Leadership, Governance and Globalisation in Nigeria: 2015-2020

Michael Ihuoma Ogu & Bukola A. Alao

Abstract
Nigeria is dubbed the African 'giant' and prides itself as the 'big brother' among the African comity of states, which is evident in the role of Nigeria in the African Union as well as the sub-regional Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). Unfortunately, however, leadership and governance have arguably remained some of the key challenges confronting the various efforts at strategically integrating Nigeria into the global polity. This paper adopts a qualitative research method in exploring leadership and governance in Nigeria, highlighting the major implications of both variables for globalization of Nigeria. The study found that globalization has not translated to significant benefits in Nigeria owing to self-serving leadership, corruption and instabilities. It was concluded that globalization holds several possible benefits for Nigeria, and thus recommended that Nigeria ought to address issues of bad leadership, lack of transparency in governance, ensure increased political stability and intensify the anti-corruption campaign in order to enjoy the merits of globalization in Nigeria.
Keywords: Globalization, Leadership, Governance, Development, Nigeria

Introduction
West Africa has, arguably, remained a key territory on the African continent for numerous reasons, among which is the presence of Nigeria in the West African sub-region, especially because of its very huge human population and huge economic prospects. The independence of Nigeria from British colonial rule in October of 1960 spelt hope and held great prospects for the entire continent, unfortunately, this arguably has remained only a 'hope' which doesn't appear to become reality in the near future. Several challenges have continued to limit the prospects and role of Nigeria among the comity of African states over the years. Notable among these challenges are those of leadership and governance, significantly complicated by corruption, ethnicity, and violent religious and political conflicts, among many others. Six decades down the line, Nigeria continues to struggle with leadership and governance challenges, which has also largely affected the role of this 'African giant' in the fast-globalizing world.

In describing the challenge of corruption in Nigeria, Ogbeidi (2012) observed that corruption destroyed most of national values which Nigeria treasured in the past. He argued further that the political class has been culprits in the corruption ravaging the country, since the legacy of both civilian and military leadership have remained institutionalized corruption which has pervaded all sectors of the public service and has also spread into the private sector as well.

This paper explores the theme of leadership and governance in Nigeria, alongside the reality of a globalizing world. The aim is to investigate how leadership and governance have aided or abated Nigeria's globalization process from 2015 to 2020. The paper will also highlight the major challenges to leadership and governance in Nigeria with a view to proffering practical suggestions to managing these challenges and securing the place of Nigeria within the purview of a globalizing nation. The study adopted a qualitative approach, generating data from relevant textbooks, journal articles and other classic sources. All the data were content analyzed and inferences drawn.

Theoretical Underpinnings

The theory of the two publics expounded by Peter Ekeh in his 1975 classic essay titled Colonialism and the two publics in Africa: A theoretical statement is best fit to understand the nature of leadership in Nigeria from a clearly historical point of view. Ekeh (1975) argues that instead of one public, as obtainable in the 'West', the years of colonialism in Africa resulted in the creation of two publics within which the same actor is expected to exist. These two publics, which he identified as the primordial and civic public realms have unique characteristics that separate them from one another based on the relationship of individuals within these publics; the former is moral, while the latter is argued to be amoral (Ekeh, 1975). The amoral civic public is depicted by the modern state structure, while the moral primordial public represents the various ethnic nationalities to which individuals, particularly Nigerians, belong.

Using Nigeria as a case in point, Ekeh (1975) argued that Nigerians and indeed, most Africans, particularly the elite, belong and prefer to gain materially from the civic public, but in turn they give grudgingly to the civic public. The reverse is the case for the primordial public, individuals are expected to give generously and materially to the primordial public, from which they receive next to no material gains. Proving further insight, Ifidon (1996) observed that the civic public realm the colonial administration, which was largely illegitimate and exploitative, having no moral links with the primordial public, hence cheating and circumventing the civic public was considered patriotism by the moral primordial public. Hence, since the same individual operated in the two public, the machinery of the state (civic public) was used to feed and cater for the primordial public, thereby, as Osaghae (1988) observed, institutionalizing corruption, nepotism, impunity and ethnicity as the hallmark of the civic public.

