UNIOFFA JOURNAL OF INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES (OJIS)
A Multidisciplinary Journal of Science, Management and Social Sciences
Website: www.unioffajis.com

THE IMPACT OF NATIONAL MECHANISMS FOR ENHANCING NATIONAL INTEGRATION IN NIGERIA

Ibrahim I. Yahaya
Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin Nigeria.
Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Sambo Dare Ibrahim
Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin Nigeria.
Department of Political Science and Public Administration
sambodare09@gmail.com

Published Date. May 2026 **Volume 1.1**

Abstract

This study examines the role of ethnicity and religion in shaping national integration within Nigeria's federal structure, with particular attention to the effectiveness of institutional mechanisms designed to manage diversity. Anchored in Social Identity Theory, the study conceptualises identity as a socially constructed and politically activated category through which individuals derive belonging, loyalty, and group alignment. The research adopts a mixed-methods design, integrating quantitative survey data (n = 382) with qualitative interviews across six strategically selected states: Lagos State, Kwara State, Enugu State, Adamawa State, Rivers State, and Kaduna State. The study population is drawn from an estimated 39 million residents, with a refined target population of approximately 4.16 million individuals actively engaged in civic and religious organisations, based on data from the National Population Commission, National Bureau of Statistics, World Bank, and United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. The findings reveal that ethnicity and religion remain deeply embedded in Nigeria's political and social systems, functioning not merely as identity markers but as instruments of mobilisation and access. Quantitative results show consistently high agreement levels exceeding 70 percent across indicators measuring the impact of identity on political cooperation, trust, and national cohesion. Notably, 85.4 percent of respondents identified elite manipulation of ethnic and religious identities as a central driver of division. Qualitative evidence further demonstrates that identity influences everyday social relations, shapes perceptions of state legitimacy, and conditions access to opportunities across regions. The study also identifies a significant gap between the awareness and effectiveness of national integration mechanisms, including the National Youth Service Corps and the Federal Character Principle. The study concludes that national integration in Nigeria is constrained not by diversity itself, but by the institutional and political context within which identities are mobilised. It recommends a shift from symbolic inclusion to structural reforms that promote equitable access, strengthen institutional credibility, and foster a shared civic identity. This research contributes to the literature by providing a multi-level analysis of integration that bridges identity theory, governance practice, and empirical evidence within the Nigerian context.

Introduction

National integration in plural societies remains one of the most enduring challenges in political development, particularly within federations characterised by deep cultural, ethnic, and religious diversity. Nigeria presents a compelling case in this regard. With an estimated population exceeding 220 million and over 250 ethno-linguistic groups, the country embodies one of the most complex sociocultural configurations globally (National Population Commission [NPC], 2023). The three dominant groups, Hausa-Fulani, Yoruba, and Igbo, have historically shaped political competition and state formation, while numerous minority groups across the Niger Delta, Middle Belt, and North-East continue to articulate concerns of marginalisation and exclusion. Federalism was adopted as an institutional response to this diversity, intended to provide a framework for balancing unity with autonomy. However, more than six decades after independence, the Nigerian federation continues to grapple with persistent identity-based tensions, raising fundamental questions about the integrative capacity of its political system.

The expectation that federalism would mitigate ethnic conflict and foster inclusive governance has only been partially realised. Instead, sub-national governance structures have, in several instances, reproduced the very divisions they were meant to manage. Empirical evidence suggests that state-level policies often reflect exclusionary

practices, particularly through indigene-settler dichotomies, unequal access to public services, and politically motivated recruitment patterns (Akinyele, 2015). This institutional reality is reinforced by public perception. Data from Afrobarometer (2022) indicate that a significant proportion of Nigerians believe ethnicity influences access to political office, employment, and state benefits. Such perceptions are not merely attitudinal; they shape behaviour, trust, and engagement with the state. The persistence of identity-based conflicts, including communal violence in the Middle Belt and long-standing intergroup disputes in various regions, underscores the extent to which these structural inequalities continue to undermine national cohesion (Nextier SPD, 2020; Nlewem, 2017).

