DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN HAPPINESS: AN OPINION SURVEY OF THE RESIDENTS OF KOGI STATE

ABRAHAM MUSA PETER, PhD
Department of Political Science, Federal University Lokoja
abraham.peter@fulokoja.edu.ng
abraham Musa Peter - Google Scholar
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6511-4987

DOI: https://doi.org/10.64633/wissj.v9i6.11

Keywords

Abstract

Research Problem:
The assumption is that democracy ought to increase human happiness since it bestows upon the people the task of electing those that govern them in a free and competitive environment. Nigeria has had that golden opportunity since May 29, 1999, when democracy was restored. However, several misgivings still permeate the various segments of society. This study is therefore a survey of the residents of Kogi State to ascertain their happiness level using the globally standardized indicators of happiness as the yardsticks.
Methods/Theory:
It adopts both qualitative and quantitative research methods, uses data from primary and secondary sources, and adopts statistical and normative methods of data analysis to examine the relationship between democracy and human happiness in Kogi State.
Results:
The study among others finds that from the survey carried out, there is a positive correlation between democracy and satisfaction with life. It further indicates that democratic systems contribute to happiness by allowing citizens to participate freely in the political process, vote in legitimate elections, and hold their representatives accountable.
Conclusion:
Democracy has been generally adopted as the most acceptable system of government. It has become an acceptable pattern of political succession globally. There is a positive correlation between democracy and human happiness because of the possibility of democracy to guarantee freedom, human rights and political liberty.
Key Contribution to Knowledge:
It contributes to the discourse on the interrelationship between democracy and human happiness particularly at the sub-national level.
Recommendations:

There is need for the satisfaction of life of the people to be improved. Secondly, there is the need to improve the economic welfare of the people by improving the credibility of the electoral process

Introduction

The triumph of capitalism, which upholds liberalism, and the end of the Cold War have made democratic government the norm throughout the world. Democracy, which is a worldwide phenomenon, is in existence, and its implementation is governed by globally recognized principles. These standards are now used globally to gauge the state of democratic government. Free, fair, and credible elections held on a regular basis as defined by the laws of the land are essential components of this worldwide benchmark.

Throughout Africa, there has been a democratic recession on a regular basis. In the aftermath of Nigeria's 2007 presidential election, for example, the elected president was keen to change the voting system and accepted its shortcomings. Similar events occurred in Zimbabwe in 2008 and Kenya in 2007, when top opposition figure Morgan Tsvangirai withdrew from the race for president, claiming voter suppression and political intimidation against him and his allies. The immediate result of these scenarios was the establishment of a government of national unity in these nations during that time (Peter, 2017).

When democracy was reinstated in Nigeria in 1999, there were high hopes for a better country and the strengthening of democracy. The democratic consolidation we had hoped for appeared to be a challenging challenge in light of the political events of the last several months, especially the way the country has conducted general elections. According to Obinna (2021), Nigeria's 24 years of democratic administration have been made worthless, and the country is today in a hazardous situation that is different from what was expected before to the 1999 election.

According to Kabir (2023), the 2023 presidential election was the lowest voter turnout since both the country's independence and its return to democratic administration in 1999. He claimed that not a single state had a voting turnout more than 40% and that less than half of the eligible voters cast ballots in any of the federation's states. This pattern may be attributed to the nation's waning faith in the political system as a result of important institutions, political leaders, and elites controlling the system during the country's political transition. Yagboyaju (2011) claims that dormant electorates, political indifference among eligible voters, and the threat posed by entities like the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC), political parties, the legislature, and the police are additional signs of Nigeria's fourth republic's declining democratization. Based on the location and timing of this, it is nearly difficult for voters to select a trustworthy leader or leaders.

The strong correlation between subjective well-being and democracy, according to Inglehart and Ponarin (2013), could mean that: (1) people are happier when they live under democratic institutions than when they live under authoritarian ones; (2) high levels of subjective well-being are conducive to democracy; (3) the correlation could be spurious, reflecting the fact that both subjective well-being and democracy are strongly

correlated with some other variable, like high levels of economic development; or (4) there may be a reciprocal relationship between happiness and democracy, possibly with a causal flow that is significantly stronger in one direction. The solution to this conundrum has broad ramifications. According to Inglehart and Ponarin (2013), if we find that high levels of happiness are conducive to democracy, this may help us understand how democracy emerges and flourishes. However, if the linkage is not spurious and democracy makes people happy, it is a strong argument for adopting democracy.

