

Public Opinion and Legislative Responsiveness in Nigeria's National Assembly, 2015–2023

Uche Jane Anene, Ph.D

Senate department, National assembly, Federal Capital Territory, Abuja, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Representative democracy assumes that elected legislators should remain responsive to citizens while exercising judgment on complex policy questions. This article examines the relationship between public opinion and legislative decision-making in Nigeria's National Assembly between 2015 and 2023. Drawing on the mixed-methods evidence and case-oriented analysis contained in the source study, the article focuses on public hearings, electoral reforms, the Not-Too-Young-to-Run reform, debates surrounding electronic transmission of election results, and broader episodes of civic mobilisation. The evidence indicates that public opinion influences legislative behaviour, but not in a uniform or automatic manner. Public hearings, constituency consultations, media engagement and civic mobilisation create channels through which citizen preferences reach legislators. However, party loyalty, electoral incentives, executive and party interference, corruption, information asymmetry, weak transparency and elite interest-group influence can weaken the translation of public preferences into legislative outcomes. The article argues that legislative responsiveness in Nigeria is therefore conditional: public pressure is most consequential when it is sustained, visible, organised and connected to institutional mechanisms capable of transmitting citizen preferences into legislative deliberation. The study concludes that strengthening public hearings, constituency feedback, transparency and civic education is essential for improving democratic accountability.

KEYWORDS

Public opinion, legislative responsiveness, National Assembly, Nigeria, public hearings, representation, principal-agent theory, civic engagement

I. INTRODUCTION

At the core of representative democracy is an institutional relationship between citizens and elected representatives. Citizens expect legislators to consider their preferences, grievances and policy priorities, while legislators are expected to exercise independent judgment in situations where public preferences may be incomplete, conflicting or rapidly changing. The resulting relationship is therefore neither simple delegation nor complete legislative autonomy.

In Nigeria, this tension is particularly important because the National Assembly operates within a political environment characterised by strong party structures, executive influence, organised interest groups, and uneven civic participation and declining public trust. The source study notes that satisfaction with the way democracy was working in Nigeria fell to

21% in a 2022 survey, illustrating the wider problem of democratic confidence. At the same time, the National Assembly has continued to enact legislation in areas such as electoral governance, economic regulation, security and social policy.

The central question is not whether public opinion exists, but the extent to which it is converted into legislative influence. The source study identifies examples in which legislative outcomes appeared responsive to public pressure, including the Not-Too-Young-to-Run constitutional reform and aspects of the Electoral Act 2022. It also identifies situations in which legislative or executive decisions did not correspond straightforwardly with public preferences, including controversies surrounding the 2018 Electoral Bill. These contrasting cases suggest that public opinion is an influence rather than a mechanical determinant of law-making.

This article therefore synthesises the source study around one principal question: under what institutional and political conditions does public opinion influence legislative responsiveness in Nigeria? The analysis is guided by principal-agent theory, which conceptualises citizens as principals who delegate authority to legislators as agents. Where monitoring, information and accountability are weak, agents may pursue party, political or personal interests rather than public preferences.

II. CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Public opinion is treated in this article as the aggregate of citizens' attitudes, preferences and judgments on matters of public concern. Such opinion is dynamic and may be shaped by social experience, media narratives, political discourse, interest groups, opinion leaders and access to information. Measurement is consequently imperfect because survey wording, sampling, non-response, social desirability and uneven political knowledge can affect observed preferences.

Legislative responsiveness refers to the degree to which legislative activity reflects, incorporates or reacts to demonstrable public preferences. It includes the initiation, amendment, debate, passage or rejection of bills and resolutions. Responsiveness should not be equated with unconditional compliance with majority opinion. In representative government, legislators may balance public preferences with constitutional duties, technical evidence, minority interests, party commitments and long-term policy considerations.

Principal-agent theory provides the central analytical lens. The electorate constitutes the principal, while elected legislators act as agents entrusted with delegated authority. The relationship is affected by information asymmetry, monitoring costs and competing incentives. The source study argues that public hearings, constituency feedback mechanisms and media scrutiny can reduce agency drift when they provide citizens with opportunities to observe and influence legislative behaviour. Conversely, weak transparency and strong party control can create conditions in which agents become less responsive to their principals.

III. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The article is derived from the mixed-methods research reported in the source manuscript. The original study examined the Nigerian National Assembly from 2015 to 2023 and

combined analysis of public engagement mechanisms, case studies and stakeholder/key-informant evidence. The substantive cases included electoral reforms, the Not-Too-Young-to-Run reform, and electronic transmission of election results, public hearings and civic mobilisation.

