



# Democracy and Development: Appraising Nigeria's Fourth Republic

<sup>1</sup>Innocent B. Barikor, PhD & <sup>2</sup>Obinna Nwodim, PhD

Department of Political and Administrative Studies  
Faculty of Social Sciences

University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

<sup>1</sup>[Innocent.barikor@unport.edu.ng](mailto:Innocent.barikor@unport.edu.ng); [innobarkor@gmail.com](mailto:innobarkor@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>[obinna.nwodm@uniport.edu.ng](mailto:obinna.nwodm@uniport.edu.ng); [obinanwodm@yahoo.com](mailto:obinanwodm@yahoo.com)

## ABSTRACT

Democracy and development are two mutually exclusive concepts in the political science discipline. They emphasize capacity and involvement of the individual in both the decision making process and the enhancement of his living conditions. In this paper, we appraise the two concepts as they apply to the Nigerian state. We examine the values of democracy with a view to establishing to what extent it has been able to engender development in Nigeria in the period under review. The study adopts the Liberal Theory of Democracy as theoretical underpinning. The Theory avers that the individual in the society has the freedom to order his life the way he deems fit and be involved in the decision making process of the state by voting and be voted for. As a qualitative study, secondary data are applied for discussion and analysis. The paper observes that democracy has not been able to enhance the living conditions of the individuals in Nigeria. It, therefore, recommends, amongst others, the importance of participatory democracy in the development objectives of successive governments in Nigeria, as well as the need for the reform of the electoral system in order to give confidence to the electorates towards participation in the electoral process.

**Keywords:** Democracy; Development; Historical Perspectives; Nigeria; Fourth Republic.

## INTRODUCTION

The concept of democracy has, most often, been used interchangeably with development. This is not only in academic circles, but amongst practitioners of politics and administration. During the era of the military in Nigerian politics, proponents for the return of the country to democracy had argued that democracy remains the best form of government that would usher in the needed development of the citizenry. Considering the features of democracy, they believed that it offered a more accommodating system of governance capable of promoting and enhancing the participation of the citizenry in governance. For instance, in his study of contemporary democracies, Powel Jr. (1989, p.12) outlines the following criteria for contemporary national democracies:

- i. The legitimacy of the government rests on a claim to represent the desires of its citizens. That is the claim of the government to obedience to its laws is based on the government's assertion to be doing what the people want it to do;
- ii. The organized arrangement that regulates this bargain of legitimacy as the competitive political election. Leaders are selected at regular intervals and voters can choose among alternative candidates. In practice, at least two political parties that have a chance of winning are needed to make such choices meaningful;
- iii. Most adults can participate in the electoral process, both as voters and as candidates for important political office;
- iv. Citizen's votes are secret and not coerced;

- v. Citizens and leaders enjoy basic freedom of speech, press, assembly and organization. Both established parties and new ones can work to gain members and votes.

Arguments and propositions of the advantages of democracy were buttressed by the fact that the international community championed by the United States of America encouraged countries of the world, particularly those of the African continent to toe the lines of democracy. As a matter of fact, the argument at the time was that African states experienced poor governance largely due to their non-democratization. Hinged on this perspective, Nigerians and indeed all and sundry agitated seriously for a return to democracy after so many years of military dictatorship. In 1999, a new democratic dispensation was ushered into the country. After over 20 years of return to democracy in Nigeria, we ask, if the yearnings and aspirations of the citizenry been achieved?

It is against this backdrop that this paper examines democracy in Nigeria and the emergence of democratic institutions, representative government and the rule of law in the Fourth Republic and whether they have brought about improved living standard of the citizenry. We hope to achieve this by discussing the theoretical framework that underpins this discourse and then some conceptualizations of key words that would guide the context of our discourse. We shall discuss the concepts of democracy and development as seen by other scholars, then we present data obtained in the course of the study which shall form the premise of our analyses and discussion and based on our analysis we shall conclude and make recommendations.

### **Conceptual clarifications**

**Democracy:** Democracy here implies the right of citizens to determine their form of government, choose those who will constitute that government, as well as how they would be governed. It also requires that government be responsive to the preferences of citizens, and that each citizen's preferences be weighted relatively equal (Obasanjo and Mabogunje, 1992). Democracy is instructively about the participation of the individuals, the promotion and enhancement of his welfare, his involvement in the choice of who makes decision on his behalf and how the decisions are made. The absence and lack of any of these is termed undemocratic. In a democracy, the people make choice of those who would lead and direct their affairs, devoid of compulsion. According to Cummings and Wise, (1997, p. 76) 'Democracy accrues with it the concept of majority rule. Everyone is free to vote, but normally, whoever gets the most votes wins the election and represents the people. For Damond (1999, p. 29), Democracy is simply rule by the majority.

**Development:** The concept of development is a man-centred phenomenon. It refers to the durable social and economic progress of the people. It means the improvement in the living conditions, which economic growth and industrialization are essential components. For the purpose of clarity and conceptualization, development is more than the passage from poor to rich, from traditional or rural setting to a sophisticated and urban one. Development here does not only imply the idea of economic progress, it also involves greater human dignity, security, justice and equity. Development is a movement from political, economic or social exploitation. It adds value, quality and worth to life and gives the individual the opportunity to express himself or herself and apply such expressions to the improvement of the society. As a matter of reality a developed society is that which affords the individual opportunity to influence decisions in the state as well as be part and parcel of the implementation of such decisions.

