on political godfathers and godfatherism impedes political dividends and governance in Kaduna State. Therefore, the study recommended that political parties should implement transparent and democratic systems in candidate selection to eliminate the power of godfatherism Kaduna State and there should be Public Private Partnership Solution (PPPS) to address the problem of infrastructure in Kaduna State by National Orientation Agency (NOA).

Keywords: Challenges, godfatherism, infrastructural development, internal democracy, Kaduna.

Introduction

Godfatherism in Nigeria's politics has changed the aim, motive and preaching of democracy where citizens elect their representatives and their leaders by themselves but their representatives and leaders become an imposition of preferred candidates from the godfathers, godsons, stakeholders and gladiators through political tactics and strategies. Godfatherism is destroying the faith of the citizens, changes the system of governance and making the politicians

become more kleptocrats and thereby denying citizens and the electorates dividends of democracy such as good roads and quality water and this serves as great threat to democracy and socio economic stability of democratic governance.

Godfatherism and democracy of political party can be traced to Action Group (AG) in Nigeria. Internal democracy was one of the reasons that led to the collapse of first republic through military coup that resulted in the killing of late Samuel Ladoke Akintola and other notable politicians across the federation. Godfatherism between first premier of the western region, late Obafemi Awolowo, and the second premier of the western region, late Samuel Ladoke Akintola, ended up in the formation of another political party Nigerian National Democratic Party (NNDP) by Late Samuel Ladoke Akintola, and forming an alliance with Northern People's Congress (NPC) when he was expelled from the Action Group. This was the reasons why Wenibowel (2011) opined that political godfatherism at times ends up in violence and it endangers the sustainability of democratic society and Babayaro & Molid (2018) agreed that godfatherism is one of the major obstacles towards genuine democratisation and good governance in Nigeria.

Party funding and self-finance of the

godfathers or wealthy aspirant or greenhorn (godson) has cause troubles, tensions, rifts and uproar in Kaduna State and this had advert effect on internal democracy in the state. This was the reason why Osayi (2015) opined that godfatherism has taken its tool in the politics of the country thereby causing disaffection, disharmony, disunity and conflict among various political and interest groups. There is absence of strategies couple with absence of strong party policies that weaken internal democracy in the Edo State among the political parties when the wealthy aspirants taken over the whole process of internal democracy through the godfathers and other stakeholders and this lead to spill over effect of tensions and rifts among the godfathers, godsons, gladiators, party leaders and electorates (delegates and party executives).

Section 84 of the Electoral Act 2022 and 1999 Constitution of Federal Republic of Nigeria mandated all political parties to conduct, party primaries, congresses and convention to choose their party officials and their flag bearers during the general elections which serve as internal democracy within the stipulated period of time. It is obvious that direct primary was not imposed on the parties; it is the part parcel of strategies to strengthening democracy through genuine internal democracy. This was the reason why James (2011) opined that party primary

revealed candidates valences.

When there is political conflict, tensions, uproar and disaffection definitely infrastructural development such as construction of good roads and supply of quality water for the citizens will be seriously affected. Political godfathers build loyalties around themselves and use their influence to manipulate the rest of society and this cause advert effect of infrastructural development. Godfathers block the participation of others within their political sphere and dictate party candidate. They became powerful due to the important leadership positions they hold and their ability to mobilise grassroots support.

Statement of the problem

The power of godfather is so colossal to extent that the rule of law is not even prevailing in the practices of democracy in Nigeria. From all indications, godfatherism seems a major debacle to political stability in any given society because it involves the employment of all illegal means to achieve their political objectives during registration of voters and conduct of both primaries and general elections in the state cum the center.

The godfathers are usually involved in the snatching of ballot boxes and papers, killing of the opposition aspirants, falsification of election results,

motivating the godsons to embezzle public fund, hijacking public securities to intimidate electorates in various polling units all over the nation-state and using their political influence to bend the public policies. 2003 and 2007 general elections in Nigeria as illustration when the general election in some states was marked with electoral mal practices as a result of godfatherism.

The politics of godfatherism, which can be seen as mechanism for denies peaceful coexistence, law and order, and all the tenets of democratic process by obstructing candidate selection and even executive selection once government is established, has resulted in a transmutation of authoritarianism rather than democratic consolidation in Nigeria (Igbini & Okolie 2020:93).

Research Objectives

The general aim of the study is to examine the challenges of internal democracy on infrastructural development in Kaduna State while the specific objectives are to:

- i. assess the effects of imposition of candidates/surrogates on infrastructural developments in Kaduna State.
- ii. assess the extent to which godfatherism deny peaceful co-existence, rule of law and propel injustice amongst the party members in Kaduna State.

