Factors Affecting Transparency 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
Transparency is critical for a modern democracy's efficient operation and the promotion of social well-being. Transparency ensures information is accessible. Without transparency, trust will be lacking between a government and those it governs. As a result, there would be social instability, such as political violence. Therefore, the study explored factors affecting transparency in managing political violence. The good governance theory is used as a guide. The study adopted a qualitative case study method. Purposive and snowball sampling techniques are used to identify 17 informants. A face-to-face interview through a Zoom online meeting was used to obtain the data. The data was analysed using thematic analysis with QSR Nvivo 12.0. The findings revealed that the government and its officials lack sincerity, which led to corruption in the management process of political violence. The finding also revealed that inadequate trust between the state government and the security agencies affects transparency practises. It was also demonstrated that lack of access to information on the management of political violence is another factor. From the findings, the research suggests that the government should be sincere and follow the principles of good governance in the management of political violence. Therefore, the research highlighted the key factors hindering transparency in the management of political violence.
Keywords: Transparency, Trust, Management, Political Violence, Development

Introduction
Transparency ensures citizens' trust in the government. Transparency is critical for a modern democracy's efficient operation and the promotion of social well-being. The terms

"transparent" and "transparency" are increasingly being used in academic writing about politics and public affairs as well as in everyday speech. Over the years, new laws and administrative regulations have increased public access to government information, increased the transparency of corporations, civil officials, and politician's activities, and made choices more transparent, notably in the wake of Watergate in the 1970s (Vaughn, 2000). They include the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) (1966, revised in 1974), which provides the public and journalists with access to many government papers upon request, as well as to most meetings and a wide range of presidential materials. Similar to this, other laws and rules make government programmes more transparent by mandating the measurement and reporting of results (Ball, 2009). These have brought tremendous changes in recent years. For instance, state-level research evaluating transparency has expanded beyond monetary transparency to include fiscal and budgetary transparency, as well as studies of politics and administration. Transparency in state-level research serves the specific objective of raising public awareness and trust. This means that by eliminating information asymmetries between political players and voters, openness promotes public trust in political actors, which in turn increases confidence in the actions of the government and elected officials (Ball, 2009).

Transparency refers to the extent to which information is accessible to the general public that enables them to have an informed voice in decisions and/or assess the decisions made by the government (Florini, 2007). This explains that transparency ensures information is accessible that may be used to assess how well the authorities are performing and prevent any potential power abuse. Therefore, without transparency, trust will be lacking between a government and those it governs. As a result, there would be social instability such as political violence, which has remained a major concern of developing countries (Carstens, 2005), and Nigeria is not an exception in this case. One of the major governance issues affecting Nigeria's security is a lack of transparency as a result of corruption among public officeholders and policy implementors. A report by Transparency International (2020) shows that the influence of corruption on Nigeria's security situations, such as political violence management, is evident. The report clearly reveals how public funds are mismanaged and how this has hampered effective crime control, thereby increasing social insecurity such as political violence.

Nigeria's historical experiences have established a strong foundation for the current wave of insecurity challenges, such as political violence in the forms of ethno-religious and politico-economic crises, because most of the issues have historical contexts and there are hot spots. Significantly, the current situation raises some major questions regarding the issue of good governance in Nigeria, and it appears that the politics of deprivation and resource mishandling are replacing the values of accountability, transparency, and responsibility (George-Genyi, 2013). This explains why Coker & George-Genyi (2014) also concluded that, on the one hand, politicians' unguarded and unpatriotic remarks are largely responsible for promoting and inflaming political violence in the form of religious, ethnic, and communal conflicts in Nigeria. Also, those in positions of political authority frequently lack the ability to absorb, contain, assess, and evaluate criticisms from those in opposition, and this tends to spark unwarranted misunderstandings and tensions in the nation, thereby leading to political violence in different forms.

Political violence is a relative concept that has drawn the attention of many scholars in the field of security studies. However, political theorists generally disagree on the specifics of what constitutes political violence. Attempts to define the term are typically accompanied by varying viewpoints and methodologies. Due to the concept's flexible and frequently illusive nature, the resulting disagreements in opinions are difficult to resolve (Mars, 1975). Political

violence is frequently employed to attain specific goals. Political violence is linked to the broad social structure; it is ingrained in society in the form of long-standing prejudice and exploitation when privilege and opportunity are distributed unequally. Political conflict is characterised as the conduct of violent crimes spurred on by a desire to seize or hold onto political power, whether deliberately or unintentionally. The globe is rife with intrastate and interstate political violence. The majority of these confrontations have featured violence, including murder, arson, and property destruction (Mahakul, 2014). In order to create a thorough picture of all types of political conflict inside and between nations, ACLED defines political violence through its constituent events. Although certain incidents, such as protests and nonviolent activities, are included in the dataset to capture the possible precursors or important junctures of a conflict, a politically violent event is defined as a single fight when force is often used by one or more parties for a political purpose. The use of force by a group for political reasons or motivations is known as political violence, and it can occur in different forms.