Several years after independence, the two publics still subsist in Nigeria, and leaders, as well as followers continue to operate in these two publics simultaneously. Nigerian leaders are arguably elected to office in the civic public on the basis of religion and ethnicity, whether or not they exploit or genuinely win the confidence of their primordial public, and once in office, they make tremendous contributions to their primordial public from which they gain little or nothing, perpetuating the already entrenched culture of corruption, negligence, half-hazard attention to the public interest and good. Pushing this argument a little further, it is debatable that Nigerian leaders in most cases neither support the civic nor the primordial public but rather are loyal to certain other individuals or groups who have supported their ascension to public office.

These two publics also manifest in the globalization process in Nigeria, as primordial and civic sentiments pervade economic, social and political foreign policy decisions and negotiations. It is arguable that leaders and diplomats who represent Nigeria in the comity of nations are not devoid of primordial influences which can influence their decisions and negotiations in vital international policies, which further undermine the globalization of Nigeria. This framework is appropriate as it captures and sufficiently explains the variable of leadership, especially leadership behavior in terms of decision making, as well as the implication of this for the various dimensions of governance, including globalization.

Overview of Leadership in Nigeria

In order to undertake a critical overview of leadership in Nigeria, one would have to begin from the very beginning – from the pre-colonial down through the colonial to the immediate post-colonial and subsequently – the tale of leadership in Nigeria is one that requires great historical background to uncover some of the peculiarities of the Nigerian case in particular and the African case in general. Pre-colonial African societies, including the territory now called Nigeria, arguably, were initially configured as smaller social groups (clans, villages, kingships, chiefdoms, emirates among others) and administered uniquely by varied styles of leadership and administrative systems. For instance, the pre-colonial Northern society was administered by the emirate system, Emirs were in charge of various emirates and sharia and other customary laws were the order of the day (Falola, 2007). While the pre-colonial Eastern societies were more egalitarian, the Western region was under the administration of the great Oyo Empire and the very many unique practices and rites of this region earned it the

widely acclaimed semblance of a constitutional monarchy. These various independent societies also interacted with one another in trade, commerce, security, among others, as well as had highly effective justice systems that helped ensure law and order within their communities (Falola, 2007). The leadership in these various traditional societies were largely devoid of corrupt practices; on the scale that it is currently perpetuated, as systems of traditional checks and balances existed, even in the egalitarian eastern communities, leaders were also loved by the people and had the unalloyed loyalty and allegiance of the masses.

Colonial rule largely altered these unique indigenous arrangements and instituted the alien indirect rule system which only emphasized loyalty and submission to the 'Crown'. Achebe (1983) describing the leadership in Nigeria in the 1980s, observed that the problem with Nigeria is the unwillingness or inability of Nigerian leaders to rise to the responsibility of leadership, and the inability of leaders to rise to the challenge of providing a personal example for the followers, which he identified as the hallmarks of true leadership. Igbokwe-Ibeto & Okoye (2014), corroborating this view, argued that from independence in 1960, most of the leaders in Nigeria particularly and Africa generally, have demonstrated no clear sense of genuine national development, rather they plunder, defraud, embezzle and mismanage their countries human and natural resources with so much impunity, they also are possessive, egoistic, selfish, individualistic, callous, greedy, secretive and nearly incapable of transparency and accountability in the administration and management of public goods.

Leadership and governance in Nigeria have remained under attack by various factors which have left the Nigerian people, and by extension the whole of the African continent wondering when this 'sleeping giant' will awake. These various challenges and the overarching nature of leadership and governance will be the crux of subsequent sections.

Nature of Leadership and Governance in Nigeria
Attempting to discuss the nature of leadership and governance in Nigeria is synonymous to undertaking an arguably inconclusive task. While the nature of leadership and governance in Africa can be summarized as largely corrupt, and self-serving, there are several arguments and conversations in the literature that help to explain this unfortunate nature. Here, we explore, military rule, ethnicity, and religion, as some of the explanations for the nature of leadership and governance in Nigeria. We would also attempt, subsequently, to link the nature of leadership and governance in Nigeria with other West African countries, and particularly how these have influenced the globalization of the Nigerian state.

