



The Quest for Democratic Rule and the Dividends of Democracy: Hope for Nigerians and Democratic Consolidation

Dr. Oche Innocent Onuche¹, Prof. Francis O. Onu², Dr. Attah Philomina Achenyo³, Dr. Musa Emmanuel Umaru⁴

¹Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Bingham University, Karu, Nasarawa State, Nigeria.

E-mail: innocent.onuche@binghamuni.edu.ng ; Phone: +234-8065296663

²Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Nasarawa State University, PMB 1022, Keffi, Nasarawa State, Nigeria

E-mail: Fonu2015@gmail.com; Phone: +234-8033424673.

³Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Bingham University, Karu, Nasarawa State, Nigeria.

E-mail: philattah707@gmail.com; Phone: +234-8064592427

⁴Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Ibrahim Babangida University, Lapai, Niger State.

E-mail: emmanet64@gmail.com; +234-(0)8034708762

ABSTRACT

The match to democratic rule was not an easy ride for Nigerians after the military interruption and rule for close to three decades. The years of military rule were politically and economically disastrous for Nigerians; institutions of states were severely undermined, corruption entrenched and the militarization of the entire system hence the quest for democratic rule. Nigerians fought with their lives, blood and every means available. The agitations eventually ushered the country into the much desired democratic rule with high hopes and expectations. Twenty-four (24) years plus of democratic rule, has the hopes and expectations of Nigerians been met? What has happen to unemployment, poverty, social inequality, infant, child, and maternal mortality (all indices of development hence dividend of democracy)? This paper evaluates the all embraced democratic rule visa-vis dividend of democracy in Nigeria. It focused on the twenty-one (21) years plus of democratic rule and how Nigerians have felt under it thus far. It was an evaluative research analyzed from the conflict/Marxist theoretical platform. The paper found that Nigerians and the nation at large have not felt much better under the democratic rule they so fought for and massively embraced; with corruption, unemployment, poverty and other indices of development still on the increase. The paper recommends good governance, a strong and impartial justice system among others.

Keywords: Dividend of democracy; democratic consolidation; democratic rule; and Nigerians.

Introduction

Nothing good can ever come out of Nigeria, what you hear are power outages, shortage of water, armed robbery and other evils. We don't want to be part of that evil (a Biafra agitator in Meredith, 2011 P. 584).

Nigeria's match to democracy has been a tortuous one. The hope of her becoming a stronghold of democratic rule in Africa came to an abrupt halt five years after independence due to the military coup of 15th January 1966; the counter-coup of 29th July 1966 and the 31st December 1983 coup, all hanged on the country's poor governance and ramped corrupt practices by leading politicians. The editorial of the Daily Times Newspaper of January 16th, 1966 painted the picture of how the military takeover of Government then was accepted by the people thus:

With the transfer of authority of the Federal Government to the Armed Forces, we reached a turning point in our national life. The old order has changed, yielding place to a new one... for a long time, instead of settling down to minister to people's needs, the politicians were busy performing series of seven day wonders as if the act of governance was some circus show...still we grope along as citizens watched politicians scorn the base by which they did ascend.

This shows the extent to which the masses accepted the military regime. The popular support they received for the coup shows that Nigerians' were long expecting such a wind of change to bail them out from the claws of the politicians of that era. Interestingly, despite the killings of some major first republic politicians, there were widespread jubilations in the country (Falola, 2008).

Unfortunately, the years of military rule were politically and economically disastrous for Nigerians. Institutions of states were severely undermined as meritocracy gave way to mediocrity. Corruption already burgeoning under the early politicians, become entrenched under military rule, and a kleptocratic

elite with a very limited vision of the future of the country came into being (Iweala, 2012). With increasing abandonment, successive military regimes clique and business associates looted oil revenues, profited from drug smuggling and engaged in systematic commercial fraud on an unprecedented scale. Babangida according to the American scholar Diamond, (1997) was considered the most massively corrupt ruler in Nigeria history behind Abacha whose loots are still being recovered from various international banks. A sharp increase in the price of oil in 1990 as a result of the Gulf crisis brought Nigeria a windfall of \$12 billion. Much of it found its way into the hands of the elites, channeled via dedicated accounts, attached to particular projects and ministries.