**Fourth Republic:** Nigeria has undergone various epoch in her democratic history. The first, beginning from 1963 to January 16, 1966 when the civilian regime was overthrown. The second was from October 1, 1979 to December 31 1983 when the military once again seized power. The botched third republic was during the Babangida transition programme that ended with the annulled June 12 1993 election. The Fourth Republic emerged on May 29 1999.

**Nigeria:** Nigeria here implies the sovereign and independent state called the Federal Republic of Nigeria geographically located in West African sub region. Colonized by the British, the country gained political independence on October 1, 1960. Nigeria is presently comprised of thirty –six (36) states and a Federal Capital Territory located in Abuja, as well as 774 local government areas. Since independence, Nigeria has experienced both military and civilian administrations. The military ruling for twenty-nine years,

while the civilian administration ruling for thirty years. The current regime which has President Muhammadu Buhari in charge of affairs was ushered in on May 29, 2015. However, since May 29, 1999, Nigeria has witnessed uninterrupted democratic regimes. Nigeria is a multi-ethnic state with over 250 ethnic groups (Nwodim and Barikor, 2019), as well as practices a multi-party democracy. In addition, the country practices a presidential system of government which it adopted in 1979. There is also the existence of a bi-cameral legislature- Senate and House of Representatives. The presidential system of government makes the practice of separation of powers between the various arms of government possible. Given its huge population as Africa's most populous country, as well as its enormous human, natural and material resources, Nigeria, Nigeria plays a dominant role in the socio-political and economic affairs of the African continent.

### **Theoretical Framework**

A theory provides the path way for the understanding of a phenomenon. Consequently to properly place this study in line with formal scientific enquiry, we adopt the Liberal Democratic Theory of Democracy as theoretical underpinning. The theory has at various times been viewed as a western concept of explanation and justification of democracy and its values and why it should be embraced. A number of scholars such as C.B. Macpherson; Robert Dahl, Joseph Schumpeter, amongst others have been identified as proponents of this Theory (Nwodim, 2018). The Liberal Democracy Theory avers that the individual in the society has the freedom to order his life the way he deems fit and be involved in the decision making process of the state by voting and be voted for. In other words, participatory democracy provides a veritable opportunity for responsive governance since the citizenry would be involved in the process of decision making. In other words, when the people are involved in the decision making process that bother on their lives, the likelihood for responsible governance manifest thereby bring about the overall development of the citizenry. The Liberal Democratic Theory affords the individual the opportunity to lead a decent life, have and improved standard of living and by extension initiating good governance in the society. Based on the assumption that liberal representative democracy has been accepted as the best method of managing political affairs (Lukeman, et al., 1998, p.129), it adheres to the principle of strict compliance to the rule of law. However the Liberal Democratic perspective has been criticized by scholars over its westernized values and orientations that do not seem to be in consonance and agreement with the culture and values of the developing countries of the Third World. Liberal democracy which seems largely acceptable is a procedural and institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire power to decide by means of competitive struggle for the people's vote (Dahl, 2000; Diamond, 1999; Plattner, 2010; Weghorts and Lindberg, 2011, Mgba, 2019).

### **METHODOLOGY**

This research is historical, descriptive and qualitative and so we adopt secondary data from the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS). Books, journals, periodicals, newspapers and magazines, as well as other on line materials also provided useful insights that enabled proper discussion and analysis in the study. The information generated provided a basis for logical analysis, discussion and conclusion. The study adopts the poverty headcount of citizens, Education Index, Life Expectancy, and Human Development Index as tools for measuring and analyzing development. These tools are adopted because they are integral factors in assessing development since they have far reaching implication on determining the level of welfare and standard of living of the people. We consider these appropriate because at the global level, the United Nations in 1990 had resolved to adopt a system of measuring development through the recognition of people as the real wealth of nations, thus making the well-being of the populace a major consideration in determining the progress of a nation.

### **The Problem**

The manner that the process of democratization has been pursued, particularly in the 1980s and 90, has presented it as the most formidable system of government that would bring the needed development to states, particularly Third World states of Africa, Latin America and Asia. Consequent upon this there was

the pressure for countries that are yet to embrace democracy democratize. Efforts were made by western democracies to demonize the military regimes and dictatorships that existed at the time. In Nigeria, civil society groups and pro-democracy organizations mounted pressure on the military regimes at the time to democratize. The popular view was that the worst democracy was better than the best or most benevolent military regime or dictatorship. The long and intense struggle for democracy saw the emergence of a new democratic dispensation in 1999. Consequent upon this, the popular phrase, dividends of democracy” emerged in the Nigerian political lexicon. No doubt, the citizens hoped for a better deal in terms of good governance, transparency and accountability by the political leadership which would in turn lead to more stable, egalitarian, participatory governance that would be responsive to the needs and aspirations of the people. The question arises, to what extent has the yearnings and aspirations of the citizenry for a better standard of living been realized. Perhaps, this is what prompts Lale (2019) to assert that: “Today, there is no gainsaying the fact that Nigeria is in the grip of a ‘democratic recession” that has affected the entire gamut of nation building. The failure of our leaders to deliver on the promises of democracy poses a major challenge to the legitimacy of the state as an instrument of social transformation.”

