

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 11 Jul 2026

Revised 28 Sept 2026

Accepted 07 Oct 2026

Published 24 Oct 2026

KEYWORDS

Democratic accountability

Citizen feedback

Public criticism

Responsiveness

Institutional mediation

Governance

Nigeria

Democratic consolidation

FUNDING

This research received no external funding.

LICENCE

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.



HOW TO CITE:

Azeez, A., Ladele, O. J., Afolabi, M. B., & Ajibowu-Yekini, S. M. (2026). From Complaint to Accountability: Citizen Feedback and Democratic Responsiveness in Nigeria, 2011–2025. *Izu: Journal of Critical Perspectives*, 4(1), 16–25.
<https://doi.org/10.68251/IZU.4.1.3>

From Complaint to Accountability: Citizen Feedback and Democratic Responsiveness in Nigeria, 2011–2025

¹Ademola Azeez ¹Oluwafemi Joseph Ladele

²Muyiwa Bamidele Afolabi ¹Suleimon Maito Ajibowu-Yekini

¹ Department of Political Science, College of Social and Management Sciences, Afe Babalola University, Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria

² Department of Intelligence and Security Studies, College of Social and Management Sciences, Afe Babalola University, Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria

Correspondence: afobam1840@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Democratic accountability depends not only on elections and formal institutions but also on citizens' capacity to communicate grievances and public authorities' willingness and ability to respond. This article examines the relationship between citizen criticism, governmental responsiveness, and democratic accountability in Nigeria from 2011 to 2025. It asks why some episodes of public criticism lead to policy adjustment, negotiation, or institutional review, while others result in limited, symbolic, or restrictive responses. Drawing on democratic accountability, voice, deliberative democracy, and political systems perspectives, the study develops a qualitative comparative framework that distinguishes responsiveness from effectiveness and accountability. It examines selected episodes under the administrations of Goodluck Jonathan, Muhammadu Buhari, and Bola Ahmed Tinubu, including the 2012 fuel subsidy protests, economic and security-related criticism, the EndSARS protests, digital mobilisation and the 2021 Twitter suspension, and responses to the 2023 fuel subsidy and exchange rate reforms. The analysis examines five institutional conditions that shape the movement from citizen criticism to governmental responsiveness and accountability: judicial independence, legislative oversight capacity, media and civic freedom, fiscal and administrative capacity, and electoral competitiveness. Comparative analysis indicates that citizen criticism can generate governmental responsiveness, but response does not necessarily produce accountability. The article argues that accountability depends on the institutional pathway connecting citizen voice to answerability, implementation, and corrective action.

1. Introduction

Democratic governance is sustained not only by elections, constitutions and formal institutions but also by the continuing relationship between citizens and public authorities. Citizens participate in democratic life not only through voting but also by expressing grievances, organising, scrutinising public authorities, protesting, petitioning, using the media, and engaging with public institutions. This suggests that democratic participation extends beyond the ballot box to include citizens' direct engagement with public authorities between elections. These activities matter because democratic government involves an ongoing relationship between public authority and those subject to it. Dahl's conception of democratic participation and contestation places citizen voice at the centre of democratic life, while O'Donnell's work on accountability emphasises the institutional mechanisms through which public officials can be required to explain and justify their conduct (Dahl, 1971; O'Donnell, 1998). Supporting this perspective, Gaventa et al. (2023) conceptualise citizen action as an important

component of accountability processes, showing how citizens can make claims, express grievances, seek to be heard, monitor authorities and pursue changes in public decisions. Their analysis also demonstrates that citizen action does not automatically produce sustained accountability; its consequences depend on the institutional and political conditions within which citizens act. The significance of citizen criticism, however, cannot be reduced to whether government reacts. A public authority may acknowledge a grievance, negotiate with protesters, establish an investigative panel, announce a reform or introduce a welfare measure without necessarily becoming more accountable. Similarly, a politically visible response may be administratively ineffective.

Responsiveness, effectiveness and accountability are therefore related but distinct dimensions of democratic governance. Responsiveness concerns whether government reacts to public demands; effectiveness concerns whether the response addresses the underlying problem; and accountability involves the institutional relationship through which public authorities must explain and justify their conduct and remain subject to scrutiny, correction, or consequences where appropriate (O'Donnell, 1998; Powell, 2004).

This distinction is particularly important in Nigeria, where democratic institutions coexist with strong executive authority, uneven institutional capacity, contested public trust and expanding forms of citizen mobilisation. Since the beginning of the Fourth Republic, public criticism has taken changing forms. Labour unions and civil society organisations played important roles in the 2012 fuel subsidy protests, while digital platforms subsequently transformed the speed and reach of political mobilisation, most visibly during the EndSARS protests. More recently, citizens have responded to major economic reforms through social media, organised labour, public commentary and demands for mitigation. Citizen feedback has consequently become a continuing component of democratic politics rather than an occasional reaction to elections or major political crises.