Statement of the Problem

Inglehart and Ponarin (2013) contend that if democracy leads to happiness, then shifts toward democracy ought to be accompanied by sharp rises in happiness. However, if happiness is a relatively stable variable that supports democracy but is not always increased by it, then democratization may not be followed by an increase in happiness. Additionally, a significant wave of democratization would weaken the subsequent correlation between democracy and happiness by bringing many less happy societies into the ranks of the democracies.

Judging from this therefore, it became necessary to interrogate the degree of happiness of the people of Kogi state in the democratic system of government that began since May 29, 1999. The central question therefore is, does democracy enhance the happiness of the people of Kogi state?

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study is to examine the effect of democracy on happiness. However, the specific objectives are to:

i. Examine the effect of democracy on satisfaction with life
ii. Assess the effect of democracy on the condition of life

Literature Review

"Both democracy and human happiness vary a great deal from one society to another," claims Inglehart (2006, p. 4). His research covers a wide spectrum of civilizations, from long-standing liberal democracies like the United States, Canada, Sweden, Denmark, and Britain to very authoritarian nations like China, Russia, and Bulgaria between 1981 and 1986 (Inglehart, 2006).

People who are content with their democracy are also likely to experience greater "luck" in their life, according to Graham and Pettinato (2000), referenced in Weingartmair (2022). Weingartmair (2022) also referenced Caplanova et al. (2014), whose research indicates that happiness and democratic satisfaction are positively correlated. Others, however, focused specifically on how democracy affected people's quality of life. According to Weingartmair (2022), research indicates that democracy—or at least some aspects of it—may influence how society evaluates life happiness.

Numerous empirical studies have also shown that aspects of governance, like democracy, are linked to happiness because democratization raises people's perceptions of their freedom of choice, which can raise happiness levels globally (Bjørnskov & Rode, 2020; Bjørnskov, 2010).

No research has been performed to examine the relationship between democracy and happiness in Nigeria since democracy was restored there in 1999. Closing this gap is essential because it would enable us to start analyzing Nigerian democracy while keeping in mind the country's increasing need for democratic consolidation.

Methodology

This is survey research. It adopts an *ex post facto* research design. This is the type of design where the independent variable is manipulated to measure its effects on the dependent variable. In an ex post facto manner, the independent variable (X) is democracy, and the dependent variable (Y) is human happiness. The empirical indicators of democracy shall be used to measure the empirical indicators of happiness so as to show whether democracy has made the residents of Kogi State happier or otherwise.

The 2022 estimated population of Kogi state is 4466800 (https://citypopulation.de/en/nigeria/admin/NGA023__kogi/. (Accessed on May 19, 2023). This shall constitute the population of the study. Taro Yamane's (1967) was used to determine the sample size as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where n = sample size
N = population
e = Error margin
Therefore using the error margin of 0.05,

$$n = \frac{4466800}{1 + 4466800(0.05)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{4466800}{4466801(0.0025)}$$

$$n = \frac{4466800}{4466801(0.0025)}$$

$$n = \frac{4466800}{11{,}167.0025}$$

$$n = \frac{4466800}{11{,}167.0025}$$

$$n = 399.9999104504543$$

$$n = 400$$

This study adopted both qualitative and quantitative research methods. Quantitatively, it relied extensively on the collection of numeric data driven essentially from the primary source. Also, it used the qualitative method, which is essential in cases where a researcher tries to understand or interpret a phenomenon based on the interpretations that people make of it in their natural environments (Peter, 2018; Peter, 2023). The significance of this is that understanding the viewpoints of other knowledge producers will be crucial to understanding the topics this article covers.

Primary and secondary sources of data were used. Data from the primary source were collected using questionnaire, whereas data from the secondary source were gotten from published texts, government official documents, national and international dailies, and other unpublished materials that were relevant to the work.

In order to articulate the variables under inquiry, secondary data were obtained from documentary evidence, including published materials and online sources, among others. The sequence of content analysis was followed in the qualitative analysis of the gathered data. This study fervently pursues the idea of a democratic coup and meticulously evaluates the circumstances surrounding the conduct of the 2023 presidential election and the attendant disputes.

