

# Peacebuilding Strategies and Internal Democracy in Lagos State: A Study of All Progressives Congress (APC), Nigeria

Moshood Abdul-Wasi Babatunde<sup>1</sup>, Orunbon Nurudeen Olalekan<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Lagos State University, Lagos, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup>Lagos State University, Lagos, Nigeria

\*Correspondence Author: [nurudeen.orunbon@lasu.edu.ng](mailto:nurudeen.orunbon@lasu.edu.ng)

## Abstract

*This research looked at the connection between the All-Progressive Congress's internal democracy in Lagos State, Nigeria, and peacebuilding techniques. To provide direction for the investigation, two hypotheses (tested at the 0.05 level of significance) were established. All political players in the state were included in the population, which was stratified into senatorial districts to provide a sample size of 289 using correlational and descriptive research techniques. Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Analysis was used to evaluate the data. The results of the study show that there is a positive, moderate, and significant relationship between peacebuilding strategies and power-sharing arrangements with the All-Progressives Congress in Lagos State ( $r = .643$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Additionally, there is a positive, weak, and significant relationship between peacebuilding strategies and inclusivity and diversity with the All-Progressives Congress in Lagos State ( $r = .312$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). The study concludes that power-sharing in Lagos State has become increasingly important due to the diverse nature of its population, which consists of people from different ethnic, religious, and socio-economic backgrounds as well as diversity and inclusivity, as it involves recognizing and celebrating the differences that exist among individuals and communities. It is recommended in the study that the political parties in Lagos State, particularly All Progressives Congress (APC) should endeavour to observe internal democracy so as to give room for transparent party primaries, as this would reduce incidences of replacing candidates, thereby promoting an atmosphere for peaceful coexistence, equity and fairness.*

**Keywords:** Peacebuilding, Internal democracy; Conflict transformation; Inclusivity; All Progressives Congress; Lagos State

## 1. Introduction

In the dynamic political landscape of Nigeria, the All-Progressives Congress (APC) has maintained its stronghold in Lagos State for over two decades since the advent of democracy in the country. While various factors have contributed to the party's sustained power, the implementation of effective peacebuilding strategies and internal democracy has played a crucial role.

One of the primary contributions of peacebuilding strategies to the APC's longevity in Lagos State has been the promotion of stability and unity within the party and among its supporters. By fostering an environment conducive to peaceful coexistence, the party has been able to mitigate internal conflicts and maintain a united front. This has allowed the APC to

present a strong and united political force, bolstering its electoral prospects and consolidating its power over time.

Peacebuilding strategies often involve engaging in dialogue and reconciliation processes, which have proven effective in resolving conflicts and bridging divides within the APC in Lagos State. By encouraging open and constructive discussions, the party has been able to address grievances and foster understanding among different factions, ensuring that internal disputes do not escalate and undermine its stability.

Moreover, the APC's commitment to reconciliation has extended beyond its own ranks. The party has actively sought to reconcile with opposition parties and individuals, promoting a culture of inclusivity and cooperation. By embracing dialogue and

reconciliation with political rivals, the APC has built bridges and expanded its support base, making it an attractive choice for voters seeking stability and progress.

Another crucial aspect of the APC's peacebuilding strategies in Lagos State has been its focus on development and empowerment. The party recognizes that sustainable peace cannot be achieved without addressing the underlying socio-economic challenges faced by its constituents. By implementing policies that prioritize infrastructural development, job creation, and social empowerment, the APC has been able to improve the quality of life for many Lagosians, thereby reducing the potential for social unrest and political instability.

Furthermore, the party's commitment to inclusive development has helped bridge the gap between different communities within Lagos State. By ensuring equitable distribution of resources and opportunities, the APC has fostered a sense of belonging and shared prosperity among diverse groups. This has not only strengthened social cohesion but has also enhanced the party's electoral prospects, as it resonates with a broader cross-section of the population.

Unquestionably, democracy as a system of government rises above all others across the world. According to Egobueze (2020), Abraham Lincoln stated succinctly that "democracy is the government of the people, by the people, and for the people." According to the description above, democracy is a people-oriented government. No surprise, the majority of the world's prospering nations, including the United States of America, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and others, use this form of governance. Although democracy began in ancient Greece, it has gained global recognition and practice in the Western World, including the United Kingdom, France, the United States, and Germany. With the advent of imperialism, it

extended to other parts of the world, including Africa and Nigeria" (Egobueze, 2020, p.52).

It is vital to emphasize that Nigeria, as a developing democracy, is more of a process than a destination. Democratization is a shift to more political reforms and a push toward greater democracy. The process of democratization necessitates pragmatic nurturing with the required democratic ideas and values. The ideas and structure include ideologically driven political parties, an open and accessible electoral process, adherence to the rule of law, liberty, and equality, a party constitution and electoral guidelines, responsive representation based on accountability, transparency, and trustworthiness, among other things. A detailed examination of the Nigerian political environment reveals bleak images of persistent disagreement, particularly in party politics. This may be traced back to the recurrent widespread and excessive need for personal happiness, which is antagonistic to the collective interest of the political party and party members. As admirable as the dream of political parties is, intra-party fighting tramples on internal democracy and amputates democratization. Yahaya (2018) and Momodu and Matudi (2013) discovered that internal squabbling among political parties disrupts the democratic process.

According to Muriithi (2007), peace building is an all-encompassing procedure that addresses issues at several levels. The endeavour is to surmount the systemic, interpersonal, and cultural inconsistencies that serve as the foundation for conflict in order to facilitate the establishment and maintenance of peace. Fundamentally, maintaining peace entails addressing the underlying causes of conflict and empowering the parties involved to continue offering solutions via dialogue and, if needed, mediation.