Research Questions

The study tended to answer the following research questions:

- i. Does imposition of candidates/surrogates affect infrastructural developments in Kaduna State?
- ii. To what extent does godfatherism deny peaceful co-existence, rule of law and propels injustice amongst the party members in Kaduna State?

Research Hypothesis

H0: There is no significant relationship between internal democracy and infrastructural development in Kaduna State.

Conceptual Clarification

1. Democracy

Dahl (2020) opined that large scale democracy requires elected officials, free, fare and frequent elections, freedom of expression, alternative sources of information, associational autonomy and inclusive citizenship. Basically, if democracy contains all these features according to Dahl (2020) it is obvious there will be no room for oppression and intimidation from relevant stakeholders in the course of politicking. Lewandowsky

et al., (2023) argued that democracy relies on a shared body of knowledge among citizens for example trust in elections and reliable knowledge to inform policy relevant debate. Democracy in the Nigeria content revolves around share of body of wealth, power and ego displaying during the internal democracy and other general election.

2. **Godfatherism**

Godfatherism has become an attribute of modern day according to Osayi (2015) in Nigeria democracy. He opines that godfatherism has taken its toll on the politics of the country thereby causing disaffection, disharmony, disunity and conflict among various political and interest groups. He emphasizes that the impact of godfatherism has further heightened political passivism and apartheidism, thus retarding Nigeria's democratic process. Basically, he explains that godfatherism is a game of power play and rivalry which often engenders political acrimony and tends to divest the people of democratic dividends.

3. **Infrastructure**

Nelson & Bigger (2022) traced the genealogies and geographies of infrastructural nature as a paradigm of investment that co-exist (sometimes tension) with extractives commonly regimes. The

nature of infrastructural is more than genealogies and geographies because nature of infrastructural can be traced to economics, anthropology, psychology and other social sciences related disciplined.

4. **Injustice**

Barnelt (2017) holds that the sense of injustice is powerful motivational conditions unlike the sense of justice which tends to be conceived in more abstract ways and tends to inspire contemplation rather than action. Injustice is a powerful motivational force that cut across all sectors of life in Nigeria. There is injustice during primaries election of political parties, there is injustice during the general elections and there is injustice even among the three arms of government.

5. **Internal democracy**

Ojukwu & Olaifa (2011) argued that internal democracy constitutes the main factor for the intra party wangling rocking the fabrics of the political parties. It is not only internal democracy that constitutes the main factors that rocking the political parties. Other factors rocking the political parties include environment, poverty, illiteracy and the role of opposition within and without the political parties. It is obvious that internal democracy can

be seen as putting into practice what the political parties are willing to preach, to showcase and does when they win the elections. Considering the internal democracy of most of the developing countries, party presidents fall into the cage of godfathers who masterminded the whole process of primary elections, congresses and conventions. In a nut shell, internal democracy means the participation of greater numbers of the citizenry in electing the leadership in elections.

6. Peaceful coexistence

Gusic (2022) argued that the plurality and subjectivity of peace means that transition from war are contested such as permeated by conflicts between previously warring antagonists who want to reorder post war society according to competing peace. He opined that while there is always exist mutually excluding peace such outlets do not foreclose middle grounds where multi peace can co exists. Without peace there can never be development. In any regime or government whether democracy or oligarchy peace is very germane to have and showcase real development. It is peace that gives room for minorities to have their way and say in any giving society. When there is no peace, conflict started and if the conflict is not well manage it

end up in war. Before war, hostility, tensions, uproar, dispute and counter disputes are other of the day. During the war, causality, lost of properties, lost of life, destruction and many more are the other of the day. After war, re habitation, reconstruction, rebuilding and reposition are the other of the day. It is obvious that there is nothing that good other than peaceful coexistence among the people, regime and government.

7. Rule of law

In the words of Stein (2019) emphasised that rule of law stipulated that it is more proper that law should govern than any one of the citizens. However, Ten (2017) emphasised that rule of law is closely related to the working of constitution. It apparent that the working and practice of Rule of law in developed countries such as USA and Britain cannot in any way comparable to the working and practice of Rule of law in developing countries such as Nigeria, Ghana and South Africa. Essentially, Rule of law is not the working of constitution in Nigeria as Ten (2017) stated.

Empirical Review

Osaghae (2024) wrote on unveiling threat to democracy: Godfatherism impact on Nigeria electoral integrity. He used

historical and contemporary methods to carry out his study. His finding was that there were manipulation of party structures and vote buying from the godfathers, godsons and other relevant stakeholders during the elections. His work focused more on impact of godfatherism on electoral integrity.

