

---

**INTRA-PARTY FEUD AND ELECTORAL PROCESS IN NIGERIA: A STUDY OF THE PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN KANO STATE, 2015 – 2019.**

**Sani UMAR Rijiyar Zaki**

Federal University, Dutse

[Saniumar45@yahoo.com](mailto:Saniumar45@yahoo.com)

**Yahaya T. BABA, PhD**

Department of Political Science

Usmanu Danfodiyo University, Sokoto

[tkbabayaha@yahoo.com](mailto:tkbabayaha@yahoo.com)

&

**Nuhu MUKHTAR Nuhu**

Department of Social Sciences

Rabi'u Musa Kwankwaso College of Advanced & Remedial Studies,

Tudun-wada, Kano

[nuhumnuhu@yahoo.com](mailto:nuhumnuhu@yahoo.com)

---

---

**Abstract**

The paper investigates the nature and dimensions of intra-party feud in the Kano State chapter of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) and its implications on the electoral process in the state. It is assumed that limited internal party democracy instigates and exacerbates intraparty feud, which culminates into the militarization of the electoral process. One of the common features of political parties in Nigeria's has been the centralization of decision-making of parties. Thus, important decisions such as party congresses, candidates' selection and funding are centralized in the hands of few influential patrons, big men or holders of executive power. This has over time been responsible for incessant crisis and feud across the major parties in the country. The rampant defection and party switching by politicians are largely explained in the context of uncontrollable intraparty feud. The Kano State chapter of the PDP has, over-time, experienced some of the most dramatic intraparty feuds in the country and the 2015 and 2019 election circles indicate the enormity and severity of this crisis. This, indeed, justifies the scope of this paper. The paper is guided by the elite theory. It relied on qualitative approach by employing in-depth interviews and focus group discussions as the major methods of data collection. Documentary sources were also used to corroborate the empirical data. The PDP major stakeholders and officials of the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) are the major respondents. The findings revealed that egocentrism of the politicians especially, party leadership, is one of the major causes of the intra-party feud in the party. The findings also revealed that the intra-party feud has contributed

immensely to the defection of members of PDP. The feud at initial stage made the party to remain in disarray and subsequently leading to factions and finally it ended up in leadership feud. The study recommended that the Independent National Electoral Commission should take serious supervisory measures to ensure that various political parties are adhering to internal democratic principles with a view to protecting the rights of the ordinary members. It is also recommended that the aggrieved individual and groups should be insisting on legal redress rather engaging in conflict or quitting the party. This will serve as deterrence as well as safeguarding the democratic integrity.

**Keywords:** Intra-party feud, Democracy, Political parties, Political feud, Militarization

---

### **Introduction**

Intra-party feud in Nigeria is a phenomenon that is crippling Nigerian politics and democracy. The process of party primaries, candidate nomination and selection, party executive selection, and taking major decisions are found to be faulty and undemocratic in nature in most political parties in Nigeria's Fourth Republic (Okhaide, 2012). The phrase intra-party feud is a concept coined to all the contention tussles and wrangling between and among members within a political party that is inimical to normal nomination and or election of party flag bearers (Jude & Ika, 2013). Intra-party feuds have characterized the Nigerian politics since pre-independence in various dimensions and ramifications (Jude & Ika, 2013; Toyin, 2014; Awofeso & Irabor, 2016). However, the pattern and nature of the feud in the Fourth Republic have become more pronounced and worrisome particularly among the members of major political parties.

The extent to which intra-party feud has affected the electoral process and democracy in Nigeria is so great. Vested elites' interests have led to violation on constitutional provisions and manipulation of party rules and regulations in the country leading to actions and reactions that are retarding democratization. Moreover, the interplay between intra-party feud, candidate selection and party primary elections are borne out of the incompatible interests catalyzed by selfish nature of individuals. The institutional structures have been enacted to avert feud within political parties but non-adherence to the dictates of such structures have birthed a wide range of intra-party feud, thus resulting to cases of defection, fictionalization, proliferation of political parties, unconstitutional change of party leaders and most importantly, the defeat of the ruling party in 2015 Nigerian general election (Adetayo and Abulrauf, 2017).

