

## IN SEARCH OF ROADMAP FOR NIGERIA'S NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: RESTRUCTURING OR ATTITUDINAL CHANGE?

**Mbanefo ODUM**

Department of Public Administration, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu-Ojukwu University, Igbariam, NIGERIA.

### **Abstract**

*Past efforts geared towards engendering national development in Nigeria have yielded unsatisfactory results and this has led to the continuing search for an appropriate model or prescription that would deliver the country from her problems. In recent times, the issue of restructuring has occupied the centre stage of the national discourse and seemingly presented in some quarters as a panacea for overcoming the national developmental challenges. While not denying that the country has several structural defects, it is necessary to appraise Nigeria's situation with a view to determining whether her problem lies with the structuring of the country per se, or whether it is borne out of attitudinal issues. To achieve this objective, this study shall adopt the documentary method of data collection to be interpreted through content analysis. The framework for analysis revolves around the Structural Change theory. The paper argues that while there is need to embark on some levels of restructuring of the Nigerian State, there is greater need to engender attitudinal change within the system so as to avoid the reoccurrence of the existing problems even after the state must have been restructured.*

**Keywords:** Attitudinal change, Development, Restructuring, Sectionalism, Unitary federalism.

### **Introduction**

The story of Nigeria depicts a picture of a project that took off on an unplanned state and only began to assume varying shapes along the line of its development. Indeed, the Nigerian project cannot be said to have been proceeding with the aspiration of getting it to suit a pre-planned specification. Whatever form it took at inception was based on the whims and caprices of the British colonialists and in line with what they considered exigent at any point.

The events that led to the formation of the Nigerian state began with direct colonisation of the affected areas and subsequent formation of different units. At inception, there were three protectorates "governed differently, even though they all came under the British

Crown" (Balogun, 1983, p. 69). If only the British colonialists had desired; if economic and administrative realities had permitted, each of the protectorates would have remained separate and transformed into an independent country. However, the Lagos colony was merged with the Protectorate of Southern Nigeria in 1906 to form the Colony and Protectorate of Southern Nigeria. By 1914, the Protectorate of Northern Nigeria and the Colony and Protectorate of Southern Nigeria were amalgamated to form a country. Since Nigeria was formed, the country has witnessed several changes in terms of its physical, political, and administrative structure. To this extent, one can say that restructuring is not strange to the country. But what remains significant is that the people who actually own the country have never been allowed to participate freely in determining the structure the country would assume. Just as it was the colonialists that decided the original shape and structure of the country, it was the home-grown government that usually decides how to structure the country. This, perhaps, explains part of the reasons the people have continued to make efforts towards being allowed to determine how to structure or restructure the country.

There are ways in which the structure of the Nigerian state is believed to have negatively affected the society. Based on the machinations of the political class, there is this general belief that it was the structure of the country that threw up a peculiar political economy and which in turn was responsible for eliciting sectional prejudices as well as socio-political and economic discrimination among the different ethnic groups and constituent units. While discussing the problems associated with the current structure of the country, the focus always appears to dwell on the advantages gained or disadvantages suffered at the level of the (major) ethnic groups or in terms of the north-south divide of the country. However, the cankerworm of sectionalism and discrimination has permeated the nooks and crannies of the country to the extent that these sectional and discriminatory practices no longer operate only at the inter-ethnic level but can now be found within the intra ethnic level. It exists at the state, local government, town, and even village level. To this extent, one can argue that mere restructuring may not solve the existing problems relating to sectionalism or clannishness since old prejudices are most likely to resurface in a restructured arrangement.

It is a known fact that in a bid to gain political and selfish socio-economic advantages, most members of the political class often resort to sectional appeal. Under such circumstances, efforts are made to rely on structural issues to sway people's sentiments whereupon such issues are presented as the scapegoat for perceived marginalisation and poor development. More often than not, the preoccupation with sectional matters tends to divert the attention of citizens from main issues to mere shadows. It equally tends to reinforce behaviours that militate against the enthrone of accountability. Trapped in the web of sectional mindedness, chances are high for an uninformed public to focus attention on how to gain advantages over the individuals on the other side of the divide

without paying attention to quality of leadership or the behavioural order that would promote national development generally.