The central question, therefore, is not simply whether Nigerian governments respond to public criticism, but what happens between criticism and accountability. Why does public pressure produce policy negotiation in some circumstances but limited implementation in others? Why can government establish an inquiry without producing sustained institutional correction? And why can governmental response sometimes expand accountability while at other times restricting the channels through which criticism is expressed? These questions require attention to institutional mediation. The study therefore examines five conditions: judicial independence, legislative oversight capacity, media and civic freedom, fiscal and administrative capacity, and electoral competitiveness. Together, these conditions shape how far public criticism can move beyond immediate government response toward sustained scrutiny and accountability.

The study consequently conceptualises citizen feedback as the beginning of an institutional sequence rather than an automatic cause of accountability: Citizen criticism → institutional mediation → government response → implementation and oversight → accountability outcome. The sequence permits different outcomes. Criticism may produce negotiation and policy adjustment; a governmental response may be weakly implemented; institutional review may occur without meaningful consequences; or government action may restrict the communicative channels through which criticism is expressed. The framework therefore avoids assuming that citizen criticism necessarily produces democratic improvement. Nigeria provides a useful setting for examining these relationships because the period from 2011 to 2025 encompasses three administrations, major policy reforms, episodes of mass mobilisation, growing digital citizenship and continuing debates over institutional accountability. The 2012 fuel subsidy protests provide evidence of sustained public pressure followed by negotiation and policy adjustment.

The EndSARS protests demonstrate how digital mobilisation transformed a specific grievance about policing into a broader demand for accountability, while the subsequent judicial panels illustrate why governmental response cannot be treated as synonymous with accountability. The 2021 Twitter suspension provides a contrasting case in which government response affected the communicative environment through which criticism was expressed. The Tinubu administration's 2023 fuel subsidy and exchange rate reforms provide another contrast because they were driven largely by fiscal and macroeconomic considerations and should not be attributed solely to citizen criticism.

This paper addresses a gap in the Nigerian literature by bringing together strands of research that have often been examined separately. Existing studies have generated important evidence on protest movements, fuel subsidy controversies, digital activism, EndSARS, legislative oversight, judicial independence and electoral participation. However, these strands have less often been connected through a common analytical sequence that traces what happens after citizens express criticism: how demands are mediated by political and institutional actors, how governments respond, whether responses are implemented, and whether subsequent institutional processes produce sustained accountability. This study addresses this gap by

comparing selected episodes across the Jonathan, Buhari and Tinubu administrations and by distinguishing governmental responsiveness from policy effectiveness and democratic accountability. The article addresses four questions. First, how is citizen criticism associated with government responsiveness in Nigeria between 2011 and 2025? Second, how do judicial independence, legislative oversight, media and civic freedom, fiscal and administrative capacity, and electoral competitiveness mediate the relationship between criticism and accountability? Third, how have the Jonathan, Buhari and Tinubu administrations differed in responding to major episodes of public pressure? Fourth, under what institutional circumstances does citizen criticism contribute to sustained accountability rather than producing limited, symbolic, poorly implemented or restrictive responses?

The article makes three related contributions. First, it distinguishes governmental responsiveness from policy effectiveness and democratic accountability, thereby avoiding the assumption that government reaction necessarily constitutes accountability. Second, it develops an analytical pathway linking citizen criticism to institutional mediation, governmental response, implementation and accountability outcomes. Third, it applies this framework comparatively to Nigerian cases that represent different pathways from citizen pressure to state response, including policy adjustment, institutional investigation, restriction of communicative space and policy mitigation. In doing so, the study shifts attention from whether governments respond to citizen criticism towards the institutional conditions that determine what happens after the response.

3. Literature Review and Theoretical Foundation

Dahl's conception of polyarchy places participation and contestation among the conditions necessary for democratic government. Citizens require opportunities to oppose, criticise, organise and communicate preferences to rulers (Dahl, 1971). Citizen criticism can therefore be understood as an ordinary dimension of democratic politics rather than a deviation from political order. More recent Nigerian scholarship similarly shows that public mobilisation can influence relations between citizens and political institutions. Houeland (2020), for example, demonstrates how the 2012 fuel subsidy protests connected popular mobilisation with institutional politics and state-citizen relations. Agbonifo (2023) further shows that fuel subsidy protests have functioned as arenas in which citizens contest power and seek greater influence over decisions affecting their lives.