In the PDP which governed the country for sixteen (16) years (1999-2015), the intra-party culminating into many serious feuds such as decamping that led to the defeat of the party as the ruling power in the 2015 Presidential Election (Sule & Yahaya, 2018). It is argued that intra-party feud and limited internal democracy were some of

the major factors that led to the loss of the People's Democratic Party (PDP) in the election (Adibe, 2015; Paden, 2015). Two political parties have dominated the political terrain of Kano State since the Nigeria's return to democracy in May 1999. These political parties were the PDP and All People's Party (APP), which later metamorphosed to All Nigeria People's Party (ANPP) on one hand, and the PDP and All Progressive Congress (APC) on the other. The PDP therefore, was able to sway the gubernatorial seat in Kano and more than 80% of all other elective positions such as the three Senatorial seats, House of Representatives and State Assemblies, during the 1999 General Elections. The success recorded by the PDP against its major opponent, the APP, was significantly due to the composition of three major pre-existing political groups in Kano which took their precedence during the democratization process initiated by former military dictator Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida (*This Day Newspaper*, 2002).

However, the new trend of political power tussle and transformations between the two political giants, who monopolise the politics of Kano since 1999 (Kwankwaso and Shekarau) was nearly to take new dimension in the intra-party feud as they coincidentally find themselves under one political party (APC). According to Sa'idu (2013), with the defection of Kwankwaso to the opposition All Progressive Congress (APC), their long sustained polarised political warfare was on its way out, but the question remains whether the two political rivals can live under the same political roof. As rightly predicted, a particular constitutional opening of the APC gave a prelude to political tension between the supporters of the two giant politicians in Kano. The constitution of the mega party gave a sitting governor the status of party leader at the state level. This APC's constitutional provision was the source of disaffection among the supporters of the then Kano's incumbent governor and his predecessor. While Kwankwaso's supporters were proudly pronouncing their principal as the one to who was to take over the structures of his new party, Shekarau's supporters were wondering how possible would it be for someone who had laboured to build his house only for it to be forcefully taken over by an 'intruder'.

After series of feud between the two actors, Shekarau predictably defected to the PDP and was immediately appointed as minister of education by the former president Goodluck Jonathan. His defection was interpreted as a strategic move by the PDP to win in Kano State during the 2015 General Elections. Analysts regarded the 2015 General Elections in Kano State as purely a battle of political supremacy between Shekarau and Kwankwaso, who were all out at that time to test their popularity. While the former fielded Mal. Salihu S. Takai to run for the gubernatorial seat under the PDP, the latter, completing his tenure, backed his deputy, Dr. Abdullahi Umar Ganduje, on the platform of the APC. Eventually Shekarau lost the battle, following a humiliating defeat the PDP suffered by losing almost everything to the APC in the State. Therefore, the research's objective is to examine the causes of the intra-party feud and electoral process in Nigeria and specifically in the Kano

---

State chapter of the People's Democratic Party PDP and how this militarized the electoral process in the state.

### **Conceptual and Theoretical Framework**

#### **i. Democracy**

Democracy embodies fundamental human rights such as freedom of expression, right to life and dignity of the human person, right to personal liberty, right to fair hearing, right to freedom of thought, consciences, religion, press, peaceful assembly and association, movement, political participation. In another sense, democracy refers to the control of an organization by its members, who take part in the making of the decisions. In other words, democracy implies majority rule and respect for fundamental rights of the people. However, it is also important to note that elections are not only meant to ensure the legitimacy of the government through a regular consent, but also to provide a fertile ground for democracy to thrive (Ogundiya & Baba, 2007).

Democracy is defined as a continuous process of promoting equal access to fundamental rights. According to Sam (2014), democracy cannot be negotiated as a new bargain to developing nations, rather it has to be richer than the liberal model, and should be capable of leading to a development strategy that is homegrown, people-centred and oriented towards eradicating poverty. In the same vein, Ake (2001) argued that, the real democratic culture that can bring about real development in Africa is the one sustained by economic and political development based on centralization of power and reliance on indigenous communities to provide some refuge from the centralized state.

Therefore, democracy, in this research, refers to a process of creating an enabling environment in both the polity and economy that allows people at all levels to exercise control and authority over their own affairs and improve their existence without the intrusion of the state, terror and counterproductive policies. Where these pillars of democracy are firmly in place, they should lead to the institutionalization of a democratic government. Essentially, democracy is a form of government in which supreme power is vested in the people collectively and is administered by them or by officers appointed by them. It is a state characterized by recognition of equality of rights and privilege for all people.

