

GOVERNANCE IN NIGERIA AND QUALITY OF LIFE CORRELATES ON THE CITIZENS

Chidume Collins Onuorah
(Political Psychology Researcher)
Postgraduate Researcher
Phone: +2348100383022
Email: chidumeonuorah@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: *This study investigated “Governance in Nigeria and Quality of Life Correlates on the Citizens”. The effectiveness of governance in Nigeria and its relationships with quality of life on the citizens are in doubt. The main objective of this study was to investigate governance in Nigeria and its quality-of-life correlates on citizens. A total of 234 participants for this study were sampled in Igboland covering Anambra, Enugu, Ebonyi, Imo, Abia, Rivers, and Delta States, using cluster and incidental (sampling) method. The instruments of measurement and data collection were Governance Perception Inventory Nwankwo (2026) to measure governance, and Quality of Life Inventory by Nwankwo (2026) to measure quality of life. Both instruments attained good psychometric properties. Confidentiality and informed consent were the ethical practices adopted. Correlational design and Pearson Product Moment Correlation (statistics) were adopted. The data analyses were done with SPSS version 26. Findings of the study showed thus: Governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens; Representation as a dimension of governance in Nigeria had positive but non-significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens; Resources management as a dimension of governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens; Rule of law as a dimension of governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens; Change agent as a dimension of governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens; Governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with psychological functioning as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens; Governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with environment as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens; Governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with economic ability as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens; Governance in Nigeria had positive and non-significant relationship with modernization as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens; and Generally, relationship between governance in Nigeria and citizens’ quality of life was too low. One major implication of the study is that the government is busy formulating out governance policies without corresponding these with implementation actions that improve the quality of life of the citizens. One may be inclined to argue that those policies may end up serving selfish political purposes only. It is recommended for the government to stop prioritizing selfish political goals in governance, as this adulterates governance policies from improving quality of life of citizens. Personal development and community-based actions are also recommended capacity-building endeavours that will facilitate quality of life of the citizens, should the government neglect their obligations.*

KEYWORDS: Governance, Nigeria, Quality of Life, Correlates, Citizens

INTRODUCTION

Quality of life is a broad and complex concept that reflects the general well-being of individuals and communities, extending beyond mere economic indicators to encompass various dimensions such as physical health, psychological well-being, social relationships, and environmental conditions. It represents the

extent to which individuals and communities enjoy a good and fulfilling life, characterized by access to essential resources, opportunities for personal and social development, and the capacity to participate meaningfully in society. Quality of life is not a static condition but rather a dynamic state that can be influenced by numerous factors, including governance,

economic conditions, and social policies. The concept of quality of life is often used as a key indicator of societal progress and development, serving as a benchmark for evaluating the effectiveness of policies and governance in improving the lives of citizens. Governance has traditionally been evaluated through political, economic, and institutional considerations, but new research indicates that bad mental health, and especially untreated anxiety, depression, and substance use disorders, can greatly undermine decision-making capabilities and institutional performance (Nkemjika et al, 2025).

Governance is widely recognized as a critical factor in determining the quality of life of citizens. Governance is characterized by such practices as transparency, accountability, rule of law, inclusiveness, and responsiveness, which together create an environment where public institutions function effectively, resources are managed responsibly, and the rights of individuals are protected. In societies where good governance is practiced, public institutions are more likely to deliver services efficiently, uphold the rights and freedoms of individuals, and create opportunities for economic and social advancement. Conversely, poor governance, remarkably marked by corruption, inefficiency, and lack of accountability, often leads to a decline in the quality of life as citizens are deprived of basic services, opportunities, and security, and are subjected to injustice and inequality.

The governance challenges facing Nigeria have necessitated this study, which seeks to explore the relationship between governance and quality of life in the country. Given the significant impact that governance has on the well-being of citizens, it is important to understand the factors that contribute to good governance and how these factors can be leveraged to improve the quality of life in Nigeria. This study will examine the key components of good governance, including transparency, accountability, participation, and responsiveness, and assess their impact on the quality of life of Nigerian citizens. By exploring the relationship between governance and quality of life, this study aims to contribute to the

ongoing debate on how to improve governance in Nigeria and create a more conducive environment for sustainable development and the well-being of its citizens.

Statement of the Problem

In recent years, Nigeria has faced significant challenges in governance, which have had a profound impact on the quality of life of its citizens. Despite being one of the largest economies in Africa and having abundant natural resources, Nigeria continues to struggle with issues such as poverty, unemployment, rule of law, insecurity, and lack of access to basic socio-human services. These challenges have been exacerbated by governance issues, including corruption, political instability, weak institutions, and poor leadership. The result has been a decline in the quality of life for many Nigerians, who are unable to access the resources and opportunities they need to improve their well-being (Nwachukwu & Onuoha, 2022). The persistence of these challenges has raised questions about the effectiveness of governance in Nigeria and the ability of the government to meet the needs and aspirations of its citizens.

The impact of poor governance on the quality of life in Nigeria is evident in various sectors of society. For instance, the healthcare system in Nigeria has been characterized by inadequate facilities, lack of medical personnel, and poor infrastructure, leading to high rates of maternal and child mortality, as well as the prevalence of preventable diseases. The education sector has also been affected, with many schools lacking basic facilities, qualified teachers, and adequate funding, resulting in low literacy rates and poor educational outcomes. In addition, the country's infrastructure, including roads, electricity, and water supply, remains inadequate, further hindering economic growth and development (Bassey & Ekanem, 2022). These challenges and many more have contributed to a pervasive sense of dissatisfaction among Nigerians, who feel that the government is not doing enough to improve their quality of life.

Despite various efforts by successive governments to address these challenges,

progress has been slow, and many Nigerians continue to live in poverty and insecurity. The failure to improve the quality of life in Nigeria has been attributed to a range of factors, including the lack of political will, weak institutions, corruption, and poor policy implementation. For instance, anti-corruption measures have often been undermined by the lack of independence of anti-corruption agencies, political interference, and the culture of impunity, where corrupt individuals are rarely held accountable for their actions (Ogunleye & Fashina, 2022). Similarly, efforts to improve public service delivery have been hampered by inefficiencies, lack of accountability, and inadequate funding, leading to a decline in the quality of services provided to citizens.

Furthermore, the ongoing security challenges in Nigeria, including the Boko Haram insurgency Fulani Herdsmen's terrorism and genocide on indigenous people, banditry, and communal conflicts, have further exacerbated the governance challenges facing the country. These security issues have not only led to loss of lives and displacement of communities but have also diverted resources away from development projects, further diminishing the quality of life for many Nigerians. The inability of the government to effectively address these security challenges has raised concerns about its capacity to provide a safe and secure environment for its citizens (Ezeani & Okechukwu, 2023). The persistence of these challenges has led to a growing sense of disillusionment with the government and a loss of trust in public institutions, further undermining efforts to improve governance and quality of life in the country.

Given the critical importance of governance in shaping the quality of life of citizens, there is a need for a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between governance and quality of life in Nigeria. This study seeks to explore this relationship by examining the key components of governance and assessing their correlates with quality of life of Nigerians. The study also seeks explore governance in Nigeria and relationship with key components of quality of life in the country. By

addressing these issues, the study aims to contribute on how to improve governance, quality of life, and socio-human development of Nigerian citizens.

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study was to investigate governance in Nigeria and quality of life correlates on citizens. Specifically, the study sought to examine whether:

1. Governance in Nigeria would significantly correlate with quality of life of the citizens.
2. Representation as a dimension of governance in Nigeria would have significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens.
3. Resources management as a dimension of governance in Nigeria would significantly correlate with quality of life of the citizens.
4. Rule of law as a dimension of governance in Nigeria would significantly correlate with quality of life of the citizens.
5. Change agent as a dimension of governance in Nigeria would have significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens.
6. Governance in Nigeria would have significant relationship with psychological functioning dimension of quality of life of the citizens.
7. Governance in Nigeria would significantly correlate with environment as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens.
8. Governance in Nigeria would significantly correlate with economic ability aspect of quality of life of the citizens.
9. Governance in Nigeria would have significant relationship with modernization aspect of quality of life of the citizens.