In response to these challenges, successive governments have introduced a range of national integration mechanisms, including the National Youth Service Corps, unity schools, and the Federal Character Principle enshrined in the 1999 Constitution. These initiatives were designed to promote intergroup interaction, equitable representation, and a shared sense of national identity. Yet, their effectiveness remains contested. Critics argue that implementation has been inconsistent and, in some cases, politically compromised. The Federal Character Principle, for instance, has been criticised for reinforcing elite bargaining rather than ensuring genuine inclusiveness, while the operational challenges facing the NYSC have raised concerns about its long-term relevance. Despite these institutional efforts, separatist agitations and ethno-nationalist movements have intensified in recent years, reflecting deeper fractures in the national fabric (Adeforiti, 2018; Ibrahim & Adebanwi, 2022).

The challenge is further complicated by the evolving role of sub-national and regional governance frameworks within Nigeria's federal architecture. Institutions such as the Niger Delta Development Commission and the Development Agenda for Western Nigeria (DAWN) Commission were conceived as platforms for coordinated development and regional cooperation. In principle, such frameworks should enhance intergovernmental collaboration and reduce disparities across states. In practice, however, their contributions to national integration remain ambiguous. Emerging evidence suggests that these institutions often function as arenas for elite negotiation, resource distribution, and regional consolidation of power. Rather than fostering cross-regional solidarity, they may inadvertently reinforce bloc identities and deepen perceptions of exclusion (Mustapha, 2020; Suberu, 2021).

Recent electoral cycles further illustrate the salience of identity in Nigeria's political process. The 2015, 2019, and 2023 general elections were marked by pronounced ethno-regional voting patterns, widespread contestation, and episodes of violence. Reports from the Independent National Electoral Commission and civil society coalitions highlight recurring issues of voter suppression, electoral intimidation, and post-election unrest, particularly in politically sensitive states (INEC, 2023; Nigeria Civil Society Situation Room, 2023). These patterns suggest that electoral competition continues to serve as a site for the mobilisation of identity rather than a mechanism for national convergence. In effect, democratic processes, rather than consolidating unity, often reproduce existing cleavages.

Against this backdrop, the question of national integration in Nigeria cannot be adequately addressed without examining the interplay between identity, institutions, and governance at both national and sub-national levels. This study is anchored in Social Identity Theory, which posits that individuals derive a sense of self from group affiliations, often leading to in-group preference and out-group differentiation. Within the Nigerian context, this theoretical lens provides a useful framework for understanding how ethnic and religious identities are constructed, mobilised, and sustained within political and institutional processes. It also helps explain why formal integration mechanisms often struggle to override deeply embedded social cleavages.

Accordingly, this study interrogates the extent to which ethnicity and religion pose challenges to national integration and evaluates the effectiveness of institutional mechanisms designed to address these challenges. More importantly, it examines whether sub-national and regional governance frameworks function as instruments of integration or as sites of fragmentation within Nigeria's federal system. By bridging theoretical insight with empirical analysis, the study seeks to contribute to a more grounded understanding of the dynamics shaping national cohesion in Nigeria and to identify pathways for more inclusive and sustainable integration.

Conceptual Review

The Concept of Federalism

The concept of federalism has received extensive scientific attention in recent years, especially in developing countries of Africa including Nigeria.

However, there has not been a widely accepted definition of the word federalism. Odion (2011) affirms that the first authors of federalist concepts such as Jean Bodin, Olto and Cosmanus considered federalism as a form of voluntary political union of independent authority. The alliance, whether temporary or permanent, is based on the need for special common objectives such as defense, commerce, telecommunications and other reasons that benefit the involved parties.

However, contemporary writers on the concept of federalism, such as Livingstone, Mcmahon, and Rikers, consider federalism to be an interaction and direct contact with at least two levels of government. These scholars have their roots in the 1787 Constitution of the United States. These scholars' definition of federalism is that federalism is a government intentionally designed by political architects to meet the two daunting challenges of maintaining unity while preserving diversity. It is based on the basic principle of a form of institutional structure (Odion, 2011). Thus, federalism is believed by these writers, to be capable of mediating the potential and actual conflicts arising from the heterogeneity within a nation-state.