Generally speaking, Nigeria is facing numerous problems that militate against national development, which include ethnic/sectional rivalry, mutual distrust, dearth of social infrastructure, high level of corruption, poor leadership, etc. To what extent can restructuring eradicate these problems? Is there any need to induce change in the attitude and mannerisms of Nigerian citizens in order to realize the dream of national development? Without understanding the dynamics of the problems associated with Nigeria's national development, especially as it relates to the issue of (re)structuring, the tendency is high that policy demands, policy statements, and policy actions may continue to miss the mark. This paper seeks to address the issue of restructuring and attitudinal change as they relate to Nigeria's national development. In order to make the presentations clearer, the paper is divided into parts. Coming after this introduction is theoretical issues, followed by conceptual explications. While part four discusses Nigeria and her structural issues, part five looks into the Politics of Restructuring in Nigeria. Part six concludes the work on the note of trying to establish whether restructuring, per se, can address the nation's developmental challenges or whether attitudinal change is equally necessary.

### **Theoretical Issues**

The structural change theory can be located within the modernization circles and this pays primary attention to how underdeveloped economy can transform from its subsistence agricultural status to one that is characterized by industrial production. Names associated with this theory include Arthur Lewis, John Fei, Gustav Ranis, etc. Whether one is looking at it from the Lewis two-sector model or from the patterns-of-development analysis, the central idea, as articulated by Todaro and Smith (2011), is to explain the mechanism by which underdeveloped economies transform their domestic economic structures from a heavy emphasis on traditional subsistence agriculture to a more modern, more urbanized, and more industrially diverse manufacturing and service economy.

Without dwelling deeply on the entire tenets of the theory, it suffices to highlight the salient issues that can be gleaned from it. By and large, the structural-change theory is concerned with how to engender efficient resource allocation in order to witness positive transformation. It proceeds on the understanding that change in the existing structure is expected to yield known positive results. Hence, the structural change should be directed towards eliminating those aspects of the existing structure that militate against development and adopting those that promote it. What this means is that the structure should be patterned in such a manner as to stimulate development. It is worth pointing out that the patterns-of-development analysis recognises that while increased savings and investment that would help in boosting industrial production are necessary, they are not sufficient conditions for engendering development. Other conditions include the transformation of production and changes in the composition of consumer demand,

resource use, desire for diverse manufactured goods and services, distribution of a country's population, etc (Todaro and Smith, 2011). By implication, there are certain behavioural traits that must exist in order to achieve the needed results. For instance, the consciousness must exist among the populace about the need for transformation. It is based on this understanding that efforts are made to identify the aspects of the existing structure that jeopardises development and work out how best to replace them with a better approach. Again, there should be demonstrated willingness to accept the new structure and adapt to the needed change in order to stimulate sustained development.

Though the structural-change theory focuses on production and maximization of surplus labour, some of the salient issues raised by the theory can be grafted into the current discourse. With the general understanding of the theory, one may begin to ruminate upon the Nigerian situation with a view to identifying the aspects of her structure that militate against national development. It is only by identifying the specific aspects of the structure that appear problematic that one can make a guided analysis aimed at identifying whether they are counter-productive or not. With this at the back of our mind, the salient questions one may begin to raise include: What are the specific aspects of the Nigerian structure that requires restructuring? What are the (positive) results expected through the restructuring? Are there negative elements in the people's behaviour that require to be changed in order to align with the outcome of the restructuring? By answering these questions, it will be clear that change in structure may necessarily require certain changes in attitude.

### **Conceptual Explications**

The term – restructuring – presupposes the existence of a structure. The simple dictionary meaning of structure sees it as a particular arrangement of parts; a thing that is made of several parts; the state of being well organised or planned with all the parts linked together (Hornby, 2015). When structure is mentioned, what comes to mind is something that has a definite and identifiable form. A structure can be in physical form, which can be seen and touched. An example is a building. We equally have structures that exist within the physical environment but do not have physical form and as such cannot be touched. Examples include social structure, economic structure and other structures that have qualitative nature, which exist within the society. The structure we are dealing with here is not just the physical (geographical) structure of Nigeria but also the one that relates to the organisation of the society or simply, social structure and this equally includes the political and economic structures. It is in this sense that Riggs (1964) explains structure to mean any pattern of behaviour which has become a standard feature of a social system. On the other hand, Holt (1967) sees it as a pattern of interrelated roles. Talking about social structure, Little (1991) identifies it, among others, with the attribute of temporal continuity, which means that as a social system feature, it persists over an extended period of time. In the light of the foregoing, we are looking at restructuring to mean the altering of an existing

structure. It is worth mentioning that there are different kinds of structures within the society and it behoves the person talking about restructuring to specify the particular structure being referred to.