### **Objectives**

The objectives of this study are:

- i. To examine the relationship between democracy and development;
- ii. To investigate if democracy, as practiced in Nigeria has been able to promote development
- iii. To ascertain what brand on democracy that is operational in Nigeria

### **Research Questions**

Following the objectives, the study attempts to answer the following questions:

- i. What is the relationship between democracy and development;
- ii. Has democracy as [practiced in Nigeria been able promote development?
- iii. What is the brand of democracy that is operational in Nigeria?

### **Overview Of Democracy**

Some scholars argue that democracy has, in recent times, acquired a universal status that has come to be formidable and attractive (Onyeukwu and Orji, 2019). Perhaps this is attributed to the fact that nearly all countries of the world practice one form of democracy or the other. The system of government provides some unique features that may have attracted some elements of representative governance, even as practitioners and scholars have x-rayed the concept. Obasanjo and Mabogunje (1992) examine democracy both as an ideology and as politics. For them, democracy as an ideology is the philosophy of governance which is at high premium on the basic freedom or fundamental rights of the citizen, the rule of law, the right of property, the free flow of information and the right of choice between alternatives. In the face of this assertion, Ogali (2019) argues that democracy even in the classical form has its limitations based on constitutional citizenship rights. In these regards, Nna and Pabon (2019) cites Ake (1997) as stating that the Greek practice of democracy manifested in the expression of popular power in the rule by the demos but, however, in its classical form democracy constituted a threat to the emerging bourgeois class and opposed it. Democracy has joined state building and the rule of law as a component of political development (Fukuyama, 2012). In the thinking of Fukuyama (2012), the shift of democracy was a result of millions of formerly passive individuals around the world organizing themselves and participating in the political life of their societies. Such social mobilization was the result of increased education and the need for people to have a voice in the way they are governed. It is important to note that despite the new and positive face of democracy, the concept has evolved over a long period of time with scholars at various times proffering their views on it. Plato saw democracy as an ordinary immoral system which produced dangerous individualist tendencies for private property and wealth, describing it as government of shoemakers and shop keepers (Onyeukwu and Orji, 2019). For Aristotle democracy was poorly rated in his description of the various forms of government Ndu, (1998). According to Held (1981), the history of the idea of democracy is both curious and puzzling. He avers that from records, little is said about democracy from Ancient Greece to 18<sup>th</sup> century Europe and North America and that the widespread adherence to democracy as a suitable form of organizing political life is less than a hundred years old.

This assumption of Held is strengthened by Levin (1920, p 39) when he argues that “with the American Revolution of 1776 and French Revolution of 1789, democracy had reemerged to become modern.”

Democracy is a political system that is guided by a set of ideals towards achieving the conditions of its own ideal. Ojo (1999, p. 197). Examining the various theories of democracy, Onyeukwu and Oriji (2019, p 65) opine that all the theories of democracy, whether it is liberal, socialist or mixed, sought a democracy in which the people would have some real decision making power over and above the formal consent of electoral choice; a democracy that placed emphasis on concrete political, social and economic rights of the individual, as well as the collective. Democratic rights are both economic and political and these cannot be separated from each other. A citizen or a segment of the population that is economically disempowered could be politically weakened (Ogali 2019, p. 9).

According to Platter (2010, pp 83-84), the concept of democracy is explained in the rule of the majority in free and fair election of representatives. Dalton, Shin and Jou (2007, p. 144) argue that democracy is seen in terms of the freedoms, liberties and rights, rather than from the perspective of institutional structures and governmental process. For Omoruyi (1999), democracy stands as a cherished political system that is participatory and allows people to choose their leaders. Citizens are at liberty to active participation in governance and by extension, on political decision making and formulation of policy for good administration and dividend of democracy to the people. Political participation is the quintessence of democratic politics. It is not just one of the qualities of democracy; it is the major criterion for the measurement of the democratic level of societies (Steed, 1972; Barnes, et al, 1979; Kornberg and Clarke, 1992; Franklin and Ebdon, 2007; Amadi, 2019). Democracy is hinged on the idea that by men contributing their quota (skills, talents, knowledge and experiences) in the course of public decision making would better address the genuine needs of society (Laski, 2010; Dewey, 1927, Amadi, 2019).

