Collaborative Governance in the Management of Political Violence in Bauchi State, Nigeria

Kabiru Bello Ilelah[1,2], Adlina Ab Halim[1], Mohd Mahadee Ismail[1] & Mohd Sabri Mohd Nor[1]

[1]Department of Government and Civilizational Studies, Faculty of Human Ecology, University Putra Malaysia, 43400, Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia, [2]Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, Bauchi State University, Gadau, Nigeria.
Corresponding Author's Email: adlina@upm.edu.my

Abstract
Collaborative governance is crucial in determining the success of the management of political violence in a nation. Collaboration in managing political violence explains the relationship among different actors toward achieving the desired goal. Recently, collaborative governance remains one of the challenges for the Bauchi state government. The problem is the inability of the state government to involve relevant stakeholders in the management processes of political violence. These hinder the effectiveness of state government in protecting lives and properties. Therefore, the study aims to explore government collaborative efforts in managing political violence and the theory of collaborative governance was adopted. The study employed a qualitative approach through the case study method. Meanwhile purposive and snowballing sampling techniques are used to identify 17 informants. Data were collected in a face-to-face interview via zoom online meeting. The interview data were analyzed using QSR Nvivo 12.0 based on thematic analysis. The result shows the exclusion of relevant stakeholders in the management process. The results further show that the lack of synergy among the security agencies is also a factor affecting the management. Based on the results, the study recommends the establishment of a collaborative mechanism that will allow the involvement of relevant stakeholders in the management process. Therefore, the study highlighted the key factors hindering collaboration in managing political violence.
Keywords: Collaboration, Governance, Political Violence, Management, The State Government

Introduction
Collaborative governance is crucial in determining the success of the management of political violence in a nation. Collaboration in managing political violence explains the relationship among different actors toward achieving the desired goal. The notion of collaborative governance is the institutionalization of a group decision-making process (Ansell and Gash, 2007), that collaborative governance comprises the government, community and private sectors cooperating and working together to accomplish more than one sector could achieve alone. Collaborative governance offers a holding system to involve the entire sector of the

community in decision-making to accomplish a common objective. This sector consists of individuals who are devoted to the community from the corporate and philanthropic sectors as well as from the community (citizen leaders, cultural leaders, and people with lived experience). This multi-sector, collaborative approach to decision-making and implementation brings together a variety of people to provide pertinent answers and long-lasting effects for their community (Chaplyn and Fraser, 2020). Therefore, collaborative governance encourages partnership between the government and the private in providing security policies such as political violence management. Although, the management of political violence in Nigeria is hindered by a lack of proper collaboration between the government and security agencies (Alao et al., 2018).

However, the history of political violence in Nigeria is dated back to the colonial era, when the colonial masters allow the locals to contest for a certain position in the colonial assembly in the 1950s (Alanamu, 2005), which led the politicians to recruit thugs as bodyguards and these thugs normally protect the interest of their masters (Esiri, 2016), and the problem continues and increases on daily bases (Kazemi, 2022). Political violence is a social threat that hinders people's peaceful co-existence and the state's effective governance. Therefore, Political violence is characterized by a diverse range of behavior aimed at causing physical, psychological, and symbolic harm to people and/or property to persuade different audiences to support or oppose political, social, and/or cultural change. Acts like property attacks, physical assaults, the detonation of explosive devices, shooting attacks, hostage taking, the seizure of aircraft or ships, high-profile assassinations, and public self-immolation are examples of actions that fall under this category and are used by actors from all political perspectives (Bosi, 2015). In the Nigerian context, political violence occurred in different forms such as electoral violence, terrorism, insurgency, riots, ethnic and religious violence, and communal crisis (Alao, 2021; Ibeogu & Nkwede, 2015). Past literature has shown that poverty, hunger, unemployment, political intolerance, and election rigging are the causes of political violence in Nigeria (Igwe & Amadi, 2021; Ikyase & Egberi, 2015). It is reported that the current insecurity in the country has increased due to improper management related to cooperation, for instance, according to ACLED, there were 22% more instances of organized political violence in Nigeria in 2021, which is a nearly 30% rise from 2020 and over 9,900 fatalities were recorded as a result of the violence, (Kazemi, 2022).

One of the forms of political violence that were affecting the peaceful co-existence of the people and the destruction of property worth millions in Bauchi is the issue of communal violence (Suleiman, 2019). Bauchi is a multi-ethnic and religious society with about 50 different ethnic groups. Due to the differences in political, economic, social, and cultural beliefs among these different ethnic groups, the issue of misunderstanding arose leading to communal violence, especially, in the Tafawa Balewa local government of Bauchi state. Generally speaking, communal identity and violence are related. According to Wilkinson (2006), there are two primary causes of communal violence. Economic, social, and political actors who participate in violence are the primary cause, while communal riots are systematically linked to the second cause. Essentially, communal violence is the terrible and inhumane embodiment of and the natural extension of the time growth of communalism as an ideology, regardless of its various manifestations based on severe communalism and

emotions of fear and hatred. In other words, communal violence is merely the exterior manifestation of the maladies of communal ideology and politics. Therefore, communal ideology is related to communal violence. Although communal ideology may succeed even in the absence of violence, communal violence is impossible without communal ideology. Thus, communalism is first and foremost a communal ideology. Because what is economically, politically, socially, or culturally in the interests of one ethnic group may not be in the interests of another, two "communities" cannot share the same economic, social, or political interests, and as a result, their secular interests must be in opposition to one another. Due to this, communalism has advanced to the point of extreme communalism (Najar, 2014).