Despite the substantial oil earnings, estimated at three hundred (300) billion dollars since the 1970s to late 1990s, Nigerians remain mired in poverty, with high rate of adult illiteracy, maternal mortality and infant mortality. The lot of the common man is increasingly grim (Meredith, 2011). The United Nations Development Programme concluded from a survey in 1990 that Nigeria had one of the worst records for human deprivation of any country in the developing world. Again a World Bank report in 1991 ranked Nigeria as the thirteenth poorest country in the world. Successive military government went into spending and borrowing spree during the oil booms in the 1970s, the 1980s, and 1990s that resulted in poorly planned and executed projects that had never stand the test of time. The injury the country sustained through the exceedingly harmful corrupt and gross abuse of the fundamental human right of citizens by the military regimes massively set the country back on the path of socio-economic advancement and other forms of development. This was the scenario that triggered the agitation for democratic rule. Nigerians fought with their lives, blood and every available means to usher the country into the democratic rule they so desired and fought for with much expectations and hope on the 29th of May 1999.

Sixty-two (62) years plus of independence and twenty-three (23) years plus of undisrupted democratic rule, Nigerians have begun to ask themselves some very hard questions. How have we felt as citizens of a nation so blessed with rich human and natural resources? Has the democratic rule that we so fought for been able to meet all our hopes and expectations? What has happen to unemployment, poverty, social inequality, infant, child, and maternal mortality (all indices of development hence dividend of democracy)? How can the state of anarchy be reversed? What are the measures that can be taken to prevent corrupt candidates from recycling themselves into positions of leadership? How do we begin to solve these challenges confronting the democracy we so fought for and generally accepted with hopes and expectations? Other pressing questions that triggered this paper as opined by Achebe (2012) include: how do we bring all the human and material resources we have to bear with development? What do we need to do to bring an end to organized ethnic bigotry? How can we place the necessary checks and balances in place that will reduce the decadence, corruption and debauchery of the past several decades? How can we sustain and consolidate our hard-earned democracy?

This paper contributes to the ongoing discourse on democratic consolidation in Nigeria by addressing critical questions raised by the Nigerian populace. By analyzing the challenges faced by the nation, such as unemployment, poverty, social inequality, and healthcare indicators, the paper further shed light on the factors hindering democratic dividends and offer practical recommendations and policy suggestions aimed at reversing the present undemocratic state in Nigeria and fostering sustainable development. By engaging with these issues, the paper provide actionable insights and policy directions for policymakers, civil society organizations, and the general public, thereby enhancing the capacity of communities to actively participate in and shape the democratic process.

Explanations and Clarifications of Key Concepts

The word 'democracy' has its root in the Greek term "demokratia", the individual parts of which are demo (people) and kratos (rule). Democracy in its basic meaning is therefore a political system in which the people, not monarchs or aristocracies rule. In other words, it is a system of government where the citizens hold power and exercise it through free and fair elections. In a democracy, citizens have fundamental rights and freedoms, and the government is accountable to the people. Democratic rule is therefore a system of government that is characterized by the rule of law, free and fair elections, and the protection of individual rights and liberties. In a democratic system, power is vested in the people, who exercise it directly or through their elected representatives. The legitimacy of democratic rule is derived from the consent of the governed and the accountability of government officials to the people. Scholars have identified various elements that are essential for the functioning of democratic rule. These include respect for human rights, an independent judiciary, freedom of the press, a vibrant civil society, and a robust system of checks and balances (Giddens, 2004; Diamond, 2014).

According to Obanya (2004), democracy goes beyond having political parties, periodic elections, elected representatives and the famous three arms of government (the executive, the legislative and the judiciary). It implies more of the complete absence of totalitarianism. It also implies the full involvement and participation of all in moving a nation-state like Nigeria forward. It means above all, complete freedom of association, of expression and freedom to decide on how we are governed.