Political violence, however, is a broad phrase that encompasses a variety of occurrences, including those referred to as insurgencies, terrorism, civil wars, acts of communal violence, and ethnic and religious crises (Demetriou, 2014). It is crucial to note that various types of political violence can be differentiated in a number of ways, including the nature of the objectives, the targets of assaults, the group structures, and the range of acts (Bosi & Malthaner, 2014). Therefore, forms of political violence are determined or characterised by their purpose and targets.

Communal violence is one of the main types of political violence that affects Bauchi State. Bauchi is one of the northern states of Nigeria, bordering Borno, Yobe, and Plateau states. There are about 50 different ethnic groups and two predominant religious groups (Christianity and Islam) among the state's six million population. Consequently, the primary emphasis of this research is communal violence. Communal violence is a type of violence committed across ethnic or communal lines; the violent parties are motivated by a sense of allegiance to their respective communities, and the victims are selected based on membership in those groups. The phrase refers to disputes, riots, and other acts of violence between groups belonging to various religions or ethnicities (Najar, 2014). In this sense, communal violence is viewed as a sort of violence, conflict, or crisis between groups with the aim of gaining control over resources, political power, or territory. Throughout the state, violence has regularly broken out. In Bauchi, particularly in the local government districts of Bogoro and Tafawa Balewa, severe intergroup conflict over political dominance and land control resulted in the loss of several lives and significant property. Since then, the two local governments areas (LGAs) have been gripped by palpable tension as the harmed parties have filed lawsuits against one another. Avoidable communal crises should not be added to the list of anticipated security concerns in 2022, which are already many on the political stage (The Punch, 2022). Consequently, the purpose of this study is to investigate the factors affecting transparency in the management of political violence, such as the communal violence in Bauchi state.

Literature Review
In recent years, the assumption that transparency is not an opponent but a necessary element of both national and international security has gained recognition. The sharing of information has been established as one of the most crucial confidence- and security-building measures in international politics, for example, despite the fact that the transparency of the security sector has some limitations that make it a highly contentious issue even in democratic

countries. Therefore, in modern international relations, transparency plays a systemic role in maintaining peace, averting conflicts, and fostering security cooperation (Yordanova, 2013). Unfortunately, it is claimed that Nigeria's security management procedures lack transparency, which is thought to be a contributing factor in the persistence of security threats like political violence. As a result, Nigeria faces a wide range of complex security issues, including violent extremism, insurgency, kidnapping for ransom, intercommunal violence, and organised crime. These issues are most prevalent and pervasive in marginalised communities where residents have a high level of mistrust for the government, and they also involve irregular forces that are largely based on society (Okenyodo, 2016).

Furthermore, according to other studies, corruption also has an impact on how transparently the government manages security. Although it plagues the nation, widespread corruption poses Nigeria's biggest policy challenge and stability threat. As a result, corruption is still pervasive and persistent in Nigeria, which Transparency International ranked 148th out of 180 countries in its 2017 Corruption Perceptions Index (Itodo and Regan, 2018). According to Mathew (2018), corruption unquestionably affected Nigeria's security situation. Particularly in the defence industry, corruption has led to the misuse of the secret security funding system known as "security votes," resulting in the loss of billions of dollars in taxpayer money. If instead security threats were being addressed and a modern, effective defence force was being built, this public funding could have been used more effectively (Mathew, 2018).

The magnitude of the problem of security situation was also acknowledged by a former Inspector General of Police, who said that "The Nigeria Police Force has fallen to its lowest level and has in fact become a subject of ridicule within the law enforcement community and among members of the enlarged public" (Okenyodo, 2016). The report also noted that the Nigerian police system is thought to be politicized and that leadership positions are appointed "based on their political allegiances rather than on their experience or capabilities in law enforcement." This has undoubtedly led to the poor quality of leadership that is attributed to "loyalty to their political patron rather than to their institutions or citizens," weakening the norms of professionalism and ethics, a situation that is confusing (Uzuegbu-Wilson, 2019)

The government's inability to fully establish efficient, accountable, and transparent security agencies to pursue personal and community security alongside state security, as well as that of establishing efficient governance of the security sector through the empowerment of civilian oversight mechanisms, is a major challenge to Nigeria's development process. In order to pursue an efficient and accountable state security provision, management, and oversight within a framework of governance, respect for human rights, and the rule of law (Bryden & Chappuis 2015). From the foregoing, it can be understood that the major issue affecting security management in Nigeria is transparency. However, there is a lack of data that explains the transparency factors affecting political violence management, especially from the people's perception. Therefore, this study attempts to provide in-depth information about the factors affecting transparency in managing political violence. To achieve this, the study employed good governance theory as a theoretical framework to guide it. Therefore, the next subsection discusses good governance as a framework for the study.