Data Presentation and Analysis

The questionnaire designed to elicit data for this study was administered through google form. The sample size of 400 was determined through the Taro Yamane sample size determination formula. Alter the expiration of the duration for the completion of the questionnaire, a total of 354 responses were received. This represents 88.5 percent response rate, which is sufficient to continue with the analysis.

Demographic Status of Respondents

Table 1: Age of the Respondents

Options	Frequency	Percent
18-27	64	18.1
28-37	119	33.6
38-47	113	31.9
48-57	43	12.1
58 and above	15	4.2
Total	**354**	**100**

Source: Field work 2025

Table 1 contains the age distribution of respondents. It shows that the majority fall within the 28-37 age group (33.6%), followed closely by those aged 38-47 (31.9%). Younger respondents aged 18-27 make up 18.1%, while participation declines with age, as seen in the 48-57 group (12.1%) and those 58 and above (4.2%). This indicates that middle-aged individuals are the most engaged, while older age groups show lower participation, possibly due to differences in interest or accessibility.

Table 2: Gender of the Respondents

Options	Frequency	Percent
Female	80	22.6
Male	274	77.4
Total	**354**	**100.0**

Source: Field work 2025

Table 2 shows the gender distribution of the respondents. It reveals a significant disparity, with males comprising 77.4% of the sample, while females account for only 22.6%. This affirms the age-long discourse of poor women political engagements.

Table 3 Educational Qualification

Option	Frequency	Percent
Degree/HND	154	43.5
ND/OND/NCE	18	5.1
PGD/Masters	142	40.1
PhD	38	10.7
SSCE	2	0.6
Total	**354**	**100.0**

Source: Field work 2025

The educational qualification of the respondents as contained on table 3 shows that the majority of them hold a Degree or HND (43.5%). This was followed closely by those with a PGD or Master's degree (40.1%). A smaller percentage (10.7%) have attained a PhD, while 5.1% possess an ND, OND, or NCE qualification. Only 0.6% of respondents have an SSCE. This distribution indicates a highly educated population, with most respondents having at least a higher education qualification. This high educational qualification of the respondents shows that they are well informed of the issue under interrogation.

Answering Research Questions

1. **Using a scale of 1-5 where 1 is the lowest and 5 is the highest, how satisfied are you with the current state of democracy in your state?**

Table 4: Rating respondents' satisfaction with the current state of democracy in their country/state

Scale	Frequency	Percent
1	160	45.2
2	113	31.9
3	58	16.4
4	13	3.7
5	10	2.8
Total	**354**	**100.0**

Source: Field work 2025

The data on table 4 shows the respondents' satisfaction with the current state of democracy in Kogi State. It reveals that a significant proportion (45.2%) rated their satisfaction at the lowest level (1), indicating strong dissatisfaction with the current practice of democracy. Additionally, 31.9% rated it at level 2, further highlighting widespread discontent. Only 16.4% provided an average rating of 3, while minimal percentages (3.7% and 2.8%)

rated their satisfaction at levels 4 and 5 respectively. This suggests that the majority of respondents perceive democracy in their state as unsatisfactory, reflecting concerns about governance and political processes.

2. **Using a scale of 1-5 where 1 is the lowest and 5 is the highest, how important is living in a democratic country/state to you?**

Table 4: Rating how important it is for respondents to live in a democratic State

Scale	Frequency	Percent
1	39	11.0
2	33	9.3
3	81	22.9
4	85	24.0
5	116	32.8
Total	**354**	**100.0**

Source: Field work 2025

The data on the importance of living in a democratic state (see table 4) shows that a majority of respondents (32.8%) rated it at the highest level (5), indicating strong support for democracy. Additionally, 24.0% rated it at level 4, while 22.9% gave an average rating of 3. Conversely, 11.0% and 9.3% rated it at levels 1 and 2, respectively, suggesting that a minority placed lower importance on democracy. Generally, the findings indicate that most respondents value democracy, though opinions vary in intensity. Essentially, the high ratings of majority of the respondents on important it is to live in a democracy is predicated on the fact that a well-practiced democracy offers a conducive environment for human freedom and the full realisation of human potentials.