Moreover, Elaigwu (2000) argues that federalism is a compromise in a multi-ethnic state between two types of self-determination. Determination to maintain a supranational governmental framework, on the one hand to ensure the security of all in the nation-state, while on the other hand, to protect the self-determination of groups seeking to preserve individual identity

Wheare (1963), believed to be an eloquent writer on federalism, saw it as a union of nations, formed for a common purpose, but whose members retained much of their original independence.

Furthermore, Federalism has adopted in Nigeria found it place in our political realm during the colonial era. This concept has closely related to various social relationships is based on coordinating relationships rather than sub-coordinating relationships. It emphasizes the relationship between the parties who claim equal legitimacy in search of a common social order. Jinadu (1979), states that it is often built by political architects as a form of government and a deliberately designed constitutional structure to address the various tasks of maintaining unity while maintaining diversity (Jinadu1979).

The Concept of Integration

In classical sociology, integration derives its meaning from evolutionary theory, signifying a progressive change from a less coherent to a more coherent form. Later, the concept became central to classical structural-functional theory (Ritzer 2000: 118). Coherence is seen to be advanced by increasing functionality of the parts for the whole; this implies a growing differentiation of roles (groups of) actors play.

Integration has been severally conceptualized. One of which is that regional integration is a process in which states enter into a supranational regional organization in order to increase regional cooperation and diffuse regional tension (Onwuka, 1982). In economic terms, it focuses on removing barriers to free trade in the region, increasing the free movement of people, labor, goods and capital across national borders, reducing the possibility of regional armed conflict through confidence and security building measures, and adopting positions which enhances common stand on policy issues. This is aimed at generating economic advantages to individuals, states and regions (UNECA, 2004).

Regional integration involves a process of increasing interaction and interdependence in the economic and political arena among a group of countries. The extensive body of literature on economic integration has its roots in the world that coincided with the beginning of the European Community, and even pre-dated it (Balassa, 1961). Amitai Etzioni on the other hand upheld that integration may be defined as a condition identified with a set of vague symbols or variables, or as ‘process’ identified with an over-increasing degree of structural linkages between two or more parts of a system or systems.

The Functionalist thesis of integration is of the view that, since the critical function of any political community is security and welfare, it follows that if a moderate sufficiency of what the people want and ought to have is given to them, they will keep peace (Mitrany, 1975). In view of this, when an organization is set up to meet these needs of the people, their loyalty would incrementally shift to the organization rather than to the nation-state system.

The Neo-functionalist on the other hand upheld that the development of ‘world Government’ that is one supreme body for all states and people, is feasible through the growth of supranational organization (Ray, 1979). They upheld further that the

efficiency and the effectiveness of the supranational organizations, in providing structural services to people in different states, however, in the same region, would ultimately lead to the shift of the people's allegiance away from their government to the organization and bureaucrats who now meet their needs. This is the approach adopted and applied by the European Union (EU) (Ray, 1979).

Literature Review

Scholars are divided on the ability of federalism to promote national cohesion and political stability in multi-ethnic states. Those in support of federalism as a strategy of promoting or preserving integration and stability in deeply divided states include F.G Carnell (1962), Duchacek (1977), Mazrui (1971), Enloe (1977) among others. For (Wheare, cited in Ojo, 2009:14) the doyen of modem federalism, he sees federalism as an appropriate form of government to offer to communities or states of distinct or differing nationality who wish to form a common government and behave as one people for some purpose but wish to remain independent and in particular to retain their nationality in all aspects. However, federalism has an instrument of integrating and promoting stability in multi ethnic state has failed because of the denial of the existence of diversity in the continent which Ojo (2009) puts at more than a thousand. The public denial of ethnic pluralism did not prevent politicians from mobilizing and manipulating ethnicity.

