

GOOD GOVERNANCE AND SOCIAL ORDER: TOOLS FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT OF NNEATO, UMUNNEOCHI, ABIA STATE

FIDELIA AMARA DURU
Department of Sociology
Abia State University, Uturu

And

IJEOMA AMAUGO
Department of Sociology
Abia State University, Uturu

Abstract

Globally, good governance and social order have remained useful instruments for both national and rural development. This is because, where people's expectations on the leader that are capable of impacting positively on their lives becomes an illusion, there is usually crises that adversely affect development efforts within the area. The paper therefore, investigated how good governance and social order were considered useful tools toward the development of Nneato in Umunneochi Local Government Area of Abia State. The population of the study was 2897 and the sample size was 500. The instrument of data collection was questionnaire and in-depth interview. The data were analyzed using statistical package for social sciences. ANOVA statistics was used in testing hypotheses 1, 2 and 3. The Hypotheses were tested at .05 level of probability using ANOVA. The study revealed that there is a strong nexus between good governance and social order to rural development. The study highlighted challenges which adversely affected good governance and social order which include corruption among others. Based on that, some recommendations were made which would improve development needs in the area of study such as transparency, accountability, among other recommendations.

Keywords: Good Governance, Poor Governance, Social Order, Development and Rural Development

Introduction

Human beings are social in nature who depend on one another to achieve their socio-economic, political and cultural desires. Leaders are elected or appointed who exercise the authority and power vested on them to maintain harmonial existence by ensuring that rules, customs and regulations that guide human relationships are observed. The leaders also have some responsibilities which they owe to the masses such as provision of security, human development, political participation, infrastructural facilities among others. Therefore, there it is not out of place saying that socio-economic, socio-political and socio-cultural development can only thrive in a peaceful atmosphere and tranquility. This is because without an enabling environment in which production, industrial activities and trade can take place and prosper; development would forever remain elusive.

The extent to which the masses become loyal to those in authority depends largely on how they evaluate activities of those in governance as being responsive to the yearnings of the people which guarantees a tranquil environment that paves for both individual and societal development. Since governance is all about positively affecting people lives, and where this is absent, the effects among others are social disintegration and disorderliness which does not create enabling environment for developmental purposes. Shettima, (2012) observes that the level of insecurity in Nigeria can be seen in the following ways: The wanton and indiscriminate destruction of lives and properties which run into thousands, the dislocation of the local economy with serious implications for the living conditions of the inhabitants, closure of

schools due to fire-bombing of educational facilities which has put a lot of stress on existing facilities and created a climate of fear among pupils and parents, the psychological trauma of victims and survivors of the crisis, especially children, women and young adults. These are clear indications that Nigeria is steadily sliding into a state of lawlessness which is related to bad governance.

According to Anyanwu (2012), most development priorities have placed too much burden on the good governance, that is, the need to alleviate poverty and rural or community development in developing countries. Soyinka (cited in Alozie, 2012) lamented the deplorable conditions the military and politicians have left the Nigeria and insisted that governments have rendered Nigerian youths a wasteful generation. Okorie (2010) observes that good governance cannot be achieved in Nigeria without adequate information to enable Nigerians understand how their resources are being managed.

However, the problem of good governance and social order which does not pave way for development either at the national or local levels has become endemic. This is because each successive government on assumption of duty emphasizes the need to improve on the former government which fell short of the expectations of the masses that often give rise to social problems thereby circumventing the progress and development of the area. Babangida, the former Military Head of the State on assumption of office in 1987 in his maiden speech said:

Our faith in the future of this country and her people remains unshakable. We are therefore convinced that we should not be prisoners of our past...We have put the past behind us and create an atmosphere that will encourage the emergence of new leaders whose motive of going into politics is service and patriotism...

As if the problem of good government is persistent, when Sani Abacha, a one time Military President of Nigeria, in his maiden speech in 1998 while addressing states Sole Administrators stated thus:

The government expects that you will use all the attributes of your military background and training to accomplish the task of maintaining law and order in your respective states and revamping stagnating social services especially in the area of education, health care delivery and public transportation. You must at all-time endeavor to promote unity and sense of patriotism. You should ensue even development in all parts of the state in the interest of equity and fairness.