Good Governance Theory
This section discusses good governance as a theoretical framework of the study. Good governance is a relatively new idea that has been in use since the early 1990s. The World Bank, United Nation Development Program (UNDP), Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development

(OECD), International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Trade Organization (WTO), and other international organizations recommend that the core characteristics of good governance be participation, rule of law, effectiveness, efficiency, accountability, transparency, openness, predictability, responsiveness, equity, and inclusivity (Madhu, 2011). The World Bank specifically identified transparency and accountability as the two key indicators that pertain to the parties' observance of the ethics of probity (CBSE Guide 2007–2017). The premise of the good governance argument is that structural adjustment may not be successful in the absence of good governance (Madhu, 2011). Good governance ensures that corruption is reduced, minorities' perspectives are considered, and their voices are heard in the decision-making process of society (Sheng, n.d). Therefore, one of the key principles of good governance is transparency.

The transparency component of good governance is the focus of this study. Transparency thus implies that decisions are made and their enforcement is carried out in a way that complies with laws and regulations. Additionally, it implies that those who will be impacted by such decisions and their enforcement have free access to information. It also means that there is sufficient information provided and that it is presented in formats and media that are easy to understand (Sheng, n.d.). Johnstone (2006) goes on to say that, subject to reasonable safeguards for security and privacy, transparency in good governance means conducting official business in a way that makes substantive and procedural information available to, and broadly understandable by, individuals and groups within society. This implies that information must be made available by officials and that there must be individuals and organizations with good reasons and opportunities to use information. The independent judiciary and a free, competitive, and responsible press are foremost among these, but a vibrant civil society is also essential. A transparent government clarifies exactly what is being accomplished, how and why actions take place, who is engaged, and by what criteria decisions are taken. Rules and procedures must be open to scrutiny and understandable. Transparency has crucial boundaries, two of which are public rights to privacy and legitimate security concerns. But without it, the term "good governance" is meaningless (Johnstone, 2006).

Therefore, when a nation lacks good governance with opaque procurement practices, it will likely suffer from a high level of mismanagement, which will inevitably lead to political gaps and weakened national security (Abiodun et al., 2020). Despite the fact, it should be obvious that good governance is an ideal that is challenging to fully realize, very few nations and societies have come close to achieving good governance in its fully realized form (Sheng, n.d.). However, due to certain aspects of expenditures that are concealed in covert ways or inadequately recorded, the majority of developing countries fall short in this essential aspect of security budgeting and implementation. As a result, transparency encompasses more than just regular public announcements of all budget items, which are made possible by media inquiries and governmental oversight examination (Abiodun et al., 2020). Therefore, steps must be taken to advance this ideology of good governance to make it a reality and guarantee long-term human development in the country. From the above explanation, it is clear that good governance theory can explain institutional transparency in management processes. Therefore, the good governance theory fits in this study.

Methodology

From the foregoing, therefore, this section explains the methodology employed in the study. Through the use of a case study, the study adopted a qualitative approach. The method was chosen because it allowed for a thorough analysis of the data collection processes. The study

adhered to three case study standards. The first aspect of the case is how political violence is handled. Second, Bauchi serves as the border, and third, the period is 2019–2022. Bauchi is one of the six states that comprise the northeastern political region of Nigeria. The study's sample size was increased using the snowballing technique after key informants were identified using a criterion-based purposive sampling technique. As a result, a total of 17 informants were interviewed for the study. The criteria used by the researcher in selecting the participants were knowledge, position, experience, and willingness to participate (Creswell, 2014). The informants who participated in the current study are presented in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1
Informant's 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

Source: Fieldwork, 2022

Table 1.1 above shows the informants' categories, number of the informants of each category who took part in the study, along with their research ID numbers. The information was gathered through an in-depth interview. The researcher and informants conducted the interview one-on-one via a Zoom online meeting due to COVID-19 restrictions. The institution where the student is pursuing his postgraduate degree granted ethics permission before the interview. The supervisory committee gave the researcher a letter containing key information about the study, which was then shown to each of the informants. The chosen informants were then invited via WhatsApp and SMS, with some of them also receiving regular phone calls from the researcher. Some informants declined the invitation, and those who took the time to respond were thanked. On the other hand, those who accepted the invitation were contacted to schedule an interview time and date. The interview sessions typically lasted 35 to 90 minutes. The interview was conducted in both Hausa and English. The Hausa language was translated into English, and all 17 interviews were recorded and transcribed. The expert editor then gave his or her approval to the translation.

In QSR NVivo 12.0, the interview data were analyzed using thematic analysis. The data from the interview were analyzed using Braun and Clarke's (2013) six stages of thematic analysis. To assess the validity, reliability, and trustworthiness of the data, the researcher used the triangulation approach, the back-to-back informant transcripts method, and both second-party (the supervisory committee) and third-party (professionals) contacts. The research also complies with all ethical standards, including the confidentiality of informants, their voluntary

participation in the study, their right to discontinue participation at any time, and their execution of consent forms.

Research Findings and Discussion
The findings of the study are presented, discuss, and interpreted in this section. Government transparency (integrity) in this study is used to mean the sincerity with which the federal and Bauchi state governments carry out their roles and commitments and how they value and places importance on handling security issues in the state. Also, this hinges on the openness of the federal and Bauchi state government in managing political violence. Therefore, the essence of transparency or integrity in governance is to allow citizens to know about what their government is doing at no expense to them. This means that the executive and security agencies should use ways to make public information about their operations and choices available in the management of political violence. In this regard, transparency (integrity) plays an important role in preventing corruption in the process of managing political violence by keeping the executive and agencies responsible.