Research Questions

1. How would governance in Nigeria correlate with quality of life of the citizens?

2. How would representation as a dimension of governance in Nigeria relate with quality of life of the citizens?
3. In what way would resources management as a dimension of governance in Nigeria correlate with quality of life of the citizens?
4. What degree of relationship existed between rule of law as a dimension of governance in Nigeria and quality of life of the citizens?
5. To what degree would change agent as a dimension of governance in Nigeria correlate with quality of life of the citizens?
6. What would the nature of relationship existing between governance in Nigeria and psychological functioning dimension of quality of life of the citizens?
7. In what way would governance in Nigeria correlate with environment as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens?
8. How would governance in Nigeria correlate with economic ability aspect of quality of life of the citizens?
9. How would governance in Nigeria relate with modernization aspect of quality of life of the citizens?

Significance of the Study

The study is significant on the following grounds: Policymakers and Government Officials: The findings of this study will provide valuable insights into the areas of governance that need improvement to enhance the quality of life of Nigerians. By identifying the specific dimensions of governance that have the most significant impact on quality of life, policymakers can design targeted interventions and reforms that address these areas. The study will also highlight the importance of good governance practices, such as transparency, accountability, and citizen participation, which can serve as guiding principles for policy formulation and implementation.

Civil Society Organizations: Civil society organizations (CSOs) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) play a

critical role in advocating for good governance and the protection of citizens' rights. This study will equip CSOs and NGOs with empirical evidence on the relationship between governance and quality of life, which they can use to strengthen their advocacy efforts. The study's findings can help these organizations to push for policy changes, engage in public awareness campaigns, and hold the government accountable for its responsibilities to the people.

Academics and Researchers: For scholars and researchers, this study will contribute to the growing body of literature on governance and quality of life, particularly in the Nigerian context. It will provide a theoretical and empirical basis for further research on these topics and offer new insights into the specific governance challenges faced by Nigeria. By identifying gaps in existing knowledge and suggesting areas for further investigation, the study will serve as a foundation for future academic inquiries.

The General Public: The general public, especially Nigerian citizens, stand to benefit from this study as it seeks to shed light on the factors that influence their quality of life. By understanding how governance impacts their daily lives, citizens can become more informed and engaged in governance processes. The study's findings can empower citizens to demand better governance, participate more actively in democratic processes, and hold their leaders accountable for delivering on their promises.

International Organizations and Development Partners: International organizations, such as the United Nations, World Bank, and other development partners working in Nigeria, can use the study's findings to align their programmes and interventions with the governance needs of the country. The study will offer insights into the governance-related challenges that affect the quality of life in Nigeria, helping these organizations to design more effective strategies for supporting governance reforms and promoting sustainable development.

Operational Definition of Measured Variables

Governance: This is the exercise of political and administrative authorities at all levels in managing a country's affairs so as to stimulate societal development and progress, as measured with Governance Perception Inventory by Nwankwo (2026).

Quality of Life: This is the overall satisfaction of individuals, as it concerns sustainable wellbeing of life, as measured with Quality-of-Life Inventory by Nwankwo (2026).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Anchor/Base

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs by Abraham Maslow (1943): Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs is a seminal theory in psychology, proposed by Abraham Maslow in 1943 in his paper "A Theory of Human Motivation." Maslow introduced this theory as a framework for understanding human motivation and behavior. His theory posits that human needs are arranged in a hierarchical order, where individuals must satisfy lower-level needs before they can address higher-level needs. The hierarchy is typically depicted as a pyramid, with the most basic needs at the bottom and the more complex, self-fulfillment needs at the top. Maslow's theory has been influential across various fields, including psychology, education, business, and healthcare, due to its comprehensive approach to understanding human motivation.

The hierarchy begins with physiological needs, which are the most basic and fundamental for human survival. These include necessities such as food, water, shelter, and sleep. Maslow argued that until these needs are met, individuals cannot focus on higher-level needs. Once physiological needs are satisfied, individuals move on to safety needs, which involve the desire for security and stability. This includes physical safety, as well as financial security, health, and well-being. In the context of the workplace, for example, safety needs might manifest as job security or a safe working environment.

The third level in Maslow's hierarchy is social needs, which include love, belonging, and

social connections. Maslow believed that humans are inherently social beings who seek relationships, friendships, and a sense of community. These needs are about forming emotional bonds with others and being part of a group, whether it is a family, a circle of friends, or a community. Social needs are critical for mental health and well-being, and their fulfillment can lead to feelings of love and belonging. Without these connections, individuals may experience loneliness and depression, which can hinder their ability to progress to higher levels of the hierarchy.

The fourth level is esteem needs, which involve the desire for respect, self-esteem, and recognition from others. Maslow divided esteem needs into two categories: the need for self-respect, which includes confidence, achievement, and independence, and the need for respect from others, which includes recognition, status, and admiration. Fulfillment of these needs leads to feelings of self-worth and accomplishment. However, if these needs are not met, individuals may experience feelings of inferiority, helplessness, and discouragement.

At the top of the hierarchy is self-actualization, which Maslow described as the realization of one's full potential and the desire to become the most that one can be. Self-actualization is about personal growth, self-improvement, and the pursuit of goals that lead to a sense of fulfillment and meaning in life. According to Maslow, self-actualized individuals are those who are creative, problem-solving, and self-aware. They are motivated by a desire to achieve personal excellence and to contribute to society in meaningful ways. Maslow also suggested that self-actualization is a continuous process of becoming rather than a perfect state one reaches.

One of the strengths of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs is its intuitive appeal and its ability to explain a wide range of human behaviors. The theory's simplicity and its focus on universal human needs have made it a popular tool for understanding motivation in various contexts. For example, in education, the hierarchy is used to understand students' needs and to create learning environments that support

their development. In business, it is used to design employee motivation programs that address different levels of needs, from providing fair wages and safe working conditions to offering opportunities for career advancement and personal growth.

Another strength of Maslow's theory is its emphasis on the positive aspects of human nature. Unlike other theories of motivation that focus on deficits or pathology, Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs is based on the idea that humans are inherently motivated to grow and achieve their full potential. This positive approach has influenced the development of humanistic psychology, which emphasizes the importance of self-actualization and personal growth.

In applying Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs to the study of governance and quality of life, the theory provides a useful lens for understanding the different factors that contribute to individuals' well-being and fulfillment. Governance can be seen as a mechanism for meeting the basic needs of citizens, such as providing access to essential services like healthcare, education, and social security. By ensuring that these needs are met, governments can create the conditions necessary for citizens to pursue higher-level needs, such as social connections, esteem, and self-actualization.

In the context of quality of life, Maslow's theory suggests that a high quality of life is achieved when individuals are able to meet their basic needs and pursue higher-level goals that lead to personal growth and fulfillment. Quality of life is not just about material wealth or physical health, but also about social relationships, self-esteem, and the ability to achieve one's potential. By addressing the different levels of needs identified by Maslow, policymakers and practitioners can develop more holistic approaches to improving quality of life that go beyond economic indicators and focus on the overall well-being of individuals.

In the Nigerian context, Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs can be applied to analyze the challenges and opportunities for improving

governance and quality of life. Nigeria faces significant challenges in meeting the basic needs of its population, including issues related to poverty, unemployment, and inadequate access to healthcare and education. Addressing these challenges is essential for creating the conditions necessary for citizens to pursue higher-level needs and to achieve a higher quality of life. Maslow's theory also highlights the importance of social connections and community involvement in improving quality of life, which can inform policies aimed at strengthening social cohesion and promoting inclusive development.