The above comments indicate that there was bad governance which led to social upheavals which did not record any development. Supporting the observations of the above Heads of the State, Izukanne (2003:26) observed that in the forty-eight years of her sovereign existence, Nigeria has been beset with a history of continuous political uncertainties, economic quagmire and social disintegration.

The expressions and observations made above are strong indications that Nigeria is bedeviled with problem of good governance, social order and development at all levels. These social services which every good government strives to achieve are those essential needs which promote both individual and societal well-being. This is in consonance with Enem (2008) (cited in Izukanne, 2009) that these services are generally provided to individuals and groups so that they can develop positively and achieve the objective they desire in their lives. According to Sani Abacha during the swearing-in ceremony of members of the Federal Executive Council on 27th November, 1993 said, "the problem of development in Nigeria has its

roots in good leadership...We have the resources to guarantee every Nigeria a reasonable standard of living if only the resources at our disposals are properly managed by the Nigerian leaders. This is in line with the Vice President, Yemi Osinbajo as reported by NTA 9 pm new on 27th October, 2018, that the biggest problem Nigeria has is corruption. This is corroborated by Grindle (2007) who maintained that corruption is the single greatest obstacle to economic and social development; and issues like accountability and transparency have emerged as potent weapons in the battle against corruption which is an index of bad governance.

It is a result of bad governance malaise that the nation in 1967 was plunged into a 3-year old Biafra and Nigeria war which devastated both human and non-human material resources. During the period neither growth nor development was recorded rather, the destruction of lives and property was the order of the day. It is equally as a result of bad governance that Nigeria continues to experience incessant cases of social upheavals like thuggery, kidnapping, ritual killing, robbery, bribery and corruption, and vandalization of oil pipelines especially in the Niger-Delta areas among others. The implication of lack of good governance is that members of a given society having felt marginalized tend to take laws into their hands which does not create a favourable environment to carry out developmental projects. It is the problem nature of bad governance and social disorder that prompted this research work.

Conceptual Issues

Governance and Good Governance

In the first place, it is pertinent to distinguish between governance and governing. The two concepts are different. Governing refers to those social activities which make a purposeful effort to guide, steer, control, or manage (sectors or facets of) societies' (Kooiman, 1993: 2). Governance on the other hand describes the patterns that emerge from the governing activities of social, political and administrative actors that is, the structures upon which the activities of the both political and social actors will be predicated. The second is that governance is not the same as government; while government centers on the institutions and actions of the state, the term governance allows non-state actors such as businesses and nongovernmental organizations to be brought into any analysis of societal steering (Lemos & Agrawal, 2006:298). However, both terms refer to purposive behaviour, to goal oriented activities, to systems of rule but government suggests activities that are backed by formal authority. Governance in other words, is a more encompassing phenomenon than government. It embraces governmental institutions, but it also subsumes informal, non-governmental mechanisms whereby those persons and organizations within its purview move ahead, satisfy their need and fulfil their wants (Rosenau, 1992: 4).

Hulme, Savoia and Sen (2014) expressed that good governance is a concept overflooded with various meanings and controversial interpretations. The concept of good governance has become a household name that call in question, efficacy of government in serving as lubricant for engine of growth (Benson, 2013). This is because meaning and interpretation varies across discipline, policy-making rationale, and state in question. Most policy makers and the world development agencies have been particular about the need for good governance in developing countries because of the preconception that the root cause of all developmental deficiencies is mal-administration (Thomas, 2010). Good governance is an antidote to bad governance which proffers solution to social problems that are associated with unfulfilled aspirations of members of a society. Nwoye (2005) maintains that the essence of good governance is basically touching people's lives in a positive and concrete ways. He further opines that the quality of governance in any political system affects the form and content of democratic dynamism or transformation. The dynamic aspect of any governance is

the one that recognizes people's plights and makes effort to address them. Good governance means effective governance which according to Grindle (2007) is the one that purposively makes poverty an abomination within its geographic entity. Ott (2009) supporting Grindle maintains that effective government guarantees and provides all necessities of life in order to make them happy citizens.

