

The Role of State Government Accountability in the Management of Political Violence in Nigeria

Kabiru Bello Ilelah^{1,2}, Adlina Ab Halim¹, Mohd Mahadee Bin Ismail¹ & Mohd Sabri Md Nor¹

¹Department of Government and Civilizational Studies, Faculty of Human Ecology, University Putra Malaysia, 43400, Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia, ²Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, Bauchi state University, Gadau, Nigeria.
Corresponding Author Email: kabirubelloilelah@yahoo.com

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v12-i7/14092>

DOI:10.6007/IJARBS/v12-i7/14092

Published Date: 28 June 2022

Abstract

Accountability enhances citizens' trustworthiness and legitimacy towards the government. Bauchi state government in Nigeria has been facing challenges in managing political violence due to a lack of proper accountability. As such state government loses the expected legitimacy from its citizens. Literature shows scanty research on state government accountability, especially on political violence management. Therefore, this study explores state government commitment toward accountability in managing political violence. The research applied good governance theory to guide the research. A qualitative method based on a case study approach was employed. Purposive and snowballing sampling techniques were used to identify informants. A total number of 17 informants which includes government officials, security personnel, community leaders, members of the NGOs, peace ambassadors, victims, and academicians. Data were collected through in-depth interviews. The data obtained were analyzed, and presented based on themes. The result reveals that state government responsibility in managing political violence is inadequately implemented. The findings further shows that there are cases of irrational justification for government action and inaction concerning the management of political violence. Based on this, there is the need for the government to be proactive in its commitment towards accountability. The research highlighted the major factors affecting accountability in governance.

Keyword: State Government, Accountability, Management, Political Violence, Legitimacy.

Introduction

Accountability is important in governance and acts as a bridge of trust between the government and the people. Accountability is the admission of responsibility, a call to duty, and willingness by the government to render explanation to the citizens about its stewardship when called upon to do so (Bivins, 2006). There are two broad forms of accountability, vertical and horizontal. The vertical allows the citizens to question the government action and in-

action on policies decisions and implementation, and the government responds to issues raised by the citizens to demonstrates its commitment to the citizens. Whilst the horizontal refers to a situation where the government hold its officials to account, in order to avoid abuse of office (Combaz & Mcloughlin, 2014). Accountability enhances citizens' trustworthiness and legitimacy towards the government. It enables people to know how the government is doing, and how to gain redress when things go wrong. It ensures that government officials act in the interests of the people that they serve (David, 2014; Malena et al., 2004). In a situation where the government fails to adequately fulfils its obligations to the citizens the results can leads to improper accountability. Improper accountability has accounted for many problems related to political violence in many countries of the world and Nigeria is not an exceptional. This has remained the major problems affecting these countries. In view of these, there is public demand for openness in administration and global outcry against corruption which leads to improper accountability (Ejere, 2013).

Political violence on the other hand, is a relative term which explain threats that are related to political motives. It is based on this that political violence, according to Gurr (1970), refers to any collective attacks within a polity against the political regime, its players, such as rival political organizations and incumbents, or its policies. Political violence is a type of violence that arises from conflicts of interest, aims, and ambitions between people, organizations, and political systems as they seek to gain and maintain power. Political violence is further defined as the purposeful use of illegitimate power and force to achieve political aims. In other words, political violence can be both physical and psychological activities aiming at harming or frightening communities (World Health Organization, 2002). Therefore, political violence is part of a power struggle directed against specific participants in the political system. Political violence has many forms which include; civil war, terrorism, insurgency, communal violence, ethnic and religious conflict, protest, riot and electoral violence (Bosi & Malthaner, 2015).

Since the return of democracy in 1999 after a long period of military rule (1983-1999), Nigeria has been having problem in managing the affairs of the citizens (Igwe & Amadi, 2020), and Mercy (2015) concluded that one of such problem is lack of accountability due to many factors among which is corruption leading to political violence. Ejere (2013) correctly observed that one of the major difficulties affecting public sector management in Nigeria is the lack of accountability, and Bauchi state is not an exception. Bauchi state government has been facing challenges in managing political violence due to lack of proper accountability. It is however, observed that political violence is beyond the state to managed and control. As such state government loses the expected legitimacy from its citizens. Though the issue of political violence in Bauchi state is not new but what is of more concern is its frequent occurrence. In this regard one of the forms of political violence that affects Bauchi state is communal violence which leads to several intimidation, arson and deaths (Suleiman, 2019). Such threat of political violence is usually posed by irregular forces and are mostly societal in nature. They are particularly common and persistent in disadvantaged enclaves, where residents have a high level of distrust for the government, which has typically built up over time. At their core, therefore, these security issue constitutes symptoms of improper accountability which affect governance (Okenyodo, 2016).