Therefore, the problem of communalism has been affecting the state government in providing security to the people in the state. The problem is manifested in the non-inclusion of relevant stakeholders and the ability of the state government to control the federal security agencies in managing security threats such as political violence in the state (Kolade, 2021; Aghedo, 2020). The non-inclusion and lack of authority to control the security agencies have undermined the effective performance of the state government in managing political violence at the state level leading to the persistence of political violence and other social crimes (Falola, 2021; Obadare, 2022; Kazemi, 2022). Despite the government's efforts in maintaining security in the state and the expectation from the people for the government to deliver, the problem of political violence continues and the majority of the people keep on questioning the government's ability in securing lives and properties (Ajodo-Adebanjoko, 2017). Therefore, a lack of collaborative governance can affect the government's efforts in managing political violence. From the foregoing, therefore, this current research intends to explore collaborative governance in managing political violence, as well as providing alternatives for best collaborative practices.

Collaborative Governance Theory
The collaborative theory was used as a framework to explore government collaborative efforts in managing political violence at the state level. For over a decade there was an ongoing debate among scholars about collaborative governance in practice and theory. Since governance is used as a model in governing and managing the affairs of the people in a country or organization procedures. Then collaborative governance is important in uniting different sectors to achieve the desired goal. Collaborative governance is considered a framework or model for assessing institutional collaboration in managing public affairs such as political violence management. As a result of its importance in management or governing, Ansell & Gash (2007) define it as a:

> "Governing arrangements where one or more public agencies directly engage no-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage public programs or assets."

The above definition explains six central principles: (1) the platform is organized by public bodies or authorities, (2) non-state actors participate, (3) group members actively participate in decision-making instead of merely being "consulted" by public institutions, and (4) the

forum is formally organized and meets in a group setting, (5) the forum seeks to reach consensus (even if consensus is not reached in practice), and (6) the attention of collaboration is a public policy or public management (Ansell & Gash, 2007). This means that for effective management of political violence the government needs to establish a forum to address, govern and manage security threats such as political violence, and the forum should allow other sectors of the community to be fully involved in the decision-making and implementation of processes in the state. The government should also make the procedures and participation more transparent for a positive outcome.

Moreover, in decentralized arrangements, individuals closest to the issue should make decisions. The systems and procedures to be adaptable and transparent will promote confidence and ensure a response. Collaboration in this aspect means that non-state stakeholders will have a real obligation to the outcomes of policies. Consequently, there is a need for stakeholders to actively participate in decision-making (Ansell & Gash, 2007). Political violence is regarded as a security threat that affects the peaceful co-existence among the people in the community, therefore, its management requires the active participation of relevant sectors of such community in decision-making.

Regarding differences in the process of collaboration in governance, Ansell & Gash (2007) further argued that for the sake of cooperation and integration, trust between collaborators is explicitly stated, actively named, and developed across the system. That is to accomplish the goal, formal and informal (social and cultural) power should be combined. Diversity has many facets, including race, gender, beliefs, and political allegiances, and is necessary to comprehend and accomplish the shared goal although Bauchi state is a multi-ethnic and multi-religious society. Therefore, the target of collaboration in the management of political violence should be based on merit rather than bias. However, collaborative governance plays a crucial role in uniting, coordinating effective teamwork, collaborating in management, and fostering service delivery.

From the foregoing assumptions, therefore, collaborative governance is a process of understanding the partnership between public and private in managing the affairs of the citizens. Many theorists articulate that the effectiveness of managing political violence requires the involvement of the private sector in the decision-making process. In this regard, the collaborative theory was adopted and used in the research due to its relevance in administration and management, since administration and management require teamwork and active participation of different units to achieve the institutional or community desired goal. Thus, the theory has helped in digging out the factors affecting the state government's collaborative efforts in managing political violence in Nigeria.

Methodology
Methodologically, the study used a qualitative approach through the case study method. The approach was selected because it permitted a thorough investigation of the data collection procedures. Three standards of a case study were followed in the study. First, the management of political violence represents the case. Second, the boundary is Bauchi, and third, the time frame is 2019–2022. One of the six states that make up Nigeria's North East

political region is Bauchi. Key informants were identified using a criterion-based on purposive sampling technique, and the study's sample size was increased through snowballing technique. Consequently, 17 informants in total were interviewed in the study. Knowledge, position, experience, and willingness to participate (Creswell, 2014), are the criteria used by the researcher in selecting the informants. The informants who participated are presented in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1