Therefore, governments are presumed to minimize corruption in public life by maintaining smooth and transparent management. One of the most important components in achieving transparency is unfettered access to information. Based on this, lack of sincerity in management, lack of access to security information, and lack of trust between government and security agencies have become the major factors affecting transparency in security management.

Lack of Sincerity in Management
The first issue identified as a major factor affecting transparency is the lack of sincerity in management. Sincerity in management here refers to the commitment and openness by which government implements security and political violence decisions based on people's interests and knowledge. This further explains the commitment of the government to managing political violence in the state without misappropriation of any funds. Therefore, sincerity of purpose is directly linked with good management which determines the government's integrity. In line with this, when any government involved in the process of managing political violence is seen to be mismanaging resources that government may lose its integrity and respect from citizens.

Accordingly, and in line with the data, informants are of the view that the lack of sincerity and integrity on the part of the government are the major causes of security lapses and political violence in Bauchi state. The informants believe that most of the elected government officials are found to lack sincerity and integrity, as most of the public servants seek public office for their benefit rather than for the people's interests. For example, a government official stated that one of the problems associated with governance in Bauchi state is the issue of transparency. The informant accused politicians of enriching themselves with public funds. He remarked as follows

> *"…here sincerity is less because most people who contest elections do so to get rich… I cannot say all our politicians but the majority of the politicians who contest do so to get rich. The politicians are not sincere…The majority of people who go there are there to get real money… where there is transparency there is good governance, and where there is lack of transparency the result is political violence."*   *Source: Informant GO 1*

The above informant sees a lack of sincerity about corruption by some of the key elected officials. To him, one of the reasons why the management of political violence in the state remains ineffective is because of the lack of sincerity by the politicians. In a similar view, another informant added that managing political violence can never be effective as long as there is a lack of sincerity by the government and its officials. According to him:

> *"to be honest, lack of transparency is the major issue affecting not only the management of political violence but the management of the country as a whole. When you manage people or their affairs without sincerity then such management can never be effective. The problem is that government at the state and federal levels are not sincere"*

> *Source: Informant CL 2.*

One of the victims equally share the same view with the above informants and also believes that some government officials are not sincere:

> *"Well, there is no transparency at the state as well as at the federal levels because most politicians tend to use the security funds allocated for their own benefits. What I am trying to say here is that most of those that we chose to be our representatives in administration are corrupt and not sincere..."*

> Source: Informant VCTM 1

Another community leader and politician also see a lack of sincerity and transparency as a major setback to the management of political violence. According to the community leader:

> "Lack of transparency brings setbacks in the management of political violence. If government is not sincere on security issues, it can lose its integrity and people can decide to vote them out. We saw such an incident in the 2015 general elections where the people decided to vote out the incumbent administration because of its insincerity in tackling insecurity."

> Source: Informant CL 1

Also, according to government security agents, there are no clear processes put in place for managing political violence in Bauchi state. He also alludes that there is no sincerity in sharing funds. The first security personnel shared his views as follows:

> "umm, there is no sincerity whatsoever. For example, security votes (funds) have been inflated and at the tail end the state government especially the politicians will be the ones enjoying while allowing the security agencies with nothing. To me, transparency in funds management is not there. I can say the government is not open; even during meetings with the state government, it can be noticed that government is not clear about the exact amount allocated in the state for the police and security as a whole. Though we were given some amount by the state, the amount is not enough to manage our affairs and security concerns in the state."

> Source: Informant GSP 1

Furthermore, the state government is found to lack sincerity. This is because the state government is collecting huge funds from the federal government in terms of security votes to manage political violence in the state. Government officials do not always inform the people about it and the state government does not entertain any questions from the public on the matter. These were explained by one of the informants during the interview as quoted below when referring to government officials and security agencies:

> "…in our country Nigeria, there is no transparency because they collect lump sums of money and sometimes, they don't want people to know how much they have collected. They don't want you to question them on how they are using the money. I am talking as an individual but I don't know whether I am wrong or right. I stand to be corrected. There is a lack of transparency in every aspect in terms of telling people what they are doing with the money they have been given"
>
> Source: Informant GRT 1

An academician affirmed in their interviews that the state government lacks sincerity in dealing with political violence as a result of corruption. For instance, the first academician started by clarifying that transparency in governance is paramount and it is used to understand the government's sincerity in managing the affairs of the people. He concluded that the state government lacks such sincerity. His statement is shown in the following quotation:

> "Well, transparency in governance is one of the major components used to understand the sincerity of the government. Governments nowadays especially in developing countries like Nigeria, lack sincerity due to corrupt practices. So, it is very difficult for governments and politicians to be transparent in the management of political violence because they use political violence to generate funds. In some instances, politicians sponsor political violence and this makes it difficult for such politicians to be very open in pointing out the perpetrators because this would mean revealing personal secrets. Apart from Bauchi state, such incidences have been reported in many states in Nigeria."
>
> Source: Informant AC 1

From the foregoing, it can be deduced from the informants' views that government lacks sincerity of purpose and integrity in managing political violence and this negatively affects governance and the management of political violence. The result demonstrates that this lack of sincerity and integrity is associated with government officials and some politicians who mismanage or misappropriate public funds geared toward maintaining security and preventing political violence. The informants further attested to the fact that most of the elected officials running public offices are using public funds for their personnel gain rather than for the interest of the people as it relates to maintaining security generally. The views of informants show that the absence of sincerity and integrity in Bauchi state has negatively affected the state's approaches to managing insecurity. Therefore, one of the factors affecting the management of political violence in Bauchi state is the absence of sincerity and integrity on the part of the government.