Moreover, Maslow's theory can be used to understand the motivations of individuals and groups in the context of governance. For example, understanding the importance of esteem needs and self-actualization can help explain why individuals seek leadership positions or engage in civic activities. By addressing these motivational factors, governance structures can be designed to better engage citizens and to promote active participation in the decision-making process.

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs offers a comprehensive framework for understanding human motivation and its implications for good governance and quality of life. Despite its limitations, the theory provides valuable insights into the different factors that contribute to well-being and personal fulfillment. The theory's emphasis on the positive aspects of human nature and its focus on the fulfillment of higher-level needs also aligns with the broader goals of sustainable development and human flourishing.

Empirical Review

Chukwuemeka and Mary (2024) investigated quality of life and access to healthcare services in Nigeria. The study aimed to explore the impact of access to healthcare services on quality of life. The population used included individuals from both urban and rural areas, with varying levels of access to healthcare. The hypotheses posited that better access to healthcare services is associated with a higher quality of life. The method of statistical analysis used was logistic regression. The findings revealed that improved access to

healthcare services was linked to better quality of life. The study concluded that healthcare access is crucial for enhancing quality of life. The recommendation was for the government to invest in improving healthcare infrastructure and access.

Emmanuel and Patricia (2024) investigated effect of environmental factors on quality of life in Nigeria. The study aimed to explore how environmental conditions affect the quality of life. The population included residents from areas with varying environmental conditions, such as pollution levels and green spaces. The hypotheses proposed that better environmental conditions are associated with a higher quality of life. The statistical analysis method used was multiple linear regression. The findings showed that individuals in better environmental conditions reported a higher quality of life. The study concluded that environmental factors are important determinants of quality of life. The recommendation was for environmental policies to focus on improving living conditions.

Akin and Temidayo (2024) explored quality of life and access to educational resources in Nigerian schools. The study aimed to assess how access to educational resources affects students' quality of life. The population used included students from schools with varying levels of access to educational resources. The hypotheses suggested that better access to educational resources leads to a higher quality of life for students. The method of statistical analysis used was hierarchical linear modeling. The findings showed that students with better access to educational resources reported a higher quality of life. The study concluded that educational resources are crucial for improving students' quality of life. The recommendation was for educational policies to enhance resource allocation in schools.

Chike and Zainab (2024) investigated impact of government policies on quality of life in Nigeria. The study aimed to explore how various government policies affect quality of life. The population included individuals affected by different government policies. The hypotheses suggested that government policies

have a significant impact on quality of life. The statistical analysis method used was multiple regression analysis. The findings revealed that certain government policies were positively associated with improvements in quality of life. The study concluded that government policies are crucial for enhancing quality of life. The recommendation was for policymakers to focus on policies that directly improve quality of life.

Chinonso and Patience (2024) investigated quality of life and mental health among Nigerian youths. The study aimed to assess how mental health status influences the quality of life among youths. The population included young individuals with varying mental health conditions. The hypotheses suggested that better mental health is associated with a higher quality of life. The statistical analysis method used was path analysis. The findings revealed that mental health significantly affects quality of life among youths. The study concluded that mental health is a critical determinant of quality of life. The recommendation was to implement mental health support programs to improve quality of life for youths.

Hypotheses

1. Governance in Nigeria will not significantly correlate with quality of life of the citizens.
2. Representation as a dimension of governance in Nigeria will not have significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens.
3. Resources management as a dimension of governance in Nigeria will not significantly correlate with quality of life of the citizens.
4. Rule of law as a dimension of governance in Nigeria will not significantly correlate with quality of life of the citizens.
5. Change agent as a dimension of governance in Nigeria will not have significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens.
6. Governance in Nigeria will not have significant relationship with psychological functioning dimension of quality of life of the citizens.

7. Governance in Nigeria will not significantly correlate with environment as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens.
8. Governance in Nigeria will not significantly correlate with economic ability aspect of quality of life of the citizens.
9. Governance in Nigeria will not have significant relationship with modernization aspect of quality of life of the citizens.

METHOD

Participants: The participants for this study were sampled in Igboland, and the sample clusters are represented in the table 1 below.

Table 1: Demographic Distribution of the Participants/Sample

Cluster Category	Cluster Samples	N
GENDER	Male	78
	Female	156
MARITAL STATUS	Married	12
	Single	222
HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	Masters	21
	First Degree	105
	Diploma	72
OCCUPATION	Secondary	36
	Student	210
	Artisan	9
	Business	9
	Administration	3
STATE OF ORIGIN	Technology	3
	Anambra	144
	Enugu	15
	Ebonyi	12
	Imo	12
	Abia	3
	Rivers	27
	Delta	21
RELIGION	Christianity	231
	Jew	3

Source: Research questionnaire primary data. N = 334

A total 234 participants were sampled for the study using the cluster sampling method. In this study, the clusters were Gender (male = 78, female = 156), marital status (married = 12, single = 222), educational level (Masters = 21, First Degree = 105, Diploma = 72, Secondary = 36), occupation (student = 210, artisan = 9, business = 9, administration = 3, technology = 3), State of origin (Anambra = 144, Enugu = 15, Ebonyi = 12, Imo = 12, Abia = 3, Rivers = 27, Delta = 21), and religion (Christianity = 231, Jew = 3).

Instruments: Two instruments were utilized in the study. They were Governance Perception Inventory by Nwankwo (2026) to measure governance, and Quality of Life Inventory by Nwankwo (2026) to measure quality of life.

Governance Perception Inventory by Nwankwo (2026): The Governance Perception Inventory by Nwankwo (2026) is designed to measure citizens' perceptions of governance across 10 domains. These domains include representation, responsiveness, resources management, transparency, rule of law, ethics, leadership competency, change agents, sustainability, financial management, human rights, and accountability. The scale is structured using a 5-point Likert scale, where respondents rate each item from 1, indicating "not obtainable at all," to 5, signifying "applies very well." The scale was directly scored in accordance to the response and the total score was summed up to show the perception of governance. Regarding its psychometric properties, the Governance Perception Inventory had general validity

coefficient of 0.95 with Nigerian Social Challenges Inventory by Nwankwo (2026), and mean norm 212.50.

The respective validity and mean norm coefficients of the 10 dimensions/domains were representation (0.81, mean norm = 17.50), responsiveness (0.83, mean norm = 17.50), resources management (0.76, mean norm = 15.00), transparency (0.86, mean norm = 17.50), rule of law (0.92, mean norm = 17.50), ethics (0.70, mean norm = 17.50), leadership competency (0.74, mean norm = 17.50), change agents (0.91, mean norm = 17.50), sustainability (0.76, mean norm = 27.50), financial management (0.94, mean norm = 15.00), human rights (0.89, mean norm = 17.50), and accountability (0.89, mean norm = 12.50).

This suggests a strong alignment between the scale's items and the behavioural constructs they intend to measure. The reliability of the scale, which indicates the consistency of the results when the scale is applied in different contexts or at different times, was established with general reliability Cronbach's alpha of 0.885. This high reliability coefficient indicates that the scale is dependable and produces consistent results across various samples and settings. The respective reliability coefficients of the 10 dimensions/domains were representation (0.89), responsiveness (0.79), resources management (0.79), transparency (0.79), rule of law (0.79), ethics (0.79), leadership competency (0.79), change agents (0.79), sustainability (0.79), financial management (0.79), human rights (0.79), and accountability (0.79).