In 2015, the citizens were very optimistic that the administration would provide adequate management of political violence and other social vices, but the reality demonstrated that

government efforts has yet to yield the expectation of the people due to lack of accountability (Ibok & Ogar, 2018). It is on the basis of the above background that this study explores accountability in the management of political violence in Bauchi state as well as providing alternative suggestions that could be used to enhance state government accountability.

Good Governance Theory

The study applied good governance theory to explain state government accountability in the management of political violence in Nigeria. The theory was first coined by the World bank in order to examine national government performance in services delivery to the people. The process of gauging how public institutions handle public affairs, manage public resources, and ensure the fulfilment of human rights in an atmosphere free of abuse and corruption and with proper regard for the rule of law is known as good governance (UNESCAP, 2009). As a result, the idea of "good governance" arises as a benchmark against which dysfunctional economies or political organizations might be measured. The notion revolves around governments and governing bodies' obligation to address the demands of the public rather than certain sections in society (Khan, 2004).

The theory has certain dimensions that was used to measure the success of government efforts in addressing social issues, and one of such dimensions is accountability. Accountability is an important component of good governance, and it may help the state gain public confidence and acceptability. Accountability is, at its core, a connection between individuals who are accountable for something and those who have the authority to assess how effectively that obligation has been carried out. When accountability works successfully, it allows for some form of communication between the government and the people it serves. It provides incentives for responsible persons to behave in the public's best interests. A good system of accountability fosters changes in how government operates (Guerin et al., 2018).

Therefore, management of political violence in relation to accountability is a type of obligation that relates to what and who is responsible. It's defined the responsibility of the holder of the trust to provide responsibility by conveying and reporting all tasks under his control to the group who offers the trust and has the authority to hold such responsibility. The public and the agencies concerned hold decision-makers in the government, and community organizations responsible. However, accountability play a critical role in fostering effective management and increasing public trust in government performance. Government personnel are answerable not just to higher authorities in the formal chain of command, but also to the public at large, non-governmental groups, the media, and a variety of other stakeholders, according to the notion of accountability (Khotami, 2017). Based on the assumptions above, the theory is important as it helps the research in understanding government stewardship towards accountability in the management of political violence.

Methodology

The study employed qualitative method based on case study approach. The method and approach were chosen because they allowed for an in-depth inquiry in the data collection processes. A case study approach has three criteria. Firstly, the case, is the management of political violence. Secondly, geographical location which is Bauchi and thirdly time bound is 2019-2022. Bauchi is one of the six states of the North East political zone of Nigeria. A purposive sampling based on criterion was used to identify key informants and snowballing

was also used to expand the sample of the study. Therefore, a total number of 17 informants were interviewed in the research. the informants were identified based on their experience, position, knowledge and willingness to participate. The informants participated are presented in the table below:

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.	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

The table 1.1 presents the informants categories who participated in this research with their identification codes.

Data were collected through the use of in-depth interview. The interview was conducted on one-on-one between the researcher and the informants via zoom meeting due to Covid-19. Before the commencement of the interview, an ethics approval was granted from the university where the student is pursuing his postgraduate study and a letter was given to the researcher by the main chairman of the supervisory committee and letter was shown to each of the informants. then the researcher sent an invitation letter to the identified informant via SMS, WhatsApp, while some were reached via normal phone calls. Those that turn down the invitation, an appreciation note was sent to them for having time to reply. While those that accepted the invitation were contacted to schedule a time and date for the interview. The interview normally lasted from 35-90 minutes. The interview was conducted both in Hausa and English.