Because the purpose here is journal conversion rather than replication of the full thesis, the article emphasises the reported empirical patterns rather than introducing new numerical estimates. The evidence is interpreted thematically around three dimensions: the influence of public opinion on legislative decisions; legislators' communication strategies; and factors conditioning the strength of the opinion-legislation relationship. This approach avoids inventing statistical values not reported in the source material.

The source study also acknowledges limitations, particularly difficulties in obtaining interviews with legislators who participated in earlier reforms, reliance on legislative aides and telephone contacts, and limited availability of current literature. These limitations are retained as important qualifications to the interpretation of the findings.

IV. RESULTS

A. Public opinion and legislative decisions

The evidence indicates that public opinion has a meaningful but uneven influence on legislative decisions. Public hearings are an important institutional route for transmitting citizen preferences, yet their effectiveness is constrained by inadequate communication, logistical barriers, limited awareness and public distrust. When citizens believe that participation will not change legislative outcomes, participation declines and the accountability relationship weakens.

At the same time, the study identifies instances in which public pressure became politically consequential. The Not-Too-Young-to-Run reform and the incorporation of electronic transmission of election results into the Electoral Act 2022 illustrate situations in which broader social demands became connected to legislative outcomes. These cases should not be read as proof that public opinion alone caused the outcomes; rather, they demonstrate that public mobilisation can become influential when it intersects with legislative opportunity and political incentives.

B. Communication and representation

Legislators use several channels to communicate with constituents and organised stakeholders. Town-hall meetings, focus groups, traditional media and social media can broaden access to legislative information and enable representatives to receive feedback. The source evidence suggests moderate satisfaction with some aspects of legislative communication, particularly the use of multiple platforms. However, dissatisfaction remains concerning the explanation of voting behaviour and the balancing of organised interests against wider citizen concerns.

This distinction is important. Communication does not automatically equal responsiveness. A legislator may communicate extensively while still failing to incorporate citizen preferences into decisions. Effective representation therefore requires a feedback loop in which citizens

can see how their contributions were considered and, where appropriate, reflected in legislative action.

C. Factors conditioning responsiveness

Party loyalty is one of the strongest constraints identified in the source study. Legislators may face pressure to support party positions even where constituent preferences differ. Electoral incentives also create conditional responsiveness: lawmakers may pay greater attention to public concerns during campaign periods but become less directly responsive after elections.

Executive and party interference further affect legislative independence. Corruption and perceptions of personal gain can weaken the connection between legislative decisions and public welfare. Elite capture by organised interest groups is another important factor. The source study reports that grassroots concerns can be overshadowed by better-resourced or more politically organised stakeholders.

Nevertheless, civic mobilisation can counterbalance these pressures. The #EndSARS movement is identified as an example of sustained public pressure that compelled greater legislative attention to police reform. This suggests that public opinion becomes more influential when it is organised, visible and difficult for political institutions to ignore.

V. DISCUSSION

The findings support a conditional model of legislative responsiveness. Public opinion is neither irrelevant nor determinative. Instead, its effect depends on the institutional channels available for participation, the intensity and persistence of public mobilisation, the electoral incentives facing legislators, and the relative strength of competing actors.

From a principal-agent perspective, public hearings, media scrutiny and constituency engagement function as monitoring mechanisms. They reduce information asymmetry by making citizen preferences more visible and allow principals to assess whether agents are acting consistently with delegated mandates. Where these mechanisms are weak or symbolic, agency drift becomes more likely.

The findings also reinforce the importance of distinguishing public opinion from interest-group pressure. Organised groups may be better positioned to access lawmakers, provide technical information or sustain lobbying campaigns. Their influence can be valuable, but disproportionate influence risks converting representative institutions into arenas of unequal access. A responsive legislature must therefore balance expertise and organised advocacy with broad-based citizen participation.

The Nigerian evidence further demonstrates that digital communication has changed the speed and visibility of public mobilisation. Social media can connect citizens and legislators directly, amplify neglected issues and facilitate collective action. However, digital participation also creates risks associated with misinformation, polarisation and unequal access. Digital engagement should therefore complement rather than replace institutional consultation and evidence-based legislative deliberation.

VI. CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The article concludes that public opinion constitutes an important accountability mechanism in Nigeria's legislative process, but its influence is mediated by political and institutional conditions. The strongest evidence of responsiveness appears where public preferences are organised, visible, sustained and connected to formal or informal channels of legislative influence. Conversely, weak participation, poor communication, party dominance, political interference, corruption and elite capture can widen the gap between citizens' expectations and legislative outcomes.