Informants' categories and codes

S/N	Categories	No. of informants	Informants' identification codes
1.	Senior government officials	2	GO 1 & 2
2.	Senior police officer	1	GSP 1
3.	A senior civil defense officer	1	GSP 2
4.	Community leaders	2	CL 1 & 2
5.	Community Grassroot	3	GRT 1, 2 & 3
6.	Victims	2	VCTM 1 & 2
7.	Members of NGOs	2	NGO 1 & 2
8.	Peace Ambassador	1	PAMD 1
9.	Politician	1	POL 1
10.	Academicians	2	AC 1 & 2

Table 1.1 above shows the informants' categories, number of the informants of each category who participated, and their identification codes in the research. An in-depth interview was used to obtain the data. Due to Covid-19 restrictions, the researcher and informants did the interview one-on-one through a zoom online meeting. Before the interview began, the institution where the student is pursuing his postgraduate degree provided ethics permission. A letter containing basic information about the research was given to the researcher by the chairperson of the supervisory committee and was shown to each of the informants. The researcher then used WhatsApp and SMS to send invitation letters to the selected informants, while regular phone calls were used to contact some of them. A thank-you message was issued to those who declined the invitation for taking the time to respond. In contrast, individuals who accepted the invitation were reached out to arrange an interview time and date. Typically, the interview sessions lasted 35 to 90 minutes. Both English and Hausa were used to conduct the interview. All 17 interviews were transcribed and the Hausa language was translated into English. The translation was then approved by the professional editor.

The interview data were analyzed using QSR Nvivo 12.0 based on thematic analysis. Braun & Clarke's (2006) six phases of thematic analysis were used to analyze the data obtained from the interview. The researcher employed the triangulation approach, and back-to-back informant transcripts method, and both second (supervisory committee) and third party (professionals) were contacted to cross-check the data to assess the validity, reliability, and trustworthiness of the information. Finally, the research respects all ethical considerations, including the confidentiality of informants, their voluntary participation in the research, and their right to withdraw at any time, as well as their signing of consent forms.

Research Findings and Discussions

The research findings and discussions are presented in this section. The information is analyzed, interpreted, discussed, and presented based on the four themes that emerged from the informant's interview transcripts. These four themes are namely; 1) Inclusion in security matters. 2) Relationship between security agencies in managing political violence. 3) security information sharing and security performance expectations.

Inclusion in Security Matters

Governance is inclusive when institutions, rules, procedures, and services are available to all members of society and are accessible, responsible, and responsive to their needs. It also takes gender and other aspects of human identity into consideration. Promoting democratic ideals, such as peaceful pluralism, tolerance for variety, human rights, and equality before the law, requires encouraging inclusive government. A country's ability to handle complicated issues like inequality leading to violence is influenced by inclusive governance. To guarantee that the government's reactions to these issues, at all levels, leave no one behind, more inclusive governance is encouraged (Government of Canada, 2019). Inclusion refers to the process of the state government involving other entities and or, groups in security management in the state. In human society, different groups in terms of language, tradition, ethnicity, and assigned functions combine to interact and live with one another. This society categorization can also be in terms of the social, political, and economic processes of the state. As such the state functions like a system as posited by David Easton; one part cannot operate without the other. To have effective management of political violence in the state, therefore, all the elements of the state need to be considered in the processes of management. Therefore, inclusion in governance encourages collaboration and involvement in the decision-making process, especially in service delivery to the public.

As earlier stated in the introduction part, one of the violence affecting the Bauchi is communal violence this is due to its multi-ethnic and religious diversity which has differences in politics, economics, and culture. The informants said that one of the factors affecting the management of political violence is the non-inclusion of relevant parties or groups in the decision-making process. For example, one of the informants in his remarks stated that the management of political violence can only be effective if the government includes the grass root traditional rulers in the process. According to him:

> *"Umm… this political violence like the communal crisis happening in the state occurs at the grassroots. There is the need for the government to directly involve people from the grassroots in the process of decision-making related to the management of political violence…we are not involved… so those that are close to the problem are left out of the matter"*

(Informant CL 2)

Similarly, another informant was of the view that the low-level traditional leaders at the community level are closer to the people but the government has chosen to work with the higher traditional leaders in decision-making. The informant said:

> *"…government values high ranking positions than the community traditional leaders in respect to the management of political violence. Though, the community leaders are under the Emirs, allowing them to be involved can make a significant contribution because they know they know their communities… in my opinion, the traditional institutions can be used as tools to manage the violence in the respective communities but they are not regarded as important in this aspect… I blame the government here."*

<div align="right">(Informant GRT 1)</div>

The other community leader confirmed that traditional leaders at the community level are not always involved in the management of political violence. He said: "…to be honest we are not involved in security meetings with government officials…in some cases, the Emirs do call and inform us about the meetings held with the government…So, we are not directly involved in the meetings." (Informant CL 2).

The people who witnessed the violence and suffered from it are most likely righteous individuals to be consulted and used in managing political violence. This is the remark of a victim when asked about the efforts of the government in managing political violence:

> *"Actually, to me …This is because the fight against political violence is not yet as expected. The issue always comes up in different forms. The very first people that can be consulted for managing political violence I think are the victims…laughs…the victims should be in the decision process because they suffer from the threat. I believe they have something to contribute, but the government is not valuing the inputs of the victims."*   (Informant VCTM 1)

The peace ambassador also posited that the state government is yet to come up with a good strategy for managing political violence because it has failed to involve the right people in the decision-making process.