From Hornby's (2015) definition, we can say that attitude is the way you behave towards somebody or something, which shows how you think or feel about the person/thing. Rollinson (2008) sees it as a mental state of readiness, organised through experience to behave in a characteristic way towards the object of the attitude. It can be thought of as the combined effect of a belief and a value, which gives feeling about a particular object. Generally, individuals form their attitudes through such means as socialization, experience, self-image, etc. The way we react towards a person can tell a lot about our disposition or how we feel about the person. It is normal for individuals to show a receptive attitude towards those they like and repulsive attitude towards those they hate. The manner in which a person perceives his work determines his attitude towards the work. In an environment with ascriptive orientation where individuals feel that they don't need to 'suffer' in order to make money simply because they are connected, their attitude towards work will be abysmal. In a nutshell, there are attitudes that are counter-productive. There are attitudes that promote national development just as there are attitudes that are antithetical to it. The persistence of such negative attitudes naturally clogs the course of progress. In order to make progress, therefore, it becomes imperative to change those negative attitudes.

In a simplistic sense, national development can be seen from the angle of having increased national wealth. In other words, it can erroneously be taken to mean the same thing as national growth. It can equally be viewed from the point of fostering national consciousness and promoting national ideals and values among the citizens. However, a good understanding of the concept of development will be helpful in capturing the true meaning of national development. As against the traditional view of development, which places primary emphasis on economic variables such as income per capita and Gross National Income, the concept has lately been measured in terms of the quality of life and living standards of the substantial portion of the population (World Bank, 1991; Ake, 1995; Brinkman, 1995; Gandhi, 1996; Sen, 1999). Todaro and Smith (2011) align with this view by recognizing that development must have at least three objectives: increasing the availability and widening the distribution of basic life-sustaining goods; raising levels of living and; expanding the range of economic and social choices. To this extent, national development should be seen in terms of the quality of life of citizens to be measured by their standard of living, welfare, freedom, security, and life opportunities.

### **Nigeria and Her Structural Issues**

When we talk about Nigeria and her structure(s), one may wish to ask: Which of the structures? Implicit in this question is that there exist different social structures in the country. One can look at the structure in terms of the form of government and its

arrangement or in terms of the organs of government and the way they are structured. Here, we look at the structure for governance generally.

Nigeria is a product of colonial conquest. At the onset, the country operated a unitary system of government with a centralised command structure (Balogun, 1983). This, however, changed with time when the country headed for a federal arrangement. As captured by Odum (2016), the foundation for the federal arrangement was laid in 1946 with the introduction of regionalism by the Richards constitution. This move was further boosted in 1951 when the McPherson Constitution introduced a semi federal structure. The country adopted a federal principle and structure in 1954 when the Lyttleton's Constitution took effect in favour of a federal arrangement that operated with three constituent regions. It is against this backcloth that Mundt and Aborisade (2004, p. 715) state that "a very decentralised federal system was already in effect at independence". From then, the country has 'formally' remained a federal state, though with an interregnum that occurred in 1966 under the first military regime. Within the period, the military headed by General Aguiyi Ironsi government adopted the unitary system of government but this lasted for only few months before the succeeding government that emerged through a counter coup reverted to a federal arrangement. Thus, the different constitutions of the country that came into effect in 1960, 1963, 1979, 1989, and 1999 featured federalism as the form of government.

Within the First Republic, the Nigeria's federal structure was one composed of the federal government and the three constituent regions. By 1963, it changed to a federation of four constituent units and from four, it grew to a federation of 12 constituent units in 1967, 19 in 1976, 21 in 1987, 30 in 1991, and 36 in 1996. Again, it was a two-tier federal arrangement initially (federal and regions) but currently, it is a federation with three tiers of government made up of federal, state, and local governments.

