

[journals.ccu.edu.ng](http://journals.ccu.edu.ng)



# CCU JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES

***Vol. 3, Issue 1, March 2022***

***ISSN: 2714-2671 (Print), 2714-268X (Online)***

**A Publication of the Faculty of Arts, Social and Management Sciences,  
Coal City University, Enugu**

## Good Governance And Purposive Followership: An Evaluation Of Nigeria's Peace And Security Woes

<sup>1</sup>Francisca Obiageli Ifedi, Ph.D & <sup>2</sup>Kingsley Chukwuka Ezechi

<sup>1,2</sup>Department of Political Science and International Relations

Godfrey Okoye University, Thinkers' Corner, Enugu

Corresponding author: [kezechi@gouni.edu.ng](mailto:kezechi@gouni.edu.ng), +23470323636600

### Abstract

*This paper seeks to examine the role of good governance and active followership in nation building. Good governance and purposive followership are two sides of a coin or twin germane concept that would address Nigeria's malaise of ethnic strife and tension, bedeviling her. In fact, they are the most important concepts that would ensure that the country comes out of her current progressive regression. However, it is the hypothesis of this study that the concept of good governance may not yield its desired fruit unless it is traded alongside that of a purposive and constructive followership. The study has adopted Structural-Functionalism theory to unearth the philosophical underpinnings on why peace and security have been elusive in Nigeria. The paper chiefly relied on the use of documentary method of data collection, adopting a qualitative-descriptive and historical method of analysis. In light of the above, the paper found that the reason for the voluble call for restructuring of the polity (though fraught with mere rhetorics), is as a result of the political aloofness of the ruling class and non-inclusive policies and actions of government. The paper, therefore concludes and recommends that Nigerians must wake up from their passive and docile behaviour towards government actions and policies, acting beyond rhetorics, if they truly want a nation-state they can call their own.*

**Keywords:** Good governance, resource control, followership, peace and security.

### Introduction/Problematic

When the terms good governance escapes the mouths of politicians in Nigeria and Africa at large, it is only but a deceptive rhetoric. Such rhetoric, they know, when uttered, would galvanise needed support during election periods and on other issues of political interest. But this ought not to be the case as it has spelt economic doom through sabotage of varied degrees and proportions. It has also necessitated agitations of different kinds in Nigeria, thus making peace and security both elusive and a luxury. The dissenting voices of

various ethnic groups and tribes heard incessantly in Nigeria is a testament to this fact. In past and recent times, there has been a seemingly choreographed avowal and refusal to obey the rule of law by the state's law enforcement agencies; fast and furious killings of citizens by Boko Haram and marauding herdsmen; front and back waves of defections of politicians; accusations and counter-accusations of vote buying at elections, etc. These have grossly unsettled the polity, endangered peace and unknitting



the stitches of State unity and cohesion of the Nigerian fabric.

The primacy of good governance and purposive followership as a requisite condition for peace and security is indisputable. To achieve this, the followers must be actively involved in the governance of the country. It is only then that they would experience the much-needed peace they deserve and also, feel secure. De Gaulle (1959-69) once comments thus: "politics is too delicate and precious to be left to politicians alone". So, followers must make a purposive, aggressive and constructive demand for good governance; else, it would not be given by mere wishing. The recent constitutional amendment by the National Assembly on some provisions of the constitution, and the resultant outright rejection of restructuring, is a pointer to this fact. The sooner the various ethnic nationalities in Nigeria know that good governance with massive followership involvement is what is needed to get them out of the valley and bottomless pit of poverty, hunger, poor infrastructure, lack of quality education, deprivation and marginalization, the better for them.

Against this background, the major thrust of the study is to evaluate the role of constructive and purposeful followership in the attainment of good governance in Nigeria. With the 2023 elections fast approaching, it is very expedient that the followers engage constructively to see to the emergence of credible candidates from the two major political parties in the country. The division of the country by politicians along tribal and ethnic lines must not be allowed to prevail in the forthcoming election. Unity and

sincerity of purpose from the followership must be the hallmark of engagement if it desires to see a functional Nigeria.

### Methodology

Documentary method of data collection was employed in the gathering of information used for the study. The study also adopted both the descriptive and historical methods of analyses respectively. Thus, descriptive method of analysis deals with the interpretation of extant conditions such as prevailing practices, beliefs, attitude, and ongoing processes (Ndagi, 1984). But Best (1970) says, "descriptive researches look at the individual, groups, institutions, methods and materials in order to describe, compare, contrast, classify, analyze and interpret the entities and events". However, and on the other hand, historical research deals with a "systematic and critical investigation of events, experience and developments of the past and their influencing factors to formulate progressive ideas for the present and future" (Ndiyo, 2005:45). Anikpo (1986:56), carefully opines that a historical research or historical method is particularly, "an attempt to understand a phenomenon or determine its process of growth, innovation and dynamics of internal changes."