> *"…the meeting is yet to come up with a vital strategy that can be used for managing political violence in the communities…My reason is that the government is not engaging as well as involving the youths in the decision-making process… You know so well that 95% if not 100% of those involved in political violence are the youth. For instance, when we conducted a simple survey after the communal crisis in Tafawa Balewa, we found that all the perpetrators are aged between 17-30 years old and are jobless."*

<div align="right">(Informant PAMD)</div>

The NGO informant also added that the government is neglecting the role of local NGOs in managing political violence. To him, the reason for the neglect is the lack of enough resources by the local NGOs to offer the government. The informant had the following to say:

> *"I can only tell you from the angle of NGOs… the government only involves NGOs that they know can bring them a lot of donations. They only look for international NGOs because they know such organizations have a lot to offer and they don't ask*

where they get their funds from. The local NGOs like mine are not part of the game, so we the local NGOs are excluded because we don't have enough resources to offer but we know the people because we sleep and live with them."

(Informant NGO 1)

Still, on the issue of non-inclusion, an academician further reaffirmed that one of the major constraints of governance in managing political violence relates to collaboration and the non-inclusion of some groups and associations. He stated that:

"One of the challenges of managing political violence in the state in my opinion is the issue of inclusion. You see, the government is neglecting important groups within the communities that can help to manage the violent threats in the communities. Come to think of the traditional rulers, think of the youths and women's associations, think of the vulnerable groups, and so on…do you know that the constitution has not even recognized the functions of traditional rulers in security matters? These are people who organized and united society even before the coming of formal administration. Even the local government council chairmen are not part of the state security meetings. So, a lot of people and groups are excluded in the process…"

(Informant AC 1)

On the contrary, a government official talked of inclusion and representation in managing political violence in Bauchi state. The informant stated that government ensures participation in the decision-making processes on security issues generally but restricts such participation to selected individuals and entities. The informant went further to say that when the need arises, other people or groups are invited for questioning by the government. He remarked that:

"…we also invite heads of security agencies, the army is represented by the brigade commander, the police by the police commissioner, the civil defense corps are also members in such meetings represented by their state commander and the honorable Anthony General is a member. When the needs arise, we also invite the chief judge while the royal highness the emir of Bauchi state who acts as the chairman of the emir's council represents all emirs in such meetings…membership of these meetings is strictly based on or rather limited to state security agencies... You know security issues are not thrown out for everybody."

(Informant GO 1)

Under this sub-theme, the findings revealed that certain important groups are not involved in the management of political violence in the state. This non-involvement of others in security matters here is the exclusion of important groups or individuals who can contribute immensely to managing political violence. The informants openly posited that certain important groups are not included in the process of managing political violence in the state. The informants believe that these individuals and or groups have vital roles to play in the management of political violence in the state. In their view, the categories of the people that

are left out include the grass root traditional rulers, the local government council chairmen, youths, local NGOs, and other women's associations. This runs contrary to the governance theory which vividly emphasizes the importance of collaboration between public institutions and private sector entities in providing solutions to matters arising. Therefore, inclusion in management is crucial. In a situation where the government is not inclusive, particularly in a country with diversity in ethnicity and language, then the management of violence related to communal violence will not be effective.

The findings in this study are consistent with the findings of some former studies in Nigeria which showed how exclusion affects the management of security situations in the country. For instance. Aghedo (2020) revealed that violence has caused terrible loss of lives and forced migration which has affected the Nigerian security process. He explained that Nigeria's insecurity prevails because of the exclusion of some stakeholders such as youths, women, and academics in discussing and suggesting solutions to insecurity. The author concludes that these stakeholders have been completely marginalized in security governance by the government and their inclusion is important in addressing security issues. Thompson & Aduradola (2016) further opines that since the beginning of terrorism in northeast Nigeria, millions of people especially the vulnerable population; mostly women and children have lost their lives. The lack of social inclusion and integration in Nigeria is a major issue to the security problem. They have explained that for peace and stability to be restored, the government needs to embrace the suggestions of different groups in the country. From the foregoing, the non-inclusion of the relevant ethnic group especially the minorities in managing political violence can be a factor in the unsuccessful management of political violence in the state and the country as a whole.

Relationship between security agencies in managing political violence
In the realm of security studies and the practice of security operations, interagency collaboration (relationship) is a common notion. Although resolving security issues is a common duty, the government has the authority to do it through different security agencies. The government of Nigeria has many security agencies that are responsible for maintaining peace and order and handling security-related concerns. Interagency rivalry, which hinders the government's efforts to have unity of command and purpose in responding to numerous threats to national security, has been one of the most persistent issues in dealing with Nigeria's security concerns. The concept of interagency collaboration is being advanced to assist Nigeria's Federal and subnational governments in precisely bringing together the various security agencies to accomplish a successful combined security operation. This strategy and effort will surely be successful in protecting and advancing the interests of the country (Mohammed et al., 2019).

