

# EUROPEAN UNION AND DEMOCRATIC CONSOLIDATION IN THE NIGERIA'S FOURTH REUBLIC

---

## Abstract

The paper is an empirical study on collaboration between European Union and Nigeria's democratic institutions. Anchoring the study on the liberal democratic theory, the target population for this study comprises all the principal officers of an international organisation; government agencies; non-governmental organisations and political parties. A sample of 200 respondents was selected using the purposive sampling technique. Utilizing secondary and primary data, the study tested three hypothetical assumptions. Analysis done through simple percentages, frequency distribution tables and chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) statistical test reveals the study found out that the Europeans Union has a strong collaborative effort with the Nigeria's democratic institutions. It further revealed that the collaboration between the EU and Nigeria's democratic institutions is a significant factor to be considered in consolidating Nigeria democracy. It is shown that the European Union is effective in strengthening the capacity of democratic institutions. The study concluded that the democratic collaboration of the EU has influenced democratic institutions positively in the Nigeria.

**Keywords:** European Union, Democracy, Democratic Consolidation, Democratic Institutions, Liberal Democracy

---

## Introduction

Democracy well consolidated in a particular state engenders political stability, economic viability, scientific advancement, technological breakthrough, educational development and ensures life enhancing social services (Oluwole, 2003). Those in government under a democratic setting are held accountable and responsible for their actions. Political officers do not have automatic security of tenure but can be challenged and even displaced in accordance with the will of the people through institutional mechanisms (Ogundiya & Baba, 2007). This mechanism makes democracy imperative as no man becomes a lord overall, but what is obtainable is the rule of law (Adeyinka & Ojo, 2014).

Democracy supports are activities, programmes and structures aimed at enhancing the practice and enforcement of democratic ethos (Khakee, 2007). These include citizens' involvement, equality, rule of law, political broadmindedness, accountability, transparency, regular, free and fair elections, economic freedom, containment of power abuse, human rights, multi-party system of governance, neutrality of state institutions and a culture of accepting the results of elections (Ibid). Therefore, any activity carried out by any party or actor with the aim of enhancing any of the above principles is democratic support.

However, with the end of the cold war, international organizations such as the United Nations, European Union and World Bank and Western States such as the US, or the Federal Republic of Germany made democratic support their mainstream of development strategies (Tanga & Thomas, 2009). It is also important to note, that support for good governance and democracy is a central element of the EU's external policy towards third world countries (Peter & Michele, 2011).

This makes the EU to stress the importance of good governance and democracy in its relations with developing countries of Africa. European Commission began funding elections in Africa in 1994 as set out in the article 6 of the Treaty on European Union (Dimpho, 2010). Thus, in the 2000 Cotonou Agreement between the EU and the members of African, Caribbean and Pacific (APC) groups of states, democracy was given a priority (European Commission, 2005).

In 2005, the EU strategy for Africa which provides comprehensive, integrated and long term framework for EU- Africa relations also stressed good governance as a central prerequisite for sustainable development (European Commission, 2005). Also in 2006, when the EU parliament council, commission and member states presented a common vision that will guide their future development actions, good governance and democracy was given prominence. They underlined that progress in the protection of human rights, good governance and democratisation is fundamental for poverty reduction and sustainable development, and that, as a consequence, these issues will be mainstreamed throughout all EU development activities (European Commission, 2006).

Similarly, the EU states increasingly emphasis good governance in their bilateral development cooperation with African states. Emphasis was also placed on democracy under the EU-Africa summit in Lisbon, Portugal of 2007 (Lorenzo, 2009). Since independence, Nigeria had been struggling to install a stable democracy. For instance, disagreement over election result brought about the collapse of the civilian government of 1966. The military coup that brought about Gen. Muhammadu Buhari and Gen Sani Abacha was justified by the controversies of both 1983 and 1993 elections. More so, only 1993 and 2011 general elections were regarded as credible according to international standard. While the annulled 1993 general election strained the Nigeria-EU relations, the integrity of the 2011 election was challenged. As a consequence of the former annulled general election, the EU suspended military cooperation and training, introduced travel restrictions for members of the security forces and their families, and restricted high-level visits (European Council, 1995).

In the aftermath of the execution of Ken Saro-Wiwa and other Ogoni leaders in late 1995 for their protests against Shell operations in the Niger Delta, political relations with the EU came to an almost complete standstill. The EU reinforced travel restrictions, imposed an arms embargo, and suspended most development cooperation with Nigeria (European Commission, 2000). The Shell connection notwithstanding, there was no oil embargo and no freezing of Nigerian leaders' assets in Europe. EU companies, including oil companies such as Shell and Total, also continued operating in the country. The EU measures were lifted after the elections in May 1999, following the death of the military dictator Sani Abacha in 1998 (European Commission, 2000).