The study adopted both comprehensive methods of analyses because it x-rays the meaning, characteristics and applications of good governance in Nigeria, the origin of resource control and its various twists and turns in the country and finally describes how peace and security can be obtained, guaranteed and sustained among the different ethnic groups in the country, given our historical antecedents. This paper chiefly relied on the use of secondary sources of data

generated from books, journal articles, magazines/newspapers and the internet.

### **Conceptual Clarification**

#### **Good Governance**

Before attempting a conceptual delineation of what good governance is, it is pertinent to know what governance is and what it is not. Many have misconstrued governance to mean government as both terms are being used interchangeably. Notably, governance does not mean government and government does not mean governance. Though, both are corollary of some sort, when it comes to governing a society. Government refers to the body of institutions created to galvanise state resources, formulate and implement policies and to superintend over the general affairs of the State. It is also that administrative machinery or instrument through which the goals and aspirations of a state are formulated, expressed and attained. Natufe (2006) defined government as "a collective body of elected and appointed institutions empowered to legislate and adjudicate for the good of the society." Persons that man these institutions and administrative machinery of the state are embodied and emboldened with powers from the constitution setting up those institutions, with which they run the State.

But according to the World Bank (1989), "governance is the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country's economic and social resources." Ninalowo (2005) defined governance as "the totality of executive or administrative functions of the state with a view to fulfilling terms of social contract or constitutional obligations to the citizenry." Natufe (2006), sees it as the "process and system by which a government manages the resources of a society to address

socio-economic and political challenges in the polity." From the above scholarly definitions of governance, we can see that it deals with the way governments of states, (institutions and persons) exercise power for the management of a state's economic and social resources, with a view to fulfilling terms of social contract and constitutional obligations to the citizenry. Thus, it is safe to say that governments are instrumentalised institutions used for governance. With the foregoing, we can say that governance is essentially value neutral. That is, it could be effective or ineffective, good or bad. Little wonder the definition of the OECD presented by the former governor of Lagos state, Bola Ahmed Tinubu (2008) says it is a "process of decision making and the way by which decisions are executed or not implemented." Having had a good understanding of what governance is, (a precursor to good governance), and what it is not, it is germane at this point to demystify the concept of good governance.

Fundamentally, it is important to note that governance is as old as humanity (George & Member, 2013). This is so, because humanity has always governed herself through certain governance structure set up by them. But the question we must ask is that: has this governance, (value neutral) perpetuated in different nations of the world through the ages led to an all-inclusive growth and development? What we see in our environment around us is a wide gulf between the rich and the poor, gross violation of human right including genocide, hunger, poverty, malnutrition, and so on. These have plagued humanity in different nations of the world.



The above inhumane conditions of humanity are very rife in Africa, Asia, America and Europe; despite the presence of governance structures in these parts of the world. This is the cardinal reason why there is a huge campaign for good governance and not just governance. Why good governance? Why should the prefixing adjective good be attached to the word governance? The answer is not far-fetched, in that it embodies qualitative social relational principles that are somewhat present in the definition given by the OECD Report, (2000), which identifies eight key principles of good governance. They are *participation, transparency, accountability, rule of law, equity, efficiency and effectiveness, consensus-oriented, and responsiveness*. In tandem with these characteristics, Adeosun (2012), UNDP (1997), Jobartech (2002), Ahmed (2012), Ifeoma (2013) and Ekpu (2009) underscored the principle of good governance as the capacity to manage a country's resources in a transparent and accountable manner; the exercise of political, economic, legal and administrative authority to the whims and caprices of the citizenry. Others include managerial and organisational efficiency, as well as delivery of election promises through government policies and programmes. The implication here is that any society or state that is devoid of these features is malfunctioning, hence, leading it to what is generally termed as bad governance; and insensitive to the plight of the people.

### **Peace**

Peace as a concept suffers from definitional pluralism. Let's consider one or two of them. Peace has been defined as freedom from disturbance. It has several origins, but the

most notable is its Latin origin, *Pax*, meaning peace, agreement, compact, harmony. It is also a lack of conflict and freedom from fear of violence between heterogeneous social groups. However, the working definition here shall be the one provided by Johan Galtung where he defined peace in two broad categories of negative and positive peace.