Therefore, the relationship between security agencies refers to the interactions that exist between different security agencies in the process of accomplishing the task of political violence management. As noted in the previous sub-theme, security agencies like the Nigeria Police Force, the Army, and the Nigeria Civil Defense Corps work in Bauchi state to maintain law and order and have different forms of operations. These differences in the mode of operations in some cases hinder the state government's abilities and performance in

providing security services. Having cordial relationships among the security agencies can provide and enhance the management processes of the political violence related to communal violence in the state. In a situation where the security agencies failed to collaborate, the issue cannot be properly managed.

However, some informants for this study explained that the inability of the Bauchi state government to effectively manage political violence hinges on the fact that very often there are conflicts among government officials. They explained that very often different ideologies on how to handle political violence. They further explain that this negates attempts at managing political violence because sometimes it becomes very difficult to decide which approach should be used. Some informants of the study narrated that the conflicts between security forces very often emanate from the debate on which agency is superior. For instance, below are remarks of the security personnel informant who said:

> *"There is no harmonization among us (we the security agencies) and we don't share vital information. For example, if the police have information about a particular situation, they don't share critical information with either the military or DSS because they see them as culprits of a particular crime. There is collaboration; let me say physically but in the real sense of it, there are fighting one another."*

> (Informant GSP 1)

A community leader also shared his experience and views and stated that there is no trust among security agencies due to misunderstandings that sometimes lead to fights. Below is what he said:

> *"yes... You see, collaboration among security agencies is inadequate because of issues related to trust among them. Whenever there are threats, they normally come together. Afterward, the police will call or come to meet us and tell us not to let others know about their presence. The police always have problems with the Civil Defence Corps we have witnessed a series of fights between them"*

> (Informant CL 1)

The politician informant also added that the Bauchi state government and security agencies are not always ready to confront a threat until it has become worse. The informant further added that fights always happen between security agencies and government usually ignores and thereby ignores some of its responsibilities. The informant said:

> *"While we cannot say the government is not making efforts or trying in terms of collaborating efforts in fighting political violence, we are anticipating more of its effort in the management of political violence. This…collaboration is lacking because sometimes it is when the situation is worsening that…government will come up with many concerns to overcome it. In most cases,   the   force   that   will   do   the   work   is   not   ready*

because…misunderstandings. As such the military or civil defense will tend not to participate in the operations. So, managing violence involves the cooperation of each security apparatus."

(Informant POL 2)

An academician pointed out that security agencies lack synergy in respect of their operations. He looked at the problem from the financial point of view. The informant shared his opinion in this way:

"Well, before there used to be collaboration among security personnel but now, there is a lack of synergy among them due to financial constraints and or disagreements. The security board has been established purposely to manage and collaborate activities of security agencies but its' staff has not always been adequately allocated to the security agents in charge of operations. This affects the collaboration and management of political violence….each one of them feels it is more superior to the others."

(Informant AC 2)

A government official explained that security agents have been trying their best despite the debate among personnel on which security agency is superior. The informant went further to add that the state government very often collaborates more with the SSS than other forces when there are conflicts. The informant said the following during the interview:

"Yes…you see any security issue or operation is guided by coordination and cooperation between the security agencies and we have this synergy among them…the SSS is the department of state services. You know its main function is to dig out security threats, identify such security threats and inform the government accordingly. The SSS and government normally share this information. For example, if there is a movement of criminals from one state into Bauchi state, the department of state services will inform the government. You know that is our internal security department. They have their sister organization. That is, the Nigerian intelligent services that work out of the country."

(Informant GO 1)

The above analysis shows that there are conflicts of authority among security agencies in the state. These conflicts arose as a result of the struggle for superiority and disagreements among them. The results further show that security agencies have different modes of operation as directed by their leaders. These differences create conflicts among them during operations designed to check the breakdown of law and order. Unhealthy competition and confrontations have evolved in several dimensions and crippling the ability of security agencies to maintain effective security containment. The lack of proper cooperation among the security agencies has led to the death of thousands of civilians and security personnel in Nigeria. Given the barrage of violent conflicts and degree of insecurity in Nigeria, security intelligence collaboration and a coordinated war on terror among Nigeria's security operators should be hailed as a significant remedy for stable national security and a timely strategy to

conflict management. If this is not done the negative perception of one group towards the others will continue and will also become the foundation of group conflicts (Odoma, 2014).

However, Mohammed et al (2019) concluded that Nigeria is not alone in having security agency rivalries. They say that this is a worldwide difficulty that frequently manifests itself in the handling and resolution of security issues. Although maintaining security is a societal duty, the government, through its different security agencies, has the authority to handle security concerns. This is because maintaining security is ubiquitous and maintaining it is a herculean task. Collaboration in managing political violence such as communal violence requires the maximum understanding of security agencies handling the responsibilities of security in the state. It is therefore necessary for various security agencies to cooperate and collaborate to achieve the desired results.