With the return to democracy, political relations between the EU and Nigeria were resumed. Since Nigeria returned to democratic rule in May 29, 1999, European Union has been supporting its democratisation processes. This is evident in the EU's support for Nigeria in its 2003, 2007, 2011 and 2015 general elections, which included financial and technical assistance. However, extant literature has not thoroughly explored how adequate and effective the EU is in supporting Nigeria's democracy. There is therefore the need to fill the gap in knowledge by assessing the effective extent of the EU in supporting the consolidation quest of Nigeria's democracy; hence this study.

## **Statement of the Research Problem**

Previous studies by Ojo (2006), Omotola (2008), Oyeleye (1981), Oluwole (2003), Ogundiya and Baba (2007) etc. have depicted the imbrolios that have ravaged the democratic aspiration of the Nigeria state. These problems have corrosive effects on the socio-political and economic development of the polity. The possibility of democracy to uphold the rule of law, protects human rights, improve the quality of life and ensure security for all and sundry Nigerians is weakened.

Nigeria under military rule experienced economic decline, fundamental human rights abuses, growing rate of unemployment, low standard of education, mismanagement of public fund etc. This is not to say that civilian government did better than the military government but it is believed that democracy create an environment for the empowerment of the populace. During the long years of military rule, various national and international actors began to advocate for democratisation in Nigeria. The stern advocacy is justified on the ground that democracy is able to ameliorate the political and economic quagmire Nigeria was plunged under military rule. In response to the pressure, Nigeria adopted the liberal democracy style of government in 1999. The expected dividends was cut short because most challenges experienced under military regimes which democracy is expected to whip off still manifested in Nigeria under democratic government. In fact, the principles of democracy that are meant to have been strongly enshrined such as transparency, accountability, rule of law, etc. still cannot find their footings in the long while adopted democracy.

EU has been at the forefront of consolidating Nigeria's democracy since May 29, 1999 when Nigeria returned to democratic regime. Nigeria, especially its credential as a regional hegemony that matters in the outside world enjoyed the involvement of EU in its democratisation process. The involvement of EU to consolidate Nigeria's democracy was hinged on the proposition that a strengthened democracy promotes peace, security and prosperity at all levels. In spite of being the most prominent international organisation supporting democratic stability in Nigeria, EU's role in the strengthening of Nigeria's democratic institutions has not been sufficiently addressed in extant literature. The study intends to fill the gap as it is expected to provide answers to questions surrounding the effectiveness of EU in the capacity building democratic institutions in Nigeria.

## **Conceptual Clarification**

### **Democracy**

The concept of democracy has been subjected to diverse forms of interpretation since its conception in the Greek City states. Most of the interpretations are opposite in nature. Sarabjit (2002) posits, democracy has been the subject of immeasurable interpretations by scholars over the years. It has been used and misused, abused and described by people according to their interest. Ntalaja (2000) observes that, democracy is one of the most attractive features of contemporary politics. According to him, few people or nation-states nowadays claim to be democratic but not in the actual sense.

Sartori (1989) asserts that democracy is more inclusive than any other political form. In the view of Momoh (2006), democracy talks about representative government and empowerment of the people. Sallah (2008) opines that democracy is fundamentally about the exercise of power by the people. It should principally focus on how people determine and manage the affairs of their countries. They also exert pressure on their representatives to ensure their general welfare is protected and guaranteed.

Joseph (1991) is of the view that democracy is a government in which the will of the majority of qualified citizens rules. Odion-Akhaine (2005) opines that democracy is a vanguard for good governance as opposed to arbitrary and tyrannical government inherent in Africa. Alani (2003) views democracy as a government that underscores the plural nature of politics. This gives recognition to the diversity of social forces in any political community. A democratic regime accommodates these forces and fosters competition and collaboration amongst them.

Ayinde (2004) views democracy as a political practice that guarantees representation, accountability and participation under conditions of liberty provided by the rule of law. Dahl (2002) argues that democracy does not only include free, fair, and competitive elections but also the freedoms that renders them truly meaningful. According to Dahl, these freedoms include freedom of organisation and freedom of expression (Ibid). Osaghae (1995) notes that in all its versions, whether liberal, capitalist, or socialist, share the fundamental objective of power belonging to the people. In a similar manner, Sharma (2007) contends that democracy means among others the involvement of the people in the running of the political, socio – economic and cultural affairs of the society.