According to Galtung, negative peace is "the absence of violence, absence of war" and positive peace is "the cooperation and integration between human groups and society with less emphasis on the absence of violence" (Galtung, 1990). On the issue of violence as an ingredient of negative peace, Galtung posits thus: "violence is built into the social system and expresses itself in the unequal distribution of power and, as a result, unequal opportunities (i.e. inequality in the distribution of income, education opportunities etc.)". Consequently, structural violence is engendered by social injustice (Galtung, 1991). But peace is that spirited state of rest, occasioned by basic economic fulfilment and good neighbourliness.

### **Security**

On the other hand, security is viewed as the condition of feeling safe from harm or danger; the defense, protection and preservation of values, and the absence of threats to acquire values (Mijah, 2007). Put simply, security is about survival and the conditions of human existence. We must quickly clear the misconception and myopic ideology of defining or understanding the concept of security to be solely military or conventional matter. Security is broadly viewed as freedom from danger or threats to an individual or a nation. It is the ability to protect and defend oneself, be it an individual

or a nation, of its cherished values and legitimate interests and the enhancement of wellbeing (Imobighe, 2004 & Mijah, 2007, Nwagboso, 2012).

There can be no development without security. The nonconventional conception of security lays emphasis on human security. Also, according to Fayeye (2011) it implies the maturation of the structures and processes that can engender and guarantee political space and sufficient conditions for the realization of among other things, personal, group or national aspirations. An inherent ingredient of security will also encompass areas such as education, health, democracy, human rights, the protection against environmental degradation and the proliferation of deadly weapons. Indeed there can hardly be security amidst starvation. So, peace building without poverty alleviation is merely a child's play and no true freedom is built on the foundation of injustice (Ibeanu, 2005).

### **Theoretical Framework**

#### **Structural Functionalism**

Structural Functionalism is a sociological theory that attempts to explain why society functions the way it does by focusing on relationships between various social institutions that make up society [Government, Judiciary, Religion] (Odunga, 2013). Social systems are collective means to fulfill social needs in order for social life to survive and develop in society. Society is made up of groups or institutions which are cohesive, share common norms and have a definite culture (Durkheim, 1997). Sometimes referred to as functionalism, it is a broad perspective in sociology and anthropology which sets out to interpret

society as a structure with interrelated parts. Functionalism addresses society as a whole in terms of the function of its constituent elements; namely norms, customs, traditions and institutions. A common analogy, popularized by Herbert Spencer, presents these parts of society as "organs" that work toward the proper functioning of the "body" as a whole (Urry, 2000)

The theory has several proponents (Auguste Comte, Herbert Spencer, Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton, Gabriel Almond, Emile Durkheim, Bronislaw Malinowskk, Alfred Reginald Radcliffe Brown, etc) with divergent but interrelated view. But the proponent's view that shall be adopt in this paper is that of Talcot Parson (1951; 1967). According to him, the society is seen as having a plethora of functions that should and must be performed by certain structures and institutions. There must not just be institutions and structures in existence alone, but they must painstakingly perform the functions for which they were created. In order for the society to survive and maintain peaceful co-existence of the diverse groups making up the society, institutions of the society must not be docile, but must be active with high impact delivery in the discharge of its functions. For instance, in order to survive as a society, it need to educate its children, produce goods for survival and sustenance, govern its affairs conscientiously, and provide security for its members on one hand, while the citizens need to ensure that this happens on the other by holding the institutions responsible for the performance of this functions accountable. These functions are performed judiciously by structures and institutions such as schools,



industries, parliaments, courts, armed forces, civil society organizations and so on.

Notably, when these structures perform their roles as they should and in accordance with the laws setting them up, then there is order in the society and one can rightly say that there is good governance and active followership. Good governance breeds peace as it makes the citizens feel safe and secured in their own land. So, from this structural functionalist perspective, good governance is achieved when all the various structures and institutions perform the functions for which they were set up and the followership must also ensure these functions are performed.

#### **Nigeria's Governance Trajectory Since Independence**

Nigeria's governance style since independence is clearly a colonial bequeathal. Such governance style that is fraught with lies, social exclusion, institutional negligence, state brutality, repressive policies and a beaten and battered followership. In view of this, most political historians would agree with me that the British governance style of indirect rule exemplifies all the above.

Another such bequeathal is the structural imbalance of the country; wherein it was unevenly divided between the north and south. The north, being given such geographical landmass that is greater than the entire south put together, became advantaged in most issues in the country; thus making the latter disadvantaged. This fact alone, as we can see in Nigeria, has made the north of a predominant Hausa/Fulani to have such a posture of superiority over the other regions in the country. Some have even brazenly issued out threats of varying degrees, most

times unprovoked. In view of this, one can unequivocally say that this was the main reason for the annulment of June 12 election of 1993, by the Babangida's regime. The most unforgivable crime committed by the British colonialist was to amalgamate the two regions who are largely incompatible in a lot of ways; such as in the areas of culture, religion, exposure, general lifestyle, business acumen, and so on. This, they obviously did, was for a selfish reason, called *administrative convenience*. Again, a governance style that largely favours the pitting of one ethnic group against another, colonial brutality on locals who have dissenting voice with the aim of shutting them up in perpetuity, repressive policies of dominance and outright control of the people's resources, negligent administrative style of not caring about the welfare of the colonized; but obsessed with their resources and how they can cart them away to London.