The hijack of political power by the Nigerian military in January 1966 paved the way for an entirely new perspective to leadership in Nigeria. From January 1966 until May 29, 1999 when the military finally handed over power to a civilian government, the military had been in power, intermittently, for over three decades, precisely 34 years. The long years of military rule significantly influenced the nature of leadership in Nigeria, and resulted in a largely military democracy. Highlighting the impacts of military rule on the Nigerian state, Frank and Ukpere (2012) observed that the extensive years of military rule resulted in the display of military tendencies in a democratic arena. They argued further that the outcome of over three decades of military rule in Nigeria was a 'militarized political culture' manifested in the behaviour of individuals in the political arena, and especially manifested in the leadership as well. Putting it more lucidly, Dukor (2003, p.228) observed that;

The climate of crass greed and poverty in Africa has unduly created interests for different elites in every segment of the population including the military. As such, most military putsches in Africa and Nigeria in particular were motivated by the enhancement of the military's corporate interests and for the purpose of self-enrichment and self-aggrandizement. Through the instrumentality of coup d'etat, the armed forces have become a shortcut to power, wealth and fame. To further these ends, the army in Africa and Nigeria, in particular has in most cases constituted itself into arbitrator in political crisis and has appointed itself the protector of national interests.

Ethnicity has been another major influence on the nature of leadership in Nigeria. It is just stating the fact that Nigeria, like many other African states is highly multi-ethnic, and this has been a major factor in the politics and governance of Nigeria from the very beginning. Long before independence, ethnicity already played a very major role in the deliberations leading up to independence and governance of Nigeria. Three of the most prominent leaders, who were arguably always torn along ethnic lines, were Sir Ahmadu Bello, Premier of the old Northern Region (from 1952 to 1966); Chief Obafemi Awolowo, Premier of the old Western Region (from 1952 to 1960); and Dr Nnamdi Azikiwe, Premier of the old Eastern Region (from 1952 to 1959). Also, ethnicity in the military was a major factor responsible for the second military coup d'etat in July of 1966 when primarily Northern officers staged the onslaught that killed Major Aguiyi Ironsi along with other military governors at the time, in response to the aftermaths of the January 1966 which was arguably adjudged an 'igbo coup'. Although the Federal Character Principle introduced in the 1979 constitution was thought to help manage the challenge, ethnicity has remained a key determinant of political appointments and allocation of public good across the Nigerian state, resulting in several reactions, especially from the minority groups. Okeke and Idike (2016) concluded that ethnicity in the leadership experience and current leadership configurations of Nigeria still occasions immense challenges, and self-evident national development would remain unsubstantiated until the ethnicity issue is better understood.

Religion and ethnicity can hardly be separated. Alumona and Azom (2018) argued that it can be difficult to isolate ethnicity from religion because members of specific ethnic group also share same religious beliefs. They argue further that political contestations in Africa generally and Nigeria in particular are often built around religion; the political preferences of the people are largely determined by their religious similarity. This is same with leadership selection as well as allocation of resources and other public goods. Oguntola-Laguda (2015) also argued that Nigerian leaders are only religious when it is time to canvass the unsuspecting masses for votes, as these leaders immediately neglect the teaching, ethics and doctrine of religion after the elections and in the process of struggling for power. He further argued that if political leaders in Nigeria are indeed guided by the principles of their religion(s), they would be considerate and see religious ethics as a matrix upon which leadership could be built.

Globalizing Nigeria
Globalisation, as a term, is a multidimensional phenomenon that can be seen from a political, social, economic as well as religious dimension, which has been frequently used in the twenty-first century to represent the current world we live in. Nnamani (2004) describes it as a phenomenon whereby countries, people and businesses around the globe relate without much difficulty. It is however important to note that there exist divergent views among scholars on the exact meaning of globalisation because of its multifaceted connotations.