Notwithstanding the claims of being a federal state, the country appears to be practising the unitary system of government. Mundt and Aborisade (2004) noted this as they pointed out that the fiscal condition of the country calls the federal concept into question. For instance, the major revenue of all the constituent units comes from the national purse. Enyi (2005) aligns with this position by observing that the fiscal aspect of Nigeria's federalism depicts one with preference for a strong centre and weak periphery (states), which is out of alignment with the principles of federalism. The situation of the local government is even worse because close watchers and scholars (Eme, 2014; Ugwu, 2017) have continued to question their actual status vis-a-vis their autonomy. This is especially in view of the fact that what one sees in practice is out of sync with the recognition accorded that tier of government by the constitution. Understandably, the wide disparity between *theory and practice* in the Nigeria's federalism was made possible by the long years of military rule, which exposed the entire society to the military command structure, and the subsequent adoption of this military orientation by successive civilian administration.

In discussing the structure of Nigeria, it is important to point out that the country is made up of numerous ethnic groups. It is against this backcloth that Enahoro (1966) described the country as a conglomeration of tribes assembled compulsorily and branded Nigeria. Despite the numerous ethnic groups, however, most discourses about ethnic struggles and mutual hatred in Nigeria usually focus on the three major ethnic groups – Igbo (East), Hausa (North), and Yoruba (West). In fact, the three major ethnic groups served as the basis upon which the country took off as a federation of three regions. Till present moment that the country has already been subdivided into thirty-six states, there are still circumstances where issues are being presented as if the country is resting on a tripod along the lines of the three major ethnic groups. For instance, the issue of rational presidency is one being looked at from the point of the three major ethnic groups.

Aside the tripartite picture of the east, west, and north or the north-south structural divide, there also exist the concept of geo-political zones upon which the country can be seen to have a structure of six major units that include the South-East, South-South, South-West, North-East, North-Central, and North-West. It is in line with this perceived demarcation that one gets to hear that the South-East has only five states whereas the North-West has seven states. At different times, any of these subdivisions has formed the basis for making certain considerations at the national realms.

The geographical structure of Nigeria is worth being highlighted in any discourse relating to the country and her internal contradictions. Oftentimes, one hears about the issue of structural imbalance, which underscores the sharp sense of division among the three major ethnic groups, or at some points, between the north and the southern part of the country. This issue of structural imbalance borders on the landmass being occupied by each of the major ethnic groups. According to Nnadozie (2005:205), the northern region remains “equal to, if not more than, the two regions in the South combined”. There have been complaints in some quarters that the colonialists began from the onset to manipulate the structure of the country in favour of the north by making the area classified as the northern part of the country to have greater landmass and population so as to maintain dominance over the other part(s) of the country. As pointed out by Nwabueze (quoted in Odum, 2016), there were areas that, geographically speaking, should have fallen under the southern part of the country yet the colonialists designated them as belonging to the north. Again, the desire of the colonialists to retain the territorial advantage accorded the region manifested in 1947 when the area was allowed to remain intact while the southern part was split into the Eastern and the Western regions. The general thinking was that the northern part, which already had a disproportionately larger landmass, would have been the area to be split into smaller units in order to match the southern part in size and by so doing maintain a balanced structure.

Nigeria has gone through both the civilian and military regimes at different stages of her development. This has equally affected the country’s political structure at different times in terms of the operational arms of government. It has to be borne in mind that the

military operated in the political scene for so many years. In those dark years of military rule, the country operated with only the executive and judicial arms of government. In fact, the executive arm of government was the only organ that appeared to be working in 'full capacity' during the military regime. Though the judicial arm of government cannot be said to have been proscribed within the period, there is an extent to which one can say that the judiciary witnessed serious assaults in the hands of the military junta. This is true in view of several incidents where judicial procedures were violated and court orders ignored by the ruling junta. The legislative organ is even worse off because the military junta, in their characteristic manner, usually suspend the legislative arm of government upon takeover of power. The legislature only operates and gains full recognition under the civilian regime. For this reason, the legislative arm of government qualifies to be regarded as the least developed in terms of the period it has been allowed to operate in the Nigerian political environment.