There must be evidence of democratic virtues before a state can be said to be democratic. Newton and Van Deth (2008) itemized the elements of democracy as follows: citizens involvement in political decision making, equality among citizens, some degree of liberty granted to citizenry, and an electoral system of majority rule. Przeworski (1991) simply defines democracy as a system in which parties lose election. He sees democracy as the peaceful transfer of power enacted through regular elections. Schumpeter (1990) argues that democracy is a method by which decision-making is conferred on individual who have gained power through a competitive struggle for the votes of the citizens. Keller (1995) asserts that democracy is the replacement of administration by another without bloodshed. He rejects the concept of sovereignty, stating that the imperfection and uncertainties of elections are preferable to the prospect of tyranny found within sovereignty.

### **Democratic Consolidation**

It has been noted that of the three basic political processes of democratisation – authoritarian break down, democratic transition and democratic consolidation, the last is the least studied and the least understood. Various definitions of democratic consolidation have been put forward. Ademola (2012) claims that a democracy is consolidated when power is alternated between rivals, support for the system is continued during times of economic hardship, rebels are defeated and punished, the regime remains stable in the face of restructuring of the party system, and there exists no significant political anti-system.

Mohammed (2013) argues that a democracy is consolidated when social relations become social values i.e. patterns of interaction can become so regular in their occurrence, so endowed with meaning, so capable of motivating behaviour that they become autonomous in their internal function and resistant to externally induced change. Democracy is consolidated when under given political and economic conditions a particular system of institutions becomes the only game in town; when no one can imagine acting outside the democratic institutions, when all losers want to do is to try again within the same institutions under which they have just lost (Przeworski,1991).

Gunther, Diamandourous and Puhle (1995) in their research entitled *The Politics of Democratic Consolidation: Southern Europe in Comparative Perspective* advance the view that democratic consolidation is complete when there has been an adoption of democratic institutions, processes and values by the political class and the masses. Ojo, (2006).

Challenges of Sustainable Democracy in Nigeria, stresses the institutionalisation of political organisations in the party system as critical to democratic consolidation. Baracani, (2007), In a publication, *The European Union and Democracy Promotion: A Strategy of Democratisation in the Framework of the Neighbourhood Policy*, emphasises the spheres of industrial and labour relations and economic policy making as crucial to democratic consolidation. Morlino (1998) in a publication entitled *Democracy between Consolidation and Crisis: Parties, Groups and Citizens in Southern Europe* makes an analysis of the political arena emphasising the relationships to civil society among the elite, parties, the state and interest association as the factor for democratic consolidation.

In spite of the divergences of the above works, their commonality is that they all explore beyond the oft-cited indicator for measuring the extent of democratic consolidation, Huntington (1991) contends that democracy becomes consolidated when an electoral regime is fully entrenched and capable of delivering free and competitive elections. He argues that there is consolidation if the party or group that takes power in the initial election at the time of transition loses a subsequent election and turns over power to those election winners, and if those election winners then peacefully turn over power to the winners of a later election. This measure of democratic consolidation has been criticised from many angles. The most persuasive of which is Diamond, Linz and Lipset's contention that in many of the world's new democracies, competitive elections have not ensured liberty, responsiveness and the rule of law (Diamond, Linz & Lipset, 1990).

### **Theoretical Framework**

To study the efficacy of the EU in supporting Nigeria's democracy, this paper adopts liberal democratic theory. The liberal theory of democracy is common among major capitalist and minor capitalist nations. The emergence of the theory is traced to the era capitalism became the prevailing mode of production in Europe and North American. The philosophical writing of John Locke, J.J. Rousseau, John Stuart Mill, Montesquieu and other Liberal writers whose theories advocate private liberty, natural rights, social justice, majority rule and private property amplified the liberal theory of democracy (Ogundiya, 2010).

The basic tenets of liberal democratic theory are: free, fair and periodic elections based on universal franchise; entrenchment of civil liberties or individual rights such as freedom of speech, assembly, press and religion; competitive multiparty system as against the one party system; pressure groups; rule of law; separation of powers and checks and balances; peaceful approach to the change of government.

The central idea of the liberal theory of democracy is the fabrication a political system where individual participation is guaranteed. In such polity, the moral development of citizens is visible. Liberal democracies usually have universal suffrage. All adult citizens reserve the right to vote irrespective of creed, race, gender disparity, sexual orientation or property ownership. Liberal democracy could be viewed in diverse dimensions. In constitutional forms: it may be a federal republic, as the Federal Republic of Nigeria, United States, Brazil, India and Germany. Otherwise, it could take the form of a constitutional monarchy such as the United Kingdom, Japan, or Spain. It has a presidential or a parliamentary system outlook.