Globalisation as a topical issue has been widely discussed by scholars from different social sciences and even non-social science disciplines. Globalisation according to Bello (2004), involves such issues relating to elimination of international economic boundaries and thus tend towards uniformity of different nations of the world on a number of issues such as market system, economic policies, political institution, information technology, cultural outlook amongst others. Like many other countries globalization has aided and driven Nigeria to open her bothers of policies and ideas with the belief that opening bothers to outside competition is good for the Nigerian society, just like the proponents of globalization argue that it allows poor countries and their citizens to develop economically and raise their standards of living. To the developing countries, Nigeria inclusive globalization seems irresistible due a desire for better living and the many opportunities (flow of capital, information technologies, labor, goods, and ideas that constitute the current wave of globalization) accorded the citizens especially the younger generation. According to Igwe (2013) Globalization effects are not optional for developing countries especially Nigeria, but as compelling and imperative. He, as well argued that developing countries are pulled into global political, economic and social relationships without their consent through juicy attractions of improved world.

Hence, globalization is a tentacle that transcends all facets including individual into the society and creates a blend of people together into one global community, it is therefore left for Nigeria to stick to an obvious fact about globalisation which is more of loss than gain as a substantial portion of national values has thus far been lost and failed, Fukuyama (1992), in his treatise, *The End of History and the Last Man*, he perceived globalization as the universalization of western values. In the perspective of Igwe (2013), the celebration of a globalized world is the bold victory of political and economic liberalism, which is evidenced in the triumph of western ideas and values and in the exhaustion of viable systematic alternatives to western liberalism.

Challenges of Nigeria's Globalization

Nigeria as a nation can be seen as not doing so well as far as the expected consequences of globalisation is involved. Several factors have contributed and served as an impediment to globalisation in Nigeria, some of these factors include, but not limited to;

Insecurity: In the studies of Otite (2012) and Issah et al (2014), Nigeria has suffered plaques of crises leading to waste of lives and loss of valuable properties in recent times than has been experienced in history. The Boko-Haram saga; prevalent kidnapping cases; host of political cum religious motivated crises are common occurrences that have put lives and properties in Nigeria in a threatened un-secured situation (Miftahudeen 2012; Ganiya, et al 2016).

Corruption: This is a major factor that serves as a challenge for most developing and underdeveloped countries as far as globalisation is concerned, as observed by Nwankwo (2014). Corruption is a disease that seems to have eaten so deep into the fabrics of developing and under-developed nations of the world. This, however, is not to say that it does not occur in the developed economies. The magnitude of impact is seen on a very high level in less developed economies. Nigeria has been reported to be one of the most corrupt nations of the world.

Political Instability: As much as periodic changes in political systems could be healthy for a nation, so can it also be unhealthy for some nations especially a nation that has the underlying problem of corruption like Nigeria. Political instability often results to government's policy fluctuations which impedes the progress of activities. This factor has as well greatly contributed significantly to the challenges of globalisation in Nigeria.

Globalization and Development in Nigeria

Globalization is naturally meant to offer developing countries like Nigeria, an avenue to make and maximize wealth, through the interactions with other nations, which should foster international trade, advancement in technology as well as creation of institutions that will ensure the positive consequences of globalisation, including social and political development. Salimono (1999) observed that globalization reduced the barriers of international trade which has opened doors to the export-led growth in developing countries like Nigeria. This has however resulted into Nigeria's dependence on agriculture for her revenue for several years. Nigeria, alongside other less developed nations exported raw materials as cash crops like cocoa, coffee, palm-produce, groundnut, to developed economies and imported them back as processed goods. Bayo(2000), Eatwell (1996). This has thus led to Nigeria being a mono-cultural nation since independence, which has so much made Nigeria to be depended on the western countries for survival (Phillips 1991; Olaiya & Adelakun 2018).

