

The Role of Leadership, Public Accountability and the Performance of Security Personnel in Curbing Insecurity in Nigeria

Bassey, Ugo Samuel Ph.D

Department of Sociology, University of Calabar
Calabar, Nigeria
Email: ugoluoisa@gmail.com

Onyema, Okwu Augustina Ph.D

Department of Sociology, University of Calabar
Calabar, Nigeria
Email: luk4tinasy@gmail.com

Abstract

In a functional society, lives of human persons are worthwhile and worth living, if the security of lives and properties are guaranteed. The impact of safety on the quality of life and well being of individual is very unusual. However, insecurity is detrimental to the general well-being of the people, with its resultant effects in the areas of illness, low life expectancy, low quality of life and even death. On the other hand, security information awareness of the lives of persons exists in a situation, where the individual are liberated and also free from any kind of threats to their lives and threats to their means of livelihood. The purpose of this paper was to examine the role of leadership, public Accountability, and performance of the security sector as a collaborative effort towards curbing insecurity and ensuring a peaceful society. Exploratory research approach was adopted for the study. Both male, female, youth and adult of some selected states in Nigeria formed the population of the study; interview schedule was used for data collection. Data collected was analyzed using means and percentages. The result revealed a significant relationship between leadership and the security architecture in Nigeria. Based on the finding of the study, recommendations were made on how to promote security awareness, and the need for our leaders to imbibe the virtue of public accountability especially in the security sector in Nigeria.

Keywords: Leadership, public accountability, security, insecurity and curbing.

DOI [URL:https://doi.org/10.36758/jirses/v1n2.2021/4](https://doi.org/10.36758/jirses/v1n2.2021/4)

Introduction

The process of leadership must be seen as part of the dynamics of conflict and power; that leadership is mothering if not linked to collective purpose; that the effectiveness of leaders must be judged not by their press clippings but by actual social change measured by intent and by the satisfaction of human needs and expectations. However, the leadership question has been therefore been at the epicenter of disputation concerning good governance. This is so because, as Asiwaju (Ahnied) Bola Tinubu, recently observed ‘leadership and national development are twin engines. You need good leadership to conceive dynamic policies levels. It is not rocket science, yet we pretend that our path to national development will be different from that of other countries who paid the price for good leadership, dynamic and result oriented policies (’the nation, Thursday, June 13, 2013:50) cited in Celestine Bassey 2015:134.

Thus leadership is more than control of societal phenomena by a few individuals in a group (Bass, 1990) but the totality of influence behaviours, interaction patterns, traits and role relationships

that reflect leadership processes (Yukl, 2013). Also leadership is an imperative component for the evolution, and prosperity of civilizations throughout different times. The leadership process primarily underscores the influence of the leader upon followers including interactive influence between the leader and the followers (Silva, 2016) cited in Okechukwu et al 2020).

Objectives of the Study

1. To examine the relationship between leadership and security architecture performance in Nigeria
2. To investigate the impact of public accountability on the performance of the security personnel's considering the rising cases of insecurity in our country

Hypothesis of the Study

- H1: There is no significant relationship between leadership and security architecture performance in Nigeria
- H2: Public accountability does not have a significant impact on the performance of the security personnel's in Nigeria

Statement of the Problem

Leadership is such an integral part of the human condition that it defies conception in traditional ways. Leadership is a form of social influence; therefore, leadership is all about relationship with other and what motivates human behavior (Bennis 2010). Since the end of the cold war, the desirability of shifting from a state and elite-focuses view of security to one that places individuals at the centre of the security equation has gained increasing acceptance in many parts of the world. The concept of human security which combines elements of national security, economic development, and basic human rights with the objective of protecting people from the fear of violence is particularly relevant in Africa. While protecting the state and its citizens from external aggression remains a consideration; the most serious threats facing countries on the African continent at the beginning of the 21st century tend to the those that either derive from internal causes or are transnational and collective nature.