Ita (2021) wrote on godfather – driven crises and internal democracy in Nigeria’s political parties: A study of People’s Democratic Party (PDP) and All Progressive Party (APC). He used surveys and analytical methods to carry out his study. His study discovered that godfatherism had adverse effects on internal democracy and there were frequent changes in party leadership as a result of godfatherism. His did not specify any state of the federation whereas there are thirty states in the federation.

Ameh et al., (2025) wrote on political godfatherism as a catalyst for corruption and impunity in Nigeria. They used case study to carry out their study. Their findings included absence of judicial independence, weak anti corruption enforcement and non transparent political financing. The gap identified in their study is that their study focused more on how godfatherism serves as catalyst for corruption whereas there are other negative effects of godfatherism in Nigerian political life.

Chijioke (2024) wrote on godfatherism

and political parties financing in Nigeria; Analysis of the 2015 general elections. He used mixed methods approach to carry out his study. One of his findings was that godfatherism has become a kind of institutional strengthening and innovative funding mechanism for all political parties in Nigeria. One of the gaps identified is that his study used 2015 general election as case study whereas there were other general elections in Nigeria such as 1999, 2003, 2007, 2011, 2019 and 2023.

Adam & Oparah (2025) wrote on review the concept of godfatherism, constitution praxis democracy ascendancy in Nigeria. They used survey method to carry out their study. Their study discovered that there were legal loopholes in Nigeria that give rise to the trend of godfatherism and there was lack of democratic culture among the political parties and stakeholders in Nigeria. Essentially, their study indicated review and review atimes may not be enough to ameliorate the problem of godfatherism in Nigeria politics.

Ejoha et al., (2020) wrote on comparative analysis of political godfatherism and electoral credibility in Nigeria evidence from the 2015 – 2019. They used analytical method to carry out their study. Their finding was that, the activities of political godfathers manifest in various forms including sponsorship and endorsement of candidates. Their

study covered the period of 2015 – 2019 whereas the study on impact of godfatherism and internal democracy on infrastructural development in some selected states in Nigeria covered the period of 2014 - 2024 and some selected states are Edo and Kaduna States.

Dele et al., (2022) wrote on an assessment of the influence of political godfatherism on Nigeria's politics; Implications for socioeconomic and political development. They used qualitative method to carry out their study. Their finding was that politics of godfatherism has a negative impact on the socio economic and political development of the nation. The gap in their study is that there is other negative effect of godfatherism apart from socioeconomic and political development. The other negative effect is infrastructural development which is the major focus of the study on impact of impact of godfatherism and internal democracy on infrastructural development using Edo and Kaduna States.

Ekeocha et al., (2020) wrote on public infrastructural development and economic performance in Africa; A new evidence from panel data analysis. They used dynamic system GMM framework and Survey methods to carry out their study. Their finding was that there was aggressive and disaggregates infrastructural development indices in Africa. Also, their finding was that

public infrastructural development and economic performance in Africa had impacted positively on GDP per capita growth in Africa. The gap in their study is that godfatherism and internal democracy did not mention at all as factors contributed either negative or positive to the infrastructural development in Africa and their study is too wide using Africa as reference.

Mhlanca (2021) wrote on Artificial Intelligence in the industry 4. 0. and its impact on poverty, innovation, infrastructural development and the sustainable development goals lessons from emerging. He used content analysis and analytical methods to carry out his study. Finding from his study was that Artificial Intelligence has a strong influence on the advancement of sustainable development goals particularly on poverty reduction. The gap in his study is that Artificial Intelligence on infrastructural development may be tampered with by human factor and can be subjected to human error if the data input has been manipulated as a result of godfatherism and internal democracy which his study did not research on at all.

Abbas et al., (2025) wrote on mega infrastructure development, tourism sustainability and quality of life assessment at world heritage stesicatering to COVID 19 challenges. They used design and methodological approach to carry out

their study. Finding from their study was that sustainable tourism increases due to the positive effects of mega infrastructure development and positively impacts the locals' quality of life. Their study focused more on mega infrastructure development, tourism sustainability and quality of life assessment as a result of COVID 19 experienced. What happened before COVID 19 and after COVID 19 to mega infrastructure development is a fundamental question to be addressed for another researcher.

Fletcher et al., (2017) wrote on water supply infrastructure planning: Decision making framework to classify multiple uncertainties and evaluate flexible. They used analytical method to carry out their study. Their finding was that there are significant reductions in capital investment using flexible design. Why using flexible design on water supply infrastructural planning/? There is other infrastructure such as road construction which is one of the focus areas of the study on impact of godfatherism and internal democracy on infrastructural development in some selected states in Nigeria compared Edo and Kaduna States.