Good governance is a process that is participatory, transparent and accountable (UNDP, 2003:3). Governance of this nature entails effective and equitable distribution of national resources that empowers members of the society. Good governance takes into cognizance inclusive participation in the activities of the government irrespective of state of origin, class or status. Good governance is a matter of integrity, efficiency, effectiveness and economy of government in the management of public affairs, and meeting government's expectation of the society (Akpa, 2011:67). Good governance according to Cobbinah, Black and Thwaites, (2013) is defined as the institutional arrangement and mechanism that are properly tailored to alleviate the sufferings of the people. Cornwall and Brock (2005) observed that when various governments were motivated to accept that the only sustainable way to good governance is capacity building, which is based on the development of human capacity to function well, as well as contributing to the development of a society.

Good governance is defined as the institutional arrangement and mechanism that are properly tailored to alleviate the sufferings of the people (Cobbinnah, Black, & Thwaites, 2013). It is a method by which government is made more responsive to the yearnings and aspirations of the masses. Its primary concern is to provide essential and basic capacity building that ensure basic infrastructure for healthy and good living of the populace. Therefore, any government that pays a deaf ear on the relevance of integrating people's needs is bound to face development crisis. From the explanations made, there is true a relationship between good governance and social order which their end result is realization of development needs. In this respect, if any organized society is to accomplish its expectations, there must be a clearly defined set of rules and regulations to guide the behaviour of members of the society. Therefore, the achievement of cooperation of the masses in order to achieve a stable environment is dependent on the positive judgment of the masses on the activities of those who govern.

Social Order

Good governance is inseparable with social order. An organized society is one in which its social setting is established on a functional network system of interaction among its members. It is premised on effective existing ethics that define the conduct of its members for the purpose of realizing their aspirations. Therefore each social operator becomes conscious of the roles which are complementary. Social order according to Igbo (2008) is defined as a state of harmonious equilibrium in which a network of duties and rights (claims) reciprocate and complement one another to achieve social goal. By implication, social order entails orderliness in a society which can only be achieved when members of society are well - disposed to play their roles in accordance with the specific rule. In order to achieve this, consciousness is created into the members of society on what is expected from one another at any given situation including the leader and the led (<https://en-wikipedia.org/wiki./socialorder> (Retrieved 14th July, 2018). This calls for reciprocity both on those who govern and the governed. The point being expressed here is that a strong nexus exists between social order and development. This is because when government is sensitive to the welfare of its members, these members in turn will be well disposed to reciprocate this gesture. Put it in the other way, when people feel marginalized due to absence of basic necessities of life, they resort to violence which may undermine any progress and development of a community. In

order to conform to these social behaviour, a people oriented leadership is needed to create enabling environment for peaceful atmosphere to be achieved. For instance, if those who govern recognize the fundamental rights of the citizenry by offering them employment opportunity, assure their security need, establish programmes that make them economically self-reliant and stable, definitely there will be social order to due to high level of cooperation from these individuals of a given society.

Development and Rural Development

The term development is a multi-dimensional phenomenon which is aimed at improving the quality and standard of living among people. Development of this nature cuts across various areas of human life which include education, politics, social, culture, economic and technology. Development entails eradication of poverty and enhancement of life status of members of a given society. It also entails qualitative and quantitative improvement in the living standard of people. Obasi (2005) maintains that development is a social process by which any group of people or society harnesses, mobilizes and utilizes all resources available to it, human and material, for the purpose of transforming their socio-physical environment for the better and ultimately improving the quality of life of its members thorough increased production of their needs and equitable distribution of such needs. Nwosu (2015), sees development as a process of transformation or modification of traditional or pre-industrial society into types of technology and social organization associated with those of the advanced western nations.