3. **Do you feel that your vote matters in elections?**

Table 5: The respondents' views on whether their votes influence election outcomes

Option	Frequency	Percent
Maybe	58	16.4
No	189	53.4
Yes	107	30.2
Total	**354**	**100**

Source: Field work 2025

The respondents' perspectives on whether their votes influence election outcomes reveal a significant level of scepticism (table 5). A majority (53.4%) believe their votes do not matter, suggesting concerns about the transparency and effectiveness of the electoral process. Meanwhile, 30.2% express confidence that their votes count, while 16.4% remain uncertain. These findings highlight varying levels of trust in the democratic system, which could impact voter participation and political engagement. This scepticism explains the growing discontent and continual rejection of elections results resulting in prolonged litigation process.

4. **Do you think the outcome of the elections reflect the votes of the people?**

Table 6: The respondents' perception of whether elections accurately reflect the people's votes

Option	Frequency	Percent
Maybe	54	15.25
No	248	70.06
Yes	52	14.69
Total	**354**	**100**

Source: Field work 2025

The data on respondents' perceptions of whether elections accurately reflect the people's votes reveal a prevailing lack of confidence in the electoral process (table 6). A significant majority (70.06%) believe that elections do not truly represent the will of the people, while only 14.69% affirm their trust in the outcome of the electoral process. Meanwhile, 15.25% remain uncertain, indicating lingering doubts and mixed opinions. These findings highlight concerns about electoral transparency and credibility, which could impact voter participation and trust in democratic institutions.

5. **How often do you participate in political activities (e.g., voting, protesting, volunteering)?**

Table 7: Respondents' views on their involvement in political activities.

Options	Frequency	Percent
I Do Not Participate	23	6.5
Most Often	106	29.9
Neutral	43	12.1
Often	106	29.9
Rarely	76	21.5
Total	**354**	**100**

Source: Field work 2025

The table 7 presents respondents' perspectives on their engagement in political activities. A significant portion, 29.9%, reported participating "most often," while an equal percentage indicated they participate "often." Meanwhile, 21.5% stated they "rarely" engage in political activities, and 12.1% remained neutral. Only 6.5% of respondents admitted to not participating at all. This distribution suggests varying levels of political involvement among respondents, with a notable proportion actively engaging in political activities.

6. **Do you feel a sense of purpose and meaning in your life?**

Table 8: Respondents' perspectives on experiencing a sense of purpose and meaning in their lives.

Options	Frequency	Percent
Maybe	49	13.8
No	46	13
Yes	259	73.2
Total	**354**	**100**

Source: Field work 2025

Table 8 presents respondents' perspectives on whether they experience a sense of purpose and meaning in their lives. The majority (73.2%) affirmed that they do, while 13.8% were uncertain, and 13% indicated that they do not.

7. **Do you believe that living in a democratic country/state has a positive impact on your happiness?**

Table 9: Respondents perspective on whether living in a democratic country/state has a positive impact on their happiness.

Options	Frequency	Percent
Maybe	72	20.3
No	93	26.3
Yes	189	53.4
Total	**354**	**100**

Source: Field work 2025

Table 9 illustrates respondents' perspectives on whether living in a democratic country or state positively impacts their happiness. A majority (53.4%) agreed that it does, while 26.3% disagreed, and 20.3% were uncertain.

8. **Do you feel that democratic institutions and practices contribute to your sense of well-being?**

Table 10 Respondents' views on the role of democratic institutions and practices in enhancing their sense of well-being.

Options	Frequency	Percent
Maybe	60	16.9
No	95	26.8
Yes	199	56.2
Total	**354**	**100**

Source: Field work 2025

Table 10 presents respondents' perspectives on whether democratic institutions and practices contribute to their sense of well-being. A majority of 56.2% affirmed that these institutions positively impact their well-being, while 26.8% disagreed. Meanwhile, 16.9% remained uncertain, indicating a level of ambivalence regarding the influence of democratic systems on personal well-being. The implication of this is that the deepening of the ideals of democracy has the tendency to enhance the sense of well – being of the people.

9. Have you experienced any negative impacts on your happiness due to democratic institutions or practices?

Table 11: Respondents' perspectives on whether democratic institutions or practices have negatively affected their happiness.