### **Development**

The term development is one of the most frequently used and yet one of the least adequately understood (Toyom 2001, p 24). Various scholars and authors have opined diverse meanings in an attempt to explain the concept and application of the concept of development. Mene (2002, p 44) citing Anikpo avers that classical economists see development as growth in income and infrastructural facilities, while to political scientists, it constitutes in its essence, political stability and liberation from oppression. Development occurs to medical scientist when mortality rates have been reduced and diseases have been eradicated. It involves the eradication of literacy to the educationists, while engineers and technologists view it as involving the acquisition of technology. For sociologists, it is seen as progress towards social goals” Depending on its usage, some have referred to developments from the perspective of improvement in infrastructural facilities and setting or establishment of modern infrastructure, while some others have taken it as growth in economy or advancement of economic indices in thee society. In other words, any advancement or progress in individuals, organizations and groups could be referred to as development. As regards the meaning of progress, Jike (2003) avers that progress means different things to different people: historically, material progress- growth of incomes and wealth, poverty alleviation has been the main consideration in development theory and practice. In an attempt to clarify the concept, Toyo (2003) further avers that development is often defined as the occurrence of structural or qualitative change from growth in which allegedly only quantitative changes occur. Development is more than a passage from poor to rich, from traditional or rural setting to a more sophisticated and urban one. It stretches beyond building sky scrapers and putting in place magnificent infrastructure and technological inventions (Nwodim, 2018). Development has also been seen from the perspective of economic development, social development, political development, technological developments, as well as cultural developments. Whether it is economic, political, social, cultural and technological development, the meaning of development as a concept has changed over time. Economic development refers to industrialization and the development of modern technology and productive structures that would sustain that technology. It is measured by such indicators as growth of national product (GNP), per capita income, caloric consumption, and the percentage of the workforce in secondary economic pursuits (production or manufacturing) or tertiary economic pursuits (service or informational) (Agara and Okonkwo, 2020). According to Apostolides and Moncrada (2013), the meaning of development has changed over time: in

addition, various groups conceived differently. As there are different disagreements due to the lack of mutual understanding between interest groups on what the true goal of what we call development is. There is also the aspect of development from the Marxist perspective and the non-Marxist orientations of development. For the purpose of this paper, development is not the volume of money in circulation in an economy or the revenue accrued to the government. For Seers (1969) development is an express manifestation that development is in relation to the people and that when we refer to development, it must be targeted at advancing the economic and social milieu of the people, including her material well-being. What this implies is that the concept of development is a man centred phenomenon. As a matter of reality, development is the durable social and economic progress of the people. It means the improvement in the living conditions, which economic growth and industrialization are essential components (Nwodim, 2018). Development is a movement from political, economic or social exploitation. It is a phenomenon that adds value and worth to life and gives the individual the opportunity to express himself/herself and apply such expressions to the improvement of the society. For Ake, development is a man-centred concept, which must focus on the improvement of the living standards of the individual. Development encompasses not only the idea of economic progress, but also greater human dignity, security, justice and equity (Nwodim, 2018). A developed society is that which affords the individual the opportunity to influence decisions in the state and also participate in the implementation of such decisions, as well as the control of the activities which affect them. According to Ake (1987, p.8) development occurs in so far as it amounts to the pursuit of objectives set by the people themselves in their own interest and pursued by means of their own resources. A people can only be the means to the end of development if they are also agents of the process. Ake's concept of development abhors exploitation and oppression of the people. The people can only be exploited if they are not in control of the development process. If they are not in control of the development process, it will be difficult to make them agents, means and end of development (Efemini, 2002, p. 13). According to Mene (2002, p.45) In line with Ake's perceptions it suffices, however, to say that development is a qualitative change which embraces the totality of a society's historical experience. It is growth that transforms into a new phase in which there is increased skill and capacity, greater freedom, creativity, self-discipline, responsibility and material well-being, both for the individual and the entire society. For Douglas-Roche (1979, p.12) development in its fullest sense, means liberation of the human spirit made possible by securing an essential economic base. True development does not pit the spirit of man against economic progress in some kind of contest. Rather, it encompasses the wholeness of man.

**DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS**

As noted earlier, the study adopts the Poverty Headcount of Citizens, Education Index, Life Expectancy, and Human Development Index as tools for measuring and analyzing development and are thus enumerated as presented by the National Bureau of Statistics indicated the level of rural poverty in Nigeria.

**Table 1 Showing National Poverty Headcount Estimates and Number of Poor Nigerians 2003-2004 and 2009-2010.**

| 2003-2004  |                    |                     |                             |                 |       |                                 |       |                                    |
|------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-------|---------------------------------|-------|------------------------------------|
|            | Head Count<br>Pa=0 | Poverty gap<br>Pa=1 | Severity of poverty<br>Pa=3 | % of population | Pa=0  | Contribution to poverty<br>Pa=1 | Pa=2  | Number of absolute poor (millions) |
| Per capita |                    |                     |                             |                 |       |                                 |       |                                    |
| National   | 64.2               | 27.4                | 15.0                        | 100.0           | 100.0 | 100.0                           | 100.0 | 80.0                               |
| Rural      | 73.4               | 32.7                | 18.2                        | 56.3            | 64.4  | 67.2                            | 68.5  | 51.5                               |
| Urban      | 25.2               | 20.5                | 10.8                        | 43.7            | 35.6  | 32.8                            | 31.5  | 28.5                               |

Source: National Bureau of Statistics, 2010

**Table 2 Showing National Poverty Headcount Estimates and Number of Poor Nigerians 2009-2010**

| 2009-2010  |                    |                     |                             |                 |       |                                 |       |                                    |
|------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-------|---------------------------------|-------|------------------------------------|
|            | Head Count<br>Pa=0 | Poverty gap<br>Pa=1 | Severity of poverty<br>Pa=3 | % of population | Pa=0  | Contribution to poverty<br>Pa=1 | Pa=2  | Number of absolute poor (millions) |
| Per capita |                    |                     |                             |                 |       |                                 |       |                                    |
| National   | 62.6               | 26.2                | 14.2                        | 100.0           | 100.0 | 100.0                           | 100.0 | 102.2                              |
| Rural      | 69.0               | 30.3                | 16.8                        | 63.8            | 70.3  | 73.7                            | 75.4  | 71.9                               |
| Urban      | 51.2               | 19.1                | 9.6                         | 36.2            | 29.7  | 26.3                            | 24.6  | 3-.3                               |