Therefore, federal experiments in Nigeria and other third world countries have been vulnerable to decay, disruption and disintegration. These experiments have moved either towards unification and greater centralization as Nigeria experience has shown or towards disintegration and secession of their components units as in the case of former Yugoslavia and defunct Soviet Union to mention but a few. For other scholars, federalism cannot bring about integration in heterogeneous societies. Notable scholars in this camp are Elazar (1987), and Ayoade (1988). Elazar (1987) contends that federal solution has not proved to be a particularly successful method for integrating plural societies unless there has been other factors compelling integration.

In the same vein, Tariton (1965) argues that there is a limit beyond which diversity and federalism are compatible. He was of the opinion that federal arrangement can be considered impossible or unworkable if the elements of diversity are very strong or if they predominate over those of unity. Ayoade (1998) disagreed with other scholars who see federalism has having the ability to promote national, integration and stability in multi-ethnic states. In his words"... to - expect federalism to produce a seamless unity is to expect too much from that system. Many federalists" expect from federalism what is not designed to give". He goes further to say that "experience has shown that it has not proved to be a particular good device for integrating plural societies into a single political system". Ayoade (1998:5-6)

However, the poor run of federalism in Nigeria has not diminished the perceived utility of the system as evidenced by the clamour for so-called true federalism in Nigeria. Again, to say all about the operation of federalism in Nigeria are negatives is to downplay the utility and relevance of federalism as a system of governance. As some writers have observed, federalism is what made Nigeria governable. This is because, as Mohammad (2008) illustrates, by virtue of the country's vast size, resources and diversities, the country habitates lots of power potentates competing for state power amongst themselves. One could have imagined the conflicts that would emerge in the process of competing for power and resources if the country had been practicing unitary system of government. But federalism by its inherent decentralization of power creates opportunities for the various ethnic nationalities to man different spheres of interest. This has successfully diverted the struggle for control from the centre to other units such as the state and local governments.

Another feat achieved by Nigeria's federal arrangement is the greater participation of Nigerians in the country's political life. This is made possible by the principle of federal character entrenched under section 14(3) of the Constitution of Nigeria 1979 and has since been recurring in the country's constitutions. Although the federal character principle has been criticized on several grounds, as we observed earlier, it has made possible for individuals within the federation to rise to positions of eminence on the platform of where they come from, an attainment which may not be possible if merit had been adopted irrespective of ethnic or cultural background (Thom-Otuya, 2013a).

Theoretical Framework

Theory of Social Identity Theory (SIT)

Social Identity Theory (SIT) was first developed by Henri Tajfel and John Turner in the 1970s and 1980s. The theory posits that individuals

derive a part of their self-concept from the social groups to which they belong, such as ethnic, religious, or regional groups (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). These social identities influence intergroup behavior, attitudes, and perceptions, including in contexts of cooperation, conflict, and competition.

SIT distinguishes between personal identity (one's individual characteristics) and social identity (membership in a group). It argues that individuals tend to favor in-groups (groups they belong to) while exhibiting bias or discrimination against out-groups (other groups), a phenomenon known as in-group favoritism (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). This dynamic is crucial in multi-ethnic and multicultural societies like Nigeria, where ethnic, religious, and regional affiliations strongly influence political behavior and social cohesion.

A key insight of SIT is that individuals tend to favor their in-group while exhibiting bias against out-groups, a dynamic known as in-group favoritism. This psychological tendency helps explain why ethnic and regional loyalties in Nigeria often supersede allegiance to the nation-state, resulting in social fragmentation, competition, and sometimes conflict.