The process of encouraging social reforms and reconciliation is also known as peace building. This intervention aims to

improve social fairness and lessen violence (Sodipo, 2013). It is a strategy for managing and preventing violent disputes via campaigns, awareness-raising, and lobbying. According to Onigu-Otite and Albert (1999), it entails developing people's ability to cope with and treat the local underlying causes of hostilities and conflicts. The idea that force cannot bring about or maintain peace is the foundation for peace building. Only comprehension will lead to its discovery (Ofuoku & Ewrierhurma, 2018). Rebuilding a society's political, security, social, and economic facets after a war is a part of peace building.

The term "peace building" also describes strategies or tactics intended to advance social change, defuse conflict, and improve harmony within society. It sometimes includes sensitization, education, advocacy, enlightenment campaigns, and awareness-raising. In the context of this study, "peace building" refers to conflict management, prevention, and resolution, especially those meant to guarantee lasting peace throughout the competition for political dominance inside any political party.

According to Ezirim & Mbah (2014), democratic administration has all the required indices to avert all sorts of conflicts that usually raise their ugly heads in Nigeria and Africa. For instance, the Nigerian State has effectively practised democratic government for almost 20 years, but not without sporadic setbacks. Nigeria's democratic adaptability, according to Ezirim (2009), has allowed the country to survive the fire that would have destroyed it. In Nigeria and, by extension, throughout West Africa, he proposes that the application of good governance, the rule of law, effective voter outreach, adequate employment, and a fair distribution of resources and values would all help to further defuse tensions and serve as conflict resolution techniques.

The assertion that Nigeria is "consolidating its democracy" is often at the core of mainstream media discourse and popular political debate in the country. However, this assertion is refuted by the available data (Momoh, 2013). Indeed, without strong political parties, democracy is impossible. Parties are supposed to help electorates become politically literate, aid in the development of political power, assist in the hiring of political leaders, and act as a uniting factor in a divided society (Omotola, 2010). The goals of party regulation, along with the unresolved issue of internal party democracy—that is, the tug-of-war between political parties to uphold their own bylaws and conduct their internal affairs in accordance with democratic principles — remain essential to the broader consolidation of Nigerian democracy (Ibeanu, 2013).

A prolonged and pervasive disagreement amongst members of the same political party is referred to as intra-party conflict. This kind of disagreement is often brought about by competing egos and interests that collide with the party's shared goals, ideologies, and platform. Because of the party's members' ongoing rivalry, democracy is doomed, and the party's cohesive and intentional goal is divided. While conflict is inevitable, what may be achieved from it depends on how it is managed and addressed. Irreconcilable disagreement therefore has a crisis-like quality that might impede rather than advance democratisation.

Since 1999, when the country reverted to multiparty rule, intraparty clashes have assumed new dimensions. As a consequence of not having a practical conflict management system, political parties have defected. These and other problems have created a great deal of discussion in the policy community and in academics about practical approaches to take when dealing with internal party crises when participants rely so heavily on zero sum game tactics. Some viable political candidates have

been pushed out of the political system by this idea, while others have become lifetime defectors (Pogson, 2014). In addition, political parties in Nigeria have been implicated in a wide range of anti-democratic actions, such as rigging party primaries and general elections, killing political rivals, engaging in hooliganism, thuggery, and vandalism during elections, having unclear nomination and flag-bearing procedures, and generally lacking internal democracy. These and other acts have become uncontrollable and have given rise to a never-ending list of political complaints (Dike, 2003).

It is instructive to note that Lagos State holds significant importance in Nigerian politics due to its economic, cultural, and demographic influence. As the country's economic hub, Lagos contributes a substantial portion of Nigeria's GDP and hosts numerous multinational corporations. Its diverse population and status as a melting pot of various ethnic groups make it a political microcosm of Nigeria. Additionally, Lagos wields considerable electoral power, with a large number of registered voters. As a result, politicians often prioritize the state in their campaigns and policies, recognizing its pivotal role in shaping the country's political landscape (Lawal, 2002). Therefore, the maintenance of political stability in Lagos State is crucial for the sustainability of the All-Progressives Congress (APC) due to several reasons. Lagos is the economic hub of Nigeria, and its stability is essential for the party's national influence and financial support. Additionally, the state has a significant population and political significance, making it a key battleground for the APC. Moreover, Lagos has historically been a stronghold for the party, and any instability could weaken its overall political standing and influence in the country. Therefore, the APC's long-term success greatly depends on the maintenance of political stability in Lagos State.

In other words, poor management of these crises has led to party alignment over time, defections, and the prostitution of party members a practise known as "party cross-carpeting." However, if member decampment is predicated on the party's ideology with respect to the national objective, then the aim of democratic consolidation will be a fiction and an impossible goal. By contrast, democratic norms will be reinforced and solidified if party alignment or defection stems from egotism and self-aggrandizement. In conclusion, the aforementioned antidemocratic forces have caused the Nigerian people to no longer be a part of the political system. What determines the survival of the system is the degree to which the populace has been socialised to use appropriate patterns of handling political conflict when it arises, such as adhering to party norms, conventions, and the constitution during intraparty decisions that would steer the process leading to democratic stability. In addition, the extent to which political parties resolve disputes in a political system based on popular policy or the constitution serves as a functional regulatory mechanism that reinforces or solidifies democratic values (Jinadu, 2014; Clean Foundation, 2014). On the other hand, one may counter that this is a fundamental characteristic of advanced political systems, which typically support the growth of politics and the economy as well as the consolidation of democracy.