Furthermore, the form that democracy takes in a given contexts is largely an outcome of how its values and goals are understood and prioritized. It is generally seen as the political system that is most able to ensure political equality, protect liberty and freedom; defend the common interest, meet citizens' needs, promote moral self-development and enable effective decision making which takes everyone's interest into account (Held, 1996). If the features alighted by Held are effectively implemented and can be seen reflecting in the daily lives of the citizens of any democratic society like Nigeria, inference can be drawn that there is in place dividend of democracy or the features of democratic rule. The expression "dividend of democracy", although worn-out and clichéd from overuse, has emerged in our political linguistics as a short hand for capturing the performance or non-performance of government in consonant with democratic ethos. It is therefore not just the actualization of electoral promises; until such electoral promises is in conformity with the democratic features and tenets, conclusion cannot be drawn that there is dividend of democracy in place. Democratic rule have though taken a contrasting forms at varying periods and in different societies, depending on how the concept is interpreted. Inglehart & Welzel (2005) and Diamond, (2014) further broadened our understanding of the concept by conceptualizing "dividend of democracy" as the tangible benefits that citizens receive from a well-

functioning democracy. These benefits can be: **Economic:** Improved living standards, higher income levels, greater economic opportunities. **Social:** Increased access to education and healthcare, reduced poverty and inequality, stronger social safety nets. And **Political:** Greater respect for human rights and civil liberties, increased political participation and voice, enhanced security and stability. The "dividend" is though not guaranteed and can vary significantly depending on the quality of democracy and the effectiveness of government policies.

Flowing from the understanding above, dividend of democracy can simply be defined as the benefits that citizens derive from living in a democratic society. These benefits include, but are not limited to, the protection of individual rights, the rule of law, the promotion of economic growth and development, and the provision of public goods and services. It is often contrasted with the costs of living in a non-democratic society, such as political repression, economic stagnation, and social unrest. Empirical studies have shown that democracies tend to have higher levels of economic growth, lower levels of inequality, and better human development outcomes than non-democracies.

It is important to further interrogate the notion of democracy in its variegated and complex forms – especially in the context of transition societies. The notion as currently conceived gives the impression of a pre-conceived destination – a uni-dimensional focus on elections as democracy: have elections, and every other thing shall follow! Nowhere is the above more apparent than in the absence of appropriate institutional arrangement for the political accommodation and management of social diversities and religious difference. By its very nature, democratic transition has radically altered existing social boundaries and divisions, accentuating hitherto suppressed or dormant identities and conflict in the post military era without providing the needed institutional arrangements beyond elections. This has placed a big question mark on the very viability of Nigeria's democratic enterprise in a manner that cannot be resolved simply by adversarial winner takes all kind of our election. Today, democracy is still on trial in Nigeria with the various agitations and ethno-religious crisis that have taken a toll on our hard earned democracy hence a challenge for consolidating our nascent democracy.

Democratic consolidation is the process by which a new or transitional democracy becomes institutionalized and entrenched. Again, it is the process by which a new democracy becomes stable with strong institutions, a vibrant civil society, and a culture of democratic values. It also involves the development of a stable and effective system of democratic governance, the strengthening of democratic institutions, and the deepening of democratic values and practices. Scholars have identified several factors that are important for democratic consolidation, including the presence of strong civil society organizations, the protection of individual rights and liberties, the ability of citizens to participate in the political process, and the presence of independent media and a robust system of checks and balances. Democratic consolidation is therefore a long-term process that requires sustained effort and commitment from both government officials and civil society actors (Olisa (2000). Democratic consolidation is not linear and can be susceptible to setbacks due to factors like: Authoritarian legacies, Economic instability, Political polarization and Weak rule of law (Linz & Stepan, 1996; Olisa, 2000; Levitsky, 2003; Schedler, 2013). Any democratic practice less than this make democratic consolidation difficult to attain which account to why Nigerians often questioned and doubt the efficacy of the democratic system. Who then is a Nigerian or qualified to be identified as a Nigerian?