The data obtained from the interview were analyzed through the six stages of thematic analysis as suggested by Braun & Clarke (2013). In order to test the validity, reliability and credibility of the data, the researcher used the method of triangulation, back-to-back informant transcripts method and both second (supervisory committee) and third party (professionals) were consulted to cross check the data. Finally, the research obtained an ethics approval from the university ethics committee, this means all the ethical consideration including informants' secrecy, voluntary participation as well as withdrawing from the research at any time, and signing of consent forms were explained to the informants and this process is highly respected by the researcher.

Results, Findings and Discussion

This section presents the findings and discussion of the research. The data are analyzed, interpreted, discussed and presented based on the three themes that emerged from the informant's interview transcripts as shown in the following subsections.

State Government Responsibilities in Security

The first theme that emerged is state government responsibilities in security. State government is established to carry out certain responsibilities such as managing political violence within its territory in order for the citizens to carry out their day-to-day activities without any fear of threat. In this aspect, the state government responsibilities in security refers to the execution of assigned duties, and roles of the government in managing political violence in the state. Unfortunately, the opinion of the informants shows that the efforts of the Bauchi state government was inadequate especially with the respect to the management of political violence.

Regarding how the Bauchi state government become ineffective, informants mentioned that there is lack of adherence to the rule of responsibility in managing security. The informants linked the problem with the over dependency of state government on federal government and lack of quick response. For instance, informants POL 2, emphasizes the way the lack of clear role of Bauchi state government in managing political violence hinders the management. This was noted in his remark during the interview as shown:

"...For example, the banning of those transporting on a motorcycle (acaba) in one way the government have tried while in the other way the process has some lapses which I see it as a failed responsibility by the government. This is because you can see among the riders some finish their school without having anything doing and it's in that side of the job, they got what to cater for their daily need. So, the government shouldn't have banned it in the name of security rather they should come up with alternative which will serve as security not a threat to their lives. So, imagine someone was stop from his sources of income without giving him alternative work to do, even the Keke napep (tricycle) that government distribute were not properly distributed to whom mostly deserve but somehow political privilege."

Sources: Informant POL 2.

The victims of political violence also show that the role of Bauchi state government in managing political violence has not meet the expectation of the citizens. The informants in this regard attested that the government has failed in fulfilling the promises made to the citizens. The informant sees state government like it has nothing to offer in respect to managing violence. The statement was noted when the informant said this:

"Laugh...well I can say... All we heard or seen are failed promises and responsibility of the state government...that the federal government will provide us with help bla, bla, bla, no result up to this day. I am under the state government not the federal government. Let the state play its role first before the federal"

government unless if the state government has nothing to offer in this matter.”

Source: Informant VCM 1

In a similar direction an academican informant added that there is no clear responsibility followed by the state government in managing political violence:

“Well,...on the accountability part, in my opinion I didn't see the clear responsibility of the state government. My reason is that whenever there is political threat in a state you will see the governor rushing to go to Abuja to meet the president to seek for a help. So, you see one can ask himself what is their role in security issues? Why do they always go out when the state needs them the most? So, this issue of over dependency to federal government is making us to question the state function and responsibility especially in security matters.”

Source: Informant AC 1

Still on the government responsibility, another informant was on the view that the Bauchi state government has fail in quick response to major political violence threats in the state. This statement was noted when the informant stated that:

“While on the part of government nothing is more appealing and expected by the society other than their rapid response to the community on security threat or matters arising, this is its main responsibility... But the response to the political violence after it occurred is the problem. In most cases government security or officials come to the scene when the threat has already occurred.”

Source: Informant CL 1

In regards to the youth aspect which sees government inadequate responsibility. An informant who happens to be a peace ambassador in the state further that no state is violent-free but the capacity of the government always determines the level of the violence. The informant went on to say that the government has neglected some of her responsibility to the people especially in respect to engaging the youth. This statement was noted when the informant said that:

“Yeah, there is no any society that is violent free but except the severity of the violence that is the degree of violence varies from one community to another depending on the magnitude of the responsibility of the institution that is handling it that is if the violence is not handle well it will continue...You know sometimes government neglect some of her responsibilities to the people especially the youth. Youth don't have anything doing that can engaged them, and youth needs to be engaged in the aspect of employment, so that they can have something to eat and what can cater for their problems as well their social need.”