#### **ii. Political Party**

Political parties are seen as important in establishing a viable democratic experience in a polity with representative democracy. They are the gatekeepers and major determinants of functional democratic system. Being the bedrock of democracy, they help to stabilize the political system (Kura, 2011). Some of the functions of political parties include governance, representation, policy making and execution, interest aggregation and articulation, peaceful change of government, making government effective and responsive (opposition parties' function also as pressure groups), accountability, as well as other general social and integration functions. In sum,

wherever a political party exists, it tends to perform common but necessary functions for economic, social, political and judicial development. Therefore, according to Kura (2011), political parties in a democratic system are expected to perform the role of recruiting and training of their members in order to aggregate diverse opinions in a society.

Political parties are the engine rooms and the pillars of democratic rule which provide platforms for electioneering process and other political activities. Political parties are conceived as the conglomeration of men who share the same ideology, principles and political views and strive to acquire power in order to promote their ideas at the governmental level (Johari, 2012). Many scholars like Lowell (1913), Schumpeter (1942), Michel (1965), Duverger (1966) and Sartori (1987) identified political parties as a group or collection of few people who designed policies and rules of conduct for the large crowd of people who have the same interest with them. Other scholars like Appadorai (2004) and Kapur (2009) and also identified political parties as a group of ideologically assembled men with the same principles who seek to promote their interest at governmental level by involving themselves in political activities. Hence, political parties played important roles in democratic process such as representation, opposition, enlightenment recruitment and training of leaders, harmonizing different interests, providing alternative choice framework, and social services to the society.

Generally, political parties are formed by groups of like-minded individuals who are interested in shaping society in a particular direction. Political Parties are expected to recruit and mobilize members which subscribe to their world views and motivations; recruit leaderships and train them for governance. So, political parties are among the critical political institutions that enhance democratic governance. The history of political parties in Nigeria dates back to 1922, with the introduction of electoral principle and the attendant granting of franchise for participation in electoral politics to Lagos and Calabar. The granting of the franchise led to the formation of the Nigerian National Democratic Party (NNDP) in 1923 and subsequently in 1938, to the formation of the Nigerian Youth Movement (NYM). Their influence barely extended beyond the immediate environment of Ibadan and Lagos (Simbine, 2014).

### **iii. Political Feud**

According to Weber (1971), a political feud is any action-oriented internally carried out by a political actor to pursue his/her will against the resistance of other actors. He further asserted that a party crisis (feud) is the process that is natural of social reality. For Coser (1966), social conflict is a struggle over status, power and scarce resources in which the aims of the group in crises are not only to gain the desired value but also to neutralize, injure or eliminate rivals. Generally speaking, feud entails struggle and rivalry for objects to which individuals and groups attach values. In view of this, political feud is informed by political conflict. At the extreme, it involves the use of machetes, rifles, clubs and guns to cause destruction.

Duverger (1980) observed that in political struggle, when men and organizations are in crisis, they tend to employ different kinds of weapons. The instruments they employ are absolutely influenced by the type of society, the type of government, the composition of groups in conflict as well as the period of history. Once feud turns violent, it becomes detrimental to the growth and stability of the system. In tandem with this, Azeez (2005) argued that violent conflict is a particular kind of interaction marked by efforts at hindering rivals. Therefore, feud (whether politically, religiously or ethnically motivated) are means of identifying the imperfection of a plural society and of suggesting remedies to remove or solve the problems of inequality, marginalization, exploitation, misuse of majoritarian democracy and national government in a prejudicial manner.

For Waltz (1971), one may see feud absolutely everywhere depending on perspective and definition. He submitted that at the level of event when those who featured in an event exhibit incompatibility as they interact, then, obviously, the parties could be said to be in feud. Speaking further, Waltz noted that the term "conflict" may be applied to struggles of wider effects, that is, struggles that have important consequences for some larger organizations. To him, conflicts that promise damage, not only to the contenders but also to the system are most terrible. In a democratic set up, feud among competitive party members may turn into political violence involving the use of undemocratic means such as thugs to achieve their desired political goal.