This theory is justified due to the fact that, it helps to examine how effective the EU is supporting the democratic consolidation project of Nigeria as it stipulates the structural

arrangement expected of a democratic polity to function. Liberal theory of democracy is a titillating theory for this piece. Its significance rests on the fact that it rationalises and justifies the expected modus operandi of any democratic political system, chiefly as it stresses the conduct of credible elections, which is one of the indices to determine the consolidated extent of a democracy.

### **Critique**

Liberal Democracy does not give cognisance to absolute majority rule. The exception is the period representatives are elected. A relatively small representative wields the real power under a liberal democracy. The influence of the majority rule under the liberal democratic setting is inconsequential compared to the few representatives in the political system.

The Liberal Democracy is criticised as an apparent decoration to glorify and favour the few. Certain Marxists, Socialists and Left-wing Anarchists, assert that, liberal democracy is a vital feature of the capitalist system. It is therefore a class-based system an anathema to a democratic or participatory system. It is safe to argue that liberal democratic setting is a system that promotes the interest of the rich few at the expense of the masses (Morton, 2004). Non-democratic socialists have also criticized modern democracy as a subtle force that manipulates and blinds the masses from recognising how marginalised they are in the political process. Liberal Democracy notwithstanding the criticisms is by and large significant in this work. The significant magnitude of the liberal theory of democracy is that it serves as a parameter that determines the effectiveness of the support of the EU in consolidating Nigeria's democracy.

### **Research Objectives**

- (i) To determine the level of collaboration between the European union and democratic institutions in Nigeria;
- (ii) To examine the significance of the collaboration between the European Union and democratic institutions during the democratisation processes; and
- (iii) To investigate the effectiveness of the collaboration between the European Union and Nigeria's democratic institutions.

### **Research Question**

- (i) What is the level of collaboration between the EU and Nigeria democratic institution?
- (ii) Is the collaboration between the EU and Nigeria's democratic institutions significant to ensure the consolidation of Nigeria's democracy?
- (iii) What is the effectiveness of the collaborative effort of the EU with democratic institutions in Nigeria?

### **Statement of Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses will be investigated in the study:

- (i) The collaboration between the EU and Nigeria democratic institutions is not strong enough to ensure democratic consolidation in Nigeria;
- (ii) The collaboration between the EU and Nigeria's democratic institutions is not significant to facilitate the strengthening of Nigeria's democracy; and
- (iii) The collaborative effort of the EU with democratic institutions in Nigeria is not effective.

## Research Methodology

A survey of 200 respondents was taken. These study units were selected and used because of their experience and knowledge in answering the questions regarding Nigeria's democratisation processes raised in the questionnaire administered. Their responses were utilised descriptively on the issues understudied. The questions raised in the questionnaire construct reflect the investigated variables thus guarantees the reliability of the gathered data. Furthermore, the reliability and validity of data was confirmed by allowing experts in statistical analysis to make useful scrutiny on the research instrument. The questionnaire construct was also given to experts in social sciences to examine to establish the consistency of the research instrument with variables raised in the assumptions and that it is at the core of the issues the researcher want to study. This therefore, solidified the construct. The data adequately depict the issues investigated which confirms the reliability of the research instrument.

## Data Presentation and Analysis

The data generated were analysed quantitatively using simple frequency distribution tables, percentages and Chi-square to ascertain the effectiveness of the collaboration between the European Union and Nigeria democratic institutions in providing democratic support for Nigeria.

## Socio-Demographic Data of Respondents

The tables below provide the socio-demography and psychographic analyses of data collected in the cause of this study.

**Figure 1: Sex of Respondents**

Item	Frequency	Percentage
Male	158	79%
Female	42	21%
Total	200	100

**Figure 2: Age of Respondents**

Item	Frequency	Percentage
18 – 25	18	9%
26 – 35	34	17%
36 – 45	120	60%
46 – 55	25	16%
Over 55 years	1	1%
Total	200	100

**Figure 3: Marital Status**

Item	Frequency	Percentage
Single	32	16%

<b>Married</b>	166	83%
<b>Divorce</b>	2	1%
<b>Total</b>	200	100

The socio-demographic data from figure 1 shows a sex composition made of 158 males representing 79 percent and 42 females representing 21 percentages. Age composition revealed that 18 respondents representing 9 percent were between 18-25 years while 34 respondents constituting 17 percent were within 26-45 years. 120 respondents representing 60 percent are between 36-45. 25 respondents representing 16 percent were 46-55 years; only 1 (1%) fell under the age bracket of 55 and above years. Marital status of respondents revealed that 32 respondents representing 16 percent are single while 166 respondents representing 83 percent were married. Only 2 respondents were divorced. In summary, the survey shows a data dominated by male respondents and majority of the respondents are within the active age of service with physical and mental vigour to life endeavours.