These studies reinforce the importance of public pressure while also suggesting that its institutional consequences cannot be assumed. The Nigerian literature also indicates that the relationship between policy reform, public reaction and governmental legitimacy is shaped by trust and perceptions of fairness. Earlier work on fuel subsidy removal found that the 2012 policy generated significant public opposition and concerns about government credibility, while more recent research has examined how political opportunities and institutional conditions shape grassroots mobilisation around the 2023 subsidy removal (Ayodele, 2014; Ajibola, 2024). Houeland (2020) similarly links the scale of the 2012 mobilisation to concerns about economic justice and political participation. These studies are useful because they demonstrate that policy controversy is not simply an economic question but may become a dispute over state-citizen relations and the legitimacy of governmental action.

Digital mobilisation has introduced another dimension to citizen feedback. Studies of EndSARS show how social media enabled citizens to document grievances, coordinate mobilisation and broaden demands concerning police conduct and governmental accountability (Iwuoha & Aniche, 2022; Uwazuruike, 2020). More recent research continues to examine digital platforms as spaces through which citizens communicate grievances and pursue public accountability. The significance of digital citizenship, however, extends beyond mobilisation itself. Its democratic value depends partly on whether institutions remain open to the criticism generated through these platforms and whether public demands can be translated into investigation, explanation and corrective action.

The literature therefore reveals substantial knowledge about particular protests, policy controversies, digital activism and institutional processes, but it remains comparatively fragmented. Studies frequently focus on a single episode, institution or administration. Less attention has been given to the institutional pathway connecting citizen criticism, governmental response and accountability across successive administrations. This study addresses this gap by comparing selected episodes under the Jonathan, Buhari and Tinubu administrations while distinguishing responsiveness from effectiveness and accountability. A government may respond to criticism without resolving the underlying grievance, just as a policy outcome may reflect broader economic or institutional factors rather than citizen pressure alone (Norris, 2011; Powell, 2004).

3.1 Theoretical Review

Hirschman's theory of Exit, Voice and Loyalty provides a useful starting point for explaining why dissatisfied citizens choose political voice. When withdrawal or exit is difficult or undesirable, citizens may use voice through petitions, protests, criticism, litigation and public advocacy to seek institutional correction (Hirschman, 1970). In the Nigerian context, labour protests, digital activism, media commentary and civil society advocacy can therefore be understood as forms of voice. The theory, however, leaves an important analytical question open: what happens after voice is expressed? The present study addresses this question by examining the institutional mechanisms through which voice is received and processed.

Easton's Political Systems Theory provides the feedback logic for this process. Political systems receive inputs such as demands, support and criticism and convert them into outputs including policies, decisions, reforms or other governmental responses (Easton, 1965). Feedback subsequently informs the system about the consequences of those outputs. Easton's framework therefore helps conceptualise citizen criticism as political feedback while drawing attention to the institutional processes through which that feedback is converted into governmental action. The present study extends this logic by examining the mediation that occurs between citizen input and accountability outcomes.

O'Donnell's conception of horizontal accountability provides the institutional dimension of the argument. Accountability requires institutions capable of monitoring, questioning and constraining public officials rather than merely the existence of public demands (O'Donnell, 1998). Citizen criticism may therefore initiate pressure for accountability, but judicial review, legislative oversight and other institutional mechanisms determine whether that pressure acquires continuing institutional force. This perspective is particularly relevant to the Nigerian context, where executive authority and institutional capacity vary across time and across policy domains.

Deliberative democratic theory adds a communicative dimension. Habermas (1989, 1996) emphasises the importance of public discourse and communicative interaction to democratic legitimacy, while Fraser (1990) demonstrates that access to the public sphere is uneven and shaped by social inequalities. This is relevant to Nigeria because citizens do not possess equal access to media, digital platforms, institutional decision-makers, or political influence. Digital communication has widened opportunities for participation, but it has not removed inequalities in visibility or governmental attention. Deliberative theory therefore helps explain both the democratic potential of citizen criticism and the conditions that limit its institutional influence.

Taken together, the theories provide a layered explanation rather than six equivalent theoretical propositions. Hirschman's concept of voice explains why citizens communicate grievances rather than withdraw from political processes; Easton's systems perspective explains how those demands enter a political system as inputs and feedback; and O'Donnell's conception of horizontal accountability explains why institutional scrutiny is necessary for citizen demands to acquire continuing accountability effects. Dahl, Habermas and Fraser provide supporting perspectives on participation, public communication and unequal access to the public sphere. The analytical framework therefore moves from citizen voice, through political processing, to institutional accountability.