Literature Review

Public Accountability

Public accountability is the hallmark of modern democratic governance. Democracy remains a paper procedure if those in power cannot be held accountable in public for their acts and omissions, for their decisions, the policies, and their expenditures.

Public accountability, as an institution, therefore, is the complement of public management. As a concept, thus public accountability is rather elusive. It is one of those evocative political words that can be used to patch up a rambling argument to evoke an image of trustworthiness, fidelity and justice or to hold critics at bay. Historically, the concept accountability is closely related to accounting. In fact, it literally comes from book keeping. Currently, accountability has moved far beyond its bookkeeping origins and has become a symbol for good governance, both in the public and in the private sector (Bovens, 2007).

Accordingly Bostock, Breese, Ridley-Duff and Crowther, 2020 maintained that, public accountability is a central element of good governance and key to the effective provision of public services, economic development and sustaining constructive relations between citizens and the state both in developed and developing countries. The available evidence suggests that poverty reduction,

social protection, domestic resource, mobilization and corruption control hinge on the existence of effective accountability mechanisms (Ackerman, 2003; Bovens 2005) cited in Bostock et'al 2020).

The Security Sector

The “security sector” is a relatively new term that refers to the actors involved in the provision, management and oversight of security in a country. Nevertheless, this simple definition leaves room for different perspectives on which security actors are considered part of the security sector in each national context, and these differences shape approaches to security sector governance and security sector reforms. This SSR backgrounder explains different perspectives on the security sector in terms of the role and responsibilities of security actors in good SSG.

However, the security sector is composed of all the structures, institutions and personnel responsible for security provision, management and oversight at national and local levels. The security sector includes both actors that use force and those responsible for controlling how force is used through management and oversight: these actors are state security providers and those responsible for security management and oversight, which includes civil society. From the point of view of good SSG, the role of the security sector is to provide for state and human security. There are different definitions of the security sector. The narrowest include only state security institutions, while the more common definitions are more comprehensive, including all the state and non-state actors that influence security and justice within a state.

Conventionally, security institutions distinguished between external and internal security, and between national security and public safety. Military capabilities for external aggression and defence were considered separate from and largely unrelated to domestic security, public safety or law and order.

Therefore, this began to change as state centric understandings of security moved towards more people centred vision of human security. Thus several factors showed that it makes sense to consider both internal and external security, military and non-military, national and domestic, and state and non-state security provision together as a single area of service provision and public responsibility.

- Human security highlighted the importance of a secure state that can offer security to its diverse population
- Development actors argued that state security institutions of all kinds should be held to the same public management and accountability standard as other parts of the public sector
- Changes in international security blurred the distinctions between internal and external security mandates.
- Recognition of the inter-linkage between subsectors of state security provision, and state and non-state security actors, showed the need for a holistic understanding of security provision, management and oversight. (DCAF-BG-3-the security sector. 11.15).

However, as the result of these factors, the idea of the security sector emerged as a more comprehensive perspective on how the state provides for its own security and that of individuals and communities of all backgrounds. The term “security sector” was inspired by new public management approaches to public service delivery, but the term “security system” has also been used to make the same point that security provision involves many interconnected actors and must be considered holistically. (SSR in nutshell, I SSAT 2012:4).

The State Security Provider

State security providers are the security institutions established by the state and authorized to use force on behalf of the state. The use of force includes the threat to use force and the limitation of certain basic rights under specific circumstances defined by law.

Every security sector is different, but typical state security provider includes the following:

- a. Armed forces, such as the army, navy, air forces, coastguards and other military and auxiliary formation
- b. Public law enforcement, such as police, gendarmerie, and auxiliary policing forces
- c. Executive protection forces, such as presidential guards or close protection units
- d. Intelligence services, both military and civilian foreign and domestic
- e. Reserves and local security units, civil defence forces, national guards, civil protection and emergency formations and commercial security providers contracted by the state.
- f. Border guards and customs authorities, the list of state security providers will be different in every national context for example, not all states have military forces or gendarmeries. but all state security provider are included in every definition of the security sector. But there is more to the security sector than state security providers. The narrowest possible definition with the concept of good SSG also includes the state structures, institutions and personnel responsible for the management and oversight of security provision. (DCAF SSR, BAKGROUND I the security sector. 11.15).