#### **iv. Elite Theory**

This theoretical approach (elite theory) elucidates power relationships in the modern society. Some of the proponents of the theory who had contributed immensely to its development are: Vilfredo Pareto, Gaetano Mosca, Robert Michels, James Burnham, Floyd Hunter and Wright C. Mills. Others include, Thomas R. Dye, William G. Domhoff and Robert D. Putnam. The theory postulates that a small group of people which can be found in the economic, policy planning and military institutions of the state is vested with overriding power. Thus, the theory is based on two main sets of ideas, principles or assumptions on the concept of structure and exercise of power. Firstly, that power lies in those in position of authority in key economic, political and military institutions. Secondly, that the psychological difference that sets apart political elite from non-elite is that they have personal resources, for instance, intelligence, skills and vested interest in government (Mills, 1956 cited in Ekundayo, 2017). The theory posits that a small minority, consisting of members of the economic elite, policy planning networks and military institutions, holds most power in any society. According to the theory, the small group of people with overriding power is referred to as the political elite. It is a group of people with exceptional abilities in politics and great monopoly of power. These so-called power elite abound in all societies and they always have the exceptional ability to secure power, perpetuate it and rule (Friedrich, 2014; Okonofua, 2013).

Some of the limitations or weaknesses of the theory include that the theory is opposed to pluralism and also contradicts state autonomy theory. Elite is anti-

democratic and views democracy as a fraud and a utopian ideal. It does not depend upon the majority or the willingness of a sufficient part of the citizenship to ensure accountability and transformation of the elite through free, fair and credible election. Rather, it relies upon the virtue and other standards of self-appointed political elite for securing responsible conduct to perpetuate or maintain power. The theory is also oligarchical and has been severally and severely criticized for its tacit support for selfish use of power by a few. Only the minority elite group is favored by the theory at the expense of the non-elite majority. Elite theory abhors equality and thrives more on inequality. It is therefore predicated on the inequalities that exist among the people and in the various segments of the society (Ekundayo, 2017). Lastly, the theory has been criticized as more normative than empirical in content and intent. It therefore does not easily lend itself to empiricism and science of politics within the party.

In spite of the foregoing analysis on the limitations/weaknesses of the theory in its application, it can be said to be applicable and relevant to the intra-party feud and the electoral process in Nigeria and specifically the intra-party feud in the Kano State chapter of the People's Democratic Party PDP 2015 – 2019. On a general note, party elites in Nigeria devise a variety of methods for maintaining themselves perpetually in power through re-cycling of leaders, elite circulation or perpetuation of regimes, contrary to the belief or assumption that there is the possibility of a gradual and continuous expansion of the party elite. The power elites are present in any society or party, no matter how small or large, old or new, the society or party is. For instance, the power elite has been identified with those occupying key positions in the economic, political party and military institutions in any country as in the United States of America. In the case of Kano PDP, the powers are subsumed in the hands of few and their collaborators. However, the power elite have remained dominantly as the party aristocratic class, which exercises overriding power in Kano PDP through party activities. Apart from the foregoing assertion, an attempt is further made in this study to clearly illustrate and investigate how this affects democratic stability in Kano.

### **Methodology**

The study uses both qualitative methods in collecting primary data and secondary data from a representative sample of target population. Focus Group Discussion and In-depth Interview are used to complement each other in collecting data for the study. Therefore, to ensure the quality of the findings are in tandem with the objectives of the study, focus group discussion (FGD) and in-depth interview were used to generate the primary data from the two sets of respondents, which includes the PDP Party elders and, leaders at both state and local government levels, PDP candidates that contested elections, Civil societies organization and INEC officials. Purposive sampling technique was used in the selection of respondents because it has to do with the selection of the respondents' based on the prerequisite knowledge for addressing the study's problem. This is considered very relevant and has provided information by virtue of various roles they play as party members and

stakeholders in Kano State politics. As such, to avoid zoning bias, the respondents were selected from the three Senatorial Districts of the State that is, Kano Central, Kano North and Kano South.

**Table 1: Respondents for In-depth Interview**

S/No	Designation	Frequency
1.	State Party Elders	3
2.	State Party Executives	4
3.	Gubernatorial Contestants/Aspirants	3
4.	Members of Civil Society Organizations	3
5.	INEC Official	1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>

**Source:** Field Survey, 2021

Six (6) FGDs were conducted consisting of nine (9) participants per each making fifty-four (54) participants. The six sessions of the FGDs were conducted in the following six (6) local governments purposively selected among the three senatorial zones in the state Rogo, Takai, Gabasawa, Tofa, Fagge, and Ungogo Local Governments Areas. The analysis of data was qualitatively done and were arranged according to each theme and presented in a narrative manner, submerged and interpreted on the bases of sub-themes.