Methodology

This study adopts a mixed-methods research design to provide a comprehensive and context-sensitive analysis of ethnicity, religion, and national integration within Nigeria's federal structure. The choice of a mixed approach is deliberate, allowing for the triangulation of quantitative breadth with qualitative depth. The study is anchored in Social Identity Theory, which provides the analytical lens for understanding how group affiliations shape perceptions of belonging, trust, and political behaviour. The research population comprises citizens actively engaged in grassroots civic and religious organisations across six purposively selected states: Lagos State, Kaduna State, Kwara State, Enugu State, Adamawa State, and Rivers State. These states were selected to reflect Nigeria's geopolitical diversity and varying experiences of identity relations. The target population is drawn from an estimated 4.16 million individuals involved in structured civic and religious networks, extrapolated from population data provided by the National Bureau of Statistics, National Population Commission, World Bank, and United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, as well as participation estimates from CIVICUS and Afrobarometer. These groups were prioritised because they function as key sites of social interaction, political socialisation, and intergroup engagement at the sub-national level.

A multi-stage sampling technique was employed to ensure representativeness and analytical balance. First, purposive sampling was used to identify relevant civic and religious organisations within each state. This was followed by stratified random sampling to select survey respondents across key demographic variables, including age, gender, religious affiliation, and urban–rural residence. A total of 382 structured questionnaires were administered, generating quantifiable data on perceptions of identity, integration, and institutional effectiveness. Complementing this, key informant interviews were conducted with selected stakeholders, including civil society actors, community leaders, and policy practitioners, to capture nuanced perspectives and lived experiences. Quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics, particularly frequency distributions and percentage analysis, while qualitative data were subjected to thematic analysis to identify recurring patterns and contextual variations. This integrative methodological approach enhances the reliability and validity of the findings, enabling the study to move beyond surface-level description toward a deeper explanation of the structural and institutional dynamics shaping national integration in Nigeria.

Result and Data presentation

Research Objective: To examine the extent to which ethnicity and religious conflict pose challenges to national integration within Nigeria's federal structure.

Table 4.2: Responses on Ethnicity, Religious Conflict and National Integration (n = 382)

S/N	Statement	SD (%)	D (%)	U (%)	A (%)	SA (%)
B1	Ethnic divisions significantly affect political cooperation	4.2	6.5	8.1	42.4	38.8
B2	Religious tensions contribute to mistrust among communities	3.9	7.3	9.4	44.2	35.2

B3	Conflicts weaken citizens' sense of belonging	5.0	8.6	10.2	41.1	35.1
B4	Political leaders exploit ethnic/religious identities	2.6	5.2	6.8	46.3	39.1
B5	Conflicts reduce inter-regional cooperation	4.7	7.9	9.1	43.5	34.8
B6	Conflicts undermine Nigeria's federal system	5.5	9.2	10.7	40.3	34.3
B7	Identity tensions discourage inter-state residence	6.3	10.1	11.5	39.8	32.3
B8	Identity conflicts threaten long-term national unity	3.4	6.1	7.8	45.6	37.1

Source: Researchers Survey, 2026

The data reveal a strong and consistent perception that ethnicity and religion remain central fault lines in Nigeria's integration trajectory. Across all eight indicators, agreement levels (A + SA) exceed 70%, with particularly high consensus on elite manipulation of identity (B4: 85.4%) and the broader threat to national unity (B8: 82.7%). This pattern is analytically significant. It suggests that respondents do not merely perceive identity divisions as social realities, but as politically constructed and institutionally reinforced phenomena**.** The prominence of B4 indicates that the problem is not identity per se, but its strategic deployment within the political arena. This aligns with the instrumentalist perspective in ethnic politics, which argues that elites mobilize identity cleavages for political advantage (Horowitz, 1985). In practical terms, this means that ethnicity and religion are not just inherited identities; they are activated variables in political competition**.** Furthermore, the relatively lower but still substantial agreement on B6 (74.6%) indicates that respondents see a structural implication: identity conflicts are not isolated disruptions but system-level threats to federal stability**.** This reinforces the argument that Nigeria's federalism operates under persistent strain from unresolved identity tensions. Another important insight emerges from B7 (72.1% agreement). A significant proportion of respondents acknowledge that identity tensions discourage inter-state mobility. This has profound implications for national integration, as mobility is a key mechanism through which social cohesion is built in heterogeneous societies (Deutsch, 1966).