Thus, at independence, there was a colonial bequeathal of this bad governance style on the new leadership of the country. The young officers of the Nigerian Army, three years after the country became a republic, got enraged at the level of corruption in the system, as well as the seeming helplessness of the governed in the matter. So, they struck. When they took the reins of power they unfortunately became more corrupt than the civilians whom they have ousted. In fact, they were much guilty of the crimes they have accused the civilians of. It was during this time that state brutality in postcolonial Nigeria, became rife. The followership was assaulted, beaten and battered. The state's coercive instruments were unleashed on the citizens, rights were abused, several deaths.

high profile ones and otherwise were recorded. It was under General Ibrahim Babangida's regime that the death of Dele Giwa came; a renowned journalist who was sent a letter bomb and subsequently died after opening same on 19<sup>th</sup> October, 1986. Under Abacha's regime, Ken Saro Wiwa and his other Ogoni brothers, met their death by hanging, after speaking against the oppressive regime of the military dictator; and as well as demanding the discontinuation of environmental degradation of the Niger Delta Region (Sagay, 2001; Imobighe, 2004). As the revered Nigerian political scientist Claude Ake (1992, p.16) argues, "the postcolonial state in Nigeria presented itself as an apparatus of violence, and while its base in social forces remained extremely narrow it relied unduly on coercion for compliance, rather than authority."

The colonial bequeathal of pitting one ethnic group against the other in order to achieve their selfish aim, called divide and rule strategy, was employed during the Nigerian-Biafra civil war (Suberu, 1998). In 1966, Isaac Adaka Boro and his men embarked on a twelve day revolution against the Nigerian government with a view to allow them control their resources at best; and at worst, proclaim a Niger Delta Republic. The Nigerian government overpowered, arrested and imprisoned Boro and his men. When General Yakubu Gowon saw other Ogonis fighting the Biafra's cause, he immediately enlisted the support of Boro and his men in exchange for their freedom and other economic benefits. Thus, as it was, Adaka Boro and his men succumbed and fought on the side of Nigeria, against the Biafrans. To

get this picture clearer, Boro, (1982), cited in Osah, (2006) puts it this way:

The General Yakubu Gowon regime in May 1967 had pardoned the Niger Delta Volunteer Force (NDVF) including its leader, Isaac Adaka Boro – after a Twelve Day Revolution in 1966. Almost all Boro's fighters were absorbed into the Nigerian Army as a way of reengaging them into service to the nation and to gain their confidence in a united Nigeria. Boro who was later decorated a major of the Nigerian Army at the age of 30 years fought against the Biafran soldiers during the Nigerian Civil War, though he consequently died in the process.

The above account is totally akin to what the British did in colonial Nigeria. The country is not better off after fighting against one another during the colonial era. In the same vein, the NDVF and the Niger Delta Region might have been better off had they remained on the side of Biafra. Consequently, getting the much need resource control would have been a lot easier for regional development and environmental preservation. But Nigeria won; Niger Deltans and Biafrans lost, and are still losing to this day.

Under Abacha's regime, Nigeria's bad governance style was echoing to the high heavens as the stench was unbearable to members of the international community. During his time, Nigeria was labelled a pariah State in 1995, for her gross abuse of human rights of the Nigerian citizens and other related administrative absurdities.

Economically, apart from the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) blunder of



1986, and apart from the clownish statement of General Yakubu Gowon in 1973, where he openly told the world that Nigeria lacked thinkers and do not have people with economic sagacity and prowess to manage the excess revenue that came into the country at the time. He said: "money is not Nigeria's problem, but how to spend it." What an economically defeatist statement. We must know that between 1960 and 1999 state actors in Nigeria siphoned over \$440 billion (Agbibo, 2013). This is six times the Marshal Plan the sum total needed to rebuild devastated Europe in the aftermath of the Second World War. Through high-level corruption, conspicuous consumption and unintelligent investments, successive governments squandered the oil windfall of the 1970s. In fact, since they borrowed billions against future oil revenues and misspent that money too, it is fair to say that the Nigerian government blew more than its entire oil windfall. By 1998, Nigerians were poorer than when the oil boom began in 1974, and the country was saddled with debts of about \$30 billion (ibid). The waste became manifestly ugly with the Brookings Report of February, 2018, declaring Nigeria as the poverty capital of the world, putting about 87million of the country's population below the poverty line.