Olufemi et al., (2013) wrote on infrastructural development and its effect on economic growth: The Nigerian perspective. They used simple model of a planning with foreign investment and public infrastructure to carry out their

study. Their finding was that there was high poverty rate and unemployment rate as a result of infrastructural development in Nigeria perspective. The gap in their study is that, they studied infrastructural development and its effect on economic growth alone. Infrastructural development in Nigeria had advert effect on environmental and ecosystem pollution.

Srinivasa & Rao (2013) wrote on infrastructure development and economic growth: Prospects and perspective. They used descriptive and analytical methods to carry out their study. Their finding was that greater access to infrastructure will bring equitable development and social empowerment. The study on impact of godfatherism and internal democracy on infrastructural development in some selected states in Nigeria compared Edo and Kaduna States is not on economic growth but on road and water supply infrastructure.

Butko & Ivanova (2016) wrote on the modern trends of infrastructure development. They used qualitative method to carry out their study. Their finding was that transport related activities have many impacts on the environment. The gap in their study is that their study did not include godfatherism and internal democracy and they concentrated more on modern trend of infrastructural development.

Olaseni & Alade (2012) wrote on Vision 20:2020 and the challenges of infrastructural development in Nigeria. They used survey and descriptive methods to carry out their study. Their finding was that quantity and quality of infrastructure needed to propel a rapid economic development in society. The gap in their study is that, their study covered period of 2020. What will be the challenges of infrastructural development before and after 2020 is fundamental question to be addressed.

Prud home (2004) wrote on infrastructure and development. He used survey and analytical methods to carry out his study. His finding was that infrastructure leads to enlarge market and operating like the lowering of trade barrier. The gap in his study is that, infrastructural development always brings investors from nooks and crannies of the globe to showcase and transact their goods, services, businesses and products.

Kuncoro et al., (2024) wrote on the impact of road infrastructure development in ecosystems and communities. They used qualitative and quantitative methods to carry out their study. Their finding was that road construction improved accessibility and local economic growth. Also, their finding was that road construction causes pollutions, habitat disruption and changes in water flow patterns. Their study did not investigate water supply which is

one of the focus areas of study on impact of godfatherism and internal democracy on infrastructural development in some selected states in Nigeria compared Edo and Kaduna States.

Theoretical Framework

Infrastructural based economic development theory

This theory combined key policy inherited from Rooseveltian Progressive Tradition and Neo Keynesim Economics in the United States of America. Rephann & Isserman (2012) regarded the theory as infrastructure driven development. Nicolas & Vincent (2011) opined that a substantial proportion of a nations resources must be systematically directed towards long term assets such as transportation, energy and social infrastructure (schools universities and hospitals) in the name of long term economic efficiency. Aschaver (1990) formulated a model and in his model he sees a positive and statistically significant correlation between investment in infrastructure and economic performance. The model emphasis that infrastructural investment not only increases the quality of life but has positive impact on both labour and multi factors productivity. He opined that multi factor productivity to include variable in the output function not directly caused by the input, private and public capital. This implies the higher multi factor production the higher

economic output and hence higher growth rate and his production functions are $Y=F(K, G, N, Z)=ZKaGBN1aB$ Y = level of output, K = private fixed capital, G = level of government productive services, N =population or labour force, Z =index of technological progress a and B =constants determined by available technology. He argued that the level of per capita output is positively and significantly related to core infrastructure investment. He concluded that an increase in the core infrastructure investments leads to an increase in level of per capita output.

The theory lack credibility and faced enormous researches because how do we determine substantial proportion of nation resources and set it aside for long term infrastructure. The model can be only worked better in developed economy. The knowledge and understanding of infrastructure driven development theory helped the study to evaluate and assess infrastructural development in Edo and Kaduna States under gone proportional, even, just, uneven and unjust distribution. Is substantial proportion of Edo and Kaduna States resources set aside and directed towards infrastructural development by the State governments?