Security Information Sharing
For the Nigerian government to ensure peaceful co-existence among the various ethnic group in the country, the government establishes different security outfits to maintain law and order. The law and order can only be maintained among the security outfit if there is proper security information sharing among them. Information sharing is a process where different agencies, departments, and organizations share security information to ensure that the management of political violence and or, insecurity is carried out effectively. Therefore, security information sharing is a collective responsibility of the government and its agencies in sharing relevant information concerning security challenges in the state. The essence of information sharing would give the government and other relevant agencies early warning about certain threats confronting the state. Such information will also give those concerned the ability to strategies on how to combat such security threats and political violence. Through proper information sharing the security agencies can be able to prioritize and identify the main issues that the security community discussed and concentrated their attention on, as well as be able to direct their knowledge in a certain direction without missing the goal. Security information sharing is a vital ingredient in advancing political violence management.

Some informants of this study have expressed concerns over the issue of neglect of information on security issues related to political violence in some cases by government and security agencies in Bauchi state. Also, an informant who is a government official stated that the essence of federal security agencies in the state is to share any information with the state government and other security agencies and to identify threats and suggest ways of tackling the problems. The informant's remarks are captured below:

> *"The SSS has its personnel in all the local government areas in the state. Whenever there is any threat to security or when there is political violence, the agency informs the state government and, shares information with other security agencies. The police will identify any such threats and depending on the magnitude of the problem, they inform the state government. They may share information with other agencies so that they can act swiftly even before reaching the state government. So, whenever any agency has information on security issues, it will share it with other security agencies in case there is a need for any special*

operation that requires personnel from other security agencies. When there is such need, personnel from different agencies will be drawn so that we can have one team to tackle the problem."

(Informant GO 1)

The above information given by a government official demonstrates the essence of information sharing among government and security agencies in the state and how security agencies have been effectively sharing information among themselves. On the contrary, an informant from the security agencies pointed to the fact that in most cases government tends to neglect security reports from security agencies due to a lack of clarity and coherence.

"…normally when an agency identifies security threats in the state, it tends not to disclose it…when the government calls the security agency, only then will the agency inform the government. This is because the agency wants to take the credit alone. But we in the civil defense corps, identify threats and whenever we have any information, we make a report either monthly or weekly and brief the government on the incidents. In most cases during meetings the police reports are not the same as the government informants' reports, the SSS report, the civil defense corps report, or the military report. In many cases, the civil defense corps' report always matches with the government's grassroots informants' report… So, there's always a disparity in security information and because of this, the government sometimes neglects some information given..."

(Informant GSP 2)

On the contrary, information from other informants reveals that information given to security agencies such as the police is very often neglected until security is breached and there is violence. In many cases, those who reveal the information to the police are detained and interrogated on how they got the information. For instance, an informant said that he notifies security agencies in the state about security threats in the community but they tend to ignore him. The informant shared the following experience:

"…sometimes you find out that if there is an early warning system it will now indicate to them what is happening. They will not even listen until when it happens…as I told you, There was a time I had a meeting with the SSS, had a meeting with the police, and alerted them that there was going to be a problem if something is not done and they assured me that they were going to do something about it. Unfortunately, nothing was done until when the incident happened… If you continue to reveal the truth sometimes government can even trace you to the community and jail you for telling them the truth. For instance, what happened in Tafawa Balewa came up as a result of not accepting the truth. The youths started killing people and burning houses. Before the incident, we informed the government and the police but they didn't open their doors to such vital information."

(Informant NGO 1)

Moreover, another informant added that the police are deliberately ignoring some information revealed to them by the communities. The informant said:

"…we at the communities normally report to the police, when we observe or see any threat and inform the police. The police tend to neglect the information given to them until such threats degenerate into political violence in the communities. The most annoying part of it is that most of the communities are marked as red zones for violence but one hardly finds security personnel monitoring such communities."

(Informant VCTM 1)

On a similar note, a community leader further stated that security agencies lack proper informants and that most of the places marked as red zones are not monitored by security agents.

"Well, the security agencies have no right informants who are providing them with accurate information on security issues. …sometimes you may see a suspicious person and inform the security agents. The good officers do their work diligently without the perpetrators knowing who exposed them while some bad ones among the securities do tell the perpetrators who exposed them and you will end up becoming a victim. So, many people tend to avoid giving any information"

(Informant CL 1)

The above analysis has shown that security information sharing in Bauchi state is not properly coordinated and this ultimately affects the managing processes of political violence in the state. As seen in the analysis, security reports made by security agencies are not properly matched with one another due to competition and rivalry among security agencies. In a situation where security information is not accurate, the strategy employed by the government or security outfit cannot adequately mitigate the problem. Literature has also reported that security information sharing is crucial in security management and lack of information sharing is a factor affecting the management of security. for instance, a study by Mohammed et al (2019) established that the sharing of intelligence information between the Department of State Services, Nigeria Police, and the Nigerian Army in carrying out joint operations against insurgents is not coordinated because of the rivalries among these security agencies. Salome (2019) observed that the lack of inter-service communication which is required to ensure prompt command and control hampers the quick relay of information among the services especially when clashes are in the formative stages. Therefore, any information gathered that may be considered a threat to political stability within the state or the country at large, be it from outside or within, must be shared with the proper agency authorized to checkmate such political violence. The lack of inter-agency cooperation concerning information sharing has greatly affected attempts to curtail security threats such as political violence in Bauchi state.