The most egregious economic crime committed by the country was the abandoning of the Ajaokuta Iron and Steel Complex Project. This project, designed by Russia's Tyazh Prom Export (TPE), was to be the best Iron and Steel Industry in the world, if it were to be completed and commissioned for operation. It was at the time, one of the most eco-friendly industrial

complex in the world and the largest in Africa (Olurounbi, 2019). Thus, Nigeria could produce and manufacture whatever she wants without doing much damage to the environment. Consequently, Nigeria would have been the sole export of iron and steel products in the whole of Africa. But the British colonialist together with their American counterpart talked Nigeria into not getting through with the Ajaokuta project by not paying the last tranche of the money budgeted for the project which has already attained about 80% completion. The steel plant has never been turned on because the second blast furnace is still uncompleted. Both blast furnaces need to be ready before it could be turned on. And when it is turned on, it can never be turned off for the next ten years. Thus, it must constantly be fed with requisite materials incessantly, for 24 hours rapid production of all manner of steel products that would have revolutionize the iron and steel industry on the continent. All these are clearly a fall out of bad governance that has plagued the Nigerian State for decades.

#### **From 1999**

When the nation returned to democratic civil rule in 1999, the citizens had high hopes and aspiration. It was largely perceived as the dawn of a new era wherein it is expected that the leaders would have learnt their lessons from past mistakes; considering the fact that the newly elected leader, former president Olusegun Obasanjo has ruled this country in the past, ought to know better. He was expected to lead, salvage and take the country to that amazing place of promise of self-sufficiency, active resource control, a free and virile press, rule of law, and so on. But

the new leader started off by being an "absentee executive", touring round the West for 354 days in his first 3 years in office (Agbiboa, 2010). He claimed he was trying to win or mend relationship between the West and Nigeria. But to use almost a calendar year to do that is awfully outrageous.

It was in Obasanjo's regime that over \$2 billion was budgeted in reconstructing roads and \$16 billion (over one trillion naira) on the power sector (Agbiboa, 2012). But none of these resources can be seen in use as the country became even darker than lighted. Obasanjo failed to revive the country's decrepit infrastructure and epileptic power supply, and the country's oil refineries were producing less when he left office in 2007 than when he was first elected in 1999 (Agbiboa, 2013). The Obasanjo regime also announced that it had lost \$4 billion in potential oil revenues in 2006 to insecurity and the damage of pipelines by ethnic militias in the oil-rich Niger Delta.

Despite his flawed regime, Obasanjo's rule was not without some administrative sagacity and ingenuity. Early in his term in office, he correctly identified Nigeria's debt issue as an obstacle to sustainable development. Along with his reliable finance minister (between 2003 and 2006), he was able to broker a deal that effectively wiped out Nigeria's entire \$30 billion external debt by paying \$12.4 billion and having \$17.6 billion annulled. This was the largest of such financial deal in sub-Saharan Africa (Agbiboa, 2012).

Again, state brutalities on well-meaning and outspoken Nigerians who have constructive views about government policies were suddenly assassinated. This was rechristened politically motivated killings. Chief Bola Ige,

a one-time former governor, former minister of power and steel and former attorney general of the federation, was shot dead in Ibadan in 2001. One of the prime suspects, Iyiola Omisore, who was detained in prison in connection with his murder, was made a senator. Others on this list are Funsho Williams, Marshall Harry, A.S Dikkibo, Igwe Barnabas and his wife Abigail, Ogbonnaya Uche of Imo, Pa Alfred Rewane, Kudirat Abiola, Ayo Daramola of Ekiti, the people of Odi in Bayelsa State, Zaki Ibiam, just to mention a few.

Under Goodluck Jonathan administration, the conduit pipe that would plunge the nation into recession in December, 2015 was properly laid through his bad governance style. During his time, he allowed the leader of the Nigeria's Governors' Forum (NGF) to pressure him into dispensing with the savings in the Excess Crude Account (ECA). According to the former president who spoke to Bloomberg TV in London, he said that his administration was pressured to squandering up to \$18 billion of the ECA savings (Premium Times, 2016). It is very instructive to point out here that the ECA was established in 2004 by the Obasanjo administration for the purpose of insulating the Nigerian economy from external shocks. This perfectly worked well because the 2008 global economic meltdown did not melt Nigeria's economy down, as it had little or no effect on it. It is such crucial savings that is meant to secure our economy against rainy days- such as recession. Other endogenous factors include high level of importation, subsidizing consumption instead of production, multiple exchange rates coupled with monetary policy summersault from the



CBN, high inflation rate, as well as administrative cluelessness and laziness on the part of state governors to generate revenues internally, for the augmentation of federal government allocation given to them in the running of their respective states.