Four policy implications follow. First, public hearings should be made more accessible through adequate notice, decentralised venues and digital participation. Second, legislators should institutionalise constituency feedback through regular town halls, documented consultations and clear explanations of voting positions. Third, legislative transparency and ethical standards should be strengthened to reduce opportunities for political interference and corruption. Fourth, civic education should equip citizens to understand bills, participate in consultations and distinguish credible information from misinformation.

Ultimately, democratic responsiveness requires more than periodic elections. It requires continuous mechanisms through which citizens can communicate preferences, observe legislative behaviour and hold representatives accountable. Strengthening these mechanisms can improve public trust and enhance the legitimacy of Nigeria's National Assembly.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abayomi, T. (2020). Challenges of public hearings in Nigeria: A case study. *African Journal of Political Science*.
- [2] Adisa, M. (2017). Public participation and legislative processes in Nigeria. [Reference as cited in the source manuscript].
- [3] Adeyemi, A., & Onabanjo, O. (2021). Public engagement, interest groups and legislative responsiveness. [Reference as cited in the source manuscript].
- [4] Adebayo, A., & Ogunleye, B. (2020). Party influence and legislative responsiveness in Nigeria. [Reference as cited in the source manuscript].
- [5] AfroBarometer. (2023). Public attitudes toward democracy and governance in Nigeria. AfroBarometer.
- [6] Bassey, E., et al. (2019). Public trust and civic engagement in Nigeria. [Reference as cited in the source manuscript].
- [7] Bello, A. (2020). Organised interests and public participation in Nigerian law-making. [Reference as cited in the source manuscript].
- [8] Broniatowski, D. A., & Reyna, V. F. (2018). Representation, deliberation and public preferences. [Reference as cited in the source manuscript].
- [9] Binder, S. A. (2004). Legislative decision-making and political institutions. [Reference as cited in the source manuscript].
- [10] Domingues, M. (2018). Public opinion and political attitudes. [Reference as cited in the source manuscript].
- [11] Eze, C., & Olagunju, A. (2018). Bureaucratic inefficiency, corruption and public distrust in Nigeria. [Reference as cited in the source manuscript].

- [12] Guardian Nigeria News. (2018, December 7). Buhari rejects electoral bill for the fourth time.
- [13] Guardian Nigeria News. (2021, July 16). 2023 in jeopardy as Electoral Act amendment splits National Assembly.
- [14] Ibeanu, O. (2017). Understanding public opinion and political attitudes in Nigeria. NOI Polls Research Brief, 7.
- [15] Ibeanu, O., & Mbah, P. (2007). Engaging the Nigerian parliament: A desktop study.
- [16] Kowalewski, J., & McCombs, M. (2019). Public opinion, media and agenda setting. [Reference as cited in the source manuscript].
- [17] Leeper, T. J., & Slothuus, R. (2014). Political parties, motivated reasoning, and public opinion. [Reference as cited in the source manuscript].
- [18] Lippmann, W. (2017). Public opinion. [Edition as cited in the source manuscript].
- [19] Okeke, C. (2019). Electoral incentives and legislative behaviour in Nigeria. [Reference as cited in the source manuscript].
- [20] Ogunbiyi, O., et al. (2019). Public hearings, accessibility and legislative accountability. [Reference as cited in the source manuscript].
- [21] Ogunyemi, O. (2018). Communication barriers and public participation in Nigeria. [Reference as cited in the source manuscript].
- [22] Olawale, A., & Bello, B. (2019). Community advocacy and legislative agenda setting. [Reference as cited in the source manuscript].
- [23] Olowojolu, O., & Bakare, A. (2021). Corruption and representation in Nigeria. [Reference as cited in the source manuscript].
- [24] Premium Times Nigeria. (2018, May 31). Not Too Young to run constitutional reform.
- [25] Smith, W. (2013). Political participation and public opinion. [Reference as cited in the source manuscript].
- [26] Umejei, I. O. (2016). The role of civic education in good governance and sustainable development in Nigeria. American Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 1(2), 37–43.
- [27] Wratil, C., Wäckerle, J., & Proksch, S. (2022). Government rhetoric and the representation of public opinion in international negotiations. American Political Science Review, 117(3), 1105–1122.
- [28] Wu, C. (2019). Public opinion, mobilisation and political decision-making. [Reference as cited in the source manuscript].
- [29] *Publication note: This manuscript is a journal-oriented adaptation of the uploaded source manuscript. References marked "[Reference as cited in the source manuscript]" should be verified and completed against the original bibliography before submission.*