4. Methodology

The study uses qualitative sequence analysis within a comparative case-study design. This approach is appropriate because the study examines sequences of citizen criticism, institutional mediation and governmental response rather than estimating statistical relationships among variables. Comparative analysis permits the identification of similarities and differences across administrations and policy episodes, while process tracing is used where the available evidence permits closer examination of temporal sequences (Collier, 2011; Mayring, 2014; Yin, 2018). The study covers 2011 to 2025 and examines the administrations of Goodluck Jonathan, Muhammadu Buhari and Bola Ahmed Tinubu. These administrations serve as the broad comparative units, while selected episodes of citizen criticism provide the principal cases. Case selection was guided by theoretical variation in the pathway from citizen criticism to governmental response rather than by the relative size or visibility of each episode.

The cases were selected to capture four analytically distinct outcomes: policy adjustment following sustained public pressure (2012 fuel subsidy protests); institutional investigation following mass mobilisation (EndSARS); restriction of a major channel of digital criticism (2021 Twitter suspension); and policy mitigation and negotiation following criticism of a reform whose initial adoption was driven substantially by fiscal and macroeconomic considerations (2023 fuel subsidy reform). The cases therefore provide variation in how citizen criticism is mediated, how governments respond, and whether the response

develops into implementation and accountability. Data were obtained from scholarly studies, official documents, legislative materials, judicial materials, media reports and civil society documentation. Greater analytical weight is placed on peer-reviewed empirical studies, while official documents are used primarily to establish government positions, policy announcements and institutional actions rather than as the sole basis for explanatory claims.

The documentary material was organised according to five analytical dimensions derived from the conceptual framework: (1) citizen criticism, (2) institutional mediation, (3) governmental response, (4) implementation and effectiveness, and (5) accountability. Within each case, the analysis first established the nature and timing of citizen demands, identified the institutions and actors through which those demands were processed, and examined the subsequent government response. The analysis then assessed evidence of implementation, institutional scrutiny, correction, remedy or restriction of civic space. This coding structure was applied consistently across cases to facilitate qualitative comparison rather than numerical scoring. The five institutional conditions: judicial independence, legislative oversight capacity, media and civic freedom, fiscal and administrative capacity, and electoral competitiveness are treated as analytical conditions rather than statistically tested independent or mediating variables. Their relevance is assessed qualitatively by examining whether the institutional arrangements associated with each condition were available, constrained or consequential within the selected episodes. The analysis therefore does not claim statistical causation but examines how these conditions may have facilitated, constrained or redirected the movement from citizen criticism to governmental response and accountability.

The study also recognises the limitations of documentary research. Documentary evidence cannot directly establish the private motivations of government officials or citizens and may be affected by differences in the availability, quality and perspective of available sources. Triangulation across scholarly studies, official records, legislative and judicial materials, media reports and civil society documentation is therefore used to strengthen the credibility of the analysis and reduce reliance on any single source type.

5. Findings

5.1. Jonathan Administration, 2011 to 2015

The Jonathan administration provides the clearest early illustration of the relationship between mass citizen criticism and policy responsiveness. Public dissatisfaction concerned insecurity, corruption, unemployment, petroleum governance and the distributional consequences of fuel subsidy policy. The January 2012 fuel subsidy protests were particularly significant because they brought organised labour, civil society groups and wider sections of the public into sustained mobilisation against a major government policy. The important analytical point, however, is not simply that the government responded after protest. The episode demonstrates the importance of institutional mediation. Labour unions and civil society organisations provided organisational channels through which public dissatisfaction was consolidated and communicated, while traditional media widened the visibility of the dispute. Agbonifo (2023) similarly shows that the mobilisation was embedded in Nigeria's institutional politics rather than being an isolated spontaneous reaction. The protests influenced state-citizen relations and institutional politics, although internal fragmentation among labour and civil society actors limited the development of sustained collective action.

The government's response provides clearer evidence of policy responsiveness than of sustained accountability. Following the January 2012 protests and national strike, the federal government partially reversed the initial price increase, reducing the petrol price from ₦145 to ₦97 per litre on 15 January 2012. The IMF's subsequent review (IMF, 2012) identifies the reversal as a direct outcome of the political resistance surrounding the reform, while Houeland (2020) situates the episode within a longer pattern of labour-government bargaining over fuel prices. The episode therefore provides evidence of responsiveness because sustained public and organised labour pressure was followed by a substantial policy adjustment. However, policy adjustment alone does not demonstrate accountability: the evidence must additionally show whether institutions required officials to explain, justify, correct or face consequences for the decision that generated the controversy. The Jonathan case therefore shows a relatively strong link between citizen mobilisation and immediate policy responsiveness, but a weaker transition from responsiveness to institutional accountability. The episode is particularly useful because it shows that citizen pressure can influence policy without necessarily transforming the institutional basis of accountability.