Nigeria is operating the bicameral legislature at the federal level and a unicameral legislature known as the House of Assembly at the state level. The federal legislature is made up of the upper chamber referred to as the Senate and the Lower Chamber referred to as the House of Representatives (House of Reps). The senate consists of 109 members, with each state producing three senators while the Federal Capital Territory produces one. For this purpose, each state is divided into three senatorial zones. On the other hand, the House of Representatives (HOR) is composed of 360 members. Unlike the senate, the membership of the HOR is unevenly spread across the different states of the federation based on certain considerations such as population size. This explains why Nasarawa state, for instance, has five members of HOR while Kano state has twenty-four. Based on the structural imbalance already mentioned, the Southern part of the country has a total of 51 and 169 members of the senate and House of Reps respectively while the North has 58 and 191 respectively. In each case, the north has more than half of the total number. In a nutshell, the Nigerian constitution recognizes the federal structure of the country as comprising of the government at the centre, 36 states and the Federal Capital Territory, and 774 local governments.

### **Nigeria and the Politics of Restructuring**

It has been noted at the introductory part of this paper that Nigeria depicts a picture of a project that took off without proper planning. The outcome of this is that the structure of the country had assumed varying shapes along the line of her development. At about sixty years after the country gained her independence, there are still agitations and seeming disagreements over how best to get the country (re)structured. In view of the fact that the structure of Nigeria has witnessed alterations at various times, one can rightly say that restructuring is not a novel exercise in the country. In 1914, for instance, the Protectorate of Northern Nigeria and the Colony and Protectorate of Southern Nigeria were amalgamated to form one country. Though the Northern and the Southern Nigeria were

still being governed separately under the control of different Lieutenant Governors even after the amalgamation had taken place, the country can be seen as existing as a whole unit under a unitary arrangement. This structural arrangement changed in 1947 when the country was subdivided into three regions – the eastern, northern, and western regions. By 1963, the Midwestern region was carved out from the Western region and the structure of the country changed to a federation of four constituent units. As indicated earlier, further changes were made in this regard in 1967, 1976, 1987, 1991, and 1996 when the number of states in the country rose to thirty-six. It is equally noteworthy that Nigeria started off at independence with a parliamentary system of government. As from the Second Republic, however, the country adopted the presidential system of government with bicameral legislation and has remained with it till date.

After making an analysis of the Nigerian structure and the restructuring that had taken place in the past, it may not be far from the truth to say that they were patterned towards serving the parochial interest of the ruling elite at every point and were never geared towards repositioning governance in the interest of the generality of the citizens or enthroning national development. From the onset, the structure of Nigeria imposed by the colonial masters was crafted to help in the exploitation of the local people and to serve the interest of the colonialists. In continuation of serving the British interests, the restructuring that was undertaken in 1947 was aimed at weakening the efforts of the local elite towards the nationalist and anti-colonial struggles. By splitting the country along ethnic or regional lines, it was expected that the local elite would invest their energies towards actualising parochial regional agenda and consequently pay less attention towards making concerted efforts for the actualisation of a Pan-Nigerian agenda. Within the era of independence, the restructuring that led to the subdivision of the country into four and twelve constituent parts in 1963 and 1967 respectively appeared on the facade to be aimed at moderating certain intra-regional factions. However, it can be seen that they were actions undertaken in the interest of the northern ruling elite with a view to weakening the base of other regional powers while strengthening the north-controlled central government.

The politics of restructuring in Nigeria is such that assumes different shades at different times for the different peoples. What a group considers worthy of being restructured at one point might appear to them, at another point, to be worthy of being left intact and vice versa. In all, the people's disposition towards what should be restructured or not depends on the selfish considerations of the political elite and which, more often than not, lack considerations for national development. For instance, it was clear that the northern region did not want any restructuring that would split the area into smaller units as at 1963. Within the period, remaining as one bloc offered them the opportunity of commanding an overwhelming majority in the parliament. Besides, the revenue sharing formula at that moment favoured derivation and as such, having multiple constituent units and the concomitant large bureaucracy within the region was not an attractive idea. It is instructive to note, however, that in view of the current revenue sharing formula that

favours the areas with greater number of states/local governments, the northern region had overtaken the other zones in terms of the number of constituent units (states and local governments).

Again, it is noteworthy that the flame of restructuring was not as heated in the western part of the country when Obasanjo was the president as it is now. The demand for secession or restructuring was not as high in the East and South-south during the days of Goodluck Jonathan as it is under Buhari. While Jonathan's tenure lasted, it was the north that was threatening to make the country ungovernable and it was from that area that insurgents were threatening to carve out a new country. Under Buhari's regime, no northern group has threatened to make the country ungovernable for him and even the Boko Haram insurgents operating in the north where the president comes from appear friendlier in the manner they kidnap, preserve, and release their hostages (school girls) without inflicting harm on them – except for the Christian among them.