Olaiya & Adelakun (2018) observed that all the variables used to measure globalisation, when testing its effect on Nigeria's development, proofed insignificant both individually and collectively. This clearly suggests that globalisation, despite the opportunities provided, is associated with serious problem that has to be managed in appropriate ways using appropriate fiscal policies, especially by developing countries like Nigeria. It is on this premise that Fadeyi & Oduwole (2016) highlights the following possible positive experiences of globalisation in Nigeria;
a.   Elimination of corruption or at least to reduce to a barest minimum
b.   A strong advocate to the West "No provision of safe havens for the economic looters"

c. Military and other forms of assistance to combat insurgency – Boko-Haram, militancy groups and the likes.
d. Provision and assistance for the internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) within the country which are on alarming rate considering the social-demographic characteristics involved – another social problem to be possibly reviewed in another study.
e. Trade – bilateral relationship.
f. Financial assistance "grants" to combat poverty, boost agriculture in order to enhance employment of the escalating unemployed youth in the country (Nigeria).
g. Assistance in the area of security challenge(s) and host of other social problems.
h. Improvement in political and democratization process (electioneering)."

While the observations above are useful in the analysis of globalization on the economic development in Nigeria, particularly, they are arguable and may not hold completely true in social and political development analysis in Nigeria. Nigeria's democracy has benefited immensely from the international community who has continued to emphasize transparency and accountability in governance, as well as the monitoring of period conduct of free, fair and credible elections of public officers. International Non-Governmental organizations have also initiated and executed several programs in Nigeria that promote the protection of human rights and help to combat crimes and criminal activities such as trafficking in persons, drug and arms, among others. Globalization in Nigeria's development, as with other areas, has had negative implications as well; importation of values and norms that are alien to the African culture and detrimental to the Nigerian people, such as drug, sex trafficking.

No doubt, globalization holds positive prospects for Nigeria, but globalization has not significantly translated to tangible benefits in Nigeria as a result of a combination of unresponsive, self-serving leadership, prevailing corrupt practices in both public and private sectors as well as political, economic and social instabilities. Nigeria's leadership ought to address the challenges of poor governance, ensure increased political stability and advance more sincerely the anti-corruption campaign if the merits of globalization are to be visible and sustainable in Nigeria.

Conclusion
This paper has demonstrated globalization as a phenomenon that Nigeria like every country around the world especially the developing embraced as they desire development/ political economy, situational occurrences reveals that Nigeria has, arguably not fully maximized the benefits from globalization as indicated above, due to factors of insincere leadership and bad governance amongst others which exacerbate inequality, deepen poverty and further overturn the gains from globalization. An obvious fact remains an impulsion for a shift of paradigm to the desired globalized Nigeria, which requires a need for citizens of Nigeria to understand how globalization works for them and the leadership choice suitable for the state, these challenges must be faced in other for Nigeria to remain relevant in the global scheme of things, though the challenges are enormous but not insurmountable and Nigeria must equip as a bulwark for effective confrontation against the dictates of foreign countries through her selfish leaders.

References
Achebe, C. (1983). *The Trouble with Nigeria*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.
Alumona I.M., Azom S.N. (2018) Politics of Identity and the Crisis of Nation-Building inAfrica. In Oloruntoba S., Falola T. (Eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of African Politics,Governance and Development*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Arugu, L., & Jacob, O. (2020) Globalisation and Public Policy in Nigeria: Challenges and Prospects. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, *7*(7), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.77.8479
Bello, M.L. (2004). The liberal perspective of globalization: A Critique. International Journal. Olaniyi (ed.) Political Science Review (3) 2:89-96. Ilorin: Department of Political Science.

Dukor, M. (ed.) (2003). *Philosophy and Politics: Discourse on Values, Politics and Power inAfrica*, Lagos: Malthouse Press.

Ekeh, P.P. (1975). Colonialism and the two publics in Africa: A theoretical statement. *Comparative Studies in Societies and History*, 19(19): 12-27

Fadeyi, A. O.& Oduwole, T. A. (2016). Globalisation and development: Nigeria's benefit. *International Journal of Innovative Legal & Political Studies*, 4(2):1-5.