**Research Question 1: What is the level of collaboration between the EU and Nigeria’s democratic institutions?**

**Table 3: Respondents view on the level of collaboration between the EU and Nigeria’s democratic institutions.**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Agree(%)</b>	<b>Disagree(%)</b>	<b>No comment(%)</b>	<b>Total</b>
There is a strong collaboration between EU and Democratic institutions in Nigeria.	151(76%)	42(21%)	7(3%)	200
The Nigerian democratic institutions do not cooperate with the European union	46(23%)	152(76%)	2(1%)	200
The European Union collaboration is accepted by the democratic institution	158(79%)	36(18%)	6(3%)	200
<b>Total</b>	355	230	15	600

**Test of Hypothesis**

**Hypothesis I**

- (H0) The collaboration between the EU and Nigeria democratic institutions is not strong enough to ensure democratic consolidation in Nigeria
- (H1) The collaboration between the EU and Nigeria democratic institutions is strong enough to ensure democratic consolidation in Nigeria

Independent variable: European Union

Dependent variables: democratic institution in Nigeria.

Test statistics: chi square(x2).

Degree of freedom (df): 4

Level of significance: 0.05

Decision rules: retain Ho if calculated  $\chi^2$  value less than (<)critical  $\chi^2$ -value. Reject Ho if calculated  $\chi^2$ - value greater than(>) critical  $\chi^2$ - value.

**The output of the chi-square model is:**

Cell	Fo	Fe	(FO-FE) <sup>2</sup> /FE
A	151	118	6
B	42	77	16
C	7	5	0.4
D	46	118	44
E	152	77	73
F	2	5	2
G	158	118	14
H	36	77	22
I	6	5	0.2
Total			$\chi^2 = 375.6$

From the table above, 151 respondents representing 76 p percent agree that the collaboration between the EU and Nigeria's democratic institutions strong enough to cause democratic impact. 42 respondents representing 21 percent disagree that the collaboration between the EU and Nigeria's democratic institutions is sturdy enough to cause democratic impact. 7 respondents representing 3% did not comment on the question of the strength of the collaboration. Regarding the attitude of the democratic institutions, 46 of the respondents representing 23 percent agree that the democratic institutions did not cooperate with the EU, while 152 representing 76% disagree that the democratic institutions did not cooperate with the EU. 2 of the respondents representing 1 percent of did not give their opinion. This means that the collaborative effort between the EU and Nigeria's democratic institutions is strong enough to cause democratic impact. 158 representing 79 percent of the respondents agree that the EU is accepted by the democratic institutions in Nigeria, 36 of the respondents disagree that the democratic institutions accept the participation of EU in Nigeria democratisation processes. 6 respondents representing 3 percent did not give their view. It can be deduced that the level of collaboration between the EU and democratic institutions in Nigeria is strong enough to entrench democratic ethos in Nigeria democratic transitions. The Ho is thereby rejected while H1 is accepted on the ground that the Chi-square calculated  $\chi^2$  375.6 greater than the Tab  $\chi^2$  (9.49)

**Research Question 2: Is the collaboration between the EU and Nigeria's democratic institutions significant to ensure the consolidation of Nigeria's democracy?**

**Table 4: Respondents view on the significance of collaboration between the EU and Nigeria's democratic institutions in ensuring the consolidation of Nigeria's democracy**

Item	Agree	Disagree	No comment	Total
EU strengthens democratic institutions to consolidate Nigeria's democracy	149 (74.5%)	49 (24%)	2(2%)	200
The presence of EU and other international organisations affect the political disposition of Nigeria democratic institutions	162 (81%)	33(16%)	5(3%)	200
Improvement in Nigeria electoral process culminate from the collaborative effort of EU and Nigeria democratic institutions	173(86%)	25(12%)	2(2)	200
<b>Total</b>	484	107	9	600

## Test of Hypothesis

### Hypothesis II

**(H0)** The collaboration between the EU and Nigeria's democratic institutions does not facilitate the strengthening of Nigeria's democracy.

**(H1)** The collaboration between the EU and Nigeria's democratic institutions does not facilitate the strengthening of Nigeria's democracy.