Enhancing Public Accountability

Within the context of Nigerian state, it is not as if successive governments have not realized the problems posed by corruption to the socio-economic development of the country. Without doubt, successive government at one point or the other have been making series of attempts at combating corruption through series of anti-corruption campaigns. What is in doubt however is the impact of the anti-corruption campaigns on society (Lawal and Ariyo, 2006; 645).

Since the return of the country to civil rule on May 29, 1999, the Nigerian government has taken a number of measures to address the problem of corruption and bad governance in the country. The measures include public service reform (Monetization to reduce waste and reduction of over bloated personnel, reform of public procurement); establishment of anti-corruption enforcement agencies (such as the Economic and Financial Crime Commission, Independent corruption and other practices commission), and the then sanitization of the financial services sector by the Central Bank under Governor Sanusi which has revealed mind bulging levels of bare faced theft by the management of several banks in Nigeria. Also, there is a new agency known as the budget monitoring and price intelligence unit, whose main objectives include promoting transparency in government financial transaction and establishing open and competitive bidding process for government contracts. It was created during Olusegun Obasanjo's administration in (Obasanjo, 2003:6).

Although Nigeria has formulated various legal instruments and established a number of watchdog institutions (like EFCC, ICPC, Code of Conduct Bureau) for regulating and monitoring the ethical behavior of its public officials. However, despite the existence of a number of legal instrument and watchdogs institutions for regulating and monitoring the ethical standard of public officials, and the adoption of multiparty system, the management of public affairs and institutions by those who are entrusted with positions of authority in the country has not improved. Nigeria cannot afford to continue on the path of unbridled corruption because corruption erodes the capacity of governments at all level to provide public services at the quality and quantity needed to improve the living standard of the people (Adejuwon, www.google.com).

Essential Estimations for Effective Public Accountability

In a bid to effectively and efficiently meet the ever changing citizens' wants and needs, government around the globe are increasingly searching for the best mechanism to improve the extent to which public office holders (Ijeoma and Sambumbu 2013:283). In the absence of comprehensive public accountability framework, achieving effective public accountability still remains increasingly a challenge. In an attempt to improve the accountability of government and its executive institutions, governments are looking towards mechanisms to secure the accountability of government and public officials (Hereden and Steyn, 2021:75).

However, measures to secure accountability serve to embed and secure whatever it is that people are accountable for. "they are instruments for calling people to account, for judging the adequacy of the accounts rendered and for bringing sanction to bear for failures to produce an adequate account" (Goodin, 2003:365). Also Agara and Olarinmoye (2009:13) note that accountability and control measures were engineered in the public service when it was observed that workers popularly called public servants require some levels of restraints in the execution of their official duties and delivery of services to the public (Adejuwon 2019), www.researchgate.net).

Theoretical Framework

Strain theory the theoretical anchorage for this work is on strain theory by Robert Mertons (1957). Strain theory states that social structures may pressure citizens to commit crime. Mertons strain theory also known as anomic theory is very similar to the very meaning of the word strain. Schmallegger (1999), proposed anomic to be a situation in which societies inadvertently bring to bear pressure or strain on individuals that can led to rule breaking behavior. The pressure or strain is caused by the discrepancy between culturally defined goals and the institutionalized means available to achieve these goals. In trying to offer an explanation for the rising crime wave across the globe (Nigeria) towards the middle of the twentieth century. Merton had postulated that a society instills in its member a desire for certain goals and prescribes socially approved means for realizing such goals. Merton had reasoned that if a person's cultural goals are thwarted through the application of legitimate means, he may adopt illegitimate methods in the alternative (Akwaji & Bassey, 2019), Merton identified five modes of adaptation: conformity, innovation, retreatism, ritualism and rebellion.