Source: Informant PAMD

Consequently, the government officials who participated in the study shows that the government are always ready to provides mechanism that can handle and addressed issues related to political violence. The informant went on to say that whenever a threat is identified the government quickly invite the security agencies to discuss on how such threat can be confronted. This is one of the responsibilities of the government. This statement was caption when the informant said this during the interview:

“Now, the role of the government as it relates to security, usually when the government have such issues at hand it is her responsibility to harmonize all the security agencies that is from the army up to the police, the civil defense corps and other para military organizations. Whenever there are any issues related security. These agencies are normally put in place and they have representatives by the head of agencies we met with them before, during and after elections or any security threat. The government will meet with them and strategies on how to effectively handle any issue that may arise.”

Source: Informant GO 1

From the foregoing therefore, it can be understood that the majority of the informants in this study believe that the state government responsibility in managing political violence is not adequately implemented. The informant’s statement was linked to overdependency on the federal government, and lack of proactive response to security threat. It is on this basis that, World Bank introduces government responsibility as dimension to identify government commitment on its roles and responsibility. UNHR (2013) further that responsibility in governance theory and practice, enables those persons in positions of power to have clearly defined roles and performance criteria and allowing for public and impartial evaluation of their actions. Where the responsibility of the government or its agencies in managing political violence is not well followed, it becomes obvious that government is not adequately responsive, therefore the issues of political violence may continue to occur. Based on the above analysis and discussion, it clear that government responsibility in security is not adhere to the rules stated in the constitution and the result contradicts the theory assumption.

Government’s Justifications for Security Management

Another theme that emerged is the government justification for security management. Government justification for security management in this aspect refers to the rationale behind government decisions and commitment to the management and enforcement of political violence. This explains how an institution such as government justifies or give a reason on certain action or inaction it takes on a particular phenomenon. Since this study is about exploring the government accountability in managing political violence, this will focus mainly on decisions of security matters related political violence in the state. In most cases, people demand some explanation from the government on why certain decisions are taken and enforced. The government response is important as it can reduce tension among the people on the matter and this is what is establish to do. Therefore, most of the informants described how the Bauchi state government is inadequately justifying certain decisions taken.

For instance, an academician posited that justification for decision taken is very paramount in the aspect of governance by the government managing political violence in the state. In his opinion the informant believed that the Bauchi state government does not give adequate justification for some of the decisions it takes. This was noted when the informant stated that:

“The government happen to be unaccountable in managing political violence because, the government at state level sees political violence as a national issue which the federal government have to account and make provision of its management. Because of this reason that’s why most state like ours don’t justify or make account on certain things related to political violence in the state. So, most of the blame goes to the federal government alone while state government have nothing to explain to the people.”

Source: Informant AC 1

The second academician added that lack of proper explanation to the people on why the government take certain decisions can lead to another political violence. The informant said this:

“Tafawa Balewa for the past 30 years, the crisis had been on and on, and the management of the crisis did not provide a lasting solution to the problems, it was during Isah Yuguda administration who relocate the local headquarters to Bununu, that is where the crisis subsidize. this further call for another agitation by other groups and tribes for not accepting the government decision resulted in communal crisis. Bauchi state government managed the crisis, but the management of the crisis is not away that will actually show the lasting solution to it due to lack of proper justification from the government.”

Source: Informant AC 2

The above idea revealed that when government failed to provide proper reasons on why certain decisions are taken, such action can lead to the emergence of another threat of political violence. This statement was confirmed by another informant from the category of community leader, where he stated that the government in most cases are not answerable to the people and also the security agencies are fond of making arrests without reasonable justification.

“So, to me, on government accountability... I can say the government is not fully justifiable on its decision in managing political violence, despite their efforts...why not. What I mean is that the government doesn’t explain it decisions to public on certain matters related to political violence in the state this bring a wide gap between government decision and the people at the grassroots. ...well... you see, security agencies are regards as national body and they don’t account on their action to be honest to the public. They make unnecessary arrest without clear explanation and the government also remain silence, that also affect the management of political violence.”

Source: Informant CL 1

The views of the grassroots informant has also shown that the government answerability and justification is based on political.

“Well, accountability like I said government... those who are against their own norms and value so to say as a people, so, if they feel you are threat to them, they can use their own power to hold you accountable. so justifying action is not based on right is just base on political affiliation that is what is the matter, but accountability is not fully implemented. what I feel is once the government or want to hold any one accountable it should be right irrespective of their political affiliation.”