Independent variable: European Union

Dependent variables: democratic institution in Nigeria.

Test statistics: chi square(x<sup>2</sup>).

Degree of freedom (df): 4

Level of significance: 0.05

Decision rules: retain Ho if calculated x<sup>2</sup> value less than (<)critical x<sup>2</sup>-value. Reject Ho if calculated x<sup>2</sup>- value greater than (>) critical x<sup>2</sup>- value.

### The output of the chi-square model is:

Cell	Fo	Fe	(FO-FE) <sup>2</sup> /FE
A	149	161	1
B	49	36	5
C	2	3	0.3
D	162	161	0.01
E	33	36	0.3
F	5	3	3
G	173	161	1
H	25	36	3.4
I	2	3	0.3
<b>Total</b>			<b>X<sup>2</sup> = 14.3</b>

The table above depict that 149 respondents representing 24 percent agree that the EU strengthens democratic institutions to consolidate Nigeria's democracy. 49 respondents representing 24 percent disagree that EU strengthens democratic institutions to consolidate Nigeria's democracy. 2 respondents representing 2% did not comment on the question.

Regarding the effect of the presence of international bodies like EU in Nigeria during democratic transition, 162 of the respondents representing 81 percent agree that the presence of EU and other international organisations affect the political disposition of Nigeria democratic institutions. On the contrary, 33 representing 16% disagree that the presence of EU and other international organisations affect the political disposition of Nigeria democratic institutions. 5 of the respondents representing 3 percent of did not say anything regarding that. 173 representing 86 percent of the respondents agree that the improvement in Nigeria electoral process culminate from the collaborative effort of EU and Nigeria democratic institutions. 25 of the respondents making 12 percent disagree that the improvement in Nigeria electoral process culminate from the collaborative effort of EU and Nigeria democratic institutions. 2 respondents representing 2 percent did not give their view. It can be deduced that the collaboration between the EU and democratic institutions in Nigeria is a significant factor in strengthening Nigeria’s democracy. The Ho is thereby rejected while H1 is accepted on the ground that the Chi-square calculated  $X^2$  14.3 greater than the Tab  $X^2$  (9.49)

**Research Question 3: What is the effectiveness of the collaborative effort of the EU with democratic institutions in Nigeria?**

**Table 5: Respondents view on the effectiveness of the collaborative effort of the EU with democratic institutions in Nigeria**

Item	Agree	Disagree	No comment	Total
Electoral officials were adequately trained	175 (87%)	21(10%)	4 (3%)	200
Adequate training materials were provided	169 (84%)	31(16%)	0(0%)	200
The electoral officials effectively and efficiently managed the polling units	182(91%)	18(9%)	0(0%)	200
<b>Total</b>	526	70	4	600

**Test of Hypothesis**

**Hypothesis III**

- (H0)** The collaborative effort of the EU with democratic institutions in Nigeria is not effective.
- (H1)** The collaborative effort of the EU with democratic institutions in Nigeria is effective.

Independent variable: European Union

Dependent variables: democratic institution in Nigeria.

Test statistics: chi square(x2).

Degree of freedom (df): 4

Level of significance: 0.05

Decision rules: retain Ho if calculated x2 value less than (<)critical x2-value. Reject Ho if calculated x2- value greater than(>) critical x2- value.

Cell	Fo	Fe	$(FO-FE)^2/FE$
A	175	175	0
B	21	23	2
C	4	1.3	2.7
D	169	175	6
E	31	23	8
F	0	1.3	1.3
G	182	175	0.3
H	18	23	1.1
I	0	1.3	1.3
<b>Total</b>			$X^2 = 13.4$

Drawing from the above table, 175 respondents representing 87 percent agree that the electoral officials were adequately trained to manage the polling units. 21 respondents representing 10 percent disagree that the electoral officials were adequately trained to manage the polling. 4 respondents representing 3% did not comment on the question. Regarding the effect of the presence of international bodies like EU in Nigeria during democratic transition, 169 of the respondents representing 84 percent agree that adequate training materials were provided during the capacity building of the electoral officers. On the contrary, 31 representing 16% disagree that adequate training materials were provided during the capacity building of the electoral officers. None of the respondents shares his or her view. 182 representing 91 percent of the respondents agree that the electoral officials effectively and efficiently managed the polling units. 18 of the respondents making 9 percent disagree that electoral officials effectively and efficiently managed the polling units. It is inferred that the collaboration between the EU and democratic institutions in Nigeria is an effective venture in consolidating Nigeria's democracy. The Ho is thereby rejected while H1 is accepted on the ground that the Chi-square calculated  $X^2$  13.4 greater than the Tab  $X^2$  (9.49)