5.2 Buhari Administration, 2015 to 2023

The Buhari administration presents a more varied pattern. Public criticism focused on economic hardship, unemployment, insecurity, corruption, public service delivery, and police conduct. Government responses

included economic programmes, social intervention measures, security restructuring and institutional investigations. Yet the relationship between government action and accountability varied substantially across policy areas. The EndSARS protests provide the strongest case of this variation. The protests emerged from longstanding grievances about police brutality and developed into a broader demand for institutional accountability. Research based on interviews and extensive social media evidence identifies a significant trust deficit between citizens and government and shows how police repression intensified the conflict rather than resolving the underlying grievance (Iwuoha & Aniche, 2022).

The government's dissolution of SARS and establishment of judicial panels constituted clear governmental responses. For example, the establishment of the judicial panels therefore marked a transition from governmental responsiveness to a potential accountability process, but the two should not be conflated. The subsequent record shows why implementation and institutional follow-through are necessary to distinguish the two. Monitoring by Yiaga Africa and Enough is Enough Nigeria identified delays in the work of several panels and limited public access to final reports and their recommendations, raising questions about the extent to which investigative processes were translated into continuing institutional correction. The EndSARS episode consequently demonstrates that a government can respond to citizen demands by establishing an investigative mechanism without that response automatically producing sustained accountability (Yiaga Africa & Enough is Enough Nigeria, 2021; Aboh, 2024). These actions demonstrate responsiveness because government reacted to the demands expressed by protesters. They do not, by themselves, demonstrate accountability. The relevant question is whether the institutional processes that followed produced sustained investigation, implementation, correction and consequences.

The case therefore exposes the difference between responsiveness and accountability particularly clearly. Citizen mobilisation could force governmental acknowledgement, but the subsequent accountability process depended on the independence and effectiveness of institutions beyond the initial executive response. Consequently, the capacity of courts, investigative bodies, legislatures, media organisations, and civil society to sustain scrutiny becomes more important than the initial announcement of reform.

Digital communication further altered this relationship. Social media enabled citizens to organise, circulate evidence and maintain public attention. Recent research on Nigerian social media similarly finds that citizens can use digital platforms to expose corruption and demand accountability (Odoh & Olagunju, 2025). The 2021 Twitter suspension represents a contrasting form of governmental response because the state acted on the communicative channel through which citizens increasingly expressed and circulated political criticism. On 4 June 2021, the Federal Government announced an indefinite suspension of Twitter's operations in Nigeria, stating that the platform was being used for activities considered capable of undermining Nigeria's corporate existence. Whatever the government's stated justification, the institutional consequence for this analysis differs from the policy adjustment observed in 2012: rather than responding primarily by modifying the substantive policy grievance, the state response affected the communication environment through which citizens could organise and express criticism. The episode therefore demonstrates that governmental responsiveness can take a restrictive form and may alter the conditions under which accountability claims are communicated.

The Buhari cases therefore reveal considerable variation within the same administration. Public criticism generated policy or institutional responses in some circumstances, while in others the response restricted the communicative environment through which criticism was expressed. The difference cannot be explained by the presence of criticism alone.

5.3 Tinubu Administration, 2023 to 2025

The Tinubu administration presents a different configuration because several major reforms were initiated in response to substantial fiscal and macroeconomic pressures rather than directly as concessions to citizen criticism. This makes the period especially useful for distinguishing citizen feedback from the original causes of policy change. The removal of the fuel subsidy in 2023 generated substantial public concern because of its effects on transportation costs, household expenditure and living conditions. Unlike the 2012 episode, the 2023 case is therefore treated as a case of feedback affecting policy implementation and mitigation rather than as evidence that citizen criticism caused the original reform. This distinction is important because the study does not assume that temporal proximity between criticism and governmental action establishes causation.

Ajibola (2024) and Uwalaka (2024), in their recent comparative research on the 2020 and 2023 episodes, suggest that the political environment surrounding the 2023 election cycle affected opportunities for immediate grassroots mobilisation, contributing to a different pattern of protest from that observed in 2012.

The government subsequently introduced and negotiated measures intended to mitigate the social consequences of reform. These included negotiations with organised labour, wage-related measures and social intervention programmes. These measures show responsiveness to the consequences of reform. They should not, however, be interpreted as evidence that citizen criticism caused the original decision to remove the subsidy. The policy had important fiscal and macroeconomic drivers independent of subsequent public pressure.

This distinction is important to the study's central argument. Citizen feedback may influence a policy's implementation, mitigation, or modification even when it did not cause the policy's initial adoption. The Tinubu case therefore broadens the meaning of responsiveness from policy reversal to policy adaptation. The case also illustrates the importance of fiscal and administrative capacity. Government may acknowledge social demands and announce mitigation measures, but the democratic significance of such measures ultimately depends on whether they can be implemented, monitored and accessed by intended beneficiaries. A policy announcement is therefore an observable response, whereas its implementation provides evidence about administrative effectiveness.