### Findings

The PDP as a political party started strongly in Kano State. It won 38 out of the 44 local government seats in the December 5, 1998 Local Government Election in the state. It also won majority of the National and State Assemblies seats as well as the Governor of the state in 1999. The party was however engulfed with feud in the build up to 2003 General Elections. It is argued that candidates and party executive selection process contributed to the feud and electoral process within the party. Table 2 shows the views of the respondents on the major causes of intra-party feud in the PDP chapter of Kano State.

**Table 2: Main Causes of the Intra-party Feud in the PDP, Kano State Chapter**

Sub-themes	Dimension	Frequency	Percentage
Party egoistic decision	Party related	12	17.65
Selfishness	Individual related factor	8	11.76
Clash of interest	Individual related factor	11	16.18
Violation of party's constitution	Party related factor	8	11.76
Injustice of party leadership	Party related factor	8	11.76
Election misconduct by the party executive	Party related factor	9	13.24
Misconduct of party executive during primaries	Party related factor	12	17.65



<b>Total</b>		<b>68</b>	<b>100%</b>
--------------	--	-----------	-------------

**Source:** Field Survey, 2021

It can be seen from Table 2 that the aggregate views of respondents show that there are about seven different factors responsible for intra-party feud that engulfed the PDP in Kano State. The result indicates that 7.65% of causative factors of intra-party feud are related to party itself while 11.76 involved party members themselves. Therefore, the themes that emerged from the responses include (1) egocentrism (2) constitutional violation and (3) misconduct in the election of party official and primaries.

A major take-away from the findings is the centrality of egocentrism of the politicians and their clash of interest in intra-party feud and disruption of electoral process of the party. Egocentrism usually arises during election of party officials and party flag bearers for general elections. Accordingly, the party uses consensus or direct election to select aspirants. As submitted by R1,

Intra-party feud and ... are often brought about due to our day-to-day activities. To be candid, in every party there are two ways in which leaders or candidates emerge. First is the consensus method, where the party members come together and declare a person that they felt is competent as the consensus candidate. When such occurs, some members may take another route, which to them is the only solution. In some instances, some party members may say the consensus decision is egoistic and sometimes they are right. This is where most party feuds start from.

Another factor that bred intra-party feud in the party is the violation of the party's constitutional provision which is tantamount to misconduct on the part of the concerned party officials or members. The constitution of each party spells out how the party could be managed but sometimes party leadership in collaboration with heavy weights, in the party may decide to abandon the provision and allow interest and selfishness to override the mechanism set in the party constitution. On this, R5 stated that: "Whenever there's a misunderstanding in politics or even our daily life generally, the lone reason is selfishness. If you come and meet a set of people being governed by a rule, and you come up with an idea to satisfy your whim, it is the beginning of feud". Similarly, R6 opined that: "What usually causes feud in the party is vested interest during election of party executives and party candidates during elections. It is during that period one would see various feud emerging with different outlooks".

The summation of the respondent's views on the nature and causes of intra-party feud in Kano State chapter of the PDP represents a set of interrelated issues; including antagonism, open confrontation, colossal failure, insubordination, and rejection of candidate among others. This corroborates the argument of Okoli (2001) who argued that factors responsible for intra-party crises are: personality difference, clash of socio-economic interests, and ideological incompatibility.

**Table 3: Intra-party Feud and Defection in PDP Kano State Chapter**

Sub-themes	Dimension	Frequency	Percentage
Throwing the party into oblivion	Party related	19	27.94
Creation of factions	Party related	14	20.59
Disharmony/unity among members	Individual	20	29.41
Leadership crisis	Leadership	15	22.06
<b>Total</b>		<b>68</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Source:** Field Survey, 2021

The results of the analysis of the respondents' responses show that 49% of their views relates to the party, while 51% goes to party members and leadership. Therefore, the themes that emerged from the responses includes (1) Disarray (2) factions (3) segregation and (4) leadership crisis. The findings from the analysis indicate that intra-party feud has contributed immensely to the defection of members from PDP to other parties. The feud at initial stage made the party to remain in disarray and subsequently leading to factions and finally it ended up in members leaving the party to other parties. As opined by R1, intra-party feud is the most difficult crisis to manage in the major political parties in Nigeria. In his words, Intra-party feud is the most difficult crisis to manage. It's better to be in confrontation with an opposition party no matter its strength than to have even a minor feud inside your party. Intra-party feud has thrown many parties into oblivion. Whenever there is feud within a party, some members begin to defect to other parties. Consequently, if care is not taken, the party may lose the elections as witnessed in many local government areas of Kano State.