The debate is still ongoing about who really is a Nigerian. Make no mistake about it; a lot of Nigerians still sees the country as a colonial joinery. Unfortunately, this debate is not being conducted with mere words or intellection but instead, people are using knives, machetes, cudgels, bombs and bullets as well. Ethnic strife and sectarian violence are now expressions of doubts, and rejection of the idea of compatriotism. In other words, people are still questioning the idea, that people of different ethnic and religious background can be equal citizens with them. They are still finding it hard to accept other Nigerians as equal citizens and stakeholders, sixty-two (62) years plus after independence and twenty-three (23) years plus after democratic rule. Be that as it may, section 25 through 28 of the Nigerian 1999 (constitution as amended) identified one qualified to be called Nigerian as so either by birth, registration, naturalization and on the bases of dual citizenship. Shedding more light on these criteria; first on the bases of birth, the Nigeria constitution stated that: *a). every person born in Nigeria before the date of independence, either of whose parents or any of whose grandparents belongs or belonged to a community indigenous to Nigeria. b). every person born in Nigeria after the date of independence either of whose parents or any of whose grandparents is a citizen of Nigeria and c). Every person born outside Nigeria either of whose parents is a citizen of Nigeria.*

On the bases of registration one claim or being identified a Nigerian subject to section 28 of the 1999 Nigeria (constitution as amended); such a person must be of good character wise, show a clear intension of his/her desire to be resident in the country and has taken an Oath of Allegiance prescribed in the seventh schedule of the constitution. While naturalization like registration shall be or is on the basis of such a person age capacity, good character, show a clear intension of his/her desire to dwell in Nigeria, cleared by the governor of the state where he/she resides and accepted and assimilate the way of life of the people where he chose to live permanently. He/she should be able to make useful contribution to the growth and development of his/her chosen area (Nigeria constitution, 1999). We are therefore Nigerians on the basis of these criteria as typified by our country's constitution hence our quest for democratic rule and the dividend of democracy.

Theoretical Framework: Conflict Theory

To better understand the nature and dimension of democratic rule visa-vis how Nigerians have felt thus far under it, and how it can be consolidated, the Conflict theory was adopted by this paper.

Conflict theory is best illustrated by the work of Karl Marx (1883), a German philosopher and social thinker. His thoughts are often referred to as Marxism which is a worldview or philosophy as well as theory of society. Conflict is a loose and vague term which refers to various situations, ranging from disagreements, tensions to open warfare. The common threads which tie theorists in the school together include: **i.** A rejection of consensus as the basis for social order; instead, the perspective points to conflict as the basis, hence the name. **ii.** Society is held together through the use of power, domination and coercion by the powerful class over the less powerful class. And there are two classes, the dominant and dominated class and integration is based on how interests of the first class are imposed on the second. **iii.** In society there are interests; more crucial is the power to translate these interests into reality

and domination which such translation involves. The interests of the dominant and dominated class are different, and in many cases divergent. **iv.** Based mostly on the work of Karl Marx, there are two recognized classes: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The one owns and controls the means of production, distribution and exchange, while the other has little else beyond labour power. This labour power is bought by the bourgeoisie on terms which the latter class also dictates (Alubo, 2022).

The theory also advances a comprehensive model to explain how society works as well as the importance of divisions in society. In doing so, conflict theorists concentrate on issues of power, inequality and struggle which are all necessary ingredients in a democratic rule like Nigeria. According to them, every society at every point is subject to process of change. While functionalist emphasize the orderliness of society, conflict theorists see dissension and conflict at every point in the social system. The existence of separate interests means that the potential for conflict is always present and that certain groups will benefit more than the others. Conflict theorists examined the tensions between dominant and the disadvantaged groups within society and seek to understand how relationships of control are established and perpetuated (Lee & Newby, 2012).

Many conflict theorists trace their views back to the writings of Marx whose works emphasized class conflict, but some have also been influenced by Weber (1920) cited in Alubo (2022). A good example is the contemporary German sociologist Darendorf (1959). In his classic work, "class and class conflict in industrial society", he argued that, conflict just like the chief exponent – Marx, comes mainly from differences of interest that individuals and groups pursue. Marx saw differences of interest mainly in terms of class but Darendorf relates them broadly to authority and power. In all societies there is a division between those who hold authority and those who are largely excluded from it, between rulers and the ruled.