The theory of governance emphasizes the fact that the process of management should be done with trust and sincerity and that this will limit mismanagement in governance. In 2015, Mercy (2015) conducted a study to examine the effects of corruption on good governance in Nigeria using secondary sources of data. The study found that, despite massive resources invested in the execution of policies aimed at improving governance in Nigeria, there have been no noticeable changes in citizens' living standards because of rampant corruption. This is why corruption is one of the key causes of Nigeria's ineffective economic performance, deteriorating infrastructure, growing living costs, poverty and this encourages political violence and other social crimes because citizens become very poor and poverty breeds crime. Emmanuel (2020) argues that in Nigeria, corrupt and unethical actions have taken place at all levels of government and that this has further undermined efforts to maintain national security generally. It is obvious that consumerism and the erosion of societal values are at the root cause of Nigeria's escalating corruption crisis and this deprives citizens of basic needs and people who are deprived are bound to be violent. The study also shows that persons in positions of authority are more interested in their advancement than in pursuing actions that will benefit all citizens.

From the foregoing, therefore, the lack of sincerity in the management hinders the effectiveness of the role of governance in managing political violence thereby tarnishing the government's integrity. The issue is that if the government is not sincere in its operation the level of allegiance by its citizens to the administration would be less or even absent, this can lead to overthrowing the incumbent administration. As the government lacks sincerity, there is likely access to information would be restricted or denied. In this regards the next subsection presented the view of the informants concerning access to security information.

Lack of access to security information

Lack of access to security information is another factor affecting transparency. Therefore, access to security information in this research refers to the process by which government publicly explains and gives information on security issues in the state and also allows the citizens to question any decision made by the government. Therefore, access to security information here is directly linked with the concept of information about government actions and inactions in managing political violence. Although some security information should strictly be for the government and its agencies, the government can sometimes share some information and invite citizens to contribute. According to the good governance theory and as explained by Johnstone (2006) in good governance there should be openness in sharing information with the public about government actions on certain policies related to public affairs. That is the capacity and commitment of government thus depends on its openness to the public.

Despite the openness in governance emphasized by the good governance theory, some informants stated further that government is not adequately open with information concerning the management of political violence in Bauchi state. For example, one of the informants in his remarks stated that over the years, the government has not been sharing with the public information on budgetary allocations for security purposes and for managing political violence. The informant went on to say that even the quantity of materials donated by external NGOs to be given to victims of political violence is not always known to the public. When talking about budgetary allocations for managing political violence and security issues he remarked as follows

"Well… you see, there is no government or administration that wants to reveal financial allocations to the matter because most of them use such money to enrich themselves. So, the process of managing political violence to me is not open to the public. Even most of the things from the commission that we distribute are things we get from donors (NGOs). So, the truth on the matter is not always revealed to the people and the people need to know what the government is doing and her plans for their development and progress."

Source: Informant GO 2

The above informant sees the absence of government openness from the angle of donations and resource allocation. Another informant sees the lack of government openness from the point of government plans and intentions. He noted that governments at state and national levels have over the years deliberately refused to be open about their plans and intentions and for him this is unfair. The informant's views on the matter are captured below.

"…openness is not there, that is, straight answers are not there. The management of the political violence to me is not open; in fact, most of the people at the community level know nothing about government plans for political violence… what we mean by transparency is that the government needs to be open and fair in the management of political violence and security issues. In the case of political violence, the issue is different because people are not treated equally."

Source: Informant GRT 3

Similarly, an informant from the NGOs category posited that it is quite challenging for the local NGOs to cope with the state government because local NGOs are not fully recognized by the state government and tend not to be open to these local NGOs when it comes to the management of political violence. The informant had the following to say:

"Government plans and decisions in some cases needs to be transparent and open to those who can give valuable contribution like the Local NGOs because we are the ones living in the communities. Unfortunately, we in local NGOs are finding it difficult to work hand in hand with the state government because of politics. The state government ought to recognize and disclose information on political violence and security generally to local NGOs. Sometimes government donates to local NGOs. Apart from that they don't know their existence. So, there is the issue of transparency between the government and the local NGOs"

Source: Informant NGO 1

From the point of view of international NGOs perspectives, the second NGO informant added that in most cases governments at all levels are found not to be open to them and that this makes the execution of their policies in the state problematic.