Similarly, R17 averred that: "The consequences of the intra-party feud may lead the party to failure in election, as it can be seen now. It would also make the party to loss supporters. On the other hand, some members will not defect but they will be creating problems for the party from within".

In the same vein, R15 and R18 unanimously, opined that:

Truth be told, this feud has contributed in the defection of members, because assuming you are strong and optimistic and eventually begin to lose your lieutenants, one would become weak. The situation the PDP found itself in Kano made Aminu Dabo, Prof. Hafizu, Bala Gwagwarwa Mal. Salihu Sagir Takai and a host of others defect to other parties, which has adversely contributed in the defeat of the party during the polls. The feud has compelled some members to leave the party while some have stayed in the party but engaged in anti-party activities and others have defected to parties that they felt their dreams can be actualized.

As we can see from Table 3, which shows the respondents' views on the connection between intra-party feud and defection of members from the party, incessant defection from one party to another is mostly due to the failure of the many members to manage their grievances. Whenever there is intra-party feud, some members would begin to defect to the other political parties. For instance, between 1999 and 2013 over 13 Senators and 35 House of Representatives members dumped

the PDP to other parties, most notably the APC. The most remarkable defection that was witnessed prior to 2015 General Elections was when five governors defected to the APC. Additionally, Mbah (2011) and Onyishi (2015) outlined the cases of feud born of defection from PDP both within the executives, legislature and other members of the party.

### **Discussion of Findings**

A number of issues were identified as the causative agents of intra-party feud in the PDP of Kano State since its inception in 1998. Such issues include among others; vested interests, egocentrism among the elites, violation of constitutional provisions by party leaders (believed to be guided remotely by their god-fathers) as they relate to internal democracy and administration of justice among party faithful, and manipulation of party constitution and the INEC guidelines on the appropriate procedure for leadership transition of party officials. Egocentrism as indicated above is found to be a serious issue among the high-profile politicians, and as such, causes internal crisis within the party. This situation has been strongly associated with the historical foundation of the PDP in Kano State.

Most of the respondents are of the opinion that the processes of transition of party leadership and that of primary elections are the primary sources of intra-party feud, which continues to put the party in the status of opposition. There are two legally acceptable ways of determining the party leaders and candidates who contest for various elective posts against other candidates from different political parties. Firstly, is to conduct an election among various party candidates within the party through the pre-determined means as suggested by the party's constitution. Secondly, the party may seek the consent of majority stakeholders to determine candidates through consensus. In so many instances, some party members happened to say that the consensus decision is egoistical and unjust, and this is where most of the PDP feuds start as far as Kano is concerned.

Another factor that fuelled intra-party feud in Kano PDP, according to the study's findings, is the violation of party's constitutional provision which amounts to misconduct on the part of concerned officials or members. The Constitution of PDP spells out how the party's affairs, especially as they relate to internal democracy and leadership transition should be conducted. Thus, sometimes party leadership, in collaboration with heavy-weights in the party, used to abandon the constitutional regulations and eventually allow vested interest to override the mechanism set in the party constitution. This, is evidently proven by the responses of some of the respondents. Such feuds were widely believed to be the main factor that caused PDP to lose the Governorship Election in Kano State in the 2003 and 2007 General Elections.

One of the major factors that make some few individuals to dominate and manipulate PDP in Kano is the issue of financing the party. The most dominant respondents maintained that from 2003 to 2019, the former Governor of Kano State,

Senator Rabiu Musa Kwankwaso, was the major financier of the party whether in power or not. However, some of the respondents, who seem to be critics of Kwankwaso, did not agree with the term major financier and that the reason for that is the fact that he is the major beneficiary of the party in Kano since its inception in 1998. What is important to note here is that the study concluded that financial buoyancy and willingness to spend on the party, even if in the pursuance of vested interest, gave some few hands decisive control over important party decisions which, in many cases, create tension, feud and sometimes conflict within Kano PDP.

As far as Nigerian politics is concerned intra-party feud have thrown many parties into oblivion as the reviewed literature suggest. Whenever there is feud within a party, some members begin to defect to other parties. Consequently, if care is not taken, the party may lose the elections as witnessed in many local government areas of Kano State. It is also observed that the feud in the PDP Kano chapter has helped activated or rather aggravated many other feuds in various state across the country in the period leading to the 2015 General Elections, which led to the defections of at least five governors and many Senators and Members of House of Representatives from the party. That crisis eventually cost PDP its long-held presidential seat and that of many state governors, alongside tenth of the Senate and House of Representatives seats the party held before the 2015 Elections. To be more precise, during the 2015 electoral process, the issue of suppressing internal democracy was not only limited to Kano, but it was also in other states' branches as well as at the national level.