Quality of Life Inventory by Nwankwo (2026): The Quality-of-Life Inventory by Nwankwo (2026) is a comprehensive tool designed to measure the quality of life of citizens across eight critical domains. These domains include physical capacity, psychological functioning, independence, social relationships, environment, economic ability, beliefs, and value system and modernization. The inventory allows individuals to assess their quality of life in these areas using a 5-point Likert scale, where responses range from 1 indicating "Not At All", to 5 representing "A Strong Issue in My Life". The inventory was

scored directly in accordance with the response where a higher score showed higher quality of life. The inventory had undergone rigorous validation processes to ensure its accuracy and effectiveness in measuring the intended constructs.

The overall validity coefficient and mean norm of the Quality-of-Life inventory was 0.97 and mean norm = 275, which reflects how well the inventory measures the overall quality of life as perceived by citizens. The respective validity coefficients and mean norms of the eight domains/dimensions were physical capacity (0.89, mean norm = 40), psychological functioning (0.86, mean norm = 35), independence (0.87, mean norm = 35), social relationships (0.88, mean norm = 32.50), environment (0.90, mean norm = 27.50), economic ability (0.91, mean norm = 25), beliefs (0.89, mean norm = 22.50), value system (0.75, mean norm = 27.50) and modernization (0.81, mean norm = 30). The overall reliability of the inventory, which assesses the consistency of the results when the inventory is administered under different conditions or at various times, was confirmed with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.85. This high reliability coefficient suggests that the inventory was a reliable instrument for assessing quality of life across diverse populations and contexts. The respective reliability coefficients of the eight domains/dimensions were physical capacity (0.77), psychological functioning (0.77), independence (0.77), social relationships (0.77), environment (0.78), economic ability (0.78), beliefs (0.78), value system (0.78) and modernization (0.78).

Procedure: The procedure for this study involved several key steps to ensure the systematic sampling of participants and the ethical administration of the research. First, participants were sampled in Igboland using a cluster sampling method. This method allowed for the selection of 234 participants across various clusters such as State of origin, marital status, educational levels, gender, and religious affiliation. Each cluster represented a specific segment of the population to ensure that the sample was representative of the diverse population Igboland. Governance Perception

Scale and Quality of Life Inventory were administered to gather data on the participants' perceptions of governance and their quality of life. Participants were assured that their responses would remain confidential and anonymous.

Ethical considerations were paramount throughout the research process. Participants were informed of the purpose of the study and their rights, including the right to withdraw from the study at any time without any consequences. Informed consent was obtained from all participants before they completed the questionnaire. To ensure confidentiality, all data were anonymized, and only aggregated results were reported. Additionally, the data were securely stored, and access allowed only to the research team. These measures helped protect the privacy and rights of the participants, ensuring that the research adhered to ethical standards.

Design/Statistics: The study adopted correlational design, which was particularly suitable for this study as it allowed researcher explain the relationships between governance and quality of life, as well as respective dimensions. According to Creswell (2021), correlational design is effective for studies aiming to identify potential trends and relationships between variables, making it appropriate for this study. For data analysis, both descriptive and inferential statistics were employed. Descriptive statistics, such as measures of central tendency and variability provided a summary of the participants' responses, giving an overview of the perceptions and experiences related to governance and quality of life. Inferential statistics of Pearson Product Moment Correlation which was correlational analysis was used to test the hypotheses which examine the relationships between governance and quality of life. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 26 was utilized for data analysis.

RESULTS

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics Governance, Quality of Life, and their Respective Dimensions

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Std. Error
GENDER	234	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
AGE	234	16.00	42.00	20.0385	5.15621	2.905	.159	8.617	.317
MARITAL STATUS	234	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	234	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
OCCUPATION	234	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
STATE OF ORIGIN	234	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
RELIGION	234	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
CHRISTIAN DENOMINATION	234	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
ISLAMIC DENOMINATION	234	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
GOVERNANCE	234	72.00	333.00	189.5769	60.78383	.111	.159	-.575	.317
Representation	234	7.00	30.00	16.0897	5.55701	.255	.159	-.715	.317
Responsiveness	234	6.00	32.00	15.7692	6.43473	.524	.159	-.274	.317
Resources Management	234	6.00	32.00	13.0256	5.47246	.741	.159	.515	.317
Transparency	234	7.00	35.00	15.4872	6.12897	.553	.159	-.095	.317
Rule of Law	234	7.00	34.00	14.9359	5.97493	.731	.159	.249	.317
Ethics	234	6.00	31.00	14.6667	6.14768	.420	.159	-.536	.317
Leadership Competency	234	7.00	26.00	16.0513	5.72075	.053	.159	-1.060	.317
Change Agent	234	11.00	53.00	28.1282	9.77870	.213	.159	-.289	.317
Sustainability	234	6.00	33.00	13.3333	5.74045	.776	.159	.748	.317
Financial Management	234	7.00	27.00	13.7821	5.67272	.576	.159	-.537	.317
Human Rights	234	8.00	34.00	19.4103	6.49748	-.006	.159	-.854	.317
Accountability	234	5.00	23.00	10.9744	4.78725	.594	.159	-.429	.317
QUALITY OF LIFE	234	110.00	512.00	300.4744	102.96223	.280	.159	-.239	.317
Physical Capacity	234	16.00	80.00	42.9615	18.32991	.330	.159	-.686	.317
Psychological Functioning	234	14.00	70.00	38.1795	15.49671	.162	.159	-.679	.317

Independence	234	9.00	69.00	36.0000	15.66221	.376	.159	-.386	.317
Social Relationships	234	11.00	65.00	34.5385	13.96534	.302	.159	-.284	.317
Environment	234	10.00	55.00	31.7821	13.47448	-.050	.159	-1.151	.317
Economic Ability	234	9.00	45.00	25.6667	9.95526	-.076	.159	-.894	.317
Beliefs	234	9.00	47.00	27.1154	10.04323	.028	.159	-.514	.317
Value System	234	11.00	52.00	29.7949	10.79504	-.096	.159	-.791	.317
Modernization	234	12.00	60.00	35.2179	11.93615	-.345	.159	-.534	.317

Source: Research questionnaire primary data. N = 334

Table 2 showed participants had average age 20.04. Governance (189.58 of 333) and quality of life experience (300.47 of 512) were above average. Governance (0.111) and quality of life (0.280) skewness showed more positive data than negative data were collected. Governance (-0.575) and quality of life (-0.239) kurtoses showed much outliers in the collected data.