## **2. Conceptual Perspectives**

### **The concept of Peace Building**

In the world of politics today, is a place of contact and every place of contact is a place of conflict. Thus, politics of today is marred by conflicts, violence, and discord, the concept of peacebuilding emerges as a beacon of hope. Peacebuilding aims to create sustainable peace by addressing the root causes of conflicts and fostering reconciliation and cooperation among

political actors and spectators. It goes beyond simply ending violence; it focuses on building the foundations for long-term peace and stability.

Muriithi (2007) claims that peace building is an all-encompassing procedure that deals with issues on many fronts. The endeavour is to surmount the systemic, interpersonal, and cultural inconsistencies that serve as the foundation for conflict in order to facilitate the establishment and maintenance of peace. The process of encouraging social reforms and reconciliation is also known as peace building. This intervention aims to decrease violence and promote social justice (Sodipo, 2013). It employs advocacy, awareness-raising, and campaigns to avoid and manage violent confrontations. According to Onigu-Otite and Albert (1999), it entails developing people's ability to cope with and treat the local underlying causes of hostilities and conflicts. The idea that force cannot bring about or maintain peace is the foundation for peace building. Only comprehension will lead to its discovery (Ofuoku & Ewrierhurhoma, 2018). Rebuilding a society's political, security, social, and economic facets after a war is a part of peace building.

The term "peace building" also describes strategies or tactics intended to advance social change, defuse conflict, and improve harmony within society. It sometimes includes sensitization, education, advocacy, enlightenment campaigns, and awareness-raising. In the context of this study, "peace building" refers to conflict management, prevention, and resolution, especially those meant to guarantee long-term peace during power struggles inside political parties.

Deep polarisation is a common feature of politics in conflict-affected situations, and how parties respond to this polarisation is crucial in determining the likelihood of peace. This is especially true in situations where animosities and grievances based on identity

have fuelled conflict. In these situations, identity-based parties are very important. These often have strong support from their constituents and may be able to guarantee that minority groups' views are taken into account during peace negotiations. But rather than playing divisive identity politics, their capacity to articulate a national vision or speak for their communities' interests in national institutions will determine how much they can contribute to peace (Castillejo, 2016).

"Inadequate representation of people's interests is the greatest detrimental effect of weak political parties, claims. Assembling and representing the interests of various groups in bargaining processes between the state and society over the nature of the post-conflict political settlement, both during peace negotiations (where parties can access or influence negotiations) and in post-conflict political life, is arguably the most important role that parties can potentially play in peacebuilding" (Carothers, 2006:16). However, parties in such situations are most obviously failing in their duty as links between the state and society (Wild & Foresti, 2010). In fact, parties in many conflict-affected environments essentially serve as front organisations for armed groups or as means of gaining power and access, with little motivation to carry out broader interests-aggregation and representation tasks.

### **Internal Party Democracy**

The term "internal party democracy" refers to a broad variety of practises that provide party members access to discussion and decision-making inside the organisation (Scarrow, 2005). In accordance with democratic ideals, it was also intended to refer to the internal organisation, structure, and coordination of political parties, which directly affects the processes of choosing candidates, establishing leaders, formulating policies, and allocating funds (Ojukwu et al.,

2011). Okhaide (2012) defines internal democracy as a party's organisational structure characterised by engagement and inclusion, which act as catalysts for the development of democracy. There are two primary types of party governance that aim to fairly represent the interests of all parties involved. To fill party official positions and choose candidates for general elections, the first option entails conducting open, fair, credible, and frequent elections. The second is ensuring that all party cadres participate in party affairs on an equal and transparent basis.

According to Mimpen (2007), internal party democracy has two fundamental tools. The first is free, fair, and regular elections for party posts and representative offices inside the party. Second, to ensure that their interests are fairly represented, all people and organisations must engage in equitable and transparent participation (Scarrow, 2005, Salih, 2006).

Inclusion is a further aspect of internal party democracy. This suggests that the party makes a variety of choices. According to Scarrow (2005), inclusion ensures that all party members have an equal voice in crucial decisions such as selecting the party's leadership and selecting candidates to serve as the group's representatives in general elections. Consequently, more inclusive parties would provide a forum for candid discussion prior to the actual decision-making processes (Hofmeister & Grabow, 2011).

The third thing that distinguishes them is the extent of institutionalisation of the party. This reveals the degree of internal decision-making and procedural codification as well as the amount to which the party's collaborative structures are ingrained in its target audience. Internally democratic parties are peculiarly institutionalised since participation rules are necessary to determine eligibility for participation and evaluate possible victors in the party's internal elections (Mimpen, 2007, Mersel, 2006, Matlosa, 2004).

In Nigeria, it might be difficult to identify the true members of a certain party. Because people in Nigeria enter politics to further their own interests, party loyalty is ephemeral (Liebowitz & Ibrahim, 2013). In a 2011 report by the International Republican Institute (IRI), just 37% of Nigerian respondents said they had a great deal of faith in parties, compared to 26% who said they had none at all and 35% who said they had none at all. There's no denying that Nigerian party partisanship and attachment are atrociously low. This is shown by the high incidence of party defection among elected officials and party representatives. The formal structure of the party is called the party-as-organization (PO), and it consists of party leaders, national headquarters, and subnational offices. It is the official party bureaucracy, with "committees" operating in almost every state and town in the nation.