After taking a critical look at the recent wave of demand for restructuring, it can be seen that there is no consensus across the country on whether restructuring should be undertaken and which areas the restructuring are required. Though the list of what should be restructured and how best to go about it is not exhaustive and not exactly the same, there seem to be some form of agreement among the states in the southern part of the country as opposed to the position of those from the north. But irrespective of the side the different groups belong, one can still see some elements of parochial elite or sectional interest vis-a-vis using the restructuring mantra as a tool for playing political game or attracting selfish political benefits to the detriment of national developmental issues. Falana (2017) is alive to this fact by stating that the agitators for restructuring had failed to address the issue of economy and instead dwelt on issues that centre on devolution of powers without responsibilities and the quest to satisfy ethnic groups.

Sieving through the positions of the pro-restructuring groups, there are certain issues that appear dominant. Kehinde (2005, p.249) raises such issues like the restructuring that should allow the states "to control their resources, or at the very least, derivation principle should carry the highest weight in the allocation formula"; restructuring the federal arrangement that looks more like a unitary system, which requires the reduction of the powers and responsibilities of the central government vis-a-vis the states; and restructuring of the component units in such a manner that they can be viable in terms of generating revenue instead of remaining as rent collection units. The Yoruba position revolve around the issue of de-emphasizing the current over-centralisation of power and establishing true federalism as obtained in the 1960 and 1963 constitutions; restructuring aimed at moving the country from a rent-seeking and money-sharing anti-development economy to productivity by ensuring that the federating units are free to own and develop their resources; establishing a federation with six regional arrangements plus the federal capital territory; and adopting a revenue sharing formula on the principle of derivation as follows – 50% to states, 35% to regional government, and 15% to federal government

(*Thisday*, 2017). The Igbo position so far, as represented by Ohaneze Ndigbo, revolve around reviewing the federal structure, having parity in terms of the number of states and local governments across the geo political zones; fiscal and structural restructuring; implementation of the 2014 confab reports, etc (Gabriel and Adonu, 2017). On the other hand, voices from the north, as represented by the Northern Elders and Youths, appear ill disposed towards the restructuring agenda being proposed by southerners (Akhaine, Ahovi, and Anwar, 2017).

In view of this, one may wish to ask what actually the kernel of the matter is. Is the matter truly about enthroning national development? Does the desire for actualising national development come as a flash affair in the minds of the different groups depending on which side the president comes from? Development is a universal concept and has a universal relevance. Everybody deserves it and desires to have it (except perhaps for the members of Boko Haram). Is it likely that people will have disagreements over an agenda geared towards enthroning development? Given the Nigerian situation, the issue is as complex as the same reason people would want to manipulate census figures of the country or add fictitious names in the voters' register. Such manipulations are not done with a view to ensuring that there is qualitative governance or unfettered development. They are rather aimed at serving parochial interests.

It is a truism that the noticeable defects in the Nigerian structure being recommended for restructuring were intentionally crafted with the aim of according undue benefits to certain people or groups. For instance, the disproportionate number of states/local governments located in the northern region was done with regard to the nature of the fiscal aspect of the country's federalism. To this extent, any restructuring targeted towards reversing this may not attract the support of the north. In the same vein, all those states that do not have the prospect of generating revenue or being viable are not likely to support any move aimed at altering the distributive character of the state or dismantling the *Father Christmas* type of federalism currently in place. In like manner, since the federal government enjoys immense powers and resources, it may prove difficult for any sitting president to acquiesce to the pruning of such powers. As they say, power is sweet! It can only take a true democrat to support such a move and such true democrats are scarce commodities within the country's political market. The implication of this is that it is only those who bear the brunt of the defects in the structure that desire to have it corrected. But the question remains: To what extent can the current structure of the Nigerian state enthrone and sustain national development?