Security Performance Expectation

Nigerian society is becoming more and more unstable, as more individuals commit crimes and become crueler, and more desperate due to ethnic differences. New types of violent crimes have proliferated in Nigeria today, especially with the establishment of the current democratic system. These crimes include rape, political violence, pipeline vandalism, abduction (really, adult or privileged people's napping) for ransom, and more. Sometimes, petty political disagreements lead to the looting of entire communities. It is generally acknowledged that the responsibility for security, lies in the hand of the government, the police, or other security agencies (Otto & Ukpere, 2012).

In this regard, security performance expectation refers to citizens' expectations of the government and its agencies in providing adequate management of political violence and other security-related matters in the state. Government has to perform its utmost in providing security to its citizens because it is through this that government can have the citizens' support and allegiance. In situations whereby government fails to provide adequate security services, then such a government may face serious protests from the people and this in some instances can lead to the overthrow of the government. Unfortunately, security threats have prevailed in Bauchi state such that some informants are of the view that government and security agencies' efforts are not encouraging. For example, a community leader's views can be seen below:

> *"With the increase in population…citizens do not abide by the laws and regulations of government and recommendations of security agencies in Bauchi state. This is responsible for security agencies' performance below expectations in arresting and punishing criminals. Even if arrests are made today or criminals are caught, tomorrow they will walk free."*
>
> (Informant CL 1)

A grassroots informant also shared a similar view with that of the community leader and said that people put so much hope and expectations on the government concerning the management of political violence. The informant's views are captured below:

> *"Well, as you know, before the 2015 general elections people began to reason and find a way to solve their internal problems…the security threats. The first thing that came to their minds was to vote against the incumbent government for a new administration. The expectation was for the new party to come up with lasting solutions to security threats and management of the political violence hindering the development of communities and the country at large. But their performance in office has failed short of expectations"*
>
> (Informant GRT 1)

Another informant sees the problem from the angle of continual late arrivals to the scenes of political violence. To him, staff of security agencies and government officials do not usually arrive on time in communities where political violence is occurring as needed. As noted in his words:

"… the security personnel usually take a long time before they arrive at the scene where such violence is happening. It is very difficult to explain such delays. Sometimes, before they arrive the damages have already been done. Even if they have the information, they normally arrive late. So, the problem in most cases is not the absence of information"
(Informant VCTM 2)

According to the other grassroots informant, managing political violence which is regarded as part of the internal security issues is handled mostly by the police while the government takes the decisions. The informant notes that the problem is that both the government and security agencies are not performing as expected either at the decision-making level or implementation of the security threats management stage. The informant had the following to share:

"Those responsible for managing internal security are, the police and the civil defense corps and any other sister agencies that are brought in are just to add strength to the management but the police are always at the helm of affairs and then supported fully by the intelligence community which ha, ha, the DSS so to say. The DSS is sent to give its views and perception and it is left for the state to act using the police. Though the decisions on security matters are taken by the government… and the police, the police always perform below average in managing security threats and political violence. This is why things usually go out of hand and the services of the military will be brought in…"

(Informant GRT 3)

The above data reveals that the performances of the government and the security agencies concerning managing security threats and political violence have not matched the expectations of citizens. For instance, there were high hopes of citizens that the current administration would address not only political violence, and the social problems threatening the co-existence of different groups in the country but also governance and other economic issues. Unfortunately, people have realized that there have not been improvements in managing security threats and political violence. The above analysis and findings are in line with the literature available.

Collaboration between government agencies on one hand, and planning and financial authorities on the other, has been a key stumbling block for development policies and programs across the world. For instance, Foyou, et.al (2018) shows the importance of collaboration in dealing with security issues in Nigeria and recommend engagement in strategic collaborative agreements that will establish long-term border security arrangements. Independent intelligence studies have revealed a lack of collaboration between state security agencies and military intelligence, as well as between the intelligence community and law enforcement, on the one hand. Therefore, the management of violence will require cooperation and collaboration between numerous governmental organizations and agencies, each of which has a specific set of skills and responsibilities (Oladele, 2020).

Conclusion

The result of the study demonstrated that collaborative governance is lacking in managing political violence in the Bauchi state. This is due to the non-inclusion of relevant stakeholders in managing political violence such as the traditional rulers and local government council chairman. However, a lack of synergy among the security agencies led to a conflict of superiority, neglect of security information sharing, and underperformance. These are some factors affecting collaborative governance in managing political violence. It is quite surprising that the Bauchi state government with its available staff is not following the collaborative standard in managing political violence as recommended by the collaborative governance theory. The state has, therefore, not performed as expected in protecting life and properties due to the lack of collaboration governance.