Options	Frequency	Percent
Maybe	29	8.2
No	51	14.4
Yes	274	77.4
Total	**354**	**100**

Source: Field work 2025

The data on table 11 reveals that a significant majority of respondents (77.4%) believe that democratic institutions or practices have negatively impacted their happiness. A smaller proportion (14.4%) do not share this sentiment, while 8.2% remain uncertain. This suggests that despite the principles of democracy, many individuals feel discontented with its practical implications on their well-being.

10. Do you think that democracy has improved your life in any way?

Table 12: Respondents' perspectives on whether democracy has positively impacted their lives.

Options	Frequency	Percent
Maybe	83	23.4
No	149	42.1
Yes	122	34.5
Total	**354**	**100**

Source: Field work 2025

Table 12 presents respondents' perspectives on whether democracy has positively impacted their lives. The majority, 42.1%, believe democracy has not improved their lives, while 34.5% acknowledge a positive impact. Meanwhile, 23.4% remain uncertain about its influence. These findings highlight a mix of scepticism and optimism regarding the role of democracy in shaping personal well-being.

11. On a scale of 1-5, how important is freedom of speech to you?

Table 13: Respondents' views on the importance of freedom of speech

Scale	Frequency	Percent
1	19	5.4
2	27	7.6
3	46	13
4	74	20.9
5	188	53.1
Total	**354**	**100**

Source: Field work 2025

Table 13 illustrates respondents' perspectives on the importance of freedom of speech. A majority (53.1%) rated it as highly important, while 20.9% also acknowledged its significance. Meanwhile, 13% maintained a neutral stance, and a smaller portion (13%)

assigned lower importance to this fundamental right. The data underscores the widespread recognition of freedom of speech as a crucial democratic value among respondents.

12. On a scale of 1-10, how happy are you with your life in general?

Table 14: Respondents' perspectives on their overall happiness in life.

Scale	Frequency	Percent
1	27	7.6
2	18	5.1
3	17	4.8
4	27	7.6
5	81	22.9
6	23	6.5
7	37	10.5
8	52	14.7
9	27	7.6
10	45	12.7
Total	**354**	**100**

Source: Field work 2025

Table 14 presents respondents' perspectives on their overall happiness in life. The responses vary across different levels of happiness, with the highest proportion (22.9%) selecting a score of 5, followed by 14.7% who rated their happiness at 8. Meanwhile, 12.7% of respondents placed themselves at the highest level of happiness (10), whereas 7.6% selected the lowest score (1). These findings suggest a diverse distribution of happiness levels, with a considerable number of respondents expressing moderate to high satisfaction with their lives.

13. On a scale of 1-5, how satisfied are you with your current economic situation?

Table 15 Respondents' satisfaction with the current economic situation of the country.

Scale	Frequency	Percent
1	152	42.9
2	115	32.5
3	61	17.2
4	13	3.7
5	13	3.7
Total	**354**	**100**

Source: Field work 2025

Table 15 presents respondents' satisfaction with the current economic situation of the country. The majority of respondents (42.9%) rated their satisfaction at the lowest level (1), indicating widespread dissatisfaction. Similarly, 32.5% selected a rating of 2, reinforcing the prevalent negative perception of the economy. Meanwhile, 17.2% chose a neutral stance with a rating of 3, while only a small fraction (3.7%) rated their satisfaction at 4 and 5, respectively. Overall, the data highlights significant discontent with the country's economic conditions among respondents.

14. On a scale of 1-5, how often do you experience positive emotions (e.g., joy, gratitude, contentment)?

Table 16: Respondents' experiences of positive emotions.

Scale	Frequency	Percent
1	24	6.8

2	43	12.1
3	120	33.9
4	110	31.1
5	57	16.1
Total	**354**	**100**

Source: Field work 2025

The data presented on table 16 reveals the distribution of respondents' experiences with positive emotions. A notable proportion, 33.9%, rated their experience at a moderate level (3 on the scale), while 31.1% reported a slightly higher level (4). Meanwhile, 16.1% expressed a strong experience of positive emotions (5), whereas 12.1% and 6.8% indicated lower experiences at levels 2 and 1, respectively. This suggests that while a majority of respondents experience positive emotions to some extent, there is a variation in intensity across individuals.