National Mechanisms for Integration in Nigeria

Research Objective: To evaluate the effectiveness of national mechanisms designed to promote integration in Nigeria.

This section interrogates the awareness, perceived effectiveness, and structural limitations of key national integration instruments, including the Federal Character Principle, the National Youth Service Corps (NYSC), unity schools, and civic-national symbols.

S/N	Statement	SD (%)	D (%)	U (%)	A (%)	SA (%)
C1	Awareness of national integration mechanisms	2.1	4.5	6.8	48.2	38.4
C2	Federal Character ensures equitable representation	8.9	18.3	14.1	34.2	24.5

C3	NYSC fosters inter-ethnic understanding	6.3	12.8	10.5	41.6	28.8
C4	Unity Schools promote national cohesion	7.8	15.2	13.6	38.1	25.3
C5	Federal institutions promote inclusiveness	9.4	17.5	12.7	36.4	24.0
C6	National symbols foster shared identity	10.1	18.9	15.0	34.3	21.7
C7	Mechanisms adequately address divisions	12.6	21.4	16.2	30.8	19.0

Source: Researchers Survey, 2026

The data present a clear paradox: while awareness of national integration mechanisms is very high (C1: 86.6%), their perceived effectiveness is significantly weaker and uneven. This gap between awareness and performance is analytically important. The Federal Character Principle (C2) records a mixed evaluation, with only 58.7% agreement compared to a notable 27.2% disagreement. This suggests that while the principle is recognized, its implementation is widely viewed as politically manipulated rather than normatively grounded. In effect, what was designed as an instrument of equity risks being perceived as a mechanism of elite bargaining. Similarly, the National Youth Service Corps (C3) performs relatively better (70.4% agreement), reinforcing its longstanding reputation as one of Nigeria's most visible integration tools. However, the presence of 19.1% disagreement indicates growing skepticism, particularly in light of security concerns and changing socio-political realities. Unity Schools (C4) and federal inclusiveness (C5) follow a similar pattern: moderate approval but no overwhelming confidence. This suggests that these mechanisms are functioning, but not transformative. The most critical finding lies in C7**,** where only 49.8% of respondents believe that existing mechanisms adequately address Nigeria's divisions, while 34% explicitly disagree. This indicates that, in aggregate terms, national integration mechanisms are perceived as insufficient relative to the scale and complexity of the problem. This supports a broader institutional critique: policy presence does not automatically translate into policy effectiveness, particularly in contexts where implementation is shaped by political incentives (Grindle, 2017).

Discussion of the findings

When the evidence from both objectives is brought together, a more coherent and revealing picture emerges. The challenge of national integration in Nigeria is not simply the persistence of ethnic and religious diversity, but the interaction between identity politics and the institutional mechanisms designed to manage it. The data suggest that these two domains are deeply intertwined, often reinforcing rather than resolving one another.

At the core of the findings is a strong and consistent perception that ethnicity and religion remain dominant structuring forces in Nigeria's political and social life. The high levels of agreement across all indicators in Objective I indicate that identity is not merely a background variable; it actively shapes political cooperation, trust, mobility, and citizens' sense of belonging. However, what gives this finding analytical weight is the overwhelming consensus that political elites deliberately mobilise these identities for strategic advantage. This shifts the problem from cultural diversity to political behaviour. In line with the instrumentalist perspective associated with Donald Horowitz, identity becomes most consequential when it is activated within competitive political contexts (Horowitz, 1985). In Nigeria, this activation is not incidental; it is systemic and often incentivised by the structure of power and resource distribution.

This dynamic is further reinforced by the broader political economy of the Nigerian state. As Claude Ake argues, where access to state power determines access to resources, political competition tends to assume a zero-sum character (Ake, 1996).

Under such conditions, ethnic and religious identities become efficient tools for mobilisation, boundary formation, and exclusion. The empirical evidence in this study reflects this reality. Respondents not only recognise identity divisions but interpret them as embedded within the logic of governance itself. This explains why identity conflicts are widely perceived as threats to the federal system and not merely as isolated social disturbances.