### **Conclusion and Recommendations**

The study concludes that the major issues that caused and aggravated intra-party feud in the PDP of Kano State are vested interests, egocentrism among the elites, violation of constitutional provisions of the party, and lack of respect for party manifesto and guidelines for leadership transition of party officials. Few individuals have dominated the affairs of the PDP in Kano since its inception in 1998 and the reasons for that are both historical and economic. It is historical because the founding leadership was built by consensus among three powerful political interest groups whose political philosophies and ideologies are different. It is economic because the overwhelming majority of the respondents believed that from 2003 to 2019, the former Governor of Kano State Senator Rabiu Musa Kwankwaso remained the major financier of the party both at the grass-roots level and at the national level. The study also concludes that the resultant effects of perpetual feud within the party are cross-carpeting (changing membership from one political party to the other) and anti-party activities (betraying and sabotaging the party while maintaining membership), losing elections in 2003, 2007, 2015, and 2019 respectively in Kano State. PDP as a party is popular among the people of Kano State such that whenever true and consultative consensus was reached among the powerful factions of the party, electoral victory is almost certain, like in the years of 1999 and 2011.

On this note, the paper recommends that the INEC should take serious supervisory measures to ensure that various political parties are adhering to internal democratic principles with a view to protecting the rights of the ordinary members. It is also recommended that all political parties should de-emphasize being heavily financed by one or few individual members. They should emphasize contribution by all members in order to be financially strong, viable and independent. This is necessary in order to avoid being manipulated by the powerful party members, and money-bags that cannot be checked by the ranks and files. It is also recommended that the aggrieved individual and groups should be insisting on legal redress rather than engaging in conflict or quitting the party. This will serve as deterrence as well as safeguarding the democratic integrity.

### References

- Adetayo, M.A. and Abdulrauf, A. (2017). Party primaries, candidate selection and intra-party conflict in Nigeria: PDP in perspective. *International Journal of Politics and Good Governance*, 8(2): ISSN:0976 -1195.
- Adibe, J. (2015). *The 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria: The issues and challenges*. Washington: Brookings Institution.
- Ake, C. (2001). *Democracy and Development in Africa*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited
- Appadorai, A. (2004). *The substances of politics*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Awofeso, A., & Irabor, P. A. (2016). Party cross-carpeting in Nigeria's Fourth Republic: Cases and causes. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 6(3), 31-41.
- Azeez, A. (2005). The Nigerian civil society and democratic consolidation: An overview of the nexus. *Political Science Review*, 2(1)
- Coser, L. (1966). *Sociological Theory: A Book of Sociological Reading*, 2nd Edition. London: McGraw Hill
- Duverger, M. (1980). *The Study of Politics*. Britain: Growell Company.
- Ekundayo, W. J. (2017). Political elite theory and political elite recruitment in Nigeria. *A publication of Public Policy and Administration Research*, Vol.7:5
- Friedrich, C. J. (2014). A Critique of Pareto's Contribution to the Theory of Political Elite. Libarairie Droz. Retrieved on 28th January, 2021 from [URL:http://www.jstor.org](http://www.jstor.org)
- Johari, J. C. (2011). *Comparative politics*. New Delhi, Sterling Publishers.
- Johari, J. C. (2012). *Contemporary political theory*. New Delhi, Sterling Publishers.
- Jude, M. A., & Ika, M. G. (2013). The implications of intra-party conflicts on Nigeria's democratization. *Global Journal of Human Social Science & Political Science*, 13(6), 1-13.
- Kapur, A. C. (2009). *Principles of Political Science*. New Delhi, S. Chand.