Source: National Bureau of Statistics, 2010

Tables 1 and 2 show that overall, absolute poverty incidence using per capita approach was calculated as 62.6% in 2009/2010. By this, there was a slight improvement over the 2003-2004 poverty rate, when the fraction of the population below the poverty line per capita approach was estimated at 64.2%. These figures also indicated that rural poverty declined faster than urban poverty. Also in addition to the headcount poverty, other measures of poverty declined, implying that poverty is still predominant in the rural area. The implication that there is the prevalence of the rural poor leaves much to be desired of democracy, bringing about the improved standard of living of the rural poor in Nigeria.

**Table 3. Showing Education Index for 2013 and 2016 by States**

| STATE       | EI (2016) | Previous EI (2013) | Difference |
|-------------|-----------|--------------------|------------|
| ABIA        | 0.8808    | 0.9477             | -0.0669    |
| ADAMAWA     | 0.6606    | 0.7672             | 0.1066     |
| AKWA IBOM   | 0.9053    | 0.9477             | -0.0424    |
| ANAMBRA     | 0.921     | 0.9682             | -0,0472    |
| BAUCHI      | 0.4145    | 0.5142             | -0.0997    |
| BAYELSA     | 0.9259    | 0.9663             | -0.0404    |
| BENUE       | 0.8061    | 0.8558             | -0.0497    |
| BORNO       | 0.5871    | 0.4819             | 0.1052     |
| CROSS RIVER | 0.8574    | 0.9814             | -0.124     |
| DELTA       | 0.9058    | 0.9695             | -0.0637    |
| EBONYI      | 0.7628    | 0.8009             | -0.0381    |
| EDO         | 0.8486    | 0.9598             | -0.0381    |
| EKITI       | 0.8944    | 0.9414             | -0.047     |
| ENUGU       | 0.8936    | 0.9339             | -0.0403    |
| GOMBE       | 0.4923    | 0.5467             | -0.0544    |
| IMO         | 0.9159    | 0.9511             | -0.0352    |
| JIGAWA      | 0.4311    | 0.4304             | -0.0007    |
| KADUNA      | 0.6414    | 0.8553             | -0.2137    |
| KANO        | 0.4957    | 0.595              | -0.0993    |
| KATSINA     | 0.4395    | 0.5419             | -0.1024    |
| KEBBI       | 0.3955    | 0.4472             | -0.0517    |
| KOGI        | 0.8572    | 0.9071             | -0.0499    |
| KWARA       | 0.6967    | 0.8334             | -0.1367    |
| LAGOS       | 1.0069    | 1.0365             | 0.0296     |
| NASARAWA    | 0.7861    | 0.8415             | -0.0554    |
| NIGER       | 0.5594    | 0.6869             | -0.1273    |
| OGUN        | 0.7797    | 0.9331             | -0.1534    |
| ONDO        | 0.8709    | 0.9102             | -0.0393    |
| OSUN        | 0.8551    | 0.926              | -0.0709    |
| OYO         | 0.683     | 0.8523             | -0.1693    |
| PLATEAU     | 0.7659    | 0.8895             | -0.1236    |
| RIVERS      | 0.9512    | 1.0334.            | -0.1119    |
| SOKOTO      | 0.3336    | 0.507              | -0.1734    |
| TARABA      | 0.7551    | 0.7646             | -0.0095    |
| YOBE        | 0.3295    | 0.3703             | -0.0408    |
| ZAMFARA     | 0.4238    | 0.605              | -01812     |
| FCT         | 0.8152    | 0.9218             | -0.1066    |
| NIGERIA     | 0.7966    | 0.8139             | -0.0173    |

Source: National Bureau of Statistics, 2010

Table 3 showing the Education Index of Nigeria for 2013 and 2016 is an indication of the low level of education attainment of citizens of the country according to the different states. It is also indicative of the reality that the education index of virtually all the states in the country was measured to have been low. The implication of these figures is the low human capacity of the citizenry which goes a long way to illustrate the level of human development of the citizenry.

**Table 4. Showing Poverty Incidence by Sector and Zone**

| SECTOR        | POOR | NON-POOR |
|---------------|------|----------|
| Urban         | 43.1 | 56.9     |
| Rural         | 63.8 | 36.2     |
| Total         | 54.7 | 45.3     |
| South-South   | 51.1 | 48.9     |
| South East    | 34.2 | 65.8     |
| South West    | 43.0 | 57.0     |
| North Central | 63.3 | 36.7     |
| North East    | 67.3 | 32.7     |
| North West    | 63.9 | 36.1     |
| Total         | 54.7 | 45.3     |

Source: National Bureau of Statistics, 2010.