At the same time, the findings reveal that identity-based tensions have direct implications for the integrative capacity of the state. The observed reluctance toward inter-state residence and interaction suggests that the social foundations of integration are weakening. Drawing on Karl Deutsch's framework, national integration depends on sustained communication, mobility, and mutual responsiveness among citizens (Deutsch, 1953). Where these processes are constrained by fear, mistrust, or perceived exclusion, integration becomes shallow and fragmented. In Nigeria's case, the data indicate that identity has become a filter through which citizens interpret both social relations and state actions, thereby limiting the emergence of a shared national consciousness.

It is within this context that the role of national integration mechanisms must be understood. The findings from Objective II introduce a critical paradox: while awareness of integration policies is high, confidence in their effectiveness is uneven and, in some cases, declining. This gap between recognition and performance is not accidental; it reflects deeper institutional limitations. Mechanisms such as the National Youth Service Corps, the Federal Character Principle, and unity schools were designed to promote inclusion, interaction, and balanced representation. To some extent, they have achieved these goals, particularly at the level of symbolic and experiential integration. For instance, the relatively strong evaluation of the NYSC suggests that direct social exposure remains one of the most effective tools for bridging identity divides.

However, the broader pattern in the data indicates that these mechanisms are not transformative. Their impact is constrained by the same political environment in which identity is instrumentalised. The mixed evaluation of the Federal Character Principle is particularly telling. While it is intended to ensure equitable representation, it is often perceived as a mechanism of elite negotiation rather than genuine inclusion. This perception undermines its legitimacy and reinforces the belief that access to state resources remains mediated by identity and political connection.

This tension reflects a classic implementation dilemma captured in governance literature. As argued by Grindle (2017), the effectiveness of public policy in developing contexts depends less on formal design and more on political incentives, administrative capacity, and the broader institutional environment. In Nigeria, integration policies operate within a dual system in which formal rules coexist with informal practices such as patronage, ethnic balancing, and loyalty networks. These informal institutions frequently reshape or even override formal intentions, limiting the capacity of integration mechanisms to produce substantive outcomes.

What emerges from the synthesis is a structural contradiction. On the one hand, the Nigerian state recognises the risks posed by identity divisions and has developed a range of mechanisms to address them. On the other hand, the same state operates through political practices that reproduce and sustain those divisions. As a result, integration efforts often take on a compensatory character. They manage tensions, create moments of interaction, and project a narrative of unity, but they do not fundamentally alter the underlying distribution of power and opportunity.

This explains why many respondents perceive national integration as more symbolic than substantive. Policies succeed in creating visibility and temporary cohesion, but they fall short in addressing deeper issues of inequality, exclusion, and trust. The consequence is a form of managed diversity, where conflict is contained but not resolved, and where citizens continue to engage the state primarily through the lens of identity.

In analytical terms, therefore, the problem of national integration in Nigeria is not the absence of policy frameworks, but the misalignment between policy objectives and political realities. Ethnicity and religion persist as powerful forces because they are embedded in the logic of governance, while integration mechanisms remain limited because they operate within that same logic. Until this structural tension is addressed, integration will remain partial, uneven, and contested.

Conclusion

This study set out to examine the extent to which ethnicity and religion constitute barriers to national integration within Nigeria's federal structure

and to evaluate the effectiveness of national mechanisms designed to manage these divisions. The evidence, when taken together, leads to a clear but nuanced conclusion. Ethnicity and religion remain deeply embedded in Nigeria's political and social fabric, not as passive identities, but as active variables shaped by elite competition, institutional incentives, and historical experience. Their persistence as fault lines is therefore less a function of diversity itself and more a reflection of how diversity is governed.