The concept of rural development is laden with fluidity because of its ambiguity and lack of uniformity by scholars on its exact definition. Its definition varies from one view point to the other due to the prevailing circumstances of the environment. Rural development is a strategy designed to bring about an improvement in the social and economic life of the rural people (Ikotun, 2002). Ogidefa (2010) sees rural development to involve creating and widening opportunities for rural individuals to realize their full potential through education and share in decision action which affect their lives. Rural development is the integrated approach to food production as well as physical, social and institutional infrastructural provisions with an ultimate goal of bringing about both quantitative and qualitative changes which result in improved living standard of the rural population. Olayide (1981) (cited in Nchukwuwe, 2012) defines rural development as a process whereby concerted efforts are made in order to facilitate significant increase in rural resources productivity with the central objective of enhancing rural income and creating employment opportunity in rural community to remain in the area. Rural development has been an integral part of development institutions'' programmes to ensure that those who live in rural settings are motivated to do so in order to curb rural-urban drift (Oladapo, 2014). The American Bureau of Statistics defines rural community in terms of those spatial area whose inhabitants is 2,500 while in Nigeria it is defined in terms of community in which population of the inhabitants is less than 20,000 (Ocheni & Nwankwo, 2012). Some of the common characteristics of rural community include relative isolation, cultural homogeneity, poor infrastructural facilities and abject poverty.

Looking at the meaning of rural development, it refers to an integrative development efforts targeted at rural people to enhance their socio-economic, political and cultural statuses which make them to reinvest in their immediate rural setting. The essence of rural development is aimed at both qualitative and quantitative improvement in the lives of rural people. These development efforts cut across employment opportunity, physical infrastructure, education, and participatory structure that provide the opportunity for rural people to have their voice heard in society. The primary focus of rural development is to

eradicate abject poverty as rural people are the most hit in this respect. It is in line with this taught that Okoli (1989) (cited in Patrick, 2013) maintains that rural development is meant to provide the panacea for the abject poverty and deprivation of the rural population. Jobowo (2000) refers to rural development as the transformation of the rural community into a socially, economically, politically, educationally, orderly and materially desirable condition with the purpose of improving the quality of life of the rural population.

Relationship between Good Governance and Social Order and Rural Development

In evaluating the nexus between the above concepts and relating them to Nigerian environment, is stimulated at serving as antidote to the recurrent issues of bad governance and its associated social disorder and rural underdevelopment. The assessment will be based on the principle of good governance as espoused by UNDP (2007) which are political participation, rule of law, transparency, responsiveness, consensus, equity and inclusiveness, efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability. The following reasons are being responsible for youth restiveness: bad governance: inadequate educational opportunities and resources; unemployment; poverty, lack of basic infrastructures; and inadequate communication flow (Anasi, cited in Chukuezi, 2018). Chukuezi (2018) posited that marginalization, unemployment, exuberance and the involvement of youths in political thuggery are the major causes of youth restiveness.

When Nigeria got her independence in 1960, there was an expectation that the new nation had been salvaged from the hands of erstwhile exploiting colonial masters who from the tracks of policy records that did not cherish development Nigeria. The expectation was high due to the enormous human and natural resources with which the nation was blessed. According to Leone, (2010), skilled labour, natural resources, abundant financial resources, vast agricultural landmass, and favourable geographical and weather conditions are all scarce resources that are abundantly available in Nigeria. However, due to bad governance, the first coup was plotted in 1966 which resulted in mutual suspicion among the various ethnic groups that made up Nigeria. In the same year, another military coup was staged by General Yakubu Gowon which shattered both human and other resources and plunged the new nation into three years civil war. It was the height of social disorder which adversely affected both human and social development. By implication, what Nigerians experienced during the military rule was dictatorship which runs against the principle of participative governance. According to Kaufman, Kraay and Mastruzzi (2006), participation is the degree of involvement of the citizens of a country in the election of their political leaders and ultimately their representatives in government. Due to the fact that military personnel are not trained to rule, the fundamental human rights were trampled upon which include lack of freedom of expression among other rights.

Another principle of good governance is rule of law which guarantees equity, fairness and justice in the society. Abdellatic (2003) maintains that good governance among other things is participatory, transparent, and accountable, effective and equitable as it promotes the rule of law. It ensures that the political, social, and economic priorities are basically tilted to broad consensus in any given society so that the most vulnerable and poorest individuals are represented in the allocation of developmental policy of the nation. Good governance theory stipulates complete entrenchment of individual and group rights and unbiased observance of the laws which in turn require an independent judiciary as well as an impartial and incorruptible police force (Harrison, 2005, Moloney, 2009, & Sheng, 2012). Experience shows that rule of law in Nigeria is a mere lip service. Equity, fairness and justice are farfetched which slow development process in Nigeria. There are substantial evidences of institutional failures in Nigeria which can lead to violent behaviour. United Nations Development Report (UNDP)