Under the current administration of President Muhammadu Buhari, the nation has even witnessed bad governance in all ramifications. Inflation rates and consumer price index is alarming, with Nigerian becoming more miserable and poorer under Buhari's administration (International Centre for Investigative Reporting, 2021). 63% of Nigerians exhaust their income on food alone, as the National Bureau of Statistics puts the inflation figure at 17% in September, 2021 (Punch Newspaper, 2020, The Guardian, 2021). The striking legacy this administration will be remembered for will be astronomical inflation.

#### **Governance And The People's Quest For Probity**

From the foregoing on good governance and purposive followership, one can comfortably infer that for there to be a clamour for good governance in different parts of the country, it is because bad governance (and not just governance) has been endemic and rife. And by way of addition, for there to be a clamour for a true fiscal federalism in Nigeria, it is also because there have been a blatant regime of fiscal centralism in operation or a false or spurious federalism, with a docile followership. In view of this, one can unequivocally say that good governance (not just governance) and purposive followership is truly a desired desideratum for the entrenchment of peace and security in Nigeria.

Also, the theoretical framework adopted in this paper is a pointer to why good governance and purposive followership should not be a thing to trifle with by States and citizens who genuinely seek peace, security and cohesion in her body polity. Thus, when the terms good governance is mooted by scholars in any intellectual conference or discourse, what pops up in the mind is an unrelenting, purposive and constructive followership/participation; without prejudice to other tenets of good governance. This is because, it is what the followers allow, that the leaders would do and ride on. If the followers are opposed to a certain government policy, ways and means of governance constructively, then the leaders are faced with little or no choice than to concur and accede to the needs and demands of the followers. Good governance is never and would never be an exclusive preserve of leadership, but an inclusive mutuality of both followership and leadership. One would say that a good working followership produces a good working leadership which inadvertently makes good governance a sure bet; and more importantly, a secured and a peaceful environment for all.

This study volubly emphasised the role of an irrepressible, purposive and constructive followership with its attendant unflinching participation because of its potent nature of demanding accountability and transparency amongst leaders and public officials. It is pertinent to note that this does not include sycophancy nor praise singers who are only after what they can get from politicians. These are not the kind of followers prescribed

in this study. This is because it is the only good governance ingredient that could make those eight lofty characteristics, an immediate reality. For instance, characteristics like equity and inclusiveness, transparency, responsiveness, effectiveness and efficiency, accountability, participation, etc., would totally lose both its meaning and the intrinsic values they hold without an unwavering, indefatigable and unrelenting followership. A dogged and irrepressible followership is what a State like Nigeria genuinely needs, to build good governance structures and institutions that would see to the welfare of the citizens.

In Nigeria, the followership is virtually non-existent. It has being beaten, battered and boxed into obscurity. Fear, has for the most part, beclouded our sense of reason, justice and even purpose of living. Nigeria is a State with one of the finest of laws in the world, but lacks a virile followership to make good of these laws. Recently, followers from different ethnic extractions in the country have been clamouring for secession in one breath and in another restructuring of the polity. Whilst these clamours of different shades and variations regarding how the Nigerian project should run are genuine, well founded and laudable; it is again pertinent to say for the umpteenth time that what is truly needed is a vociferous clamour for good governance with full citizen participation. The reason for this, is not distant at all. This is so because the current crop of Nigeria's political elite irrespective of their political and ethnic leanings and cleavages are largely prebendal at heart and nepotistic in character. They favour impunity with a blend of immunity, and have been infected with what

one may call a "grab-grab" disease; not caring for the constituency they represent, nor delivering the dividends of democracy as promised during electioneering campaigns. What is of interest to them is the wellbeing of their cronies and families. The only time they appear to be engaged with the followers, especially those from the same ethnicity, is when the state's largesse is no more flowing their way, and so they need to get it back by deceitfully consulting and consorting with the followers, who would blindly take to the street in protests and demonstrations, crying of marginalization and deprivation. Some vandalize and destroy public facility in the name of agitation and championing a genuine cause. Acts of these followers, like the negative diehards, (Kellerman, 2008) are largely misplaced, and often leads to an erosion of peace in the society. This is clearly the only time the followers are genuinely needed for the purpose of putting back control of resources in the hands of hapless politicians.