15. On a scale of 1-5, how satisfied are you with your social relationships (e.g., family, friends)?

Table 17: Respondents' satisfaction with their social relationships

Scale	Frequency	Percent
1	21	5.9
2	31	8.8
3	88	24.9
4	131	37
5	83	23.4
Total	**354**	**100**

Source: Field work 2025

Table 17 illustrates respondents' satisfaction with their social relationships. The data reveal that the majority of respondents reported moderate to high satisfaction, with 37% rating their satisfaction at level 4 and 23.4% at level 5. Meanwhile, 24.9% of respondents indicated a neutral stance, whereas a smaller proportion expressed lower satisfaction levels. This suggests that while most respondents find their social relationships fulfilling, some experience varying degrees of dissatisfaction.

16. On a scale 1-5, how important is political freedom to your overall happiness?

Table 18: Respondents' perspectives on the importance of political freedom to their overall happiness.

Scale	Frequency	Percent
1	28	7.9
2	40	11.3
3	92	26
4	87	24.6
5	107	30.2
Total	**354**	**100**

Source: Field work 2025

Table 18 illustrates respondents' perspectives on the significance of political freedom in shaping their overall happiness. The data reveals that a considerable proportion (30.2%) of respondents view political freedom as highly important, while 24.6% also rate it as a significant factor. Meanwhile, 26% maintain a neutral stance, and a smaller segment (19.2%) considers it less relevant to their happiness. These findings suggest that while political freedom is valued by many, its perceived impact on personal well-being varies among respondents.

Discussion of Findings

The effect of democracy on satisfaction with life

The findings from the survey carried out showed a positive correlation between democracy and satisfaction with life. For instance, 77.4 percent of the respondents gave a positive response to the question on whether democratic institutions or practices have negatively affected their happiness. Also, 42.1 percent believed that democracy has not had any positive impact on their lives. These findings confirm the positive correlation

between the status of democracy and the level of happiness of the people.

The tables below show the 20 happiest and least happy countries from the World Happiness Report 2022 mapped against their associated Democracy Index score and regime type. As indicated on the tables below, 75% of the countries on the list of the 20 happiest countries in the world are on the scale of full democracy with the remaining 25% as flawed democracy. No country in Africa makes the list of the 20 happiest countries in the world.

20 Happiest Countries

#	Country	Happiness	Democracy	Type
1	Finland	7.82	9.27	Full democracy
2	Denmark	7.64	9.09	Full democracy
3	Iceland	7.56	9.18	Full democracy
4	Switzerland	7.51	8.90	Full democracy
5	Netherlands	7.41	8.88	Full democracy
6	Luxembourg	7.40	8.68	Full democracy
7	Sweden	7.38	9.26	Full democracy
8	Norway	7.37	9.75	Full democracy
9	Israel	7.36	7.97	Flawed democracy
10	New Zealand	7.20	9.37	Full democracy
11	Austria	7.16	8.07	Full democracy
12	Australia	7.16	8.90	Full democracy
13	Ireland	7.04	9.00	Full democracy
14	Germany	7.03	8.67	Full democracy
15	Canada	7.03	8.87	Full democracy
16	United States	6.98	7.85	Flawed democracy
17	United Kingdom	6.94	8.10	Full democracy
18	Czech Republic	6.92	7.74	Flawed democracy
19	Belgium	6.80	7.51	Flawed democracy
20	France	6.69	7.99	Flawed democracy

Source: Happiness and Democracy | Action for Happiness (2022)

On the other hand, 50% of the 20 least happy country in the world are authoritarian on the democracy scale. 30% of the countries on the hybrid scale on the democracy index whereas the remaining 20% are on the flawed democracy index.