(2006) observed that despite huge financial allocations to NDDC, OMPADEC, derivation fund, less is achieved in terms of development of the region due mainly to corruption, mismanagement, lack of adequate justice and human right abuses. The expectations of achieving meaningful development through infrastructural provision, environmental protection are lacking due to poor governance (d'Agostino, Dunne, & Pieroni 2016). Equally Akpomera (2015), pointed out that weak government institutions may results in failure to protect the environment through strict environment laws ultimately leads to environmental degradation. Stating further, this gives room for host community leaders and influential people to support the youths to vandalize crude oil pipelines in the name of liberating the region from government neglect. Ultimately this becomes the source of livelihood of many youths and some community leaders in the Niger delta region.

Other ways in which bad governance has robbed true development efforts in rural communities in Nigeria include lack of transparency, responsiveness, broad consensus, equity and inclusiveness, effectiveness and efficiency, accountability and strategic vision. Ekundayo (2017) maintains that it has been observed that there is no accountability as well as its twin element of transparency by political leaders in particular which is limited to the current fourth republic and has been in existence since the first republic. Their constant abuse by each successive government has retarded the rate of development both in the national and local environments. The glaring evidence of bad governance is the issue of embezzlement by each successive government. The Economic and Finance Crime Commission (EFCC) in its efforts to curb corruption among our leaders has been arraigning and parading Nigerian leaders both the past and present in courts. The question is, are these funds recovered utilized to promote development or diverted in an individual account? We observe on daily basis the confiscated articles like cars, bullets, rice and other contraband goods by the custom authority and members of the public are not given account on how they are been used. This is bad governance and corruption in a new disguise.

Objectives of the Study

The general objective of the study is to find out how good governance and social order bring about development of rural areas such as Nneato in Umunneochi Local Government Area of Abia State. Specifically,

1. To investigate how good road network relates to rural development.
2. To identify how empowerment of youth's is related to rural development.
3. To find out the relationship between law abiding citizens and rural development.

Research Questions

The following research questions will be used.

1. What is the relationship between provision of good road network and rural development?
2. How does youth's empowerment relate to rural development?
3. Is there any co-relation between law abiding citizens and rural development?

Research Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses will guide the study.

1. There is no significant relationship between good road network and rural development.
2. There is no significant relationship between youth's empowerment and rural development.
3. There is no significant relationship between law abiding citizens and rural development.

Methodology

The study adopted was descriptive design. It was limited to Nneato in Umunneochi Local Government Area of Abia State. It was made up of three autonomous communities namely,

Akawa, Ubahu and Eziana respectively. The population of the study was 2500 which was made up of youths between 18 to 40 years. The sample size was 500 which was selected using stratified random sampling technique. The instrument for data collection was questionnaire and focus group discussion. Three sessions of Focus group discussion were carried out in the three communities. Research hypotheses were tested using t-test while the data from the questionnaire were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences which include simple percentages and tables. Qualitative data were analyzed by pulling out important remarks from the interviewees.

Theoretical Framework

This paper adopts Governance Theory as the framework which is credited to Hyden and Court (2002). According to them, governance refers to the formation and stewardship of the formal and informal rules that regulate the public realm, the arena in which state as well as economic and societal actors interact to make decisions. They explained that governance deals with the constitutive side of how a political system operates rather than its distributive or allocative aspects that are more directly a function of policy. Good governance is characterized by accountability and transparency in the conduct of public affairs most especially in the execution of policies and decisions on public goods and services. By implication, where government is transparent, responsible, accountable and responsive to the yearnings of the masses, its resultant effect is reciprocity on the part of the masses by being committed and conscious of their roles in a society to ensure order and tranquility. It is only when the masses actualize their expectations from the leaders that they become law abiding citizens otherwise, they react negatively which retards any development ventures.

Anasi (cited in Chukwuezi, 2018) identified the following reasons as being responsible for youth restiveness: bad governance: inadequate educational opportunities and resources; unemployment; poverty, lack of basic infrastructures; and inadequate communication flow as being responsible for youth restiveness.