It is inviolable and hence sacrosanct to apply the internal democracy concept to political party affairs, especially when it comes to primary elections. Due process, fair play, equality, and conscience in fulfilling obligations to organisations, groups, or society at large are the cornerstones of internal democracy. The notion of internal democracy seems to be increasingly violated inside the ranks of most political parties in Nigeria, as basic human desires—such as avarice, greed, nepotism, and plain ravenous ambition—continue to take precedence over the needs of the populace. Today, there are cases of questionable substitution, disqualification, and reversal of nomination of previously screened and accepted candidates due to a complex web of party intrigues, overt displays of power, cultures of impunity, and disregard for internal democracy and fair play.

Some scholars have proposed a list of traits that characterise internal party democracy, which includes the party's structure and institutions as well as the relationship between the party and its

members. Some of these features include equal and proportional representation of minorities within the party, majority rule voting, substantial influence over the party's platform and agenda, and the power of party members to elect party leaders or dissolve the leadership as well as select candidates for public office. Other features include safeguarding the freedoms of party members, including the prohibition against expulsion without due process, the availability of independent counsel, the freedom of expression and association within the party, especially concerning the formation of factions, and the right to access information and transparency about the party's management, particularly with regard to financial accountability. This is a bit of a broad definition of internal party democracy.

For example, a political party cannot be deemed internally democratic if it prohibits party splits or does not conduct free and fair elections for member leadership positions. In that sense, the organisation of such a party is vertical because power moves from the top, or the leadership, to the bottom rather than from party members at the bottom to the leadership (Mersel, 2006).

To boost the impact and participation of the party's politically engaged people, internal party democracy is required. In a democratic state, political parties must be free of anti-democratic elements. Many nations have legislative measures requiring political parties to follow their own intraparty democratic procedures. But in reality, these are often broken (Hofmeister & Grabow, 2011).

According to Hofmeister & Grabow (2011), adhering to internal party democracy principles produced the following outcomes:

1. It encourages all members to take part in the party's internal issues.
2. It allows party members to voice their opinions inside the organisation.
3. It increases the subgroups' level of active involvement, including women,

adolescents, people with physical disabilities, minorities, etc.

4. Tolerance and acceptance of differing viewpoints as long as they fit within the framework of the party's core policies.

5. Compliance with the guidelines governing member involvement and intraparty decision-making.

6. When interacting with regular party members, the party leadership shows respect.

### **The Failure of Internal Democracy in Lagos State All Progressives Congress (APC)**

Internal democracy is a fundamental principle of any political party, as it ensures fairness, inclusivity, and transparency within the political organisation. It allows party members to participate in decision-making processes, choose their leaders, and shape the party's policies. However, the All-Progressive Congress (APC) in Lagos State has been marred by the failure of internal democracy. Some of the causes of the failure include:

**Lack of Level Playing Field:** One of the primary reasons for the failure of internal democracy in the Lagos State APC is the lack of a level playing field. The party leadership has often been accused of favoring certain candidates or factions, leading to a skewed electoral process. This bias undermines the trust and confidence of party members, discourages participation, and hampers the growth of a vibrant political culture.

**Imposition of Candidates:** Another significant issue within the Lagos State APC is the imposition of candidates. This practice involves the party leadership handpicking candidates for various positions without considering the aspirations and preferences of party members. By doing so, the leadership disregards the principle of internal democracy and undermines the will of the majority. This imposition not only stifles the voices of party members but also limits their choices, leading to a lack of representation and accountability.

**Influence of Money and Power:** The influence of money and power also contributes to the failure of internal democracy within the Lagos State APC. Politics, unfortunately, attracts individuals who are willing to use their financial resources and connections to gain an advantage. Party positions and nominations become commodities that can be bought and sold, rather than earned through merit and popular support. This undermines the integrity of the party and erodes the trust of party members in the leadership.

**Lack of Intra-Party Dialogue:** Effective internal democracy requires open and robust intra-party dialogue. However, within the Lagos State APC, there is a lack of constructive engagement and meaningful discussions. Decision-making processes are often opaque, with little or no consultation with party members. This lack of dialogue prevents the party from benefiting from the diverse perspectives and experiences of its members, leading to a stagnant and unresponsive leadership.

### **Reasons for Ineffective Establishment of Peacebuilding Strategies and Internal Democracy in Lagos State All Progressives Congress (APC)**

Lagos State, as a key economic and political hub in Nigeria, and All Progressives Congress (APC) as a major political party in the state since the inception of Fourth Republic in Nigeria. There are some factors that have rendered peacebuilding strategies and internal democracy ineffective, these include political, economic, and legal aspects.

#### **Political Factors**

Political instability and power struggles have hindered the progress of peacebuilding and internal democracy in Lagos State. The state has experienced a history of intense political competition, often leading to polarization and division among various political factions. This has resulted in a lack of consensus on key issues, making it difficult to

implement cohesive peacebuilding strategies and democratic reforms. Moreover, the influence of powerful political elites has sometimes overshadowed the voices of the general populace, undermining the principles of inclusive governance and citizen participation. As a result, the effectiveness of democratic institutions, such as local government councils and community assemblies, has been compromised, impeding the development of a robust democratic framework (Olaniyi, 2017).

#### **Economic Factors**

Economic disparities and limited access to resources have also posed significant obstacles to peacebuilding and internal democracy in Lagos State. The unequal distribution of wealth and opportunities has fueled social grievances and disenchantment, leading to tensions and conflicts within the society. These economic disparities have created fertile ground for the rise of discontent and political unrest, undermining the stability necessary for effective peacebuilding efforts.

Furthermore, economic considerations often influence political decisions, potentially compromising the integrity of democratic processes. The intertwining of economic interests with political power dynamics can erode the accountability of public officials and weaken the institutions responsible for upholding democratic principles (Chijioke, 2017).