The innovator is the most likely to engage in criminal behavior as the innovator accepts the socially recognized goals of society, but rejects the legitimate means to achieve these goals. However, the innovator uses proceeds from crimes such as insecurity, corruption; fraud, theft and illegal drug dealing to access culturally defined goals (Tierney, 2010). Anderson (1999) described many of the objective strain in poor inner-city African community/nations through their experiences of certain events and condition to establish the link between such strains and their extent of deviation. In addition, Ageneju (2001) found conditions like goal blockage, loss of positive stimuli and/or the presentation of negative stimuli as constituting objective strain that can expose one to criminal involvement or behavior. In contrast with Merton, Cloward and Ohlim (1960) in Igbo (2007) cited in Akwaji and Bassey (2019) however, extend this theory by arguing that even the illegitimate means are unevenly distributed in the society since, not all individuals can attain their goals through illegitimate means because, the opportunity for doing so are not available to everyone just as there are different in the opportunities available to individuals who adopt legitimate means for achieving their cultural approved goals. The relevance of Mertons strain theory to this work is that it can be used to explain the role of leadership and the causes of insecurity in our nation.

As long as the culturally dominant goals remain wealth and the means for acquiring wealth is not evenly distributed, the prevalence of leadership failure public accountably and the performance of security personnel's in curbing insecurity in Nigeria has continued to be unabated.

Research Methodology

The study adopted an exploratory research approach to determine the role of leadership and public accountability and the performance of security personnel in curbing insecurity in Nigeria. Data was collected via a survey of 300 respondents using non-probabilistic sampling techniques comprising of purposive and techniques. The research instrument used for the study was the structured questionnaire. Out of the 300 copies of questionnaire administered 268 were retrieved and analyzed given us a response rate of 90%. Out of the 26 respondent 144 were female and 125 were males. The items of measurement were rated on 5-points liker type scale which ranks responses on a scale of (1) strongly disagreed to (5) strongly agreed. Data collected were analyzed using correlation and linear regression analysis with the aid of statistical package of social sciences (SPSS) version 17.

Results

Table 1: Correlation matrix

Variables		The role of leadership	Public accountability
The role of leadership	Pearson correlation sing (2-tailed) N	1	734
		268	.000 268
Public accountability and security sector	Pearson correlation sing (2-tailed) N	.734 .000	1
		268	268

Correlation is significant at 0.05 levels (2 tailed)

Source: authors field work 2021.

Table 1 shows the correlation between the role of leadership, public accountability and security sector in Nigeria. There exists a significant positive high correlation between the role of leadership, public accountability and security sector ($r = .734$, $n = 268$, & $p < 0.005$).

This implies that, the role of leadership has a strong and positive relationship with public accountability and the performance of security personnel in curbing insecurity in Nigeria. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Linear regression analysis

Table 2: model summary

Model	R	R2	Adj-r2	Std. Error of the estimate
1	0.594	0.568	0.407	0.213

Source: authors, field survey, 2021

- (a) Predictors: (constant), the role of leadership
- (b) Dependent variable: public accountability and security sector

Table 3: ANOVA

Model	Sum of square	Df	Mean	F	Sig.	Remark
Regression	21.510	2	6.411			
Residual	13.017	263	0.375	24.312	0.000	Sig.
Total	34.527	265				

Source: authors, field survey, 2021

- (a) Dependent variable: the role of leadership
- (b) Predictors (constraint). Public accountability and security sector

The linear regression shows (R^2) value of 0.568 which revealed that the role of leadership independently account for 56.8% of the variation in security personnel's in curbing insecurity in Nigeria, the F. statistic of 24.312 revealed that the model is statistically significant at 0.05 significant levels. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Discussion of Findings

The result amongst others showed that there is a positive and relationship between the role of leadership and public accounting in curbing insecurity challenges in Nigeria. The finding is in agreement with Bostock, Rideley-Duff and Growther, 2020 study that revealed the relationship between public accountability and security performance in curbing in insecurity challenges. As predicted, the study also revealed that the role of leadership exerts a positive and statistically significant impact on the security performance in Nigeria. The findings is in agreement with Silva (2016) cited in Okechukwu et'al (2020) and Yukl (2013) views that leadership plays a very important and crucial role in improving the performance capacity of the nation security challenges. From the findings therefore, Nigerian leaders especially those occupying public offices must be encourage to develop the spirit of accountability as this will go a long way to minimize to the dearest minimum the security challenges in Nigeria.