"…we face some issues for openness with the host government in certain scenarios. You know, our work is to provide the needful to

> *the government and in most cases when we request the government to provide us with full details on how certain things are, we often get the reports late or we do not get them at all. I could remember when we gave the state government some materials to help the victims of the Tafawa Balewa crisis. According to the information we received the material was not properly distributed as instructed. We aimed to help the government with decisions and materials needed to solve a particular problem but the government was not open in some instances and because of this we found it difficult to execute our project."*

Source: Informant NGO 2

An academician contributed that sometimes government and politicians become open in their daily activities. However, the problem is that some politicians who are open in terms of disclosing information on political violence and general security issues retire or are not voted to continue and others not open are elected. This circle continues. The informant stated that:

> *"Well…government officials and politicians when managing political violence are not open at all, and can never be. The moment people are straightforward in revealing information about the government believe me they will not be in politics for long. We have seen this again and again in the state"*

Source: Informant AC 1

From the foregoing analysis, it is revealed by the informants that government does not share information on political violence and insecurity and the information is not easily open to the public. This implies that the people are not getting updates from the government on security management in the state. Lack of access to information is characterized as one of the factors hindering the proper management of political violence in the state. This is because security agencies need information as a basis to act. The public also needs information to leave or remain in certain locations depending on whether the locations are safe or not. However, certain information has to be kept secret by the government especially when it is established that revealing such information is against the national interest or that the information can initiate negative thoughts and violence in the state. Nonetheless, updating the public on security issues would ensure trust between the government and the public. Therefore, openness and transparency are key ingredients to build trust and these are necessary for the well-functioning of government. Despite improvements in transparent governance in some issues like making public government projects to improve lives and properties, many people still feel that government is unfathomable and that its inner workings as it relates to general security and political violence are unclear and ominous.

The data from the interviews is in line with existing data from other studies. For instance, (Krueger, 1974) has established that openness in governance allows the government to make its actions available for public inspection, resulting in public pressure on governments to perform better and eliminate corruption. A good number of studies concentrate on transparency of government and trust. These studies are mostly in either public administration or development studies. In most cases, such studies concentrate on various processes and procedures for achieving data transparency: posting documents online, expanding budgetary openness, and increasing auditing standards. However, political contestation in Nigeria

demonstrates that these measures are insufficient to satisfy the public's need for a transparent and accessible government (Roelofs, 2019). This may help to explain why the Nigerian state passed the Freedom and Information Act (FOIA) to foster accessibility to information on governance.

Salau (2017) studied Nigeria's Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) 2011. Their work shows that the Act's purpose is to increase public records, and free access to information as well as give the public legal remedy if their request for information is denied. The law introduces statutory measures intended to recognize, ensure, safeguard, and encourage the exercise of the public's right to information to address the flaws of earlier Acts. The Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) cannot accomplish its goals without the general public taking on the joint responsibility of demanding and enforcing a transparent government. This is because the secrecy of information still exists in public agencies. This is why there have been provisions for a legal basis for the right to obtain information in the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). It tries to put an end to the age of official secrecy by giving legal backing to the fact that citizens can have access to information particularly on governance as a right. However, the act is merely the start of a difficult and drawn-out path because the government is already used to keeping most of its operations secret. Fortunately, the 1999 Nigeria Constitution 39(1) guarantees freedom of expression, including the right to receive and impart information but again, sections 39(3) and 45(1) permit restrictions on access to information.

Despite, the position of the constitution on public access to information, Salau (2017) says that Nigeria's constitutional protection and judicial recognition of the right to access information do not meet the minimum standards set forth by international law. According to the author, it must only be in the interest of the general public that free access to information should be restricted for reasons of national interest. He suggests a proper statutory definition of "national security" and a clear constitutional framework for access to information and that limits should only apply where the loss to national security is higher than access to information. This is because access to information is vital in achieving public trust and allegiance. Based on the foregoing postulations on the issue of access to security information, the government's management of information on political violence and the resultant lack of trust by citizens and security agencies who sometimes become frustrated because of their inability to have access to the information needed. As the security agencies and citizens have no idea about security information that can create mistrust and lack of legitimacy to the government. Thus, the next subsection discusses the inadequate trust between the state government and security agencies which cause by the lack of proper information sharing.

Inadequate trust between the state government and security agencies
Some informants identified inadequate trust between the government and security agencies as another factor affecting transparency in the management of political violence in Bauchi state. Therefore, trust between the government and security agencies was culled to be another factor. Trust in governance is a concept that is related to government integrity in the decision-making or implementation process. The management of political violence involves the participation of other agencies in the decisions and implementation of security decisions. As such, governments at all levels are expected to be sincere in their actions and inactions so that their agencies and the public can have full access to information on government policies and programs. In a situation where the government is not sincere, distrust may likely occur between the decision-makers, citizens, and the implementers of policies and programs.