Table 4 showing poverty incidence by sector indicates that the urban poor was 43.1% while the non-poor was 56.9%. The rural poor was 63.8% while the non-poor was 36.2%. Spreading it across the geopolitical zones indicates that in the South-South, there were 51.1% poor and 48.9% non-poor; South East 34.2% poor and 65.8% non-poor, South West, 43.0% poor and 57.0% non-poor; North Central, 63.3% poor and 36.7% non-poor, North East 67.3% poor and 32.7% non-poor, while the North West consisted of 63.9% poor and 36.1% non-poor.

**Table 5. Showing Primary Coping Mechanism for Poverty**

| COPING MECHANISM                 | %      |
|----------------------------------|--------|
| Reduced number of meals          | 25.27  |
| Informal borrowing from friends  | 16.54  |
| Substitute meals with fruits     | 10.83  |
| Reducing other household items   | 5.85   |
| Other piece –work                | 5.17   |
| Work –on food for work programme | 4.60   |
| Asking from friends              | 4.21   |
| Others                           | 3.60   |
| Wild food                        | 3.16   |
| Relief food supplies             | 2.87   |
| Sale of assets                   | 2.84   |
| Formal borrowing                 | 1.73   |
| Religious assistance             | 1.56   |
| Petty vending                    | 0.86   |
| Pulling children out of school   | 0.41   |
| NGO assistance                   | 0.14   |
| Public begging                   | 0.09   |
| Total                            | 100.00 |

Source: National Bureau of Statistics, 2010.

Table 5 indicates the basic coping strategies adopted by the citizens in mitigating the effects of poverty.. The various strategies are reduction in the number of meals, 25.27%; informal borrowing from friends, 16.54%; substituting meals with fruits, 10.83; reducing other household items, 5.85%; other piece work, 5.17% work on food for work programme, 4.60%; asking from friends, 4.21%. Other strategies are: wild food, 3.16%; relief food supplies, 2.87%; sales of assets, 2.84%; formal borrowing, 1.73%; religious

assistance, 1.56%; petty vending, 0.86%; pulling children out of school, 0.41%; NGO assistance, 0.14% and public begging, 0.09%.

**Table 6. Showing Trends in poverty levels 1980-2004**

| YEAR | POVERTY INCIDENCE | ESTIMATED TOTAL POPULATION | POULATION IN POVERY |
|------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| 1980 | 28.1              | 65m                        | 18.26m              |
| 1985 | 46.3              | 75m                        | 34.73m              |
| 1992 | 42.7              | 91.5m                      | 39.07m              |
| 1996 | 65.6              | 102.3m                     | 67.11m              |
| 2004 | 54.4              | 126.3m                     | 68.70m              |

Source: National Bureau of Statistics, 2010.

Table 6 showing poverty trends levels from 1980 to 2004 shows that in 1980, at a population of 65m, 18.26m people were poor in Nigeria giving poverty incidence of 28.1%. In 1985, there was an estimated population of 75m with a population of 34.73m in poverty. In 1995, the population estimated of 91.5m had 39.07m n poverty. By 1996, there were 102.3m people with 67.11 m people living in poverty making a poverty incidence of 65.6%. In 2004, with a population of 126.3m, 68.70m were poor resulting to a poverty incidence of 54.4%. This is indicative of the increasing poverty rate of the country over the years even as a new report by the World Poverty Clock shows that Nigeria has overtaken India as the country with the most extreme poor people in the world. The Report indicates that as at 2020, 86.9m Nigerians out of the estimated 180 million populations are living in extreme poverty representing nearly 50% of the poverty incidence (Kazeem, 2020).

**Table 7. Showing Life Expectancy in Nigeria**

| STATE      | LIFE EXPECTANCY AT BIRTH | MALE | FEMALE |
|------------|--------------------------|------|--------|
| ABIA       | 52                       | 49   | 53     |
| ADAMAWA    | 43                       | 42   | 44     |
| AKWA IBOM  | 51                       | 49   | 52     |
| ANABRA     | 48                       | 47   | 50     |
| BAUCHI     | 45                       | 44   | 48     |
| BAYELSA    | 50                       | 47   | 53     |
| BENUE      | 47                       | 46   | 50     |
| BORNO      | 43                       | 42   | 48     |
| CROS RIVER | 54                       | 51   | 56     |
| DELTA      | 49                       | 48   | 50     |
| EBONYI     | 48                       | 47   | 52     |
| EDO        | 50                       | 48   | 51     |
| EKITI      | 53                       | 51   | 55     |
| ENUGU      | 52                       | 49   | 53     |
| GOMBE      | 48                       | 45   | 49     |
| IMO        | 53                       | 51   | 54     |
| JIGAWA     | 47                       | 44   | 48     |
| KADUNA     | 45                       | 43   | 48     |
| KANO       | 47                       | 46   | 49     |
| KATSINA    | 49                       | 47   | 51     |
| KEBBI      | 52                       | 49   | 53     |
| KOGI       | 46                       | 45   | 48     |

|           |    |    |    |
|-----------|----|----|----|
| KWARA     | 42 | 49 | 54 |
| LAGOS     | 49 | 48 | 51 |
| NASSARAWA | 50 | 46 | 52 |
| NIGER     | 50 | 47 | 53 |
| OGUN      | 53 | 51 | 55 |
| ONDO      | 52 | 50 | 54 |
| OSUN      | 52 | 50 | 54 |
| OYO       | 51 | 49 | 52 |
| PLATAEU   | 46 | 43 | 47 |
| RIVERS    | 47 | 46 | 49 |
| SOKOTO    | 50 | 48 | 51 |
| TARABA    | 47 | 46 | 50 |
| YOBE      | 44 | 42 | 46 |
| ZAMFARA   | 50 | 48 | 51 |
| FCT       | 52 | 50 | 55 |
| NATIONAL  | 49 | 47 | 51 |