Conclusion

The study has revealed through its perceived findings that the role of leadership has a strong and positive impact on security sector in Nigeria. Also, the relationship between public accountability and the role of leadership was confirmed. In conclusion, the driving force of economic growth and development is to encourage effective public accountability in all sector, considering that "leadership and national development are twin engines, because Nigeria need good leadership to conceived dynamic policies levels. Besides, no nation can experience meaningful development in the mix of insecurity challenges. It was revealed that corruption in particular as the major bane of public accountability and effective performance because the challenges of corruption in the security sector remain a major devastating issue facing Nigeria since the colonial period, and till today this phenomenon has become a cankerworm that has eaten deep in the fabrics of every sector/segments of the country.

Recommendations

Based on the empirical and theoretical findings of this study, the following policy recommendations were made:

- Government should take measures of ensuring accountability in the system and for promoting its integrity through the consistency of the explication of rules and regulations in

order to be able to predict actions and curtail the culture of impunity and arbitrariness in government.

- There is need to reposition the public service, making it more efficient, effective, dynamic and result-oriented by enhancing its work culture that will, among others, enhance transparency, accountability and ethical standards.
- There is need to reform the anti-corruption agencies in Nigeria; these agencies should be given the authority to go after any person who is suspected of being corrupt without fear or favour.
- It is important to implement accountability measures as a central concept for good government; accountability here requires that elected and unelected officials in government account for their performance to the public or to their duly elected representatives.
- There should be need for auditing public office holders, because auditing is to detect and prevent corruption and malpractice, ensure accountability, encourage improvement and contribute to security sector efficiency.
- There should be effective inspection and audit system that plays major roles in deterring potential corruption by providing a real chance of detection and punishment
- The security sector of the nation should be restructured in such a way that the monster of criminalities insurgency, Boko-Haram, kidnapping etc. can be curtailed.

References

- Abid, Saleem, Zabra M. B. Muhammed and Sada Z. (2019) Enhancing performance and commitment through leadership and empowerment.
- Adejuwon D. K (2020) Enhancing public accountability and performance in Nigeria.
- Bassey, C. O. and Agbor, U.I. (2015) Public policy and politics in Nigeria: A critical discourse.
- DCAF, Inter-parliamentary union (2003) Parliamentary oversight of the security sector.
- DCAF, NATO (2010), building integrity and reducing corruption in defence: A compendium of best practice.
- Emmanuel U. W. (2019) security sector governance and its impact on development in Nigeria.
- Hans Born, Lan Leigh (2005), Making intelligence accountable: legal standards and practice for oversight of intelligence agencies.
- Hezekiah, F. et'al (2018) measuring work engagement strategies employees behavioral outcomes in Nigeria.
- Ndem A. N. (2008) Poverty to sustainable development: (A community-based approach).
- Ngozi U. O. (2020) the role of leadership in the empowerment of Nigeria employees.
- Okenyodo O. (2016) Governance accountability and security in Nigeria.
- OSCE (2016) Handbook on combating corruption.
- OSCE (2016) security sector governance and reform guidelines for OSCE staff.
- Peter K, John P. U. Jiwen L. S, and Honghi N. (2016) the impact of leadership styles on innovation.
- Ronal B. (2014) Advance in management comprehensive leadership review.
- Securitysectorintegrity.com. Auditing-security sector integrity.
- Stephen O., Alex A. Kofo A. and Ozordi E. (2019) corruption: perception, institutional quality and performance of listed companies in Nigeria.
- www.oxfordhandbooks.com. Public accountability.
- www.researchgate.net: The role of leadership.