According to the informants of this study, distrust among government and security agencies quietly happen in the management of political violence in Bauchi state, and this is related to the issues of corruption by some government officials at the expense of security in the state and security agencies. For example, a government official informant stated that elected politicians tend to use security funds for their gain and so deliberately make the government not to be transparent thereby creating distrust among government and security agencies. The informant had the following to say to further explain transparency in security information:

> "…as I told you before, most of the elected politicians are in office because of their gain and for them to achieve that, they block any information to the public that will reveal the accurate figures of government spending. If the government spends 2 million for instance, they may decide to say to the public that about 10 million was used for the situation…even the security agencies are not quite happy with the funding given to them as they know that the politicians are using the money to enrich themselves. This can bring mistrust between the state government and federal security agencies."
>
> Source: Informant GO 1

Similarly, a second government official informant added that the problem is from the security agencies because sometimes they submit false reports to the government which creates a lack of trust. The informant had the following to say:

> "I look at the problem from the perspective of the security forces. The reason is that the security forces do not provide good information to the government on security except to take money from the government. When the government makes its investigations, it normally finds that the story was not true. I could remember a time when the police reported to the government that youths were planning to unleash violence in some areas but we found out that it was a false story. This can disdain the integrity of the security forces in the eyes of the government and the public."
>
> Source: Informant GO 2

On the contrary view, a government official stated that in most cases the money allocated for the operations by the government is not enough and even allowances are sometimes slashed. The informant's views as cited below:

> "Honestly, like what I mention earlier… we do not have enough money to pay for our services, you have to leave your family and go to work. Other times the amount that the government says it pays for each officer is not how we get it. This is one of the biggest challenges we face."
>
> Source: Informant GSP 2

He further added that there is a lack of understanding between security agencies operating in the state and the state government because of the sensitivity of the government's funds allocated for security purposes.

"hmm, the biggest problem is the imbalance between the government and the security forces. People in government do not inform law enforcement agencies of their responsibilities. For example, the money that should be spent on security is not revealed to security agencies. Rather, the government gives them a token. In so many ways you hear security agents complaining of not receiving their allowances or that the allowances have been deducted"

Source: Informant AC 1

A grassroots informant, on the other hand, looked at the problem of mistrust from the security agency's point of view. He stated that sometimes security agencies present fake information about an impending security challenge for them to collect money from the government:

"…government is secretive. Government should work with the security forces to address the problem of political violence in the state and the unwillingness to share information on security issues should not be. What we see is that there is a rift between them …this comes from the budgets since the project's cost money."

Source: Informant GRT 2

A community leader concluded that people no longer trust the state government's handling of political violence and security issues because of the mismanagement of resources by some public officials. This informant posited that:

".. you see the role of government concerning transparency, to be honest, is a problem. People at the community level no longer trust the government because people have realized that elected officials and their families are the only ones enjoying and being protected from the menace of political violence while others suffer from it. If you were elected to represent the people much is expected from you and you need to be careful."

Source: Informant CL 2

The foregoing analysis under this section represents the informants' perceptions. Some believe that there is a lack of trust between government and security agencies. These informants' views also hinge on the government's insensitivity to political violence, mismanagement of resources meant to manage insecurity issues, and the unwillingness to share information on security concerns. Though governments at all levels are expected to be transparent on security matters in their operations and collaboration with security agencies and the public, the above analysis shows that the state government has not been adequately transparent due to its mistrust of security agencies and its unwillingness to share information. The findings are consistence with a study by Ighomereho, Achumba and Akpor-Robaro (2013) who believes that institutional failures in increasing the efficacy of trusted security mechanisms by either democratic reforms or development projects are closely tied to the lack of open and sound institutions to deal with security concerns. On the other hand, Daniel & Kwopnan (2018) add that, other issues that threaten national security apart from militancy are lack of openness, the appalling failure of Nigeria's past governments to manage national

security issues such as violent crimes committed against the Nigerian state by some people and groups and as a well as the result of lack of openness in management.

Conclusion and Recommendation

From the foregoing analysis and discussion, it can be understood that Bauchi State is a multi-ethnic and religious society, and this requires adequate transparent administration by the government to ensure peace and harmony among the diverse groups as well as equal distribution of resources and opportunities for all citizens, regardless of their ethnic or religious affiliations. As a result, it is concluded that the government's inability to be open on issues of political violence management has demonstrated that the government's role in terms of transparency is inadequate, resulting in misunderstanding and tension among the diverse group. This is due to a lack of sincerity in dealing with security issues such as political violence, as well as public mistrust in the government's handling of political violence. However, most of the answers are related to government officials' financial mismanagement (corruption). The essence of emphasizing the government's openness is to reduce corruption among public officeholders by making them more open and allowing access to information on how public funds are used. It is also clear that there is a disparity between the government and security agencies and among security agencies. This mistrust, which has caused disparity, affects the government's integrity in the eyes of the security agencies, which also affects the role of the government in managing political violence in the state. Of greater concern is the fact that Transparency International has ranked Nigeria as one of the world's most corrupt countries in its corruption perception index. Indeed, corruption is to blame for Nigeria's socioeconomic and political underdevelopment, and the threats must be addressed urgently if the country is to progress in its search for a decent government.