20 Least Happy Countries

#	Country	Happiness	Democracy	Type
127	Sri Lanka	4.36	6.14	Flawed democracy
128	Madagascar	4.34	5.70	Hybrid regime
129	Egypt	4.29	2.93	Authoritarian
130	Chad	4.25	1.67	Authoritarian
131	Ethiopia	4.24	3.30	Authoritarian
132	Yemen	4.20	1.95	Authoritarian
133	Mauritania	4.15	4.03	Hybrid regime
134	Jordan	4.15	3.49	Authoritarian
135	Togo	4.11	2.80	Authoritarian
136	India	3.78	6.91	Flawed democracy
137	Zambia	3.76	5.72	Hybrid regime
138	Malawi	3.75	5.74	Hybrid regime
139	Tanzania	3.70	5.10	Hybrid regime
140	Sierra Leone	3.57	4.97	Hybrid regime
141	Lesotho	3.51	6.30	Flawed democracy
142	Botswana	3.47	7.73	Flawed democracy
143	Rwanda	3.27	3.10	Authoritarian
144	Zimbabwe	3.00	2.92	Authoritarian
145	Lebanon	2.96	3.84	Authoritarian
146	Afghanistan	2.40	0.32	Authoritarian

Source: Happiness and Democracy | Action for Happiness (2022)

The effect of democracy on the condition of life

According to research, democratic systems make people happier by enabling them to freely engage in politics, cast ballots in valid elections, and hold their representatives responsible. Higher reported well-being is significantly influenced by this freedom of choice and sense of self-governance. On the respondents' perspectives on their overall happiness in life, 22.9% are on the average scale. With reference to respondents' satisfaction with the current economic situation of the country, majority of respondents (42.9%) rated their satisfaction at the lowest level (1), indicating widespread dissatisfaction.

Conclusion

Democracy has been generally adopted as the most acceptable system of government. It has become an acceptable pattern of political succession globally. There is a positive correlation between democracy and human happiness because of the possibility of democracy to guarantee freedom, human rights and political liberty. Surprisingly, there are great correlations between the scale of democracy and the level of happiness as a whopping 75% of the happiest countries are on the full democracy scale. A great number of the respondents are unanimous that their lives were not better under the current democratic dispensation.

Recommendations

The study among others recommended the following:

i. There is need for the satisfaction of life of the people to be improved. In doing so, the degree of democracy of the state

needs to be deepened as a means of enhancing people's satisfaction with life.

ii. Secondly, there is the need to improve the economic welfare of the people. The foundation is for us to improve the credibility of the electoral process by ensuring that people's votes count and the negative perception of the people is addressed.

References

Bjørnskov, C. (2010). How Comparable are the Gallup World Poll Life Satisfaction Data?. *J Happiness Stud,* 11, 41–60. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-008-9121-6.

Bjørnskov, C., Rode, M. (2020). Regime types and regime change: A new dataset on democracy, coups, and political institutions. *Rev Int Organ*, 15, 531–551. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11558-019-09345-1

Inglehart, F. R. and Ponarin, E. D. (2013). Happiness and Democracy, 1972-2008. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences,* 8 (6), 1097-1106.

Inglehart, R. (2006). Democracy and Happiness: What Causes What? A Paper presented at conference on human happiness at Notre Dame University, October 22 – 24, 2006.

Kabir, Y. (2023). Analysis: Trend of low voter turnout continues in Nigerian elections. https://www.premiumtimesng.com/news/top-news/586193-analysis-trend-of-low-voter-turnout-continues-in-nigerian-elections.html

Obinna, E. (2021). 2023 elections: Nigeria back to pre-1999 era. https://businessday-ng.ampproject.org/v/6/businessday.ng/am/politics/article/2023-elections-nigeria-back-to- pre-1999-era/

Peter, A. M. (2017). Assessing the effects of government of national unity on political stability in Africa: The examples of Kenya and Nigeria. *Journal of Research and Development in Arts and Social Sciences (JDRASS)*, 1 (1), 161 – 183.

Peter, A. M. (2018). Between the perils and the opportunities: Exploring the strategies for overcoming the challenges of quantitative technique in political science research. *Endarch: Journal of Black Political Research* 2 (2018), 1 – 17.

Peter, A. M. (2023). *Research Methodology in Social Sciences*. Lokoja: Bansquare Publishers.

Weingartmair, M. (2022). Does democracy make countries "happy"? The (possible) influence of democracy on life satisfaction in societies. An Unpublished MA Thesis of the Paris Lodron University of Salzburg

Yagboyaju, D.A. (2011). Nigeria's fourth republic and the challenges of a flattering democratization. *African Studies Quarterly, 12(3), 93-106.*