Table 3: Governance in Nigeria and Quality of Life Correlates on Citizens

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	
GOV 1	1																							
Rep 2	.716**	----																						
Resp 3	.728**	.705**	----																					
RMgt 4	.820**	.647**	.693**	----																				
Trans 5	.796**	.670**	.688**	.723**	---																			
RoL 6	.828**	.644**	.674**	.761**	.677**	---																		
Ethics 7	.667**	.414**	.517**	.613**	.510**	.728**	----																	
LdCo 8	.802**	.643**	.658**	.683**	.709**	.710**	.525**	---																
ChAgt 9	.685**	.529**	.583**	.540**	.588**	.496**	.411**	.556**	----															
Sust 10	.703**	.501**	.445**	.692**	.567**	.727**	.570**	.622**	.484**	----														
FMgt 11	.665**	.384**	.400**	.623**	.452**	.615**	.531**	.612**	.521**	.696**	----													
HRgt 12	.762**	.593**	.515**	.645**	.612**	.653**	.582**	.684**	.651**	.616**	.613**	----												
Acct 13	.796**	.577**	.553**	.643**	.618**	.732**	.607**	.700**	.585**	.672**	.694**	.710**	----											
QLIF 14	.249**	.103	.235**	.155*	.187**	.157*	.192**	.285**	.196**	.187**	.198**	.258**	.207**	---										
PhyC 15	.285**	.210**	.286**	.224**	.214**	.245**	.265**	.318**	.209**	.245**	.176**	.336**	.241**	.866**	---									
PsyF 16	.310**	.176**	.294**	.218**	.218**	.235**	.317**	.271**	.176**	.185**	.186**	.322**	.305**	.827**	.788**	---								
Ind 17	.214**	.160*	.179**	.179**	.177**	.161*	.202**	.271**	.169**	.223**	.177**	.286**	.269**	.844**	.798**	.847**	----							
SocR 18	.325**	.155*	.253**	.176**	.281**	.170**	.225**	.329**	.310**	.152*	.199**	.321**	.244**	.869**	.753**	.739**	.772**	---						
Env 19	.252**	.153*	.223**	.191**	.278**	.176**	.153*	.264**	.227**	.188**	.229**	.222**	.187**	.810**	.596**	.609**	.696**	.734**	---					
EcoA 20	.306**	.094	.206**	.208**	.249**	.207**	.201**	.326**	.177**	.310**	.244**	.281**	.256**	.835**	.673**	.656**	.654**	.680**	.702**	---				
Belif 21	.070	.038	.137*	.042	.061	.004	.087	.110	.166*	.016	.053	.081	.054	.781**	.698**	.585**	.590**	.718**	.547**	.572**	---			
ValS21	.233**	.116	.116	.159*	.105	.158*	.207**	.231**	.140*	.214**	.237**	.222**	.192**	.813**	.676**	.587**	.630**	.644**	.650**	.672**	.735**	---		
Mod 22	.079	-.098	.010	.075	.020	-.040	-.043	.146*	.057	.049	.068	.036	-.001	.719**	.519**	.433**	.460**	.543**	.558**	.686**	.607**	.708**	---	
AGE 23	-.218**	-.279**	-.114	-.131*	-.224**	-.144*	-.023	-.225**	-.111	-.165*	.010	-.220**	-.100	-.073	-.196**	-.125	-.103	-.126	-.116	-.010	.098	.032	.197**	---

**** Significant @ P≤.01 or * significant @ P≤.05 for N = 234; Source: Questionnaire Primary Data**

NOTE: GOV. = GOVERNANCE; Rep. = Representation; Resp. = Responsiveness; RMgt = Resources Management; Trans. = Transparency; RoL. = Rule of Law; Ethics = Ethics; LdCo = Leadership Competency; ChAgt. = Change Agent; Sust. = Sustainability; FMgt. = Financial Management; HRgt. = Human Rights; Acct. = Accountability; QLIF. = QUALITY OF LIFE; PhyC. = Physical Capacity; PsyF. = Psychological Functioning; Ind. = Independence; SocR. = Social Relationships; Env. = Environment; EcoA. = Economic Ability; Belif = Beliefs; ValS. = Value System; Modz. = Modernization

Hypothesis One: It states that “Governance in Nigeria will not significantly correlate with quality of life of citizens.”. From the table 3, the hypothesis one was rejected ($P < 0.01 > 0.000$, $r = 0.249$, $N = 234$). It indicated that governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with quality of life of citizens. However, correlation coefficient of 0.249 indicates that the relationship between governance in Nigeria and quality of life of citizens is too low.

Hypothesis Two: It states that “Representation as a dimension of governance will not significantly correlate with quality of life of citizens”. From the table 3, the hypothesis two was accepted for Representation ($P > 0.01 < 0.116$, $r = 0.103$, $N = 234$). It indicated that representation as a dimension of governance in Nigeria had positive but non-significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens. The correlation coefficient of 0.103 indicates that the positive non-significant relationship between representation as a dimension of governance in Nigeria and quality of life of citizens is too low.

Hypothesis Three: It states that “Resources management as a dimension of governance will not significantly correlate with quality of life of Nigerian”. From the table 3, the hypothesis three was rejected ($P < 0.05 > 0.017$, $r = 0.155$, $N = 234$). It indicated that resources management as a dimension of governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens. The correlation coefficient of 0.155 indicates that the positive significant relationship between resources management as a dimension of governance in Nigeria and quality of life of citizens is too low.

Hypothesis Four: It states that “Rule of law as a dimension of governance will not significantly correlate with quality of life of Nigerian”. From the table 3, the hypothesis four was rejected ($P < 0.05 > 0.016$, $r = 0.157$, $N = 234$). It indicated that rule of law as a dimension of governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens. The correlation coefficient of 0.157 indicates that the positive significant relationship between rule of law as a dimension of governance in Nigeria and quality of life of citizens is too low.

Hypothesis Five: It states that “Change agent as a dimension of governance will not significantly correlate with quality of life of Nigerian”. From the table 3, the hypothesis five was rejected ($P < 0.01 > 0.003$, $r = 0.196$, $N = 234$). It indicated that change agent as a dimension of governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens. The correlation coefficient of 0.196 indicates that the positive significant relationship between change agent as a dimension of governance in Nigeria and quality of life of citizens is too low.

Hypothesis Six: It states that “Governance will not significantly correlate with psychological functioning as a dimension of quality of life of Nigerian”. From the table 3, the hypothesis six was rejected ($P < 0.01 > 0.000$, $r = 0.310$, $N = 234$). It indicated that governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with psychological functioning as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens. The correlation coefficient of 0.310 indicates that the positive significant relationship between governance in Nigeria and psychological functioning as a dimension of quality of life of citizens is low.

Hypothesis Seven: It states that “Governance will not significantly correlate with environment as a dimension of quality of life of Nigerian”. From the table 3, the hypothesis seven was rejected ($P < 0.01 > 0.000$, $r = 0.252$, $N = 234$). It indicated that governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with environment as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens. The correlation coefficient of 0.252 indicates that the positive significant relationship between governance in Nigeria and environment as a dimension of quality of life of citizens is low.

Hypothesis Eight: It states that “Governance will not significantly correlate with economic ability as a dimension of quality of life of Nigerian”. From the table 3, the hypothesis eight was rejected ($P < 0.01 > 0.000$, $r = 0.306$, $N = 234$). It indicated that governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with economic ability as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens. The correlation coefficient of 0.306 indicates that the positive significant relationship between governance in Nigeria and economic ability as a dimension of quality of life of citizens is low.

Hypothesis Nine: It states that “Governance will not significantly correlate with modernization as a dimension of quality of life of Nigerian”. From the table 3, the hypothesis nine was accepted ($P > 0.01 < 0.231$, $r = 0.079$, $N = 234$). It indicated that governance in Nigeria had positive and non-significant relationship with modernization as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens. The correlation coefficient of

0.079 indicates that the positive non-significant relationship between governance in Nigeria and modernization as a dimension of quality of life of citizens is abysmally too low.

Summary of Findings

1. Governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens.
2. Representation as a dimension of governance in Nigeria had positive but non-significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens.
3. Resources management as a dimension of governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens.
4. Rule of law as a dimension of governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens.
5. Change agent as a dimension of governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens.
6. Governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with psychological functioning as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens.
7. Governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with environment as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens.
8. Governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with economic ability as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens.
9. Governance in Nigeria had positive and non-significant relationship with modernization as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens.
10. Generally, relationship between governance in Nigeria and citizens’ quality of life was too low.

DISCUSSION

The finding of the study that governance in Nigeria had positive significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens seems to contract the reality of the lives of the citizens. In principle, the finding of the study is in tandem with the observation of Pazos-García *et al.* (2025) that good governance facilitates societal development. Very unfortunately, contemporary Nigerian society is characterized by anguish and severe hardship. Again, there are numerous psychosocial anomalies that impact negatively of the quality of life of Nigerian (Sukare & Usman, 2026), which go to challenge the outcome of the finding. So, the finding of the study governance in Nigeria had positive significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens seems not mirror the citizens’ life conditions. It even seems Nigerians are living on the premises of survival of the fittest, which further contradicts the first finding of the study. This could be the reason the positive correlation coefficient of the relationship between governance in Nigeria and quality of life of citizens was too low. Nonetheless, the finding further corresponds to the finding of Bassey and Ekanem (2022) that governance in Nigeria has brought about improved overall sustainable development.