**Source: National Bureau of Statistics**

Life expectancy is an indicator of the standard of living of individuals in a society. The rate of poverty, access to healthcare, basic social facilities, amongst others go a long way to determine the quality of life of individuals thereby determining their life expectancy and in order words, their development. From the Table above, the various states in Nigeria have different life expectancy. This is as a result of the diverse socio economic conditions that are prevalent in the states. However, the figures show that the national life expectancy for male is 47, while that of the female is 51. The average life expectancy in Nigeria is 49. Obviously, the data reveals that the average life expectancy of 49 is relatively poor and low compared to other democracies, both developed and developing. For instance while the average life expectancy in South Africa in 2017 stood at 63.54, Tunisia had 76.79, Morocco, 76.77; Ghana, 64.17, Zambia, 63.84; Angola, 61.21; Cameroon, 59.39; India 69.73.

From the forgone, any state that alienates the people cannot promote genuine development. From the data obtained for this study, indices for development have declined successively despite the efforts by governments to institute programmes and policies aimed at improving the living standards of the citizenry. There do not seem to be clear cut programmes and policies that are aimed to lift the majority of the citizens out of poverty and that is why the poverty rate and level continue to increase with the widening gap between the rich and the poor increasing.

### **SUMMARY/CONCLUSION**

From this study, we have identified the reality that development must emancipate the people from political bondage such as those of authoritarianism or dictatorship and so democracy is the viable option that promotes the welfare and interest of the citizenry. Indeed, development is a phenomenon that must be driven by the social will of the people, If this is so, it implies that democracy is the form of government that has the capacity to achieve this. We have understood that when the people participate in the decision making process of the state, there is bound to be stability and better decisions that would promote their welfare. Hence, there is a relationship between democracy and development. However, in the midst of this relationship, and from the study, democracy has failed to bring about the needed development in terms of improving the living conditions and welfare of the citizenry. Development is not *ad hoc* economic growth or accidental improvement in the well-being of the people. It is a planned and conscious efforts and strategy the people must do for themselves and therefore participatory. The brand of democracy that is operational in Nigeria is that which alienates the people from the state. The state machinery is captured by the few privileged class who fight their way to power either by hook or crook

and when they get to power they apply the state apparatuses to enrich themselves and their cronies at the expense of the citizenry.

## FINDINGS

In the course of the study, we observed that there is a wide difference between development and growth. While growth is a quantitative change in a phenomenon, development is a qualitative change that brings about a more durable and enduring effects. The inter relatedness of development and democracy cannot be over emphasized. Both concepts have their bearings on the individuals and both cannot operate in isolation. In other words, democracy breeds development and on the other hand development needs democracy to be actualized.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the forgone, we make the following recommendations:

Civil society organizations should take the responsibility to mobilize th populace in political activities and the decision making process of the state. This would bring about quality decision \ that would have direct bearing on the lives of the citizenry.

Political leaders and decision makers in the polity should be made to understand that development is about the improvement of the living conditions of the citizenry and their ability to have access to the basic infrastructure of life.

Efforts aimed at development should be concentrated at the local/grassroots level. This is owing to the reality that the rural populace have been largely neglected in the development efforts of governments, hence their present state of development.

## REFERENCES

- Agara, T. & Okonkwo, C. (2020). Democracy, Good Governance and National Development: A Critical Examination of the Nexus in *NPSA South- South Journal of Political Science*. Vol 1 No. 1 March 2020.
- Ake, C. (1987). "An African Conception of Human Rights". *Africa Today* Vol. 34. Nos 1 &2.
- Amadi, G. (2019). Political Participation and Stability in Democracy. In O. Nwodim; M.D. Ogali, and E.C. Ndu (eds). *The State, Politics and Development; Essays in Honour of Professor Eme Ekekwe*. Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt Press.
- Apostolides, A. & Moncada, S. (2013). *Development Theory and Development in Practice: A Dialogue*. Cyprus: NGO Support Centre Retrieved from [www.ngo-sc.org](http://www.ngo-sc.org).
- Sharela, B.F. (2015). Theories of Development. In *International Journal of Language and Linguistics* Vol 2 No 1 March 2015 Centre for the Promotion of Ideas, U.S.A. Retrieved from [www.ijllnet.com](http://www.ijllnet.com).
- Barnes , S.H., Allerrbeck, K.R., Farah, B.G. , Heunks, F.J., Inglehart, R.F., Jennings, M.K., Rosemary, L 91979). *Political Action*. Beverly Hills: SAGE.
- Charcote, R. H. (1984). *Theories of Development and Under development*. London: Westview Press.
- Dahl, R. (2000). *On Democracy*. Yale: Yale University Press
- Dalton, R.J.; Shin, D.C.; & Jou, W. (2007). Understanding Democracy: Data from Unlkely Places. In *Journal of Democracy*. Vol. 18. No. 4 pp 143-156.
- Dewey, J. (1924). *The Public and its Problems*. New York. Holt.
- Diamond, L. (1999). *Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Douglas-Roche M.P. (1979). *What Development Is All About?* Toronto: New Canada Publications.
- Efemni A. O. ed (2002). *Ake and African Development: Selected Issues*. Port Harcourt: Paragraphics.
- Franklin, A. L. & Ebdon C. (2007). Democracy, Public Participation and Budgeting: Mutually Exclusive or Just Exhuasting (pp 84-106). In R.C. Box (ed). *Democracy and Public Administration*. New York: M.E, Shape.
- Fukuyama, F. 92012). *The Origin of Political Order: From Pre-human Times to the French Revolution*. London: Profileeeee Books.
- Held, D. (1981). *Models of Democracy*. Oxford: Polity Press.