Based on the results, the study recommends that the state government should provide a collaborative standard mechanism that can allow full participation of both profit and non-profit organizations in managing political violence such as communal violence in the state. Providing such a mechanism would allow the local government council chairman, traditional rulers, and religious leaders to be part of the management process in the state. These categories of stakeholders are crucial in the management and implementation of decision-making because they are closer to the people and they may likely have first-hand information in regards to a security threat. It was recommended that sensitization should be provided to different ethnic groups to have ethnic and religious tolerance in the state. The study further recommends proper monitoring and checking of the activities of security agencies in the state. It can be achieved through the state available body to evaluate, report, coordinate and sanction the security personnel if found guilty of negligence of their statutory responsibilities. Implementing such can reduce conflicts and enhance synergy and performance among security agencies in providing security to people and properties.

Acknowledgment

References

Aghedo, A. (2020). Inclusive Participation in Nigeria security sector: Trends and Opportunities. Nigeria, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES).

Alanamo, A. (2005). Issues in Political Violence. Ilorin, Hamson Printing Communication.

Alao, A. (2021). Electoral Violence in Nigeria's Fourth Republic: Implication for Democratic Development. Journal of Administrative Science, 18(2), 320-344.

Alao, D. O., Adewunmi, T., & Babatunde, O. (2018). Nigeria Customs Service, Inter-Agency Cooperation and National Security.International Journal of Advance Research, 6(12), 1186-1194.

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2007). Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18, 543–571.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2008). Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77-101.

Bosi, L. (2015). Political Violence. Book chapter: Oxford Handbook of Social Movements. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Chaplyn, J., & Fraser, S. (2020). Collaborative Governance: An Introductory Practice Guide. CFI Report.

Esiri, M. O. (2016). Political Thuggery and The Crisis of Confidence Among Youths in Nigeria. Journal of Humanities and Social Science,21(1), 01-07.

Falola, T. (2021). Political Violence. In Understanding Modern Nigeria: Ethnicity, Democracy, and Development. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Foyou, V. E., Ngwafu, P., Santoyo, M., & Ortiz, A. (2018). The Boko Haram Insurgency and its Impact on Border Security, Trade and Economic Collaboration Between Nigeria and Cameroon: An Exploratory Study. African Social Science Review, 9(1), 66-76.

Government of Canada. (2019). Action Area Policy: Inclusive Governance. https://www.international.gc.ca/world-monde/issues_development enjeux_developpement/priorities-priorites/fiap_inclusive_governance paif_gouvernance_inclusive.aspx?lang=eng

Ibeogu, A. S., & Nkwede, O. J. (2015). Political Violence and the Sustainability of Nigerian Democracy. Journal of Social Science Research, 8(2), 1607-1612

Igwe, P. I., & Amadi, L. (2021). Democracy and Political Violence in Nigeria Since Multi-Party Politics in 1999: A Critical Appraisal. Open Political Science, 4, 101–119

Ikyase, T. J., & Egberi, A.E. (2015). Political Violence and Democratic Stability in Nigeria: Reflecting on the Past and Charting the Way Forward. Review of Public Administration and Management, 4(8), 32-40.

Ajodo-Adebanjoko, A. (2017). Towards Ending Conflict and Insecurity in the Niger Delta Region: A collective non-violent approach. AJCR, 1.

Kazemi, E. (2022). Multiple Security Threats Persist Around the Country. ACLED.

Kolade, E. (2022). Cybersecurity in Nigeria's Financial Industry: Enhancing Consumer Trust and Security. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Mohammed, I., Yusuf, M., & Garba, L. (2019). Interagency Cooperation: Imperatives for Effective Joint Security Operations in Nigeria. Gombe Journal of General Studies, 3(1), 184-194.

Najar, M. I. (2014). Communal Violence, Its Causes, and Solutions. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention, 3(12), 2319 – 7714.

Obadare, E. (2020). Escalating Violence Is Putting Nigeria's Future on the Line. Council on Foreign Relations.

Odoma, S. (2014). Superiority Struggles and Inter-agency Feud in Nigeria. Global Journal of Human, Social Sciences, Sociology, and Culture, 14(5): 33-41.

Oladele, F. A. (2020). Inter-Agency Cooperation and National Security; an Assessment of Internal Security Operations in Nigeria. International Journal of Management Sciences and Business Research, 9(2), 22-28.

Otto, G., & Ukpere, W. I. (2012) National security and development in Nigeria. African Journal of Business Management, 6(23), 6765-6770. DOI: 10.5897/AJBM12.155 ISSN 1993-8233

Salome, C. N. G. (2019). Inter-agency Collaboration and Coordination: The Rule of Investigators and Prosecutors and Prisons. Adhering to The Rule of Law in Investigation and Prosecution. At the National Workshop for Investigators and Prosecutors on the NJI calendar of Program Held at the Andrew Otutu Obaseki Auditorium National Judicial Institute, Mohammed Bello Centre, Abuja. 26th August.

Suleiman, I. (2019). Ethno-religious Conflict in Nigeria: A Case Study of Tafawa Balewa L.G.A. International Journal of Political Science and Governance, 1(2), 30-37.

Thompson, O. O., & Aduradola, R. (2016). Terrorism, the Vulnerable Population, and Social Inclusion Question in Nigeria. ASUU Journal of Humanities, 3 (3), 1-14.

Wilkinson, S. I. (2005). Religious politics and Communal Violence. In: F. Z. H. K. B. Francine R, ed. Critical issues in Indian Political series. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.