The findings demonstrate that identity-based divisions continue to influence political cooperation, weaken trust, and constrain citizens' sense of belonging. More importantly, they reveal that these divisions are widely perceived as being reinforced through political processes, particularly elite mobilisation and distributive competition. This aligns with the instrumentalist tradition associated with Donald Horowitz, while also reflecting the structural critique of the state advanced by Claude Ake. In effect, identity becomes most politically consequential where access to power and resources is mediated through it.

At the same time, the study finds that Nigeria's national integration mechanisms, including the National Youth Service Corps, the Federal Character Principle, and unity schools, have made meaningful contributions, particularly in fostering interaction and symbolic inclusion. However, their overall impact remains limited and uneven. While these mechanisms are widely recognised, they are not consistently trusted to deliver equitable outcomes. This gap between policy visibility and policy credibility represents a central weakness in Nigeria's integration framework. The broader implication is that Nigeria's approach to integration is largely compensatory rather than transformative. Policies are designed to manage diversity and reduce tension, but they do not sufficiently address the structural conditions that sustain inequality, exclusion, and mistrust. As a result, national integration remains partial and contested, with sub-national and national institutions functioning more as stabilisers of fragmentation than as drivers of cohesive nationhood.

Recommendations

1. Reframe Integration from Symbolic Management to Structural Inclusion
National integration policy must move beyond symbolic initiatives toward substantive reforms that address inequalities in access to political office, public employment, and economic opportunity. Without visible fairness in distribution, symbolic gestures will continue to lack credibility. This requires strengthening merit-based systems while ensuring that inclusion does not become a proxy for elite bargaining.

2. Reform the Implementation of the Federal Character Principle
The Federal Character Principle should be recalibrated to balance equity with competence. Transparent criteria, independent oversight, and public reporting mechanisms should be institutionalised to reduce perceptions of manipulation. The goal should be to transform the principle from a political compromise into a credible instrument of inclusive governance.

3. Strengthen and Modernise the National Youth Service Corps
The NYSC remains one of the most practical tools for fostering intergroup interaction. However, its effectiveness depends on security, relevance, and post-service opportunities. Reform should focus on ensuring participant safety, aligning service activities with local development needs, and creating pathways for sustained inter-regional engagement after the programme.

4. Institutionalise Inter-Group Contact Beyond Youth-Level Interventions
Integration efforts should not be limited to youth programmes. Policies should encourage cross-regional collaboration in professional sectors, civil service exchanges, and private sector partnerships. This aligns with the communication-based integration model of Karl Deutsch, which emphasises sustained interaction as a foundation for cohesion.

References

Adeforiti, A. (2018). Ethnic politics and separatist agitations in Nigeria. *Unpublished manuscript*.

Ake, C. (1996). *Democracy and development in Africa*. Brookings Institution Press.

Akinyele, R. T. (2015). Federalism and ethnic conflict management in Nigeria. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations, 9*(3), 102–115.

Deutsch, K. W. (1953). *Nationalism and social communication.* MIT Press.

Grindle, M. S. (2017). *Politics and policy implementation in the developing world*. Princeton University Press.

Horowitz, D. L. (1985). *Ethnic groups in conflict*. University of California Press.

Ibrahim, J., & Adebanwi, W. (2022). Political transitions and identity conflicts in Nigeria. *Journal of Modern African Studies, 60*(2), 215–234.

Independent National Electoral Commission. (2023). *Report on the 2023 general elections*. https://www.inecnigeria.org

Mustapha, A. R. (2020). Regionalism and federal restructuring in Nigeria. *Centre for Democracy and Development Working Paper Series*, 12(4), 1–28.

National Population Commission. (2023). *Population projections report*. https://nationalpopulation.gov.ng

Nextier SPD. (2020). *Conflict trends in Nigeria: An analytical report*. https://nextierspd.com

Nlewem, C. (2017). Communal conflicts and state responses in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies, 5*(1), 44–61.

Nigeria Civil Society Situation Room. (2023). *Election observation report*. https://www.nigeriacivilsocietysituationroom.org

Suberu, R. T. (2021). Federalism and regional governance in Nigeria. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism, 51*(3), 389–412.