5.4 Comparative Analysis

The three administrations reveal a common pattern but different institutional pathways. Under Jonathan, mass mobilisation mediated through labour, civil society and traditional media was associated with negotiation and policy adjustment. Under Buhari, digital mobilisation expanded the speed and reach of citizen criticism, but the EndSARS and Twitter cases show that government responses could range from institutional concession to restrictions on communicative space. Under Tinubu, citizen feedback operated within a policy environment dominated by major fiscal and macroeconomic reforms, making policy adaptation and mitigation more analytically important than simple policy reversal. The comparison therefore produces three findings.

First, citizen criticism can generate governmental responsiveness, but the strength of the relationship varies across policy domains and political circumstances. The 2012 fuel subsidy protests and EndSARS provide clearer temporal sequences between public pressure and governmental response than reforms whose principal drivers were fiscal or macroeconomic.

Second, governmental response is not itself evidence of accountability. Negotiation, policy adjustment, panels, public statements and welfare measures demonstrate responsiveness, but accountability requires additional institutional processes of scrutiny, explanation, implementation and correction.

Third, institutional conditions matter because they shape what happens after the initial governmental response. Judicial independence affects the availability of legal review. Legislative oversight affects formal scrutiny of executive action. Media and civic freedom affect the capacity to sustain public attention. Fiscal and administrative capacity affects implementation. Electoral competitiveness affects the extent to which persistent dissatisfaction can be translated into political sanction.

Table 2. Comparative Institutional Pathways from Citizen Criticism to Accountability

Administration	Principal feedback episode	Main institutional mediation	Government response	Accountability implication
Jonathan	2012 fuel subsidy protests	Labour, civil society, media and public mobilisation	Negotiation and partial policy adjustment	Stronger evidence of responsiveness than enforceable accountability
Buhari	EndSARS	Digital networks, media, civil society, investigative and judicial mechanisms	SARS dissolution and judicial panels	Response was visible, but accountability depended on subsequent institutional implementation
Buhari	Digital criticism and Twitter suspension	Digital public sphere and regulatory institutions	Restriction of communication channel	Demonstrates that state response can constrain rather than deepen accountability
Tinubu	2023 subsidy reform and cost of living pressures	Labour, media, civil society and administrative institutions	Negotiation, mitigation and social intervention	Evidence of policy adaptation, but not proof that criticism caused the original reform

Source: Authors' comparative analysis based on the study's qualitative coding and process tracing.

6. Discussion

The findings provide a more qualified explanation of the relationship between citizen criticism and democratic accountability in Nigeria. Public criticism matters because it introduces citizen demands into the political system, but its democratic consequences depend less on criticism itself than on the institutional pathway through which it is processed. The cases show that citizen pressure can produce negotiation, institutional review, policy adjustment, symbolic response or restriction of civic space. This reinforces the distinction between responsiveness and accountability. The Jonathan administration negotiated after the 2012 fuel subsidy protests; the Buhari administration dissolved SARS and established judicial panels after EndSARS; and the Tinubu administration introduced mitigation and negotiation measures amid the social consequences of major economic reforms. These responses demonstrate governmental responsiveness, but they do not by themselves constitute accountability. Accountability requires public authorities to remain subject to processes of explanation, scrutiny, review, correction and, where appropriate, sanction. In this respect, vertical pressure from citizens may initiate an accountability process, while horizontal institutions determine whether that process acquires institutional force (O'Donnell, 1998).

The findings further demonstrate that the quality of institutional mediation is crucial to this process. Judicial independence and legislative oversight provide formal channels through which citizen concerns can be converted into institutional scrutiny. Independent judicial review can provide an avenue to question governmental conduct, although the formal availability of judicial review does not guarantee equal practical access. Okaisabor's (2025) analysis of the Nigerian judiciary, for example, identifies inadequate funding and incomplete fiscal autonomy as continuing constraints on judicial independence. Similarly, legislative institutions can translate issues raised through public criticism into investigation and demands for executive explanation, but political interference and resource constraints may weaken this function, as recent research on legislative oversight in Osun State suggests (Monday & Modupe, 2025). Citizen voice and institutional oversight should therefore not be treated as competing mechanisms. They can form a sequence in which public criticism identifies or amplifies a problem, while judicial and legislative institutions provide channels for formal scrutiny and answerability.