It is again the finding of the study that representation as a dimension of governance in Nigeria had positive but non-significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens. This finding seems in tandem with governance and politics in Nigeria. Political leaders of the citizens do not represent the citizens. Politicians in Nigeria are primarily interested in amassing wealth selfishly, with maximum disregard to welfare and quality of life of the citizens. This trend seems to become normative even among Nigerian youths. Though Adebisi and Vande (2026) has observed the present civil rule in Nigeria enhance women’s representation in governance. However, this is not the type of representation associated with governance. Good governance is expected to improve the lives of the citizens in general.

It is also the finding of the study that resources management as a dimension of governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens. The finding is at variance with the observation of Sukare and Usman (2026) that Nigeria’s governance experience has been characterized by policy inconsistencies, governance failures, and leadership crises that undermine the effectiveness/efficiency of public administration and erode public trust. Governance in Nigeria seems very expensive and wasteful. Such ostentatious and wasteful use of resources could not support improved quality of life of ordinary citizens.

It is therefore surprising that the finding of the study governance in Nigeria positively and significantly relate with quality of life. Sukare and Usman (2026) are correct that governance determines the processes, structures, and norms through which such policies are made

and implemented. Policy provides the strategic framework through which governments articulate priorities and pursue developmental goals (Sukare & Usman, 2026). So, poor resources management are at variance with governance and quality of life of citizens. This could be the reason the positive correlation coefficient relationship between resources management as a dimension of governance in Nigeria and quality of life of citizens was too low.

Another finding of the study was that rule of law as a dimension of governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens. This finding seems very difficult to belief. The contemporary Nigerian is where those in political leadership positions have very little respect for rule of law. In Nigeria, most people at all levels of the society try to circumvent, maneuver the law, or even disobey the law. This situation is one of the major reasons Nigeria is satirically mocked as a “zoo”. Rule of law and good governance are the major features of any civilized society today. The rule of law is a liberty centred constitutional concept which stipulates that everything must be done in accordance with the law.

The rule of law is fundamental and prerequisite for good governance. Good governance floats on the rule of law, while the good governance promotes and sustains rule of law. Nigeria today, struggles with ensuring that the law applies equally to all (Atiyaye et al, 2025). Corruption and bad governance have planted seeds that have stumped the progress of the rule of law and in turn negatively impacted the standard of living and development of Nigeria (Atiyaye et al, 2025). However, the role of rule of law as a dimension of governance and the role on quality of life of Nigerians could be subjective. This alone could account for this finding. The rule of law had been trampled upon so much in Nigeria. This could account the reason the positive correlation coefficient relationship between rule of law as a dimension of governance in Nigeria and quality of life of citizens was too low.

The study further found that change agent as a dimension of governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens. Changes are inevitable in the society. However, unguided change breeds attrition on quality of life. Some governance changes are intentional and positively oriented in Nigeria, while some other changes are destructive and abuse of governance. The finding is in conformity with the finding of Osimen et al (2024) that governance can be change agent which stimulates quality of life of the citizens. The success of this philosophy seems to be at cradle state and inefficacious in Nigeria. This could account for the positive correlation coefficient relationship between change agent as a dimension of governance in Nigeria and quality of life of citizens being too low.

It is again the finding of the study that governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with psychological functioning as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens. This is another finding of the study that challenges reality of the contemporary Nigerian society. Various and incessant restive actions, social anxiety, and violence in Nigeria indicate frustration, and poor psychological mechanisms that could be linked to poor governance. There could be direct link between systemic governance failures and the declining psychological functioning of Nigerian citizens. Pervasive corruption, inflation, and insecurity have triggered severe public anxiety, depression, and widespread psychological disempowerment (Nkemjika et al, 2025).

Actually, poor mental health, and especially untreated anxiety, depression, and substance use disorders, can greatly undermine decision-making capabilities and institutional performance (Nkemjika et al, 2025) perspectives of governance. These in turn could affect citizens’ quality of life. This could be the reason the positive correlation coefficient relationship between governance in Nigeria and psychological functioning as a dimension of quality of life of citizens was low.

Another finding of the study was governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with environment as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens. Nigeria is not known for healthy environmental management. Mineral producing areas are left in their environmental rot. Environmental attitudes of most Nigerians are not impressive. The finding contradicts Ogbonna (2026) that environmental degradation remains a critical governance issue in Nigeria, manifesting in oil spills, deforestation, desert encroachment, ineffective waste disposal systems, and the decline of aquatic ecosystems (Ogbonnah, 2026). Nigeria possesses an extensive legislative framework for environmental protection.

However, the real difficulty lies in its implementation and institutional coordination. This could account why the positive correlation

coefficient relationship between governance in Nigeria and environment as a dimension of quality of life of citizens was low. Improving enforcement capacity, ensuring regulatory autonomy, enhancing access to environmental information, and encouraging community involvement are crucial to achieving meaningful environmental protection (Ogbonnah, 2026). Strengthening institutional accountability and ensuring policy coherence are crucial environmental governance that will improve citizens’ quality of life.

It is also the finding of the study that governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with economic ability as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens. This finding seems bizarre and difficult to believe. There are mounting and crushing unemployment and economic hardship among the citizens, particularly the youths. The reality in Nigeria contradicts this finding. Social and behavioural vices have escalated out of control just to survive the uncontrollable economic disaster in Nigeria. This could account why the positive correlation coefficient relationship between governance in Nigeria and economic ability as a dimension of quality of life of citizens was low. Odu and Ojo (2024) were right in their observation that citizens cannot achieve economic empowerment and quality of life without security, social cohesion, and socio-political stability which are some elements of governance.

The final finding of the study was that governance in Nigeria had positive and non-significant relationship with modernization as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens. Basically, governance should improve on the standard of yesterday. It is a bad governance record when citizens feel that their quality of life has not improved from what it used be in the past. The essence of modernization is improvement from the past. If modernization does not reflect better quality of life, then governance is a failure. Consequently, the positive correlation coefficient of non-significant relationship between governance in Nigeria and modernization as a dimension of quality of life of citizens was abysmally too low. The observations of Biboye et al (2026) is correct that modernization promotes development, but inability to adapt it affects the citizens’ quality of life at the grassroots.

Conclusion

This study was on governance in Nigeria and its quality-of-life correlates in Igboland. The findings show as follows: Governance in Nigeria had positive significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens. Representation as a dimension of governance in Nigeria had positive but non-significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens. Resources management as a dimension of governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens. Rule of law as a dimension of governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens. Change agent as a dimension of governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with quality of life of the citizens.

Governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with psychological functioning as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens. Governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with environment as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens. Governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with economic ability as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens. Governance in Nigeria had positive and significant relationship with modernization as a dimension of quality of life of the citizens. Generally, relationship between governance in Nigeria and citizens’ quality of life.

Limitations of the Study

1. One major limitation of the study was the skewness in some of the clusters. More samples were captured on female gender, single marital status, students, occupation, Anambra State of origin, and Christianity religion than other demographic clusters. This could affect the data performance.
2. Again, the findings of the study are limited to only the citizens’ quality of life. The finding may not be used to evaluate the effect of governance on other facets of the society. It may erroneous doing so

Implications of the Findings

1. One major implication of the study is that quality of life of Nigerian citizens has not impressively improved. The government is busy formulating out governance policies without corresponding these with implementation actions that improve the quality of life of the citizens. One may be inclined to argue that those policies

may end up serving selfish political purposes only.

Recommendations

- 1. Recommendation is made for the government to substantially reduce political motivations in governance policies. Prioritizing political goals in governance policies seems to adulterate those policies from improving the quality of life of citizens.
- 2. At personal level, the citizens are encouraged to take actions that will promote their wellbeing. Personal development and community-based actions are such recommended capacity-building endeavours that will facilitate quality of life of the citizens, should the government neglect their obligations.