- Jike V.T. (2003). Democratic Governance, Gender- Culture and the Challenge of Sustainable Development in Nigeria. In Iyioha, P.E., Aghagere, V.O. and Oviasuji, P.O. E (eds). *Rethinking Governnace and Development in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Edo: Institute of Governance and Development, Ambrose Alli University.
- Kazeem,Y (2020). Nigeria has become the poverty capital of the world. Quarts Africa retrieved from <https://qz.com/africa/1313380/nigeria-has-thee-highest-poverty-rate-of-extreme-povert-globally/>.
- Konberg, A. & Clarke, H. D. (1992). *Citizens and Community Political Support in a Representative Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lale, N.E.S. (2019). Democracy and the Leadership Question in Nigeria: Missed Opportunities and the Way Forward. In O. Nwodim, M.D. Ogali, and E.C. Ndu (eds). *The State, Politics and Development; Essays in Honour of Professor Eme Ekekwe*. Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt Press.
- Laski, H. (2010). *A Grammar of Politics*. India: Surject Publications.
- Levin, M. (1920). *The Spectre of Democracy: Thee Rise of Modern Democracy as seen by Modern Critics*. London: Macmillan.
- Platner, M. (2010). “ Populism, Pluralism and Liberal Democracy”. *Journal of Democracy*. Vol 21. No 1 January. Pp 81-92.
- Mene, C. (2002). Ake on the Obstacles to Africa’s Development. In A.O. Efemini (ed) *Ake and African Development: Selected Issues*. Port Harcourt: Paragraphics.
- Mgba, C. 92019). Political Parties and Democratization in Nigeria’s Fourth Republic. In O. Nwodim, M.D. Ogali and E.C. Ndu (eds). *The State, Politics and Development; Essays in Honour of Professor Eme Ekekwe*. Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt Press.
- Ndu, EE.C. (1998). *Ancient and Medieval Politics*. Owerri; Springfield Publishers.
- Nna, N.J & Pabon, B.G. (2019). Ethnicity and Democractic Poliitiics in Nigria. In O. Nwodim, M.D. Ogali and E.C. Ndu (eds). *The State, Politics and Development; Essays in Honour of Professor Eme Ekekwe*. Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt Press.
- Nwaorgu, O.C. (2005) Imperialism and Development in Nigeria in H.E. Alapiki (ed). *The Political Economy of Globalization*. Port Harcourt: Amethyst and Colleagues Publishers
- Nwodim, O. (2018). Assessing Development Initiatives in Etyche Local Government Area of Rivers State, 1999-2002; 2003-2007. In *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management Research* Vol 4. No 4 2018 Retrieved from [www.iiardpub.org](http://www.iiardpub.org).
- Nwodim, O. & Barikor, I. (2019). Public Policy and National Integration in Nigeria, In *Journal of Political and Administrative Studies*, University of Port Harcourt. Vol. 1 No. 1 December, pp 19-93.
- Ogali, M.D. (2019). African Egalitarianism, Liberal Democracy and Electoral Violence: A Theoretical Explanation. In *Nigeria Journal of Oil and Politics*. Vol 4. No 2 November 2019.
- Ojo, O. (1999) Military Language and Democratization I Nigeria. In D. Olowu et al (eds). *Government and Democratization in West Africa*. Darkar: CODESRIA.
- Omoruiyi, O. (1993). *Democratization in Africa: Ngowari Perspective*. Benin City: Hima and Hima Limited.
- Seers, D. (1969). The Meaning of Development. Paper presented at the Eleventh World Conference of the Society for International Development. New Delhi. India.
- Steed, M. (1972). Participation Through Western Democratic Institutions. In G. Parry (ed). *Participation in Politics*, pp 80-101. Manchester: Manchester University Press,
- Toyo, E. (2001). Ideology and African Development: A Clarification of issues . In Ozo-Eson & Ukiwo, U (eds) *Ideology and African Development: Proceedings of the Third Memorial Programme in Honour of Professor Claude Ake*. Centre for Advanced Social Sciences and African Centre for Democratic Governance.
- Weghorst, K. & Lindberg, S. (2011). Effective Opposition Strategies: Collective Goods or Clientilism”. In E. Uddhammar, E. Gren and J. Sodersom (eds), *Democratization: Special Issue Political Opposition and Democracy in Sub Saharan Africa*. Vol 18. No. 5 October. Pp 1093-1214.