### **Conclusion: Restructuring or Attitudinal Change?**

It is clear that there are aspects of the Nigerian structure that are defective and unsupportive of national development. Such aspects require restructuring in order to promote national development. For instance, the manner federalism is being practised in the country is out of alignment with the known federalist order. There is a wide disparity

between the unitary and federal systems of government. As such, there is serious problem when the practice of one starts appearing like the other. Again, a structure that discourages regenerative competition and encourages only distribution of rents and other unproductive practices cannot support national development. In fact, some of the items that appear on the restructuring list of certain groups might fizzle away if the country sheds off her distributive character and emphasises derivation as the basis for attracting nationally shared revenue. For instance, the clamour for more state/local government creation might die off under such circumstance. In sum, there is need for the restructuring of the defective aspects of the Nigerian structure. But is it likely that restructuring will act as a magic wand for solving the country's national developmental challenges?

Restructuring, per se, cannot solve the developmental problems that exist in the country. The negative attitude usually exhibited by the political elite in their quest for power and competition for supremacy will continue to militate against national development even under a 'restructured' state. This refers to the attitude of mobilising the masses for political support by blindfolding them with divisive sentiments. Having permeated the blood system of many a great number of Nigerian masses, the sectional attitude being witnessed under a federal state with a very strong and powerful centre will continue to rear its head even after the centre must have been weakened and the constituent units made stronger. Just as the issue of rotating the presidency on the basis of the major ethnic groups appears at the national level, the issue of rotation of the gubernatorial seat on the basis of senatorial districts or other sectional/religious grounds appears to have been entrenched within most states of the federation. Same goes with the chairmanship and councillorship positions at the local government and ward levels respectively.

It is a truism that the issue of *who gets what appointment* has affected the political judgement of most Nigerians. Once the list of appointments is released, the first reaction of most people is to run their eyes through it in order to find out who came from where. As it appears, members of the masses feel satisfied once they find out that 'their people' are well-represented in the list. With this sense of satisfaction, questions about performance and demand for accountability are usually relegated to the background. For instance, when people say that the tenure of Jonathan favoured the east, what they might have been looking at were the 'juicy' appointments or positions offered to people from the Igbo extraction and not in any way in terms of developmental projects that affected the lives of the masses in a significant way. It is in the same fashion that some people say that the tenure of Buhari is unduly 'favouring' the north. With this kind of attitude where the 'quantity' of political appointments offered to a group is used in determining how good or bad a leader is, national development will continue to suffer even after restructuring must have been undertaken.

The inexplicable attitude of undue tolerance over things that are evil based on clannish considerations runs deep in the system and does not even stop at the government circles.

For example, one of the main criticisms most of the Igbo traders engaging in the drug business were levelling against the late Prof. Dora Akunyili during her days as the NAFDAC boss border on the manner she went about confiscating and destroying fake drugs not minding that Igbo people remain in majority of those in the drug business. For them, she was destroying the 'businesses' of her kinsmen. In the same vein, a Yoruba or Hausa man may find it difficult to understand why his kinsman occupying a position of authority should be the one to punish him even if he had erred. This attitude will definitely manifest even in a restructured environment unless positive steps are taken to eradicate it.

It is quite agreeable that the calls for restructuring/secession across the country became so glaring under the incumbency Buhari as the president of the federal republic. This cannot be divorced from his attitude or what has been popularly referred to as his *body language*, which is suggestive of divisiveness. It is on record that the president did not hide his feelings about his sense of division right from the moment he won elections. The president stated publicly that he won't treat the constituencies that gave him only *five percent* votes as fairly as those that gave him *ninety-seven percent*. Again, his attitude towards the rampant killings being perpetrated by cattle herders project him as not being so much bordered about the victims. In effect, the attitude of Nigerian leaders that appear tribal or sectional equally contributes to the problem on ground. If such sectional attitude finds its way into a restructured arrangement, the problem is most likely to continue.

Assuming the country is restructured as to correct the noticeable defects, there are some salient questions that must be asked. To what extent will the exercise deliver the goods? Can regionalism take away corruption? Can it take away the people's lethargic attitude towards demanding for accountability? To what extent are people currently demanding for the accountability of political office holders at the state and local government levels? Will regionalism eradicate the spirit of sectionalism that has already permeated all the nooks and crannies of the country? In as much as there are defects in the system, the truth remains that some of the existing developmental challenges emanate from the inability of the government at the lower levels to make judicious use of the funds available to them. As such, these negative attitudes must be changed. The lower tiers of government should begin to demonstrate openness towards accountability. Public servants at that level should demonstrate commitment to duty and shun corrupt acts. The intra-regional developmental challenges emanating from poor governance at the local level must be surmounted. For instance, the collapse of government-owned companies such as the Anambra Vegetable Oil Products (AVOP) and NIGERCEM Nkalagu cannot be directly linked to the poor structure of the Nigerian state but should be blamed on the poor managerial ability of the concerned South Eastern State governments. Unless the negative attitudes that gnaw at the heels of development are changed, the physical and fiscal restructuring being clamoured for cannot usher in the desired developmental change.