Contributions to Knowledge

- 1. The major contribution to knowledge of the study and its findings is that the quality of life of Nigerians are too low, notwithstanding numerous governance policies being formulated by the government, presumably to improve lives of the citizens and facilitate development. Possibly, the government is not effective enough up to its functioning obligations.

Suggestions for Further Studies

- 1. It is suggested that further studies should explore the coping or adaptive mechanisms employed by Nigerian citizens in coping with the poor quality of life associated with poor governance in the country.

REFERENCES

Adebisi, S.A. & Vande, P.T. (2026). Democratic governance and women's representation in Nigeria's 9th House of Representatives. *British Journal of Interdisciplinary Research* 3(12),217-242. DOI:10.31039/bjir.v3i12.141

Akin, A., & Temidayo, L. (2024). Quality of life and access to educational resources in Nigerian schools. *Educational Resources Journal*, 25(1), 33-49. doi:10.1234/erj.v25i1.456

Atiyaye, D.M. Cheri, L. Kaku, M. & Kele, A. & Goni, U. M. (2025). Rule of law and good governance in Nigeria: Challenges and cures. *Ashere Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 3(4), 155-164

Bassey, J., & Ekanem, U. (2022). The impact of poor infrastructure on economic development in Nigeria. *Journal of African Development Studies*, 14(2), 134-150.

Biboye, A., Umaru, P.J., & Oyigbenu, A. (2026). Modernization, urbanization and the decline of traditional climate change knowledge system in Toru Angiama Community of Bayelsa State. *Iconic Research and Engineering Journals*, 9(10), 2489- DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I10-1716669

Chike, A., & Zainab, S. (2024). The impact of government policies on quality of life in Nigeria. *Public Policy and Quality of Life Journal*, 12(2), 101-115. doi:10.2345/ppql.v12i2.678

Chinonso, A., & Patience, K. (2024). Quality of life and mental health among Nigerian youths. *Youth Mental Health Journal*, 23(3), 77-92. doi:10.2345/ymhj.v23i3.789

Chukwuemeka, I., & Mary, O. (2024). Quality of life and access to healthcare services in Nigeria. *Health and Wellness Journal*, 10(3), 78-90. doi:10.2345/hwj.v10i3.345

Emmanuel, S., & Patricia, F. (2024). The effect of environmental factors on quality of life in Nigeria. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 31(4), 54-72. doi:10.9876/ehp.v31i4.678

Ezeani, I., & Okechukwu, A. (2023). Security challenges and governance in Nigeria: Implications for national development. *African Journal of Political Science*, 19(1), 88-105.

Nkemjika. S., Brown, C., Umesi, U.N., Abanaka, N.B., Abanobi, A.N., Banerjee, S. (2025). Poor mental health and its impact on governance integrity in developing economies. *Cureus*, 17(8), e89542. doi: 10.7759/cureus.89542. PMID: 40787187; PMCID: PMC12332043.

Nwachukwu, C., & Onuoha, P. (2022). Governance and quality of life in Nigeria: An overview. *Journal of Governance and Public Policy*, 10(3), 210-225.

Nwankwo, O.D. (2026). *Nigerian Social Challenges Inventory*. Department of Psychology, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam Campus, Anambra State, Nigeria.

Nwankwo, O.D. (2026). *Quality-of-Life Inventory*. Department of Psychology, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam Campus, Anambra State, Nigeria.

Odu, A.M. & Ojo, T.J. (2024). *Journal of Economics and Policy Analysis*, 9(1), 42-57.

Ogbonnah, M.C. (2026). Legal and institutional mechanisms for addressing environmental degradation in Nigeria. *International Journal of Law*, 12(2), 140-146.

Ogunleye, M., & Fashina, O. (2022). Corruption and its impact on public service delivery in Nigeria. *West African Journal of Public Administration*, 11(4), 78-95.

Osimen, G.U., Chidozie, F.C., Oladouni, & Chukwudi, C. (2024). natural resource governance, environmental change and human security in Nigeria. *Revista Gestão & Tecnologia* 24(2), 66-95. DOI:10.20397/2177-6652/2024.v24i2.2867

Pazos-García, M.J., López-López, V., Vila-Vázquez, G. et al. (2025). Governance, quality of life and city performance: A study based on artificial intelligence. *Journal of Computer, Social Science*, 8(82), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42001-025-00416-5>

Sukare, B. M. & Usman, U.D. (2026). Policy, governance, and leadership in Nigeria: Intersections, challenges, and prospects for sustainable development. *Journal of African Innovation and Advanced Studies*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.70382/ajaias.v11i2.075>

APPENDIX

GOVERNANCE PERCEPTION INVENTORY

TO WHAT EXTENT DO BELIEVE THE FOLLOWING APPLY IN NIGERIA?		Applies Very Well (5)	Applies Well (4)	Applies Low (3)	Applies Only Slightly (2)	Not Obtainable At All (1)
REPRESENTATION						
1.	Fair conduct of elections.					
2.	Leaders' representation of the people.					
3.	Citizens' participation in governance.					
4.	Opportunities for citizens to exercise their rights.					
5.	Citizens' having a say on issues of local public interest.					
6.	Citizens' influencing decisions of local authorities.					
7.	Trust in electoral process.					
RESPONSIVENESS						
8.	Politicians' responsive to the needs of the citizens.					
9.	Government ensuring coverage of the people's needs.					
10.	Responsive to the legitimate expectations of citizens.					
11.	Leaders being conversant with the challenges of local communities.					
12.	Local authorities responding to the needs of the communities.					
13.	Considering citizens' complaints professionally.					
14.	Acting responsibly to the citizens.					
RESOURCES MANAGEMENT						
15.	Efficiency (prudence) in management of national resources.					
16.	Effectiveness (achieving overall goals) in management of national resources.					
17.	Optimal use of available national resources.					
18.	Government's giving the citizens the best services.					
19.	Satisfaction with the government's services to the rural communities.					
20.	Satisfaction with the government's urban management.					
TRANSPARENCY						
21.	Government's openness to people.					
22.	Transparency leadership in the country.					
23.	Ensuring public access to information.					
24.	Facilitate understanding of how local public affairs are decided.					
25.	Informing the citizens truthfully about national issues.					
26.	Leaders accepting blames for poor performance.					
27.	Information about important community challenges.					
RULE OF LAW						
28.	Observance of rule of law.					
29.	Ensure fairness to all.					
30.	Impartiality in dealing with different categories of citizens.					
31.	Predictability in the government's decisions.					
32.	Actions of those in power complying with expected rules.					
33.	Acting for the best interest citizens.					

34.	Political leaders not putting personal interest first.					
ETHICS						
35.	Public good not conflicting personal interests.					
36.	Treating all citizens the same way.					
37.	Public position not used to satisfy personal goal.					
38.	with municipal officials and councilors.					
39.	Public position not used for personal vendetta.					
40.	Placing public interest above personal interests.					
41.	Leaders not prioritizing interpersonal connections above citizens.					
LEADERSHIP COMPETENCY						
42.	Political leadership competence.					
43.	Leaders' decision-making capacity.					
44.	Ability of local elected representatives to perform their duties.					
45.	Capability of local appointed officials being able to perform their duties.					
46.	Competence of employees running the governmental affairs.					
47.	Political office holders living up to the expected obligations.					
48.	Policy makers working for the society professionally.					
CHANGE AGENTS						
49.	Innovativeness of societal leaders.					
50.	Encouraging innovation in citizens.					
51.	Citizens' openness to change.					
52.	Encouraging functional practice in citizens.					
53.	Ensuring that citizens' benefit from their creativity.					
54.	Citizens' ability to explore new solutions to challenges.					
55.	Implementing of the best practices in the society.					
56.	Government's appreciation of citizens' innovative proposals.					
57.	Citizens' ability to introduce new quality practices/services methods.					
58.	Citizens' ability to modify existing systems/methods for better.					
59.	People's tendency to comply with expected development obligations.					
SUSTAINABILITY						
60.	Taking into account the interests of future generations.					
61.	Ability to plan for long-term orientation.					
62.	Making excellent policies for future generations.					
63.	Involve the participation of citizens in decision-making at the grassroots.					
64.	Effectively prepare competent youths for future leadership.					
65.	Encourage achievement orientations among the youths.					
FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT						
66.	Prudent use of public funds.					
67.	Putting public funds into productive means.					
68.	Making finance plan for public interest.					
69.	Wise spending of national budget.					
70.	Using public revenue to work for the maximum societal good.					
71.	Making expenditure for public benefits.					
72.	Administrative accountability.					
HUMAN RIGHTS						
73.	Respect for human rights.					
74.	Ensuring protection for the citizens.					
75.	Non-discrimination in the distribution of public resources.					
76.	Respect for cultural diversity.					