Source: Informant GRT 3

On the account of non-governmental organizations, an informant sees government justification as political. That is when the government have something to benefit, they can give reason to certain policies or action, but if they have nothing to gain, they tend to ignore the explanation. The informant has this to share:

The justification for managing political violence is politically motivated. Sometimes you find out those who have the passion to get involved in mitigating conflict, for example the NGOs are not even given the opportunity to get involved rather they will look for politicians to assist them to monitor not exactly what was supposed to be done but what exactly they wish to be done so that they will be able to benefit from it. Therefore, the role of Bauchi state government in managing political violence in respect to accountability is purely political.”

Source: Informant NGO 1

Consequently, a grassroots and security personnel informants sees the problem from the angle of resources where they attested that most of the governors of the state such as Bauchi are not accounting the money sent them by the federal government in relation to the management of security such as political violence in the state. For instance, in his remarks as cited below:

“As far as I am concern, most of the governors in the state has failed us in terms of governance and accountability because so much fund is given to them very little is seen but I did not say all but some you see something on ground. For me the process of managing political violence in the state is unjustifiable and this is the crux of the matter. The state government are not coming out to explain in detail how such money is spent or used”

Source: Informant GRT 1

Similarly, the security personnel added that the distribution of fund that was meant to use for managing political violence is not efficient and equally distributed among the security

agencies and the government is not doing anything about it despite the complaint. The informant has this to say:

In fact, there is no fairness in the distribution of funds... For example, in the joint task force, the police force has almost 100 people, civil defense force has brought in 34 people, the SSS has brought in 18 people, the military has brought in 60 people then the air force only brings three people, and NDLEA only five people. When it comes to the distribution of the operation fund, the money given to the air force who have only 3 people will be given to the civil defense with 34 people. The police with 100 people who are more than the military with 60 people will be given equal amount. The distribution of the money is made on the table, the police will pick up first, follow by others. So, if this fund is given to managed the security in the state, why will the money be cut not distributed according to the personnel?"

Source: Informant GSP 2

This act of unfair distribution of funds among the security agencies by the government is capable of demoralizing other security agencies who may feel short-changed. This is capable of creating more security threat rather than solving the prevailing insecurity situation. An Informant added that if the government wants to address the issue of political violence like the case of communal violence it has to start from the grassroot and be justifiable to the people:

"For me, so many things are further needed when it comes to management of security in the community, because if truly they want to stop or manage the violence, they need to start from the grassroot and the people need to understand the process properly..."

Source: Informant POL 2

The above informant believes that government should create awareness among the people, and the starting point in dealing with security threat is through the grassroot.

The foregoing section analyzes the views, opinions and perceptions of the informants in regards to government justification on political violence decisions. Ideally, justification is one of the measures in understanding the government ability and commitment towards achieving or providing proper management of political violence to the people. According to Schadler, Diamond & Plattner (1999) that the notion of answerability or justification indicates the obligation to respond to nasty questions and vice versa. The UNHR (2013) argues that answerability or justification is a process where the public expects government officials and institutions to provide purposeful explanations for their actions and decisions to those who are affected, including the general public. However, the result revealed that the government in most of its decisions are found to be lacking sufficient justification in terms of policies and funding related to the management of political violence. Based on this explanation and the result of the study it can be clearly understood that Bauchi state government is not quite answerable to people. This may affect the effectiveness of the management of political violence in the state.

Security Decision Making Enforcement

Security decision making enforcement means the processes of implementing security decision by relevant agencies. Therefore, the security decisions reached by the government are channeled to the various security agencies for enforcement when the need arises. Some informants stated that there is lack of ability by the state government to enforce or properly implement security decision in the state. The informants cited the cases of the appointment of government officials' allies, friends, relatives or unprofessional persons, who because of the close relationship, could not be subjected to government control to oversee the security matters such as political violence in the state. As such, this type of appointment made has reduce the government efforts to monitored and ensure proper management of political violence.