#### **Legal and Institutional Constraints**

The legal and institutional framework in Lagos State has faced challenges in effectively promoting peacebuilding and internal democracy. Weak enforcement of laws, inadequate legal infrastructure, and a lack of transparency in governance have contributed to an environment where impunity and disregard for the rule of law persist. This has undermined the trust of citizens in the justice system and has hindered the establishment of a culture of respect for human rights and democratic values.



Additionally, the absence of robust mechanisms for conflict resolution and the protection of minority rights has impeded the state's ability to address internal tensions and foster inclusive political processes. Without a strong legal and institutional foundation, efforts to build sustainable peace and strengthen democratic governance face significant limitations.

### **3. Theoretical Perspective**

#### **Democratic Peace Theory**

In international affairs, the Democratic Peace Theory postulates that democracies are less likely to resort to military confrontation with one another. It claims that democratic countries are more likely to choose diplomacy and collaboration over violent ways of resolving disputes. The globe is moving more and more towards democracy, and over 120 nations have had general elections that have been deemed to be fair and free. A negotiated peace that includes an electoral process to create political structures that are acceptable to all parties and an agreement by the parties themselves to deliver on a sustainable peaceful settlement through a democratic transition is the outcome of many internal conflicts (Gerald Ekenedirichukwu Ezirim, 2009; Harris & Chapman, 2004).

Fundamental to the liberal paradigm of conflict resolution and management in Africa are democracy and elections (Abubakar & Gorondutse, 2013; Fayemi, 2009; Kaur, 2007). These notions are drawn from Western socio-historical and political experience. Theorists of liberal political science have made certain generalisations about how democracies relate to one another.

As a mechanism, democracy offers the structures, rules, channels, and procedures that allow different groups to peacefully pursue their goals and reduce the likelihood that they would turn to the more expensive and unlawful tactic of revolt, which might lead to violence. A democratic government offers a

structure that is deemed acceptable for the selection of leaders via regular, nonviolent elections that are competitive (Abubakar & Gorondutse, 2013). As a result, the Democratic Peace Theory postulates that democracies are less likely to clash militarily with one another. It suggests that since democratic nations share many institutions, procedures, and principles, their interactions tend to be more harmonious. According to the notion, democratic governments have a greater stake in preserving peace since they are answerable to their constituents.

Additionally, democratic countries often have mechanisms in place for resolving disputes peacefully, such as mediation and diplomacy. The theory provides a useful framework for understanding the potential benefits of democratic governance.

Several explanations have been proposed to understand why democracies tend to be more peaceful. One argument is that democratic governments are accountable to their citizens, who bear the costs of war both in terms of human lives and economic resources. As a result, leaders in democracies are more cautious and are less likely to engage in unnecessary conflicts. Another explanation is based on the idea that democracies have institutions and processes in place that promote peaceful resolution of conflicts (Ombella, 2023). For instance, democratic nations often have strong legal systems, independent judiciaries, and free press. These institutions provide a platform for peaceful negotiation and dispute resolution, reducing the likelihood of resorting to violence.

While the Democratic Peace Theory has gained significant support, it is not without its critics. One criticism is that the theory only applies to liberal democracies, which have a specific set of values and principles. It does not account for non-liberal democracies or countries with different cultural or historical contexts. Another criticism is that the theory does not explain the instances when

democratic nations have engaged in armed conflict. Critics argue that there have been numerous examples where democracies have gone to war, such as the United States' involvement in the Vietnam War or the invasion of Iraq. These examples challenge the notion that democracies are inherently peaceful.

#### 4. Method

##### Research Hypotheses

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between peacebuilding strategies in terms of inclusivity and diversity and internal democracy of All Progressives Congress in Lagos State.

**H<sub>02</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between peacebuilding strategies in terms of power-sharing arrangements and internal democracy of All Progressives Congress in Lagos State.

This presents the methodology that was used in carrying out the research work. It therefore discusses the research design, area of study, sample size and sampling technique, data collection technique/source of data, and data processing and analysis.

In the choice of a design for this study, descriptive and correlational research designs are considered suitable. This is because the study will make an attempt to describe: peace building, internal democracy, All Progressives Congress as a political party, and their relationship. The study also describes the interplay between the variables. The study covers the Lagos State, a state in South-Western Nigeria.

The study population comprises all the political party stakeholders in all the twenty local government councils in Lagos State. The stratified random sampling technique will be used to select thirty percent (30%) of total number of political party stakeholders in Lagos State. That is, for all the political party stakeholders, 30 percent of them was chosen after stratifying into local government

councils. That is, two local government councils were selected from the three senatorial districts of the state, making six (6) local government councils.

Again, a purposive sampling technique was employed to select those that really involve in the political party activities. It is purposive in that, persons that have stayed or have been participating in their various political activities for four years are selected as participants in the study.

Therefore, a total of 300 political party stakeholders are used for the study. That is, 50 participants per each local government council. However, the selection of respondents from each local government council was based on an equal basis.

Qualitative archival and library research was consulted to provide data for; analyses of the background of peace building strategies and internal democracy in particular reference to All Progressive Congress in Lagos State, Nigeria. The research instrument used for the study was responded to by the political party stakeholders such as ward chairmen, youth leaders, women leaders, canvassers during election, executive members of political parties and party members. The questionnaires were tagged Peacebuilding Strategies Questionnaire (PBSQ) and Internal Democracy Questionnaire (IDQ). This instrument was used to elicit information from respondents regarding peacebuilding strategies and internal democracy. The (PBSQ) and (IDQ) which were responded to by the political party stakeholders such as ward chairmen, youth leaders, women leader, canvassers during election, executive members of political parties and party members, and the instrument is divided into two parts. Section A requests for information on personal data of respondents. Section B contains structured items that were patterned along the Likert-type four-point scale with the options, Strongly Agreed (SA), Agree (A),

Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD) for IDQ, and PBSQ.