### **Conclusion**

From the findings of this study, it is obvious that European Union's democratic support for Nigeria has significant positive effect on the country's democratisation process. The sum of EURO 35million was provided for INEC to run electoral demands. Prior to this, the EU donated USD25million which is the highest given to the DGD project of 2012-2015. Various training for electoral officials were supported by the EU through the supply of training kits for the participants. The EU supported the capacity of CSOs to monitor Nigeria's electoral process. The effect is the increase in the number of CSOs that monitored the 2015 elections compared to the 2011 general elections. In the country's democratic experience the 2011 was marked a success compared to the previous general elections. However, the 2015 general election was the first successful democratic challenge of incumbent president in the country's history. President Goodluck Jonathan's concession to president-elect Muhammadu Buhari, prior to the official announcement of the result will be remembered as a signature moment in the consolidation of Nigeria's democracy. This milestone in Nigeria's democratisation process has improved the quality of relation with the rest of the world. Thus, the stability of Nigeria's democratic terrain has propelled the EU in furthering its support for Nigeria's political system in other areas such as poverty reduction, conflict management initiative and anti corruption initiatives.

### **Recommendations**

The proposals on evolving an enduring and sustainable democracy in Nigeria are large and increasing. However, this piece advances proposals that are considered germane approach the E can adopt in supporting the consolidating adventure of democracy in Nigeria

The EU in supporting the consolidation of Nigeria's democracy should take into cognisance the peculiar nature of the Nigerian state. In considering the historical, political, economic and socio-cultural uniqueness of Nigeria, it is imperative for the EU to foresee the possibility of violence in subsequent democratisation processes. Therefore, Two years before an election, the EU in collaboration with the federal government need to deploy a team of electoral and conflict experts to assess the danger of violence and to design appropriate steps that national actors can take to ensure that the democratic development is not truncated.

The autonomy of the electoral body is very crucial to democratic development in any country. Therefore, the need for EU to secure approval from the federal government to aid the structural independence of INEC cannot be over-emphasised. Establishing the structural independence of INEC in the area of appointment of commissioner and fund fundamentally guarantees the sustainability of democracy in Nigeria.

Taking advantage of technology in Nigeria's democratisation process is an indispensable the EU need intensified its interest to sustain Nigeria's democratic building. Technology in electoral processes could afford accurate online voting, and prevent electoral violence and malpractices. This is because technology can offers every electorates the opportunity to vote anywhere without disrupting their daily routines.

In assisting Nigeria to take advantage of technology, the EU should encourage the electoral umpire, INEC to make the use of technology extremely simple even for the illiterates. In this way, no illiterate will be technically disenfranchised rather they will be afforded the opportunity to participate effectively in the electoral process.

## References

- Ademola, A., (2012). Endangering Good Governance for Sustainable Democracy. The Continuing Struggle against Corruption in Nigeria. *Journal of Research on Peace, Gender and Development*. pp.307-314
- Adeyinka, T.A. & Ojo, E.O. (2014). Democracy in Nigeria: Practice, Problems, and Prospect: *Development Country Studies*. Vol.4, No.2, p.107
- Alani, B. I. (2003). Ethnic Politics and Democracy in Nigeria's Political History in Nigeria. *Forum* 24, (3-4), March /April, Lagos, NIIA. p.77
- Ayinde, A.F. (2004). Democracy Dividend and Nigeria's Fourth Republic. in *Nigerian Forum*, 26, (3-4), March/April, Lagos, NIIA p.95
- Baracani, E. (2007). The European Union and Democracy Promotion: A Strategy of Democratisation in the Framework of the Neighbourhood Policy. <http://www.fscp.unict.it/EuroMed/baracani.pdf>, accessed on 21/05/2015.
- Creswell, J. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- European Council (1995). Common Position by the Council on the Basis of Article 12 of the Treaty on European Union, on Nigeria. 1995/515/CFSP [http://ec.europa.eu/external\\_relations/human\\_rights/eu\\_election\\_ass\\_observ/nigeria/rep03.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/human_rights/eu_election_ass_observ/nigeria/rep03.pdf), accessed on 5/07/2016.