For instance, a community leader posited that the government has the ability to establish agencies within its power to ensure that the function of government is maintained. The informant added that the Bauchi state government established the Bauchi Road Traffic Agency (BAROTA) with the aim of regulating and sanctioning violators but the person in charge is one of the governor's allies who is given the full power to do as he wishes and the government doesn't care about that:

"In respect to enforcement, the government used it constitutional power to establish a body that can enforce it decision in ensuring political violence matters. For instance, when the government banned the okada business it gives instructions to its body known as BAROTA to arrest any person seen for okada business. Though, there are series of abusive of power and the government is not doing anything about it... yea it was because the people handling the management of the body are the government allies"

Source: Informant CL 1

It was added by an informant from the academician category that most of the personnel appointed by the state government for the maintenance and control of security are not professionals, in fact they are there because of their close relationship with the politicians:

"Actually, most of those controlling the security matters like the political violence in the state are not professional rather a politician, family members or friends. Because they are his allies the governors would not question them or make them to work according to the government policies because the governor wants something in return from them. So, to me, you cannot link politics with security because they are two separates' issues. The only politics that can relate to security is that of decision making and implementation but not politics of game."

Source: Informant AC 2

From the views of the above two informants (CL1 & AC2) it can be understood the government should recruit on the basis of merit not on the basis of politics or personal

relationship. When the government fail to recruit the right personnel and properly monitor the activities of its agency, it can lead to several issues such as political violence. Another informant further stated that law enforcement is in the hands of security agencies while the decision remains with the government at all levels.

“Well... the government normally make the decision and passed it to the security agencies to execute the decision. In regards to Bauchi state the security agencies are not fully complying with the state government decision, the simple reason is because of their allegiance to the federal government since they are owned by them. Look at what has happened in other states when the security is withdrawn. So, state government are not enforcing the security agencies to comply as expected”

Source: Informant GO 2

The above results portray that the government is found to be unable to control its officials in making them to obey and follow the standard procedures in dealing or addressing issues related to political violence. The informants related the problem of inability of government to control it appointees because the politicians appoint those in charge of security matters without following due process. This issue has become one of the major factors hindering the governance and the management of political violence in the state and the country in general. As put forward by Fukuyama (2013) who sees governance as the ability of government to enforce rules. It was added by the UNHR (2013) that enforcement refers to a situation where institutions set in place procedures that track how well public officials and institutions adhere to specified standards, apply consequences on those who don't, and ensure that proper preventive and remedial action is implemented when necessary. Going by the informant point of view it can be understood that the state government has insufficient mechanism or tools put in place to monitored, evaluate, enforce, sanction which make the public official accessible for questioning by the public. Therefore, this lack of mechanism or tool has weakened the governments capacity to manage the political violence at the state level.

From the foregoing, the results shows that the state government is mostly found to lack adequate responsibility, rational justification and enforcement. Therefore, this are some factors of accountability affecting the management of political violence in the state. The management of political violence in the state is a delegated responsibility by the federal government to state governments, that is why the constitution state that the governors at the state level are the chief security officers of their state (Nigerian Constitution, 1999 as amended). Studies in Nigeria, for example, Onubogu (2019) further reported that Nigeria's failure to hold its government responsible to its population is a pressing concern not only for the nation, but also for the African region. The author concluded that lack of accountability by the government is the key to the internal problem facing Nigeria. Lawal (2020) portrays that since 2010 the country budget changes, which allocated its 50-55% of the country budget to security management in the country, despite this huge allocation, financial accountability is weak and not given appropriately due to corruption. Okenyedo (2016) lamented that corruption has thrived inside the security agencies such as the police force due to the lack of efficient accountability systems. In 2011 the Nigerian government enacted the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) in an effort to decrease the privacy that has shrouded public finance

management of the Nigeria security agencies, despite this effort there is less room to hold leadership accountable.

Conclusion and Recommendations

It is concluded that state government accountability in managing political violence is inadequate due to its overdependence on the federal government on funding and manpower. It is further concluded that the state government is unable to monitor and evaluate the performance of its officials in ensuring that standard procedures in addressing issues related to political violence are followed accordingly. This is attributed to the lack of adherence to clear role of responsibility, and lack of proper justification in decision making implementation. In view of these, the state is unable to be proactive in its response to security threats. This attitude of government can affect the management of political violence in the state. Therefore, state government is found not to be quite accountable in managing political violence in the state.