The information gathered was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Tables, charts, figures, and percentages were among the descriptive statistics used. Inferential statistics used were correlation analysis for testing hypotheses 1 and 2 at 0.05 level of significance through the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24.0.

In terms of scoring both questionnaires (PBSQ) and (IDQ), all positively worded items for the Likert-type of instruments were scored in this order:

- Strongly Agree (SA), = 4
- Agree (A), = 3
- Disagree (D) = 2
- Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1

However, the reverse was the case for the negative worded items.

## 5. Result and Discussion

The hypotheses for this study were tested at 0.05 Level of Significance through the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient.

### Test of Hypotheses

**Table 1: Correlation showing relationship between peacebuilding strategies in terms of inclusivity and diversity and internal democracy of All Progressives Congress in Lagos State**

		Inclusivity and Diversity	Internal Democracy
Inclusivity and Diversity	Pearson Correlation	1	.312**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	289	289
Internal democracy	Pearson Correlation	.312**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	289	289

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 shows that there is a positive, weak and significant relationship between peacebuilding strategies in terms of inclusivity and diversity and internal democracy of All Progressives Congress in Lagos State ( $r = .312$ ,  $N = 289$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). This implies that peacebuilding strategies in terms of inclusivity and diversity do significantly influence internal democracy of All Progressives Congress in Lagos State. Therefore, the hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between peacebuilding strategies in terms of inclusivity and diversity and internal democracy of All Progressives Congress in Lagos State, Nigeria is rejected.

**Table 2: Correlation showing relationship between peacebuilding strategies in terms of power-sharing arrangements and internal democracy of All Progressives Congress in Lagos State**

		Power-sharing arrangements	Internal democracy
Power-sharing arrangements	Pearson Correlation	1	.643**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	289	289
Internal democracy	Pearson Correlation	.643**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	289	289

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The result in Table 4 shows that there is a positive, moderate and significant relationship between peacebuilding strategies in terms of power-sharing arrangements and internal democracy of All Progressives Congress in Lagos State ( $r = .643$ ,  $N = 289$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). This implies that peacebuilding strategies in terms of power-sharing arrangements could only influence internal democracy of All Progressives Congress in Lagos State to a very

moderate extent, and statistically significant. Therefore, the hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between peacebuilding strategies in terms of power-sharing arrangements and internal democracy of All Progressives Congress in Lagos State is rejected.

In recent years, the importance of inclusivity and diversity in fostering robust internal democracy has gained significant recognition. One of the key ways in which inclusivity and diversity influence internal democracy is through the representation of different perspectives and experiences. When political parties actively seek to include individuals from diverse backgrounds, they bring in a range of ideas, knowledge, and lived experiences. This diversity of thought can lead to more informed decision-making processes and help prevent groupthink (UNDESA, 2007).

A political party that actively incorporates members from different racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic origins, for instance, is more likely to respond to the demands and concerns of a varied population. Diversity and inclusivity are also essential for improving problem-solving in political groups. When people from various experiences and viewpoints collaborate, they each bring a unique set of abilities and methods to the table. This variety of opinion encourages creativity and invention, which helps groups come up with original answers to challenging political problems. Diverse teams routinely outperform homogenous ones in problem-solving exercises, according to research. Political parties may harness the collective brains and creativity of its members to facilitate more effective decision-making and problem-solving processes by promoting varied representation and inclusion.

In diverse communities, power-sharing systems are often put into place with the intention of fostering stability, inclusion, and amicable dispute resolution. The goal of these

agreements is to distribute political power more fairly among various stakeholders or groups in order to provide a more equal allocation of opportunities and resources.

One of the key aspects of power-sharing arrangements is the allocation of decision-making authority among different groups or parties. In some cases, power-sharing can lead to a dilution of democratic principles, as decision-making becomes a process of negotiation and compromise rather than a clear expression of the will of the people. This can result in a lack of transparency and accountability, as decisions are made behind closed doors and are often influenced by political calculations rather than the needs and aspirations of the citizens (O'Leary, 2005).

Moreover, power-sharing arrangements can create a sense of entitlement and a perpetuation of existing power structures. When certain groups are guaranteed a share of power, it can create a sense of entitlement and privilege, leading to a perpetuation of inequality and exclusion. This can hinder the development of a truly inclusive and representative democracy, as marginalized groups may continue to be marginalized even within the power-sharing framework (United Nations & World Bank, 2018).

Another challenge that power-sharing arrangements pose to internal democracy is the potential for the manipulation of power dynamics. In some cases, dominant groups or factions may use their share of power to consolidate their control and marginalize dissenting voices. This can lead to a narrowing of political space and a stifling of democratic participation, as those who do not conform to the dominant narrative may face repression or exclusion.

However, it is important to note that power-sharing arrangements can also have positive implications for internal democracy. By providing a platform for different groups to participate in decision-making, power-sharing can promote inclusivity and ensure

that diverse perspectives are taken into account. This can lead to more comprehensive and balanced policies that reflect the needs and aspirations of a broader range of citizens (Lijphart, 2002).