Methodology

Research designs for the study were analytical and descriptive research

types. Primary sources that used were questionnaire, structured interview and focus group discussion while secondary source of data were journals, text books and internets. The study population included State Party Executive of All Progressive Congress (APC) fifty (50); State Party Executive of People Democratic Party (PDP) forty seven (47); Local Government Executive APC thirty (30); Local Government Executive PDP thirty (30); Electorates APC thirty (30); Electorates PDP thirty (30); INEC eighteen (18); Academias thirty two (32), Civil Society twenty five (25) making a total population of two hundred and ninety two (292). Out of the population the study randomly samples State Party Executive of All Progressive Congress (APC) twenty two (22); State Party Executive of People's Democratic Party (PDP) twenty one (21); Local Government Executive APC fourteen (14); Local Government Executive PDP fourteen (14); Electorates APC fourteen (14); Electorates PDP thirteen (13); INEC seven (07) ; Academias twelve (12), Civil Society eleven (11) making a total of one hundred and twenty eight (128). Questionnaire were distributed to the selected samples and retrieved by the researcher using all avenues at his disposal. The avenues used to retrieve the questionnaire included physical contact and through on line engagements.

Respondents for the selected interview

for the study included party chairmen of All Progressive Congress (APC) and People's Democratic Party (PDP) four (4), party secretaries of All Progressive Congress (APC) and People's Democratic Party (PDP) four (4), senatorial leaders of All Progressive Congress (APC) and People's Democratic Party (PDP) three (3), religious leaders three (3) and traditional rulers three (3) making a total of seventeen (17). While respondents selected for the focus group discussion for the study included old and educated male and female ten (10), old and uneducated male and female ten (10), youth and educated male and female ten (10), and youth and uneducated male and female ten (10) making a total of forty (40).

Five research questions were raised to guide the study and questionnaires were distributed to answer the research questions. Instrument the study relied upon was questionnaire on impact of godfatherism and internal democracy on infrastructural development in Kaduna State, (COPPIDOIDIKSQ) and it was used to collate data from the respondents. The face and content validity test of the instrument was determined by Seniors Political Scientists and Statisticians in Kwara State University Malete.

Data in this research was presented in tables. A five-point Likert scale was used in the following manner: Strongly Agreed (SA), Agreed (A), Undecided (UD),

Disagreed (D), and Strongly Disagreed (SD). The responses on a five-point scale were measured at 3.0 levels. Items of research questions with a mean response of 3.0 and above were accepted while any item with a mean response below 3.0 was rejected. The descriptive and inferential statistics on the collected data provide information such as frequency, simple percentage, and statistical tools. In the analysis of data presentation, a Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 2.0 was utilized for the data analysis.

Empirical Analysis

Table 1. Effects of imposition of candidates on infrastructural developments in Kaduna State

S/N	Statements	SA	A	SD	D	N	Total	Aggregate Response
1	There is the diversion of public funds by godsons to godfathers.	52 47.2%	32 29.1%	8 7.3%	7 6.4%	11 10%	110 100%	Strongly Agreed
2	Rifts and tensions between the godfather and godson during the internal democracy seriously affected infrastructural projects.	31 28.2%	39 35.5%	23 20.9%	13 11.8%	4 3.6%	110 100%	Agreed
3	Godfathers in the State have failed to showcase and transact their political ideologies that can help transform the entire state.	43 39.1%	35 31.8%	17 15.5%	10 9.1%	5 4.5%	110 100%	Strongly Agreed
4	Self-finance by godfathers or godsons limits the capability of political parties during internal democracy.	39 35.5%	31 28.2%	19 17.3%	12 10.9%	9 8.1%	110 100%	Strongly Agreed

Source: Researcher's Field Survey 2025

On whether there is a diversion of public funds by godsons to godfathers. Data collected revealed that, 52 (47.2%) + 32 (29.1%) = 84 (76.3%) agreed, while 8 (7.3%) + 7 (6.4%) + 11 (10%) = 26 (23.7%) disagreed. These results demonstrate that, because elected politicians are still financially dependent on their sponsors, political godfatherism facilitates corruption by diverting public funds. Also, Respondent 11Kd is of the opinion that, godfatherism is manoeuvring and manipulating at all costs to fix a candidate into a position of leadership. (FGD, Fieldwork 2025).

Respondent 8 argued there are godfathers that want everything at all costs and such

godfathers will not bring development especially good roads and quality water to the electorates. There are godfathers that have the love of citizens and the electorate in their mind and such godfathers will bring good roads and quality water to them. (Fieldwork Interview, 2025). On whether rifts and tensions between godfathers and godsons during internal democracy seriously affect infrastructural projects: Data collected revealed that, 31 (28.2%) + 39 (35.5%) = 70 (63.7%) agreed, while 23 (20.9%) + 13 (11.8%) + 4 (3.6%) = 40 (36.3%) disagreed. These results show that disputes between political godfathers and their followers seriously impair infrastructure development and governance.

Table 2. The extent to which godfatherism denies peaceful co-existence, rule of law and propel injustice amongst the party members in Kaduna State.