To this end, if the followers must clamour for secession or restructuring, one wonders if they would import leaders from other countries or planet to run the affairs of their new-found State, or the newly restructured entity, if they became successful. These same leaders would continue to plunder, loot the commonwealth of the people and also continue to abuse their rights, leaving them hungry and poor, to the extent of being destitute in their own land and country. The blind support given by ethnicists in Nigeria derails the essence of good governance and followership. This has been the case because, over the years, when an individual from a certain ethnic group calls out a politician



from another ethnic group for a particular wrongdoing or corrupt act, followers from the same ethnic group as that corrupt politician been called out, swiftly come out in defense of that politician. Most times, when one listens to what they say in defense of their so-called kinsman or woman, one would wish to be deaf and dumb. If you are not deaf at the time, you hear statements like: "he/she is being accused of corrupt acts and practices because he/she is from our ethnic group and not from theirs." At this time, only the deaf and the dumb would be spared from these nauseating statements. So, we would urge followers from certain ethnic group to call out their kinsmen who are perceived to have pilfered or helped themselves with the common wealth of the country. When this happens, followers from other ethnic group can lend their support to the call for probe and subsequent prosecution. As events go on this way, it reduces the followership to the subtle pitting of one ethnic group against the other, by prebendalistic and nepotistic politicians. And again, it will also eliminate the divisive "we vs them" situation, being contrived by politicians, causing followers to spill blood, maim and kill themselves, while their families and cronies luxuriate in foreign lands.

### Conclusion

It is clear from the foregoing that both concepts of good governance and purposive followership are the key to salvaging the Nigerian state from its current woes of progressive backwardness that have been the main ingredient of insecurity and erosion of peace in the country. The followership in Nigeria has been strongly called upon to step

up and guarantee their own security and that of their environment.

### Recommendation

To achieve the much-needed good governance, peace and security in Nigeria, the followership must consider being one or more of Babara Kellerman's followership models. Kellerman's followership models and styles are isolates, bystanders, participants, activists and diehards (Kellerman, 2008). Of these followership models, Nigerian followers must endeavor to be both the activist and participant followers. These two followership styles or models are the most engaging. They tend to purposively and constructively support or criticize government's actions and inactions as they affect the citizens; not the isolates nor the bystanders who would often prefer being spectators in the scheme of things. But would later cry, wail and lamenting how they have been marginalized, isolated and excluded. These same categories of followers, including the negative diehards are the ones easily manipulated by politicians to breach the collective peace and security enjoyed in the State. The activists and participants are the ones to ensure that the dividends of any good governance regime is guaranteed and secured; either in the country Nigeria, as presently constituted, or as any separatist state or republic, as have been clamoured for by the different ethnic groups in the country.

### References

- Adeosun, A. B. (2010). *Federalism and national integration: the Nigerian*

- experience. *Journal of Science, Management and Technology*, 1 (1).
- Agbibo, D. E. (2010). Exploring the nexus between corruption and underdevelopment: Which way Nigeria? *Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies*, 34(5), 474-509.
- Agbibo, D. E. (2012). Between corruption and development: The political economy of state robbery in Nigeria. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 108, 325-354.
- Agbibo, D. E. (2013). Corruption and economic crime in Nigeria: Social and economic perspectives. *African Security Review*, 22(1): 47-66.
- Agbibo, D. E. (2013). As it was in the beginning: The vicious cycle of corruption in Nigeria. *Studies in Sociological of Science Vol. 4(3)* pp. 10-21
- Ahmed, B. A. (2012). Nigeria @ 50: the role of good governance and effective public administration towards achieving economic growth and stability in fledgling democracy. *International Journal of Politics and Good Governance*, Vol. 3. (3.3) Quarter III.
- Anikpo, M. (1986). *Foundations of social science research: A methodological guide for students*. Enugu: Abic Publishers.
- Ayodele, B. (2008). The rule of law and constitutional democracy in Nigeria. In Saliu, H. A., Taiwo, I. O., Seniyi, R. A., Salawu, B. & Usman (eds) *Nigeria beyond 2007: issues, perspective and challenges*. (pp.24-35), Ilorin: Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, University of Ilorin.
- Best, J. (1970). *Research in Education*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Boro, I. A. (1982). *The twelve days resolution*. Benin City, Idode Umeh Publishers
- Durkheim, E. (1997). *Division of labor in society*. New York Free Press.
- Ekpu, R (2009, December 21). *Ten years of faltering steps*. Newswatch.
- Fayeye, J. O. (2011). Role of the security sector in promoting democratic governance in Nigeria. In Akanji, T. A, Danjibo N. D, Eselebor, W.A (eds) *Challenges of Democratic Governance in Nigeria*. Ibadan: John Arches Ltd.
- Galtung, J. (1991). Violence and Peace. In Smoker, P., Davis, R., and Munske, B (eds), *A Reader in Peace Studies*. Oxford: Pergamin Press.
- Galtung, J. (1990). Cultural Violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 27 No. 3.
- George, G., & Member, E. (2013). Good governance: antidote for peace and security in Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, vol. 2, no 2, pp 56-65, 2013.
- Ibeanu, O. (2005). Conceptualizing Peace. In Gaya Best, S. (ed) *Introduction to Peace and Conflict Studies in West Africa*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books.
- Ifeoma, D. (2013). Good governance in Nigeria: What role for the media. *European Scientific Journal* November edition vol.9, No.32.
- Imobighe, T. A. (2004). Conflict in Niger Delta: A Unique case or a Model for



Future conflicts in other oil producing Countries; In Rudolf Traub- Mern and Douglas Yates (eds) *oil policy in the gulf of Guinea: Security and Conflict, Economic growth, social development*. Bonn: Friedrich Elbert Stiftung.