- Kura, S. B. (2011). Political parties and democracy in Nigeria: Candidate selection, campaign and party financing in People's Democratic Party. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*. 13(6), 268-'98
- Lowell, L. A. (1913). *Public Opinion and Popular Government*. New York, Longman.
- Mbah, P. (2011). Party defection and democratic consolidation in Nigeria, 1999-2009. *Afro-Asian Journal of Social Sciences*. 2(2):1-21.
- Michel, R. (1965). *First Lectures in Political Sociology*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Muhammad, A. Y. (2019). The changing nature and pattern of intra-party conflict in Nigerias' Fourth Republic: Critical assessment of All Progressive Congress. *Online Malaysian Journal of Society and Space*, 15(2): 57-68
- Oddih, M. (2007). *Electoral Fraud and Democratic Process, Lessons from 2003 Elections, in Nigeria*. Jos: Vintage Art Gallery Limited
- Ogundiya, I. S. & Baba, T. (2007). Electoral violence and democratic consolidation in Nigeria. In A. Jega, & O. Ibeanu, (eds) Elections and the future of democracy in Nigeria. *A Publication of the Nigerian political science Association (NPSA)*.
- Okhaide, I. P. (2012). Quest for Internal party democracy in Nigeria: Amendment of electoral 2010 as an albatross. *International Journal of Peace and Development Studies*, 3(3), 57-75
- Okoli, A. C. (2001). The political economy and Intra-party opposition in Anambra State (1999-2001). B.Sc. Project submitted to the Department of Political Science, Nnamdi Azikwe University, Awka.
- Okonofua, B. A. (2013). Who Rules Papa's Land? C. Wright Mills and the Nigeria Power Elite. Sage Open. Retrieved on 28th January, 2021 from [URL:http://sgo.sagepub.com](http://sgo.sagepub.com).
- Onyishi, A. O. (2015). Between Man and his Institutions: Intra-Party Politics and the Future of Democracy in Nigeria. <http://www.bris.ac.uk/medialibrary/sites/sps/documents/policy-politics/Onyishi%20Intra-Party%20Politics%20in%20Nigeria.docx>. Retrieved on 10<sup>th</sup> October, 2021.
- Osaghae, E. E. (2001). *Ethnic Groups and Conflicts in Nigeria*. Ibadan, Nigeria: PEFS
- Paden, J. (2015). Midterm challenges in Nigeria: Elections, parties and regional conflicts. United States Institute of Peace. Security analysis and research. Evolving Security Situation in Advance of Presidential Elections, 14 February, 2015.
- Sa'idu, I. (2013). Kwankwaso vs Shekarau: Can APC reconcile the political enemies? Kano: *Daily Trust* Newspaper
- Sam, E. (2014). Internal democracy in Nigerian political parties. In Olu Obafemi, Sam Egwu, Okechukwu Ibeanu and Jubrin Ibrahim (eds.). *Political Parties and Democracy in Nigeria*, Jos: Vintage Art Gallery Limited
- Sartori, G. (1987). *The Theory of Democracy Revisited*. London: Chatham House Publishers

- Schumpeter, J. (1942). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. New York, Harper & Row.
- Simbine, A. T. (2014). Single party dominance and democracy in Nigeria: The People's Democratic Party (PDP) in focus. In Olu Obafemi, Sam Egwu, Okechukwu Ibeanu and Jubrin Ibrahim (eds.). *Political Parties and Democracy in Nigeria*, Jos: Vintage Art Gallery Limited
- Sule, B., & Yahaya, M. A. (2018). The politics of decamping and the future of democracy in Nigeria. Conference Proceedings. Universiti Malaysia Kelantan.
- This Day* Newspaper, 2002
- Toyin, O. S. (2014). Party conflicts and democratic consolidation in Nigeria (1999-2007). *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(11), 248-269.
- Waltz, K. N. and Spiegel, S. L. (1971). *Conflicts in World Politics*. Cambridge: Winthrop
- Weber, M. (1971). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Urwin: University Books.

### Appendix

#### Focus Group Discussion (FGD's) and In-depth Interview (IDI's) Guide

**Introduction:** This guide is meant to collect data for the research titled *Intra-Party Feud and the Electoral Process in Nigeria: A Study of the People's Democratic Party in Kano State, 2015-2019*.

#### Questions One:

- What are the causes of the intra-party feud and electoral process in the Kano State chapter of the People's Democratic Party PDP?
- What is the contribution of the intra-party feud and defection in PDP Kano State chapter?
- How can you describe such crisis during candidate selection in the primaries?

#### Questions Two:

- How do party executives use internal democracy to resolve party issues in the Kano State chapter of the People's Democratic Party PDP?
- In what ways do party executives build trust and understanding among members?
- What measures do party executives take in resolving misunderstanding among party members in PDP Kano State chapter?