Media and civic freedom, together with fiscal and administrative capacity, shape whether this process can be sustained and translated into effective outcomes. Digital platforms have expanded opportunities for Nigerians to expose wrongdoing, circulate grievances and mobilise collective action, as demonstrated particularly by research on social media and EndSARS. Yet the Twitter suspension illustrates the reverse possibility: governmental action can restrict the communicative infrastructure through which criticism is sustained. The relevant question is therefore not merely whether the government responds, but whether the civic environment remains sufficiently open for continued scrutiny. Fiscal and administrative capacity introduces another distinction. Governments may acknowledge criticism and announce corrective measures without possessing the resources or administrative capability to implement them effectively. This is particularly relevant to the Tinubu period, where economic reforms generated significant social pressures and government responses included wage negotiations, palliatives and other mitigation measures. Responsiveness therefore concerns governmental reaction to public demands, whereas effectiveness depends substantially on the capacity to implement responses and address underlying problems.

Electoral competitiveness constitutes a further but distinct accountability pathway. Elections give citizens an institutional mechanism to express approval or dissatisfaction, but electoral accountability depends on the credibility of the electoral environment and citizens' willingness and capacity to participate. Recent research identifying a long-term decline in Nigerian voter turnout (Owonikoko & Ashindorbe, 2025) associates this pattern with factors including insecurity, electoral violence, voter suppression, distrust and poor governance. Electoral competition should therefore not be reduced to another form of citizen criticism; it represents a distinct institutional mechanism through which citizens may reward, sanction or replace public officials. Taken together, these institutional conditions demonstrate that citizen criticism is neither inherently democratic nor inherently destabilising. Where judicial and legislative institutions can scrutinise decisions, civic and media spaces remain open, administrative systems can implement corrective measures and electoral mechanisms provide credible avenues for political sanction, criticism has greater potential to become part of a continuing accountability process. Where these conditions are weak, governments may still respond, but responses are more likely to remain temporary, symbolic, poorly implemented or directed towards controlling the channels of criticism.

The findings also require caution about causality and the meaning of responsiveness. Democratic responsiveness should not mean that government must accept every public demand, since legitimate decisions may involve competing interests, constitutional requirements and fiscal constraints. What matters is whether public authorities remain open to explanation, scrutiny and reasoned adjustment. Nor should temporal sequence be mistaken for proof of causation. The 2012 protests provide evidence of mobilisation followed by negotiation and policy adjustment, while EndSARS demonstrates a visible relationship between mobilisation and governmental response. The 2023 subsidy reform, however, had fiscal and macroeconomic drivers that preceded and cannot be reduced to citizen criticism. Citizen feedback is therefore better understood as an intervening force that can influence how governments communicate, negotiate, mitigate or modify policies rather than as a universal cause of policy change. The central accountability question is consequently not simply whether citizens complain and governments respond, but whether institutional arrangements allow their interaction to produce sustained scrutiny, explanation, implementation and correction. This shifts the analysis from the existence of citizen voice to the institutional conditions that determine whether voice becomes consequential democratic accountability.

7. Conclusion

This article examined the relationship between citizen criticism, government responsiveness and democratic accountability in Nigeria from 2011 to 2025. Comparing the Jonathan, Buhari and Tinubu administrations shows that public criticism is an important channel through which citizens communicate grievances and place issues on the governmental agenda. Yet the evidence also demonstrates that responsiveness and accountability are analytically and institutionally distinct. Thus, the study's principal contribution is to shift the explanation from a simple criticism-response relationship to an institutional pathway. Citizen criticism constitutes the initiating input, but its consequences are mediated by judicial independence, legislative oversight capacity, media and civic freedom, fiscal and administrative capacity, and electoral competitiveness. These conditions do not guarantee accountability, nor are they treated as statistically tested independent variables. Rather, the comparative cases demonstrate how variation in these institutional conditions can help explain why similar forms of public pressure produce different forms of governmental response and different possibilities for accountability.

The cases further show that responsiveness may take several forms. It may involve negotiation, policy adjustment, welfare intervention, institutional review or public explanation. It may also involve restriction of the communicative channels through which criticism is expressed. Consequently, the presence of a governmental response cannot by itself be treated as evidence of democratic accountability. The study therefore concludes that the democratic significance of citizen criticism lies not simply in its capacity to force governments to react, but in its capacity to enter institutional processes of scrutiny and correction. Where those processes are credible and implemented, citizen criticism has greater potential to become part of sustained democratic accountability.

The study is limited by its reliance on documentary evidence and its qualitative comparative design. It does not establish statistical relationships among the identified institutional conditions. Future research can build on the framework through state-level comparison, citizen surveys, interviews with policymakers and protest actors, and systematic examination of whether differences in judicial independence, legislative oversight, media freedom, administrative capacity and electoral competitiveness are associated with measurable differences in accountability outcomes.