Falola, T., Uhomoibhi, M., Mahadi, A., Anyanwu, U., (2007). *History of Nigeria 3: Nigeria in the Nineteenth Century*. Lagos: Longman Nigeria Plc.

Frank, E. O. and Ukpere, W. I. (2012). The Impact of Military Rule on Democracy in Nigeria, *Journal of Social Sciences*, 33:3, 285-292, DOI: 10.1080/09718923.2012.11893106

Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The End of History and the Last Man*. Free Press. ISBN 978-0-02- 910975-5.

Ganiya, O. A., Yinusa, M. A., Lawal, E. E. & Abdullateef, R. (2016). Globalisation and Entrepreneurial development in Nigeria: The challenges and the opportunities. *Bangladesh e-Journal of Sociology*. 13(2). 119-134.

Ifidon, E. A. (1996). Citizenship, statehood and the problem of democratization in Nigeria. *African Development*, 21 (4): 93-107.

Igbokwe-Ibeto, C.J & Okoye, J. C. (2014). Anti-corruption Crusade in Nigeria: More Words than Deeds. *International Journal of Public Policy and Administration Research*, 1(2):47-63

Igwe D. O. (2013) Nigeria in the Age of Globalization. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research*. Vol. 5(5) pp. 109-116.

Issah, M, Olatunji, A. & Yusuf, M.S (2014). 'Functional National Security: A Panacea forAttaining Sustainable Industrial Development in Nigeria' In Imhonopi D.O & U.M. Urim (Eds.) *Trajectory for industrial development in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Cardinal Printspp 116-131.

Miftahudeen, A. (2012). 'Insecurity in Nigeria and the way out'. *Osun Defender*, June 1st 2012.

Nnamani, C. (2004). *Globalizing in Poverty*. Published by the Department of Political Science, University of Ilorin.

Nwankwo, O. C. (2014). Challenges of globalisation and education in Nigeria. *Journal of Research in Education and Society*, 5(1), 49-54.

Ogbeidi, M.M. (2012). Political Leadership and Corruption in Nigeria since 1960: A Socio-Economic Analysis. *Journal of Nigeria Studies*, 1, 1-25.

Oguntola-Laguda, D. (2015). Religion, leadership and struggle for power in Nigeria: A case study of the 2011 presidential election in Nigeria. *Studia HistoriaeEcclesiasticae*, *41*(2), 219-233. https://dx.doi.org/10.17159/2412-4265/2015/225

Okeke, R. & Idike, A. (2016). Ethnicity, Political Leadership and National Development in Nigeria: The Contradictions and the Local Government Nexus. *World Scientific News*. 56. 67-81.

Olaiya, S. A. & Adelakun, O. J. (2018). The Nexus of Globalisation and Economic Development: The Nigeria Experience. *International Economics and Business*, 4(2), 1-17.

Orga, J. I. (ND). Globalisation: The Nigerian Experience. *Review of Public Administration &Management* Vol. 1 No. 2. Retrieved October 22, 2020 https://www.longdom.org/open-access/globalisation-the-nigerian-experience-2315-7844-1-109.pdf.

Osaghae, E. E. (1988). Legitimacy Crisis, the Character of the State and Social Mobilization in Africa: An Explanation of Form and Character. In Tyoden, S. G. (ed.) *Democratic Mobilization in Nigeria: Problems and Prospects*. Proceedings of the   Fifteenth Conference of the Nigerian Political Science Association, Held at the University of Ibadan June 26 to July 1st 1988.

Otite, E. (2012). *State of insecurity in Nigeria: A challenge to the government*. Retrieved October 12, 2020 from http://nnn.com.ng/?page_id=4449

Peter, A. E. & Oyovwi, D. (2003) Globalisation and Nigerian Development, *Journal of   Social Sciences*, 7:2, 155-160, DOI: 10.1080/09718923.2003.11892375

Michael Ihuoma Ogu (PhD) is of the Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Babcock University, Ogun State, Nigeria.

ogum@babcock.edu.ng

Bukola A. Alaois of the Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Babcock University, Ogun State, Nigeria.alaob@babcock.edu.ng