Flowing from the central argument/tenets of this theory, the same blight is afflicting Nigeria democratic rule today. Time and time again, her potentials for economic development have been disrupted by the predatory policies of the ruling elites seeking personal gains. The problem is not much that development (or the drives for democratic dividend) has failed as observed by Ake (1996) in his easy titled "Democracy and Development in Africa", as that it was never really on the agenda of the ruling elites in the first place.

The theory has several criticisms; it has been criticized for being too dogmatic, and for its uni-lineal view of conflict being the only route to change in human society. But in spite of these criticisms, the theory has been applied to a wide range of issues such as nature of stage, labour relations and democratic rule. Ideas of Marx, the chief exponent of the theory are expressed in different ways but the essential ingredients of domination of one class by another and how this domination result in particular form of social order like the democratic rule of Nigeria remains. Hence the relevance of this theory to this study despite the criticisms leveled against it.

The Nature of the Nigerian State and Nigerians, Twenty-two (22) Years after Democracy

It is not that there have been no progress, or achievements recorded since May 29, 1999. Though, the democratic space has been a bit widened, though the Nigerian economy shows blink hope of improvement. However, Nigerians are becoming restive and impatient with the slow pace of the delivery of the gains of democracy. The expected sociopolitical and economic gains of democracy are still too distant and hazy on the horizon. Poverty is still too close for comfort to majority of Nigerians in spite of our government much touted poverty alleviation programmes and other social empowerment programmes. All of these pose a big obstacle to our quest for a desirable and sustainable democracy. So long as our political leaders continue to be self-serving and disrespectful of popular desires and expectations, the democratization process would continue to be far from what is desired.

Unless those in government are in a country different from ours, the conditions of life are currently very hard for the average Nigerian. Eating poses a real problem, not to mention taking members of one's family to the hospital. Many families can no longer pay school fees. There are no jobs for even those who have graduated from secondary schools, polytechnics and universities. There is still a large labour army of unemployed, ready to be used for diverse odious jobs. Armed robbery, political thuggery, kidnapping, banditry and other forms of crime have virtually been legitimized by the logic of the imperatives of survival.

Since May 1999, there have been greater challenges of security than at any point in time in our history, thus rendering our political stability fragile, democratic institutions and processes fluid and our economy debilitating. Nigeria Human Development Index (HDI) ranking deteriorated from 142nd out of 174 countries in 1998 to 148th out of 173 countries by 2002 (UNDP, 2003). This implies a low level of overall societal welfare and development. According to the United Nations Development Programme's (UNDP) (2021) Human Development Report, Nigeria has a HDI of 0.547, which ranks it 161 out of 189 countries. This places Nigeria in the "low human development" category. The report shows that Nigeria's HDI has increased steadily over the past few decades, from 0.314 in 1990 to 0.547 in 2020. However, Nigeria still faces significant challenges in terms of human development. For example, the report highlights that Nigeria has a relatively low life expectancy of 54.3 years, which is significantly below the global average. In addition, Nigeria has a relatively high infant mortality rate and a high prevalence of malnutrition, particularly among children. The report also notes that Nigeria faces significant inequality and social exclusion, particularly with regards to gender and ethnicity. For example, women in Nigeria have lower levels of educational attainment and less access to healthcare than men, and there are significant disparities in income and wealth between different ethnic groups.

According to the National Planning Commission (NPC) (2009) statistics, two-thirds of Nigerians are poor. As the rates of poverty in Nigeria (currently 48 per cent) continue to grow, the rate of crime occurrence has since been growing and changing faces too. 27.1 per cent of Nigerians are unemployed according to a Federal source (FOS, 2011). According to FOS (2020) report, the jobless rate in Nigeria is currently 33.3 per cent. Despite our substantial oil earnings, Nigerians, still remain mired in poverty with high rates of adult illiteracy placed at 65 per cent in 2015; maternal mortality, infant mortality and so on. The latest mortality estimate released by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) (2020) shows that Nigeria has overtaken India as the world capital for under-five (i.e. child) deaths. According to the report, Nigeria recorded an estimated average of 858,000 under-five deaths in 2019

against India, which ranked second with 824,000 deaths out of 5.2 million under-five deaths globally. Infrastructures are poor, and per capita, electricity consumption is low (Aboyomi, 2021).