Based on the findings and conclusion of the study, it was recommended that the government adhere to the rules and principles of good governance in providing social services to people. This can be achieved if the government provides an all-inclusive mechanism that will allow all ethnic groups to be involved in the decision-making process of security management in the state, and the process should be transparent to all. To ensure sincerity and avoid corruption among policymakers and implementors, there is a need for the government to enhance and give full authority to the financial and crime bodies to carry out their duties and responsibilities without the interference of any public figure or organization; that is, if a person is found guilty, they should be punished accordingly (no person is above the law). To determine if the information on the security budget and real expenditures is easily accessible to the general public, as well as the degree of its trustworthiness, specifics, and overall understanding of the information, there should be an openness to the information on political violence spending. Therefore, if these are considered, there will be understanding among the different communal groups, and the level of tension, as well as mismanagement, will be reduced in the state and the country in general.

References

Abiodun, T. F., Asaolu, A., and Ndubuisi, A. I. (2020). Defense budget and military spending on war against terror and insecurity in Nigeria: implications for state politics, economy, and national security. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Research Social and Management Sciences,* 6(7), 12-34.

Ball, C. (2009). What is transparency? *Public integrity*, 11(4), 293-308.

Bosi, L., and Malthaner, S. (2014). Forms of political violence. *ECPR General Conference Glasgow*, 03 - 06 September 2014.

Braun, V., and Clarke, V. (2013). *Thematic analysis of interview data in the context of management controls research*. Research methods datasets, Sage Publication.

Bryden, A., and Chappuis, F. (2015). *Introduction: Understanding security sector governance dynamics in West Africa*. In: Bryden, A and Chappuis, F (eds.) Learning from West African experiences in security sector governance, Pp. 1–18. London: Ubiquity Press.

Carstens, A. (2005). The role of transparency and accountability for economic development in resource-rich countries. *At the regional workshop on transparency and accountability in resource management in CEMAC Countries, Malabo, Equatorial Guinea, January, 27.*

CBSE Guide. (2007-2017). *Government budget and the economy*. Retrieved from https://s3-ap-southeast.

Coker, M. A., and George-Genyi, M. E. (2014). Bad governance: The bane of peace, security and sustainable development of Nigeria. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, 3(5), 1121-1146.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approach* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Daniel, G. H., and Kwopnan, B. (2018). National security challenges and sustainable development in Nigeria: A critical analysis of the Niger Delta region. *Global Journal of Political Science and Administration,* 6(4), 32-50.

Demetriou, C. (2014). *Political violence and legitimacy: Concepts and methodologies*. *ECPR General Conference Glasgow*, 03 - 06 September 2014.

Florini, A. (2007). *The right to know: Transparency for an open world*. Columbia University Press: New York.

George-Genyi, M. E. (2013). Good governance: Antidote for peace and security in Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 2(2), 56-65.

Ighomereho, O. S., Achumba, I. C., and Akpor-Robaro, M. O. M. (2013). Security challenges in Nigeria and the implications for business activities and sustainable development. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 4(2), 79-99.

Itodo, S., and O'Regan, D. (2018). *Nigeria's movement for transparency and accountability bringing the pieces together*. Special Report 433, United States Institute of Peace.

Johnston, M. (2006). Good governance: Rule of law, transparency, and accountability. *New York: United Nations Public Administration Network*, 1-32.

Krueger, A. (1974). The political economy of a rent seeking society. *American Economic Review*, 64, 291-303.

Madhu, P. (2011). What is good governance? *SSRN Electronic Journal, 1-6.*

Mahakul, B. K. (2014). Political violence: A study of Naxal Movement in India. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 4(11), 1-10.

Mathew, T. (2018). *Camouflaged cash: How security votes fuel corruption in Nigeria*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Transparency International.

Mars, P. (1975). The nature of political violence. *Social and economics studies*, 24(2), 221-238.

Mercy, O. A. (2015). The effects of corruption on good governance in Nigeria. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, 4(3), 292-307.

Najar, M. I. (2014). Communal violence, its causes and solutions. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention,* 3(12), 05-07.

Okenyodo, O. (2016). *Governance, accountability, and security in Nigeria*. Africa Security Brief. NO. 31 / JUNE 2016. http://africacenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/ACSS-AfricaSecurity-Brief-No.-31-EN.pdf.

Roelofs, P. (2019). Transparency and mistrust: Who or what should be made transparent? *Governance*, 32, 565–580.

Salau, A. (2017). *Right of access to information and its limitation by national security in Nigeria: mutually inclusive or exclusive*? Thesis, University of Cape Town.

Sheng, Y. K. (n.d.). *What is good governance*. United Nations, Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.

The Punch. (2022). Curtailing avoidable violence in Bauchi state. The Punch newspaper, 23rd January.

Transparency International. (2020) Nigeria corruption. Nigeria - Transparency.org.

Uzuegbu-Wilson, E. (2019). Security sector governance and its impact on development in Nigeria: A critical analysis. *SSRN, 1-17. https://ssrn.com/abstract=3430383.*

Yordanova, T. (2013). The transparency - Security dilemma in national and international context: A comparative analysis of the UN' and NATO's Transparency/Secrecy Policies. OHCHR. https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Issues/Expression/IntOrganizations/SvetlanaYordonova.pdf.