## 6. Conclusion

In Lagos State, political parties that embrace internal democracy are more likely to resolve conflicts in a peaceful and inclusive manner. Lagos State has witnessed the positive outcomes of embracing internal democracy in political parties. The ruling All Progressives Congress (APC) in the state has implemented mechanisms such as primaries and internal consultations to promote inclusivity and transparency. This has helped to build trust among party members and reduce the incidence of intra-party conflicts. As a result, the party has been able to focus more on delivering good governance and addressing the needs of the electorate.

Inclusivity is the key to fostering a democratic society that values the participation and representation of all its citizens. Lagos State, being a melting pot of cultures and traditions, must embrace inclusivity to ensure that all voices are heard and considered in the decision-making process. This means actively involving individuals from different ethnicities, genders, religions, and socio-economic backgrounds in political processes and structures.

When inclusivity is prioritized, it leads to a more comprehensive understanding of the diverse needs and aspirations of the people (Scarrow, 2005). It helps in formulating policies and initiatives that are inclusive and responsive to the challenges faced by different communities within Lagos State. Moreover, it promotes social cohesion, reduces conflicts, and enhances the overall stability of the state.

Diversity goes hand in hand with inclusivity, as it involves recognizing and celebrating the differences that exist among individuals and communities. Lagos State is

home to a wide range of ethnic groups, including the Yorubas, Igbos, Hausas, and many others. Each of these groups brings unique perspectives, experiences, and talents to the table. By promoting diversity, Lagos State can harness the collective strength and knowledge of its diverse population.

In Lagos State, power-sharing has become increasingly important due to the diverse nature of its population, which consists of people from different ethnic, religious, and socio-economic backgrounds. One of the key aspects of power-sharing in Lagos State is the need for inclusivity and representation. It is essential that all sections of society have a voice in the political decision-making process. This can be achieved through the inclusion of diverse groups in political parties, government appointments, and policy formulation. By promoting inclusivity, power-sharing ensures that the interests and concerns of all citizens are taken into account.

## 7. References

- Abubakar, A. N., & Gorondutse, A. H. (2013). Effect of Democratic rule on National security in Nigeria: Evidence from Post Election Violence in Nigeria (2007-2011). *Developing Country Studies*, 3(10).
- Carothers, T. (2006). *Confronting the Weakest Link: Aiding Political Parties in New Democracies*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Castillejo, C. (2016). Political Parties and Peacebuilding. Norwegian Peacebuilding Resource Centre Report, January 2016.
- Chijioke Jannah, "Lagos LG Poll: APC Members in Apapa Threaten to Dump Party over Alleged Imposition of Candidate," May 29, 2017, [www.dailypost.ng/2017/05/29/lagos-lg-poll-apc-members-apapa-threaten-dump-party-alleged-imposition-candidate](http://www.dailypost.ng/2017/05/29/lagos-lg-poll-apc-members-apapa-threaten-dump-party-alleged-imposition-candidate);
- Onozure Dania, "Lagos LG Polls:

- Aspirant Rejects APC's Candidate Imposition," Vanguard, June 12, 2017, [www.vanguardngr.com/2017/06/lagos-lg-polls-aspirant-rejects-apcs-candidate-imposition](http://www.vanguardngr.com/2017/06/lagos-lg-polls-aspirant-rejects-apcs-candidate-imposition). 36.
- Clean Foundation. (2014). *Security Threat Assessment: Towards 2015 Elections*. Retrieved November 15, 2014, from [www.africappractice.com](http://www.africappractice.com).
- Dike, V. (2003). "Nigeria and the Politics of Unreason: Assassinations, Decampments, and Moneybags".
- Egobueze, A. (2020). *The State and the people*. Port Harcourt, A&G Hildian Ltd and Pearl International Publishers Ltd.
- Ezirim, Gerald (2010). Democracy as a conflict management strategy. In: Albert, I.O. and I.O. Oloyede eds. *Dynamics of peace processes*. Ilorin/Ibadan, Centre for Peace and Strategic Studies/John Archers Publishers. pp. 38–48.
- Ezirim, Gerald (2010). Democracy as a conflict management strategy. In: Albert, I.O. and I.O. Oloyede eds. *Dynamics of peace processes*. Ilorin/Ibadan, Centre for Peace and Strategic Studies/John Archers Publishers. pp. 38–48.
- Ezirim, Gerald E, & Mbah, P. O. (2014). Electoral process and political violence in Africa: A preview of the 2015 elections in Nigeria. *Society for Research Academy*.
- Ezirim, Gerald Ekenedirichukwu. (2009). *Democracy as a Conflict Management Strategy in Nigeria*, 1–10.
- Fayemi, A. K. (2009). Towards an African theory of democracy. *Thought and Practice*, 1(1), 101–126.
- Harris, A., & Chapman, C. (2004). Democratic leadership for school improvement in challenging contexts. *Democratic Learning: The Challenge to School Effectiveness*, 164–178.
- Hofmeister, W and Grabow, K (2011) *Political Parties: Functions and Organisation in Democratic Societies*, Singapore: Konrad Adenauer.
- Ibeanu, O. (2013). *Regulating Nigerian Political Parties: Role of the Independent National Electoral Commission*. Being a paper presented at National Conference on Political Parties and the Future of Democracy in Nigeria, organized by the National Institute for Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS), Kuru, in collaboration with the Democracy and Governance Development Project (DGD) II of UNDP, 26-28 June, 2013.
- Jinadu, A. (2014). *Political Parties and Democracy in Nigeria*. In Olu Obafemi, Sam Egwu.
- Kaur, S. (2007). Institutional development as a challenge to democratic sustenance in Nigeria. *International Studies*, 44(3), 217–233.
- Lawal, K, (2002). In Search of Lagosians. Lagos: CEFOLAS.
- Liebowitz, J. & Ibrahim, J. (2013). *A Capacity Assessment of Nigerian Political Parties*. NNDP Nigeria.
- Lijphart, A. (2002). The Wave of Power-sharing Democracy. In A Reynolds (ed). *The Architecture of Democracy: Constitutional Design, Conflict Management and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Matlosa, (2007). Electoral System, Constitutionalism and Conflict Management in Southern Africa. *African Journal on Conflict Resolution*, 4(2), 11–53.
- Mersel, Y (2006) The Dissolution of Political Parties: The problem of internal democracy. *Oxford Journals .org*, 1. CON Volume 1. 84-113.
- Mersel, Y. (2006). The dissolution of political parties: The problem of internal democracy. *Oxford Journals .org*, 1, 84–113.
- Mimpen, J. (2007). Intra-party democracy and its discontents: Democratisation in a volatile political landscape. Retrieved from <http://plein66.nl/documents/64/intra>