The broader implication is that democratic accountability should not be understood as an event occurring only at elections or as an automatic consequence of public protest. It is a continuing institutional relationship in which citizens communicate grievances, political and public institutions process those demands, governments respond, and public authorities remain subject to scrutiny concerning what they have decided, what they have implemented and what they are prepared to correct. The Nigerian cases examined here indicate that the movement from complaint to accountability is therefore contingent on the institutional pathways available between citizen voice and corrective action. The intensity of public criticism may initiate political pressure, but whether that pressure becomes sustained accountability depends on the capacity of democratic institutions to receive, scrutinise, implement and follow up governmental responses.

ORCID iD

¹ Ademola Azeez  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2439-3588>

¹ Oluwafemi Joseph Ladele  <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-6954-7746>

² Muyiwa Bamidele Afolabi  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8108-7862>

¹ Suleimon Maito Ajibowu-Yekini  <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-9756-6540>

References

- Aboh, S. C. (2024). 'It will never be well with SARS': A discourse analytic study of the #EndSARS protests on social media. *Discourse & Society*, 35(2), 221–239. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265231200994>
- Agbonifo, J. (2023). Fuel subsidy protests in Nigeria: The promise and mirage of empowerment. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, 16, 101333. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2023.101333>
- Ajibola, B. S. (2024). From COVID-19 to fuel subsidy removal in Nigeria: Assessing the political opportunities for local grievance. *Urban Governance*, 4(4), 351–361. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ugj.2024.12.007>
- Ayodele, J. (2014). Trust in government and the politics of fuel subsidy removal in Lagos, Nigeria. *Inkanyiso*, 6(1), 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.4102/ink.v6i1.243>
- Collier, D. (2011). Understanding process tracing. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 44(4), 823–830. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096511001429>
- Dahl, R. A. (1971). *Polyarchy: Participation and opposition*. Yale University Press.
- Easton, D. (1965). *A systems analysis of political life*. Wiley.
- Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. *Social Text*, 25/26, 56–80.
- Gaventa, J., Joshi, A., & Anderson, C. (2023). Citizen action for accountability in challenging contexts: What have we learned? *Development Policy Review*, 41(S1), e12697. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12697>
- Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society* (T. Burger, Trans.). MIT Press. (Original work published 1962)
- Habermas, J. (1996). *Between facts and norms: Contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy* (W. Rehg, Trans.). MIT Press.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states*. Harvard University Press.
- Houeland, C. (2020). Contentious and institutional politics in a petro-state: Nigeria's 2012 fuel subsidy protests. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, 7(4), 1230–1237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2020.05.010>
- International Monetary Fund. (2012). *Nigeria: 2012 Article IV consultation—Staff report; Press release on the Executive Board discussion; and statement by the Executive Director for Nigeria*. IMF.
- International Monetary Fund. (2022). *Nigeria: Selected issues*. IMF.
- Iwuoha, V. C., & Aniche, E. T. (2022). Protests and blood on the streets: Repressive state, police brutality and #EndSARS protest in Nigeria. *Security Journal*, 35(4), 1102–1124. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41284-021-00316-z>
- Mayring, P. (2014). *Qualitative content analysis: Theoretical foundation, basic procedures and software solution*. Klagenfurt, Austria: Author
- Monday, T. U., & Modupe, O. (2025). Legislative oversights, accountability and corruption in Osun State Nigeria, 2010–2022. *African Identities*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14725843.2024.2439418>
- Norris, P. (2011). *Democratic deficit: Critical citizens revisited*. Cambridge University Press.
- Odoh, A., & Olagunju, A. T. (2025). The role of social media in combating corruption, promoting accountability, and sustainable development in Nigeria's democracy. *Journal of Developing Societies*, 41(2), 242–267. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0169796X251322248>
- O'Donnell, G. (1998). Horizontal accountability in new democracies. *Journal of Democracy*, 9(3), 112–126.

- Okaisabor, J. O. (2025). The quest of fiscal autonomy for judicial independence: The case of the Nigerian judiciary and its challenges. *African Identities*, 23(3), 756–780. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14725843.2024.2349613>
- Owonikoko, S. B., & Ashindorbe, K. (2025). Trend analysis of voter turnout in Nigeria's general elections, 1999–2023. *The Round Table*, 114(1), 18–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00358533.2025.2469078>
- Powell, G. B. (2004). The quality of democracy: The chain of responsiveness. *Journal of Democracy*, 15(4), 91–105. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2004.0070>
- Uwalaka, T. (2024). Social media as solidarity vehicle during the 2020 #EndSARS protests in Nigeria. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 59(2), 420–438. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00219096221108737>
- Uwazuruike, A. R. (2020). #EndSARS: The movement against police brutality in Nigeria. *Harvard Human Rights Journal*, 34, 1–6.
- Yiaga Africa, & Enough is Enough Nigeria. (2021). *Weekly updates on the #EndSARS judicial panels of inquiry – No. 19*.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.