International Centre for Investigative Reporting (2021). *Why Nigerians are getting poorer under Buhari-Peter Obi*. Retrieved from <https://www.icirnigeria.org/why-nigerians-are-getting-poorer-under-buhari-peter-obi>

Jobartech, M. (2002). Role of media in promoting good governance and accountability. Paper presented the World Press Freedom Day Symposium on 3 May 2012 TANGO Conference Hall.

Kellerman, B. (2008). *Followership: How Followers are Creating Change and Changing Leaders*. Harvard: Business School Press.

Mijah, B. E. (2006). National security and the consolidation of democracy in Nigeria: Issues and Challenges. *Academy journal of defence studies*, vol. 3, No 2.

Natufe, I. (2006). Good governance and politics in Nigeria. A lecture delivered at the staff and graduate seminar, department of political science and public administration, university of Benin on November 21.

Ndagi, J. O. (1984). *Essentials of Research Methodology for Nigeria Education*. Ibadan: University Press Ltd.

Ndiyo, N. A. (2005). *Fundamentals of research in behavioural sciences and humanities*. Calabar: Wusen Publishers.

Ninalowo, M. O. A (2005). Antimonies of corruption and democratic governance. In L. Olurode & S.O. Akinboye (eds), *democracy, good governance and corruption in Nigeria*. Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES) pp. 28-21.

Nwagboso, C. (2012). Security Challenges and Economy of the Nigerian State (2007-2011). *American International Journal on Contemporary Research*

Odunga, J. (2013). *Structural Functionalism*. Retrieved from [https://www.shcollege.ac.in/wpcontent/uploads/NAAC\\_Documents\\_IV\\_Cycle/Criterion-IV/2.3.2/PGSEM1THEORY1structuralfunctionalism.pdf](https://www.shcollege.ac.in/wpcontent/uploads/NAAC_Documents_IV_Cycle/Criterion-IV/2.3.2/PGSEM1THEORY1structuralfunctionalism.pdf) on 29<sup>th</sup> January, 2022.

Osah, G. (2016). Politics of amnesty and conflict management in Nigeria's Niger Delta. *Journal of Research and Development Vol 3, No. 1*, 2016.

Oharounbi, R. (2019, October 30). Back to the future as Nigeria turns to Russia on Ajaokuta steel project. *The Africa Report*. Retrieved from <https://www.theafricareport.com/19380/back-to-the-future-as-nigeria-turns-to-russia-on-ajaokuta-steel-project/>

Parsons, T. (1951). *The Social System*. New York: Free Press

- Parsons, T. (1967). *Sociological Theory and Modern Society*. New York: Free Press
- Premium Times (2016, July 7). How we were pressured to squander \$18bn excess crude saving —Jonathan. *Premiumtimes*. Retrieved from <https://www.premiumtimesng.com/news/headlines/204809-pressured-squander-18bn-excess-crude-saving-jonathan.html>
- Punch Newspaper (2020). Nigerians exhaust income on food –Report. Retrieved from <https://punchng.com/inflation-worsens-under-buhari-63-nigerians-exhaust-income-on-food-report/>
- Sagay, I. (2001). Nigerian federalism, the constitution and resources Control (2). *The Guardian*, May 24.
- Suberu, R. T. (1998). States' Creation and the Political Economy of Nigerian Federalism. In: K. Amuwo et al (eds.). *Federalism and Political Restructuring in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd., 281-291.
- The Guardian (2021). Nigeria's inflation slows to 17.38%. Retrieved from <https://guardian.ng/news/nigerias-inflation-rate-slows-to-17-38/>
- Tinubu, B. A. (2008). Good governance, democracy and sustainable development. speech delivered at the centre for peace and conflict studies, university of Ibadan, 15 December.
- UNDP (2007). *Fighting Climate Change: Human Solidarity in a Divided World*. Human Development Report 2007/2008, Published for the United Nations Development Programme, New York, USA.
- World Bank (1989). *Sub-Saharan Africa: From crisis to sustainable growth*. Washington: World Bank.