S/N	Statements	SA	A	SD	D	N	Total	Aggregate Response
5	Godfatherism serves as one of the impediments to political dividends and good governance.	46 41.8%	39 35.5%	13 11.8%	8 7.3%	4 3.6%	110 100%	Strongly Agreed
6	The rights of the vast majority are being denied through disenfranchisement.	41 37.3%	35 31.8%	16 14.6%	13 11.8%	5 4.5%	110 100%	Agreed

S/N	Statements	SA	A	SD	D	N	Total	Aggregate Response
7	Wide spread of rigging, monetisation of politics and political thuggery.	48 43.6%	28 25.5%	15 13.6%	10 9.1%	9 8.2%	110 100%	Strongly Agreed
8	Godfathers and godsons do influence the security officials and INEC officials during party primaries.	39 35.5%	35 31.8%	13 11.8%	16 14.6%	11 10%	110 100%	Agreed

Source: Researcher's Field Survey 2025

On whether godfatherism serves as one of the impediments to political dividends and good governance: The quantitative results collected revealed that 46 (41.8%) + 39 (36.5%) = 85 (78.3%) agreed, while 13 (11.8%) + 8 (7.3%) + 4 (3.6%) = 25 (22.7%) disagreed. These results show that, godfatherism seriously impairs the provision of political dividends and good governance in Kaduna State. In support of the above position, Respondent 6Kd argued that, godfatherism is a system of politics where somebody serves another person as his leader or mentor. (Fieldwork Interview, 2025).

On whether the rights of the vast majority are being denied through disenfranchisement: The quantitative

results showed that 41 (37.3%) + 35 (31.8%) = 76 (69.1%) agreed, while 16 (14.6%) + 13 (11.8%) + 5 (4.5%) = 34 (30.9%) disagreed. These findings demonstrate that disenfranchisement remains a key issue in the political landscape of state and thereby compromising the democratic rights of citizens. It is imperative to take cognizant of the Focus Group Discussion (FGD) conducted with the participants from youth and educated when Respondent 5Kd explained that godfatherism denies peaceful co-existence, rule of law and injustice among the party members in Kaduna State. There is a flexing of political power between the godfather and godson and turns the state into uncondutive, unsafe and unstable for the

citizens. (FGD, Fieldwork 2025). This agreed with Ameh et al., (2025) when they emphasised that political godfatherism is a catalyst for corruption and impunity in Nigeria because of absence of judicial independence, weak anti corruption enforcement and non transparent political financing.

Discussion

The first objective is on the effect of candidate imposition on infrastructural development in Kaduna State. The results further support the claim that political parties' financial limitations encourage corruption, erode internal democracy and have an impact on infrastructure development and governance in Kaduna State. There is diversion of public funds from godsons to godfathers because the data shows that a sizable majority (more than 76% in the states) says that elected officials embezzle public funds to their sponsors. According to field interviews, these conflicts exacerbate underdevelopment by resulting in dilapidated roads, inadequate water supplies, and heightened poverty. Issues including postponed infrastructure projects, ineffective government, and the preference for political control over the general welfare were mentioned by respondents 8Ed.

The second objective is on impact of godfatherism on peaceful coexistence,

rule of law and injustice among party members in the Kaduna State. 78.3% of respondents think that godfatherism impedes political dividends and governance. Respondents interviewed say that godfatherism is a deceptive system that restricts the ability of godsons to make autonomous policy decisions by forcing them to stay faithful to their sponsors. Godfatherism results in voter rights violations and disenfranchisement, according to quantitative results 69.1% of respondents. Vote-buying, political violence, and electoral fraud were confirmed by 69.1% of respondents. During party primaries, 53.3% agreed that godfathers influence election organisations and security forces.

Hypothesis Testing

The hypotheses were tested using regression analysis and correlation. The strength of evidence in support of a null hypothesis is measured by the p-value. If the p-value is less than the significance level (0.05), the null hypothesis is rejected. If the p-value is greater than the significance level (0.05), the null hypothesis is accepted.

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between internal democracy and infrastructural development in Kaduna State.