Based on the findings, the research recommends that there is the need for the state government to be self-reliant in respect to security manpower and funding. This can be achieved through the statutory creation of state security outfit such as state police. The state should also have the power to fund its security outfit in order to avoid the overdependence on federal government. The source of funding can be derived through Internally Generated Revenue (IGR). However, it is not enough to have a well-funded independent state security outfit without proper monitoring and evaluation. Therefore, there is the need for proper monitoring and evaluation of performance of the state security outfits in order to check personnel excesses and ensure proper accountability in managing political violence in the state. The state government should also adopt good governance principles such as accountability in the management of political violence. Applying accountability, can help in reducing the issues hindering the management of political violence. In this regard, the government needs to be giving rational justification on her decisions to the people of the state. Moreover, the state government needs to be proactive in its commitment in providing security services to the people, by taking the full responsibility in managing political violence. Providing the utmost security services requires a commitment to the management of political violence and this remains one of the core functions of the state government.

Acknowledgement

The study acknowledges the contribution and commitment of the informants who participated and gave valuable information on the subject matter of the research. Without them, the result cannot be accomplished. The research further acknowledges University Putra Malaysia for providing good atmosphere and environment for research. Finally, Bauchi state university is further acknowledged in the research.

References

- Bivins, T. (2006). Responsibility and Accountability. In *Ethics in Public Relations: Responsible Advocacy*. London: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Bosi, L., & Malthaner, S. (2015). *Political Violence*. The Oxford handbook of social movements, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Thematic Analysis of Interview Data in the Context of Management Controls Research*. Research methods datasets, Sage Publication.

- Combaz, E., & Mcloughlin, C. (2014). *Voice, Empowerment and Accountability*. Applied knowledge services, UK: GSDRC.
- David, A. K. (2014). Enhancing Public Accountability and Performance in Nigeria: Periscoping the Impediments and Exploring Imperative Measures. *Africa's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review*, 2(2),102-125.
- Ejere, E. S. I. (2013). Promoting Accountability in Public Sector Management in Today's Democratic Nigeria. *Tourism & Management Studies*, 3, 953-964.
- Fukuyama, F. (2013). "What Is Governance?". Center for Global Development. Working Paper 314.
- Guerin, B., McCrae, J., & Shephard, M. (2018). *Accountability in Modern Government; Recommendations for change*. Institute for Government.
- Gurr, T. (1970). *Why Men Rebel*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ibok, A. K., & Ogar, A. O. (2018). Political Violence in Nigeria and Its Implication for National Development. *GNOSI: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Human Theory and Praxis*, 1 (1), 87-94.
- 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
- Khan, M. H. (2004). *State Formation in Palestine: Viability and Governance during a Social Transformation*. 1st Ed, UK: Routledge.
- Khotami. (2017). *The Concept of Accountability in Good Governance*. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR)*, 163, 30-33.
- Lawal, A. A. (2020). *Towards an Accountable Security Sector in Nigeria*. Friedrich-Ebert Stiftung in collaboration with the Civil Society Legislative Advocacy Centre and Co-founded by the European Union.
- Malena, C., Forster, R., & Singh, J. (2004). *Social Accountability: An Introduction to the Concept and Emerging Practice*. Social Development Papers, Participation and Civic Engagement. The World Bank.
- Mercy, O. A. (2015). The Effects of Corruption on Good Governance in Nigeria. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, 4(3), 292-307.
- Okenyodo, O. (2016). Governance, Accountability, and Security in Nigeria. *Africa security brief*, 31, 1-8.
- Onubogu, O. (2019). *Peace in Nigeria Will Require Accountable Governance*. Washington DC: The US Institute of Peace.
- Schadler, A., Diamond, L. J., & Plattner, M. F. (1999). *The Self-restraining State: Power and Accountability in New Democracies*. Boulder London: Lynne Rienner Publishers
- 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
- UNESCAP. (2009). *What is Good Governance*.
<https://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/good-governance.pdf>
- UNHR. (2013). *Who Will Be Accountable? Human Rights and the Post-2015 Development Agenda*, New York and Geneva.
- World Health Organization. (2002). *World Report on Violence and Health*. Geneva: WHO.
https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/42495/9241545615_eng.pdf