Nigerians all agree that corruption has been an endemic problem in the political system and constitutes a major challenge to democratic governance. Corruption in the country's governance has been growing over the years and therefore seen today as the cancer rooted in the centralized, clientelist and patronage nature of our country's politics. The informal network of power-based relations, pragmatic alliances, financial deals; the monopolizing of information and patrimonial distribution of patronage has further sustains corruption at the federal, state and local government levels. To maintain power, the system of patronage – composed of self-serving politicians, business people, political fixers and 'godfathers' that have changed as well under the 'change and next level' mantra to party chieftains and elder state men, trade offices, co-opts rivals, distributes concessions and contracts to clientelists, political parties and political thug has strife and gradually swallowing the democratic system. While the current effort under President Muhammadu Buhari's (PMB) administration to fighting corruption is encouraging, it cannot stem the spectacular of political corruption in Nigeria today until it is attacked from its systemic root.

Other indicators are no more encouraging. School enrolment is falling and illiteracy is common place, life expectancy has fallen and still falling. We are at the losing side at the globalization forum – part of the package of democracy, lacking both skills and infrastructure to favourably compete.

The pace of urban growth has produced massive pressure on public services. Between 1980 and 2010, the proportion of Nigerians living in towns and cities increased from 28 to 40 per cent. Millions are enduring a grim of existence in slums and shanty towns deprived of basic amenities. With government already unable to meet the demand for basic services, housing and social support, millions more face a threadbare future (Meredith, 2012). One can conclude on the bases of these facts and realities that, the quest for democratic rule and the dividend of democracy are not in consonance in Nigeria today, a relationship which the Economist (2012) said seems hopeless.

Conclusion

The twenty-three (23) years plus of the present democratic rule since May 29th, 1999 have been the longest uninterrupted period Nigerians have known since the country was granted self-rule by the British imperialist on October 1st 1960. This long uninterrupted period and the quest for democratic rule has not meet the hopes and yearnings of Nigerians due to dozens of challenges confronting the hard earned democratic rule of the country; ranging from poor governance, corruption, unemployment and poverty to electoral malpractices and insecurity, all serving as threats to our quest to deepening and consolidating our democracy. There is therefore, the need to reform the entire institutional edifice upon which the Nigerian democratic rule was built to ensure the actualization of its dividend to her citizens as well as its consolidation.

The Hope for Nigerians and Democratic Consolidation (Recommendations)

In spite of overcoming the jinx of the 2019 election and the challenges of the 2023 election before us, it is clear that the question of national restructuring and institutions building remain the central issues that will not go away from the country's quest for democratic dividend and consolidation. The questions that well-meaning Nigerians have continued to pose will have to be answered with all its attendant ramifications; without resolving the issue of national structure on the basis of contestation and dialogue, it is difficult to see how democratic consolidation and the dividend of democracy can emerge. If the structural dimension of the crisis of governance can be successfully addressed, it is possible to begin the journey towards developmental democracy which we must nurture and strengthen and strive for towards ensuring the freest and fairest elections that can usher in the right leadership.

Under the rubric of a democracy, a free and objective press can thrive; and a strong and impartial justice system can flourish. We must strive to put this in place as it will ensure the checks and balances and the laws needed to curb corruption. We must as a matter of necessity strengthen and increase the growing voices of our civil society organizations that have become more clear and resolute over the years. Ironically, the rise of civil society over the past thirty (30) years began during the period of military regimes, since many of the civil society organizations (CSOs) were conceived in opposition to oppressive and arbitrary rule. Today, there are plethoras of human rights and Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that are capable champions of reform and are developing new strategies and tactics under civilian rule, such as enhancing access to the legislature, serving in watchdog roles, and encouraging more effective citizen participation in local affairs. We must join these voices and activities taking advantage of the social media to growing and deepening our democracy.