- Momodu, J & G, Matudi 2013. The implications of intra-party conflicts on Nigeria's democratization. *Global Journal of Political Science and Human Social Science*, 14 (6), pp. 1–13.
- Momodu, J. & Gambo, M. (2013). The implications of intra-party conflicts on Nigeria democratization. *Global Journal of Political Science and Human Social Science*. 14(6), 1-13.
- Momoh, A. (2013). Party System and Democracy in Nigeria being a paper presented at National Conference on Political Parties and the Future of Democracy in Nigeria, organized by the National Institute for Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS), Kuru, in collaboration with the Democracy and Governance Development Project (DGD) II of UNDP, 26-28 June, 2013.
- Muriithi. (2007). Institute of Social ShuUes.
- Murtin, F., & Wacziarg, R. (2014). The democratic transition. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 19(2), 141– 181.
- O'Leary, B., (2005). Debating Consociational Politics: Normative and Explanatory Arguments. In Noel, S., ed., 2005. *From Power Sharing to Democracy*. Montreal: McGill/Queen's University Press. 3-43.
- Odigwe, O. K. (2015). Nigeria political parties and internal democracy. *African Journal of Governance and Development*, 4(2); 15.
- Ofuoku, A., & Ewrierhurhoma, F. (2018). Effect of land conflict on arable crops production in Delta State, Nigeria. *Ege Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 55(3), 357–366.
- Ojukwu, Chris & Olaifa (2011). Challenges of internal democracy in Nigeria's political parties: The bane of intra-party conflicts in the People's Democratic Party of Nigeria. *Global Journal of Human Social Science*, 2 (3), 24–34.
- Okhaide, I.P (2012) Quest for Internal Party Democracy in Nigeria: Amendment of Electoral Act 2010 as an Albatross. *International Journal of Peace and Development Studies*, 3(3); 57-75.
- Olaniyi, J. O. (2017). State Independent Electoral Commissions and Local Government Elections in Nigeria, *Africa's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review* 5,1 [www.apsdpr.org/index.php/apsdpr/article/view/133/246](http://www.apsdpr.org/index.php/apsdpr/article/view/133/246).
- Ombella, J. S. (2023). Legal Framework Regulating Switching and Disciplining of Political Parties: Tanzanian and South-African View-point. *Journal of Election and Leadership*, 4(1);31-53.
- Omotola, J. S (2009). Nigerian Parties and Political Ideology. *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences*, 1(3), 612-634.
- Onigu-Otite, K., & Albert, I. O. (1999). *Community conflicts in Nigeria: Management, resolution and transformation*. Spectrum Books Limited.
- Pogeson, A.I. (2014). Women, Political Parties and Exclusion in Nigeria: 1999-2012. In Olu Obafemi, Sam Egwu, Okechukwu Ibeanu & Jibrin Ibrahim (Eds), *Political Parties and Democracy in Nigeria* (pp. 237- 264). National Institute for Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS), Kuru, Nigeria.
- Salih, M.A.M (2006) *Globalizing Party Politics in Africa: The Influence of Partybased Democracy Networks*, in Peter Burnell (ed.), *Globalising Democracy: Party Politics and Political Parties*, London: Routledge, 142–62.
- Scarrow, S (2005) *Political Parties and Democracy in Theoretical and Practical Perspectives: Implementing Intra-party Democracy*. Washington DC: National Democratic Institute.
- Sodipo, M. O. (2013). Mitigating radicalism in northern Nigeria. National Defense Univ Fort McNair DC Africa Center for Strategic Studies.

- Sodipo, M. O. (2013). *Mitigating radicalism in northern Nigeria*. National Defense Univ Fort McNair DC Africa Center for Strategic Studies.
- UNDESA, (2007). Final Report on the Expert Group Meeting on Creating an Inclusive Society: Practical Strategies to Promote Social Integration. Unpublished
- United Nations & World Bank, (2018). Pathways for Peace: Inclusive Approaches to Preventing Violent Conflict. Washington, DC: World Bank, pp. 144-146. Available at: <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/28337>.
- White, J. K. & Shea, D.M. (2000). *New Party Politics: From Jefferson and Hamilton to the Information Age*. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's 14.
- Wild, L. & M. Foresti. (2010). *Support to political parties: a missing piece of the governance puzzle*. ODI Briefing Paper. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Yahaya, M. A. (2018). *The Challenging Nature and Pattern of Intra-party conflicts in Nigeria Fourth Republic: Critical Assessment of All Progressives Congress*. Retrieved from [Ejournal.ukm.my/gmiss](http://Ejournal.ukm.my/gmiss).