#### **References**

Ake, C. (1995). *Democracy and development in Africa*. Washington: Brookings Institution.

- Akhaine, S; Ahovi, A.I; and Anwar, A. (2017). North cautions Yoruba, southerners on clamour for 1963 constitution. *The Guardian*. <https://www.google.com.ng/amp/s/guardian.ng/news/north-cautions-yoruba-southerners-on-clamour-for-1963-constitution/amp>
- Balogun, M.J. (1983). *Public administration in Nigeria*. London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Brinkman, R. (1995). Economic growth versus economic development: Toward a conceptual clarification. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 29 (December), pp. 1171-88.
- Eme, O.I. (2014). Local government autonomy in Nigeria: Myth or reality. *SIPAS*, Vol. 2, No 1, pp. 181-208.
- Enahoro, P. (1966). *How to be a Nigerian*. Ibadan: Caxton Press.
- Enyi, J.E. (2005). Fiscal federalism and its implementations for national unity and stability in Nigeria. in W.O. Alli (ed), *Political reform conference, federalism & the national question in Nigeria* (pp. 295-306).
- Falana, F. (2017). The nation Nigeria: Restructuring, secession or status quo – the way forward. Lecture delivered at Law Dinner organised by the Young Lawyers Forum of Nigeria Bar Association (NBA) Ado Ekiti Branch held at Obafemi Adewale Colloquium. Retrieved from: <https://www.google.com/ng/amp/dailypost.ng/2017/10/22/falana-sets-agenda-restructuring-nigeria/amp/>
- Gabriel, C. And Adonu, C. (2017). Restructuring: What Ndigbo want – Ohanaeze, Ezeife. *Vanguard News*. <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2017/07/Ndigbo-want-equal-number-states-fiscal-federalism-ohanaeze-ezeife/>
- Gandhi, P.J. (1996). The concept of development: Its dialectics and dynamics. *Indian Journal of Applied Economics*, 5 (May), pp. 283-311.
- Holt, R.T. (1967). A proposed structural-functional framework. In J. C. Charlesworth (ed), *Contemporary political analysis*. Toronto: The Free Press.
- Kehinde, M.O. (2005). Unsettling the settings: Restructuring the Nigerian federal system in W.O. Alli (ed), *Political reform conference, federalism & the national question in Nigeria* (pp. 241-251).
- Little, D. (1991). *Varieties of social explanation: An introduction to the philosophy of social science*. Colorado: Westview Press.
- Mundt, R.J. and Aborisode, O. (2004). Politics in Nigeria. In G.A. Almond; G.B. Powell, Jr.; K. Strom; and R.J. Dalton (Eds.), *Comparative politics today* (pp. 691-741). Delhi: Pearson Education Inc.
- Nnadozie, U.O. (2005). National conference, federalism, and the national question: Federalism, constitutionalism and elections in Nigeria. in W.O. Alli (Ed), *Political reform conference, federalism & the national question in Nigeria* (pp. 197-213). A publication of NPSA.
- Riggs, F.W. (1964). *Administration in developing countries: The theory of prismatic society*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Rollinson, D. (2008). *Organisational behaviour and analysis: An integrated approach*, Essex: Pearson.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. New York: Alfred Knopf.
- Thisday (2017). Dissecting the Yoruba position on restructuring. <https://www.thisdaylive.com/index.php/2017/09/11/dissecting-the-yoruba-position-on-restructuring/>
- Todaro, M.P. and Smith, S.C. (2011). *Economic development*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Ugwu, S.C. (2017). *Local government autonomy in Nigeria: Issues and constraints*. Enugu: ESUT.

### Biographical Note

**Mbanefo ODUM**, *PhD*, is a Reader and Head, Department of Public Administration, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu-Ojukwu University, Igbariam, NIGERIA.