Model Summary

Model	R	R-Square	Adjusted R-Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.604a	.365	.363	.38947	2.117

- a. Predictors: (Constant), AV_Godfatherism
- b. Dependent Variable: AV Infrastructural development

ANOVAa

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig (p-value)
Regression	28.247	1	28.247	186.451	2.117
Residual	49.875	49.875	.148		

Total 78.122 339

- a. Dependent Variable: AV Infrastructural development
- b. Predictors: (Constant), AV_Godfatherism

Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig (p-value)
	B	Std. Error	Beta	

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig (p-value)
Infrastructural development(- Constant)	2.103	.087		24.178
AV_Godfatherism	.425	.031	.604	2.103

a. Dependent Variable: AV_ Infrastructural development

According to the null hypothesis, godfatherism and infrastructural development in Kaduna State do not significantly correlate. Nonetheless, the ANOVA findings indicate a p-value of .000 and an F-value of 186.451, both of which are below 0.05. Furthermore, the R-Square value of .365 suggests that godfatherism accounts for 36.5% of the variance in imposition of candidates. The null hypothesis (H_{01}) is rejected since the p-value is less than 0.05. This means that there is a significant relationship between godfatherism and infrastructural development in Kaduna State.

Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis	Decision
H_{01} : There is no significant relationship between godfatherism and infrastructural development in Kaduna State.	Rejected (Significant relationship found)

Conclusion

Apparently, internal democracy among political parties were trouble by high cost of electoral campaign, insufficiency of party funding and financial constraint and this make godfatherism flourish in Kaduna State because the godfather, godson, stakeholder and other gladiator that release a huge sum of money for the conduct of primaries, congresses and general elections did at the expenses of getting maximum rewards and the rewards always cause trouble for infrastructural development. Fear of impeachment affects governance and policy implementation as governor prioritizes political survival over developmental goals. Internal democracy challenges within political parties contribute to frequent legal battles between political godfathers and their protégés in Kaduna State.

According to the respondents, political parties rely on self financing rather than institutional or public funding. Some area were neglected when godfathers championing real development to boost their morale and campaign though their objective is self enrichment which bring inadequate infrastructure and lack of basic services. Godfather, godson and other high ranking stakeholders provide a substantial amount of party funding and this affect internal democracy and infrastructural development. While Respondent 12Kd submitted that imposition of candidates or surrogates on

infrastructural development as residents in the state live through yearly difficulty on roads, lack of water and this resulted in water born diseases and unsafe drinking water and unpleasant taste, delay in completion of roads and disputes between the godfather and godson during the distribution of infrastructure and inefficiency of the legislative bargaining and under performance.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made to ameliorate challenges of internal democracy on infrastructural development in Kaduna State.

1. Regular political education, orientation and civic engagement from a body such as National Orientation Agency (NOA) and relevant agencies on good governance and internal democracy. Strengthen anti-corruption laws and enforcement through ICPC, EFFC and Code of Conduct Bureau.
2. Provision of infrastructure should not solemnly rest only on the shoulders of the governments of Kaduna State but rest on other relevant bodies such as Public Private Partnership Solution(PPPS) in the state and outside the states. Political parties should implement transparent and democratic systems in candidate selection to eliminate the power of

godfathers in Kaduna State.

3. Political parties and other relevant stakeholders in Kaduna State should provide platform for strong political institution and ideology that will reduce excessive influence of political godfathers and godsons. Building a strong political institution and ideology in Kaduna State will give room for genuine internal democracy and destroy any influence from the godfathers or godsons.
4. Making and enforcement of laws to enhance infrastructural development: The members of State Assembly in Kaduna State should consider the making and enforcement of laws relating to enhance infrastructural development as an urgent of priority and necessity to make life bearable for their citizens.
5. Develop long-term strategies for sustainable infrastructure development: Instead of focusing on short term strategies for sustainable infrastructure development, Kaduna State should concentrate more on long term strategies for sustainable infrastructure development. This will give room for long term planning towards infrastructure development. For example roads that want to be constructed to last for five years when putting long term

strategies into consideration will be constructed and lasted for twenty years.