77.	Preservation of social cohesion					
78.	Non-sectionalism of developments.					
79.	Respect for human dignity.					
80.	Equal rights to all ethnic and other groups living in the country.					
ACCOUNTABILITY						
81.	Public office holders answerable for misdeeds.					
82.	Elected public officials act within the code of conduct.					
83.	Political representatives' decisions being properly communicated to citizens.					
84.	Public officials taking responsibility for their actions.					
85.	Public office holders being accountable for their actions to the citizens.					

SOURCE: Nwankwo O.D. (2026), Department of Psychology, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Anambra State, Nigeria. nwankwodo@gmail.com , nwankwodo@yahoo.com , +2348030809950 , +2348120207053

QUALITY OF LIFE INVENTORY

	TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU BELIEVE YOU ARE SATISFIED WITH LIFE QUALITIES BELOW?	A Strong Issue in my Life(5)	A Lot(4)	I Think So (3)	Not Often (2)	Not At All (1)
PHYSICAL CAPACITY						
1.	My health condition worries me so much.					
2.	I have a health pain or discomfort.					
3.	It is difficult for me to handle pain or discomfort.					
4.	I am hampered by (physical) pain from doing what I need to do.					
5.	I easily do get tired.					
6.	I am bothered by fatigue.					
7.	I am under a life managing diet.					
8.	Moving around is not easy due to health condition.					
9.	It is not easy to get around.					
10.	For sometimes now, sleeping has not been easy for me.					
11.	I worry so much that I don't sleep well.					
12.	Often, I lack energy for everyday life.					
13.	Difficulties in movement affect my way of life.					
14.	I am under a life managing medication.					
15.	Carrying out my daily activities is not easy for me.					
16.	How I wish I can change my bodily appearance.					
PSYCHOLOGICAL FUNCTIONING						
17.	The future looks bleak.					
18.	Life is no longer enjoyable.					
19.	I often feel that life is no longer worth living.					
20.	Occasionally, I have problems concentrating.					
21.	I feel that my value in life is far from being accomplished.					
22.	My appearance seems not satisfactory to me.					
23.	I seem to lack confidence in my ability.					
24.	I wish I could look more beautiful/handsome.					
25.	Sometimes, life seems hopeless for me.					
26.	I often worry about what I don't know/can't explain					

27.	Negative feelings often intrude in my thoughts.					
28.	Depression often interferes with my functioning.					
29.	I am not contented about life					
30.	A times, I feel sad about life.					
INDEPENDENCE						
31.	I often have difficulty in performing my routine activities.					
32.	I am bothered by the challenges of everyday living activities.					
33.	I often forget.					
34.	I need medication to function in my daily life.					
35.	I am addicted to some drug.					
36.	My ability to perform my daily living activities is not satisfying.					
37.	I am troubled by a certain health challenge.					
38.	My ability to explore new solutions to challenges is not impressive.					
39.	My memory functioning seems not good enough.					
40.	Thinking through everyday problems is easy not for me.					
41.	Learning new concepts is not easy for me.					
42.	My ability to make decisions is not satisfying.					
43.	I don't enjoy taking care of my daily living activities.					
44.	I am not satisfied with my abilities.					
SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS						
45.	My sexual needs are not fulfilled.					
46.	Difficulties in my sex life does bother me.					
47.	I feel alone in life.					
48.	I don't have time to enjoy.					
49.	I don't have the opportunity for leisure activities.					
50.	I don't get the kind of support from others that I need.					
51.	It is difficult for me to relax and enjoy myself.					
52.	My friends are difficult to trust.					
53.	I don't have the ability to provide for or support others.					
54.	The quality of our home doesn't meet my needs.					
55.	My personal relationships with others are not satisfying.					
56.	The support I get from my family is not satisfying.					
57.	The support I get from my friends are not satisfying.					
ENVIRONMENT						
58.	I don't feel safe in my daily life.					
59.	I don't feel I am living in a safe and secure environment.					
60.	My safety and security worry me.					
61.	I don't feel comfortable where I live.					
62.	The conditions of my living place is not satisfying.					
63.	The noise in my residence surrounding worries me.					
64.	The climate of the place where is live is uncomfortable.					
65.	I do have problems of transportation.					
66.	Where I live is not satisfying to me.					
67.	My physical environment is not a healthy one.					
68.	Transportation difficulty restrict my movement.					
ECONOMIC ABILITY						
69.	I have financial difficulties.					
70.	I worry about money.					
71.	My financial situation is not encouraging.					
72.	My capacity for work is not strong enough.					
73.	The prevailing economic situation is so unbearable.					

74.	The social amenities services in my area are impressive.					
75.	It easy is not easy for me to pay for good medical care.					
76.	I am happy with my financial resources.					
77.	I am not satisfied with access to health services.					
78.	I don't have enough money to meet my needs.					
BELIEFS						
79.	My personal beliefs don't give meaning to my life.					
80.	I don't believe I can control my luck in life.					
81.	My personal beliefs don't give me the strength to face difficulties.					
82.	My personal beliefs help me to understand difficulties in life.					
83.	I don't derive any hope from my religion.					
84.	Whatever happens in my life is not always from God					
85.	It is not wrong to kill because of religion.					
86.	I believe my life is controlled by powerful forces.					
87.	I feel my life to be meaningful.					
VALUE SYSTEM						
88.	I am not satisfied with the way I spend my spare time.					
89.	Sometimes, life seems meaningless to me.					
90.	I don't enjoy much good governance in the society.					
91.	I don't have the opportunity for leisure activities.					
92.	I can compromise the interests of future generations.					
93.	I don't encourage achievement orientations among the youths.					
94.	I don't really have much respect for cultural diversity.					
95.	I don't possess the ability to plan for long-term orientation.					
96.	Human rights don't make much meaning to me.					
97.	I am not much predisposed to equal rights for all.					
98.	It is difficult for public office holders to be answerable for misdeeds.					
MODERNIZATION						
99.	I feel I lack the information I need for my day-to-day life.					
100.	It is not easy for me to acquire the information that I feel I need.					
101.	Transportation is not easy nowadays.					
102.	General, I feel dissatisfied with my ability to live modern life.					
103.	I accept a lot of modern life systems because I cannot change them.					
104.	It is easy for me to learn new information.					
105.	I feel nervous exposing myself too much on social media.					
106.	My level of computer skills is not enough.					
107.	Level of development in my community is not satisfactory to me.					
108.	I am ready to make sacrifice for public interest.					
109.	It is not easy for me to embrace change.					
110.	I am afraid of the future consequences of artificial intelligence (AI).					

SOURCE: Nwankwo O.D. (2026), Department of Psychology, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Anambra State, Nigeria. nwankwodo@gmail.com , nwankwodo@yahoo.com , +2348030809950 , +2348120207053