Furthermore, to build a strong and healthy democratic rule, there is an urgent need for us to learn and adopt principles and mechanisms that few African countries have put in place helping their democracy to grow and result oriented. South Africa, in the post-apartheid era, has emerged as well-managed democratic state, with solid institutions and a system of checks and balances firmly entrenched in a modern constitution. Botswana is another central Africa country that stands out as a unique example of an enduring multiparty democracy with a record of sound economic management that has used its diamond riches for national advancement and maintained an administration free of corruption and corrupt practices. There is nothing absolutely wrong if we borrow a leaf from them to make our democracy healthy, workable and effective as well.

Furthermore, it is important to recognize the role of power and resources in shaping the democratic system in Nigeria. This may involve working to reduce the power of political elites and to increase the representation of marginalized groups in the political process. It may also involve addressing the structural inequalities and power imbalances that contribute to these challenges by promoting access to education and employment opportunities for marginalized groups and advocating for policies and reforms that promote transparency and accountability in the political system, such as campaign finance reform or strengthening of electoral institutions.

Finally, putting all these recommendations in place through honest and objective actions, we would be able to prove and proclaim to the world that we are a country of democracy, a country of healthy democratic institutions and cultures; a nation of good governance where the people participate and the rule of law are upheld.

Reference

- Ake, C. (1996). *Democracy and Development in Africa*. Washington: Brookings Institutions.
- Achebe, C. (2012). *There was a country. A personal history of Biafra*. London: Penguin books Ltd.
- Aboyomi, W. (2021). Nigeria power supply (2). In *financial Nigeria, Vol. 5 (57) Lagos: Fineprint limited*.
- Alubo, O. (2022). *Sociology: A Concise Introduction (3rd Edition)*. Jos, Nigeria: LEAGO Charis Enterprises Ltd.
- Darendorf, R. (1959). *Class and class conflict in industrial society*. Stanford, California: Standford university press.
- Diamond, L. (1997). *Transition without end: Nigeria politics and civil society under Babagida*. Rienner: Boulder press.
- Diamond, L. (2014). What is the Real "Dividend of Democracy? *World Politics*, 66 (3), 566-602.
- Falola, G. (2008). *Military coups and the Nigerian State*. Ibadan: University of Ibadan Press
- FOS, (211). *Poverty profile in Nigeria, 1980-1996*. Abuja: FOS Media.
- Giddens, A. (2004). *Sociology (4th Edition)*. London: polity press.
- Held, A. (1996). *On democracy*. New haven: Yale university press.
- Inglehart, R.F., Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernizing, Democratizing, and Secularizing: How Economic Development Changes Human Values*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Iweala, N.O (2010). *Reforming the unformable: Lessons from Nigeria*. Massachusetts: MIT press.
- Levitsky, S. (2003). How Democracies Die. *Journal of Democracy*, 14(2), 39-55.
- Lee, D. and Newby, H. (2012). *The Problem of Sociology*. London: Hutchinson Education Press.
- Linz, J.J., Stepan, A.C. (1996). *Problems of Democratic Consolidation: Latin America and Southern Europe*. Hopkins USA: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Marx, K. (1964). The economic and philosophic manuscripts of 1884. Dirk, J.S (ed). New York: international publishers.
- Meredith, M. (2012). *The state of Africa: A history of the continent since independence*. London: Simon and Schuster UK Ltd.
- Mosca, (1965). *The intervention of society*. Cambridge, England: Polity press.
- NBS, (2019). The State of Nigeria Economic. Quarterly Report. Abuja: NBS.
- NPC, (2009). *Nigeria demographic and health survey*. Calverton, Maryland: NPC and ORC. Macro.
- Obanya, P. (2004). *Educating for the Knowledge Economy*. Ibadan, Nigeria: Mosuro Publishers.
- Olisa, T. (2000). *Consolidating Nigerian Democracy*. Enugu: Sunrise Publications.
- Schedler, A. (2013). *The New Autocracy: An Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- UNDP, (2009). *Human Development*. Index: <http://www.jubilee2000uk.org/analysis>