References

- Abbas, J., Mamirkulva, G., & Sulaifi, I. A. (2025). Mega infrastructure development, tourism sustainability and quality of life assessment at world heritage stesticatering to COVID 19 challenges. *Kybernetes*, 54, (14).
- Adam, E. M., & Oparah, C. O. (2025). Review the concept of godfatherism, constitution praxis democracy ascendancy in Nigeria. *African Journal of Law and Human Rights*, 9, (1)
- All Progressive Congress (APC) Constitution (2014)
- Ameh, S. O., Anande, T. J. & Nnani, E. (2025). Political godfatherism as a catalyst for corruption and impunity in Nigeria. *Educational Research (IJMCER)*, 7, (2)
- Babayaro, S., & Molid, A. (2018). Godfatherism and political party financing in Nigeria: Analysing the 2015 general election. *Geografic*, 14 (1).
- Barnelt, C. (2017). *The priority of injustice: Locating democracy in critical theory*. GA University of Georgia Press.
- Butko, M., & Ivanova, N. (2016). The modern trends of infrastructure development. *Baltic (1) Journal of Economic Studies*. 2, (3).
- Chijioke, O. P. (2024). Godfatherism and political parties financing in Nigeria; Analysis of the 2013 General Elections. *Madonna University Journal of Social and Management Sciences*, 1, (1).
- csc.kadunastate.gov.ng
- Dele, I., Waki, I. M., & Ikpi, A. K. (2022). An assessment of the influence of political godfatherism on Nigeria's politics; Implications for socio economic and political development. *African Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Reserarsch*, 5, (2).
- Dahl, R. A. (2020). *On democracy*, New Haven London, Yale University
- Ejoha, M. O., Ogoh, A. O., & Yusufu, A. A. (2020). Comparative analysis of political godfatherism and electoral credibility in Nigeria evidence from the 2015 – 2019. *African Journal of Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 14, (4).
- Ekeocha, D. O., Ogbuabor, J. E. , & Orji, A. (2020). Public infrastructural development and economic performance in Africa; A new evidence from panal data analysis. *Economic change and restructuring*, 5, (2).
- Federal Republic of Nigeria, (1999).

- 1999 Constitution, Lagos: Government Publisher.
- Fletcher, S. M., Miotti, M., & Swaminathan, J. (2017). Water supply infrastructure planning: Decision making framework to classify multiple uncertainties and evaluate flexible design. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 143, (10).
- Gusic, I. (2022). Peace between peace? Urban peace and the coexistence of antagonists in city Space. *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*. 16, (5).
- Igbini, D. M., & Okolie, U. C. (2020). Godfatherism and its treat to the Nigeria's nascent democracy. *Journal of Public Administration, Finance and Law*.17.
- Ita, V. E. (2021). Godfather – Driven crises and internal democracy in Nigeria's political parties: A study of People's Democratic Party (PDP) and All Progressive Party (APC). *Akpa Campus*.
- Kuncoro, E., Wurarch, R. N., & Eran, I. E. (2024). The impact of road infrastructure development on eco systems and communities. *Social, Ecology Economy for Sustainable Development Goals Journal*. 1, (2).
- James, M. S. (2011), Electoral selection with parties and primaries. *American Journal of Political Science* 55, (4).
- Lewandowsky, S., Ecker, UKH & Cook, J. (2023). Misinformation and the epistemic integrity of democracy, *Correct Opinion in Psychology*, Elsevier 101, (7).
- Mhlanca, D. (2021). Artificial Intelligence in the industry 4. 0. and its impact on poverty, innovation, infrastructural development and the sustainable development goals lessons from emrging. *Sustainability* 13, (1).
- Nelson, S. H., & Bigger, P. (2022). Infrastructural nature. *Progress in Human Geography*, 46, (1).
- Ojukwu, C. C., & Olaiifa, T. (2011). Challenges of internal democracy in Nigeria's political Parties: The base of intra party conflicts in the People's democratic Party of Nigeria. *Global Journal of Human Social Sciences*, 11, (3).
- Olaseni, M., & Alade, W. (2012). Vision 20 ; 2020 and the challenges of infrastructural (1) Development in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development*. 5, (2).
- Olufemi, E. A., Olatubosun, A. J., & Olaleye, S. O. (2013). Infrastructural development and its effect on econom-

- ic growth: *The Nigerian perspective*. (1).
European Scientific Journal
9, (31).
- Osaghae, G. O. (2024). Unveiling threat to democracy: Godfatherism impact on Nigeria electoral integrity. *Frontline Social Sciences and History Journal* 4, (3).
- Osayi, F. O. (2015). Regressive democracy: The monstrous role of godfatherism in Nigeria. *International Journal of politics and good governance* 6 (6.2)
- People's Democratic Party (PDP) Constitution (2007)
- Prud Homme, R. (2004). Infrastructure and development. World Bank
- Rephann, T., & Isserman, A. (2012). New highway as economic development tools, *West Virginia University Regional Research Institute*, 3, (7).
- Srinivasa, E., & Rao, P. S. (2013). Infrastructure development and economic growth: Prospects and perspective. *Journal of Business Management and Social Sciences Research*. 2, (2) . pp. 81-89
- Section 84, Electoral Act (2022)
- Stein, R. A. (2019). What exactly is the Rule of Law? *Huston Law Review*. 57,
- Ten, C. (2017). *Constitutionalism and the Rule of Law: A companion to contemporary Political Philosophy*. John Wiley and Sons Limited
- Wenibowel, K. (2011). Political godfatherism, violence and sustainable democracy in Nigeria, *International Journal of Advanced Legal Studies and Governance*. Hein Online.