- European Commission (2005). Towards a Euro-African Pact to Accelerate Africa's Development. Brussels, <http://www.delnga.ec.europa.eu/projects/Project%20TimePlan1.xls>, accessed on 15/4/2016.
- European Commission (2006). The European Consensus on Development. Joint statement by the Council and the representatives of the governments of the Member States meeting within the Council, the European Parliament and the Commission on European Union Development Policy (2006/C 46/01), paragraphs 86 and 101, [www.consiliumeuropa.eu/uedocs/cms\\_data/docs/press/en/1032a0006.htm](http://www.consiliumeuropa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/press/en/1032a0006.htm), accessed on 28/9/2015.
- European Commission (2000). Nigeria-European Community Country Support Strategy and Indicative Programme for the period 2001–2007. <http://www.delnga.ec.europa.eu/docs/CountryStrategy.pdf>. accessed on 28/11/2015.
- Gunther, N., Diamondourus, & Puhle (1995) Introduction, The Politics of Democratic Consolidation: Southern Europe in Comparative Perspective, John Hopkins University Press.
- Huntington, S. (1991). The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Joseph, R. (1991). Democracy and Prebendal Politics in Nigeria. Ibadan, Spectrum Books Limited
- Jill S., & Pettiford L. (2005). Introduction to International Relations: Perspectives and Themes. England, Edinburg, Pearson Education Limited
- Keller, E., (1995). Liberalization, Democratization, and Democracy in Africa. *Africa Insight* 25(4):224-230.
- Khakee, A. (2007). EU Democracy Promotion in Nigeria : Between Realpolitik and Idealism. FRIDE working paper,
- Lorenzo, F. (2009). African Perception of the European Union: Assessing the Work of EU in the Field of Democracy Promotion and Peacekeeping. Sweden, Stockholm, International IDEA. p.6
- Mitrany, D. (1976). The Functional Theory of Politics. New York: St. Martin's Press. p.101
- Morlino L., (1987) Democratic Establishment: A Dimensional Analysis in Baloyra, (ed) Comparing New Democracies. pp.53-78
- Mohammed, U. (2013). Nigeria Elected System: A Change to Sustainable Democracy in the Fourth Republic. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development*. pp. 567-581
- Newton, K., Van Deth. (2008). Foundations of Comparative Politics. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Nzongola-Ntalaja, G. (1997). *The State and Democracy in Africa*. Africa Association of Political Science (AAPS). 19 Bodle Avenue, Eastlea, Harare, Zimbabwe.
- Oluwole, S.B. (2003). "Democracy and Indigenous Governance: The Nigerian Experience", in Oguejiofor, J.O. (Ed.) *Philosophy, Democracy and Responsible Governance in Africa*. New Brunswick and London, Transaction publishers, pp.419-430.
- Ojo, E., (2006). *Challenges of Sustainable Democracy in Nigeria*. John Archers Publishers Ibadan.
- Ogundiya, I.S. and Baba, T.K. (2007). "Electoral Violence and Democratic Consolidation to Nigeria" in Jega, A. and Ibeanu, O. (Eds.) *Elections and the Future of Democracy in Nigeria*. A publication of the Nigerian political Science Association (NPSA).
- Ogundiya, (2010). *Corruption the Bane of Democratic Stability in Nigeria*, *Journal of Social Sciences* 2(4):233-241
- Odion-Akhaine, S. (2005). *The Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC) and Election Management in Nigeria: The April 2003 General Elections in Perspective in the Constitution*. *A Journal of Constitutional Development*. 5(4)
- Osaghae E, (1995). *The Study of Political Transitions in Africa*. *Review Of African Political Economy*.
- Peter K., & Michele K., (2011). *Instruments of the EU's External Democracy Promotion*. USA, Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Przeworski, A. (1991). *Democracy and the Market*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosamond, B. (2000). *Theories of European Integration*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Sartori. G. (1987). *The Theory of Democracy Revisited*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.
- Schumpeter, J.A. (1990). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Sarabjit, K. (2002). *Challenges of Democratic Substance in Nigeria*. Paper presented at Centre for Democracy and Development, Lagos, 5th, July, 2002 under the auspices of South – South Exchange Programme.
- Sallah, H. (2008). *Democratic Transition in West Africa: Models, Opportunities, Obstacles and Options*. A paper presented at a workshop organised by the Commonwealth Secretariat and Commonwealth Parliamentary association on government and opposition: roles right and responsibility. Abuja, 16-18 June. p.1
- Sharma, S.D. (2007), *Democracy, Good Governance and Economic Development*. *Taiwan Journal of Democracy*. Vol.3 No.1
- Tanja A. & Thomas R. (2009). *Promoting Democracy and Rule of Law, American and European Strategies*. CPI Antony Rowe, Chippenham and Eastbourne, Great Britain.