In Africa, of which Nigeria is one, the crisis of development has been described as a crisis of governance by the World Bank (2003). Nigeria's democratic system battles with bad political leadership which is characterized by corruption, authoritarianism and violence. This, it is believed is visible in varying degrees in virtually all the political tiers of the country and this has contributed to the present economic and political violence, masses taken laws into their hands as is the case in the Niger-Delta areas, activities of herdsmen and book haram in the northern part of Nigeria, repression and famine which the nation suffers. All these negative activities are antithetical to a genuine development plan. To the World Bank, good governance is synonymous with sound development management while bad governance has lack of accountability and transparency as its elements. Taken together, good governance is linked to social stability and development of human and physical environment in both urban and local settings. The crisis of governance has affected negatively the quantity and quality of public goods and services delivered in Nigeria.

Challenges of Good Governance and Social Order in Nigeria

The following are the challenges which confront good governance and social order towards the development of rural communities in Nigeria.

1. Institutional corruption
2. Political fatherism and politics of money bags
3. Mass poverty
4. Ethnicity/parochial interest
5. Electoral Manipulation and violence
6. Unemployment, among others.

Data Presentation and Analysis

Section A: Socio-Demographic Information of the Respondents

Table 1: Socio-demographic information of the respondents on Age Bracket

Items		Frequency	Percentage
Age Bracket			
	21 - 30	239	66%
	31 - 40	121	34%
Total		360	100%

Sex:		Frequency	Percentage
	Male	240	67%
	Female	120	33%
Total		360	100%

		Frequency	Percentage
Academic Qualifications	Primary/Basic education	43	12%
	Senior/High School	92	26%
	University undergraduate	110	31%
	First degree/HND	92	26%
	Others	23	6%
Total		360	100%

		Frequency	Percentage
Marital Status	Married	242	67.2%
	Single	118	32.8%
Total		360	100%

Source-Field Survey 2018

Data from the above table 1 shows the Socio-demographic data of the respondents. On the age bracket of the respondents, those within the ages of 21-20 comprised the highest proportion (66 %), those within the age bracket of 31-40 followed in proportion which is (34%). Males were however higher in proportion (67%) than females (33 %). Largest proportion of respondents were single (32.8%), married were (67.2%). On the level of education, the table revealed that (12%)of the respondents are holders of first school living certificate, 26%) are senior level certificate holders, (26%)are first degree holders while 31%are undergraduates. This shows that those with senior level certificate are more than others.

Section B: Substantive Issues of the Topic

Methods of Data Analysis

Responses of the respondents were computed using Mean and Standard deviation for research questions. Each research question will be brought into focus and then analyzed using statistical techniques to uphold or reject each in turn. Likert scale of rating has been used. The respondents were required to indicate the degree of agreement or disagreement as follows: strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), strongly disagree (SD) and Disagree (D) with assigned values of 4, 3, 2, and 1 for the items respectively.

Hence, a criterion mean value of 2.50 was used in decision making. Where the mean score was equal to or less than the criterion mean of 2.50, it was concluded that the response to the items was positive (Accepted) whereas if the mean score was greater than criterion mean value it was concluded that the response to the items was negative (Rejected). ANOVA statistics was used in testing hypotheses 1, 2 and 3. The Hypotheses were tested at .05 level of probability using ANOVA. This method of analysis was adopted because a factorial level with many groups was involved in each case of analysis. Where the P-value is equal to or less than the critical value of .05, it was concluded that the stated null hypothesis will be rejected whereas if otherwise the stated null hypothesis will be accepted.

Table 1: The Relationship between Good Road Network and Rural Development

Item	SA(4)	A(3)	D(2)	SD(1)	STD	Pool Mean	Remark
2	165	134	34	27	69.92	2.20	Accept
	215	368	102	108	124.51		
Percentage	24%	29%	21%	21			
5	209	101	37	13	87.60	2.18	Accept
	209	382	141	52	139.67		
Percentage	31%	22%	23%	10			
8	197	121	17	25	85.56	1.92	Accept
	297	242	51	100	115.97		
Percentage	29%	26%	11%	19			
9	114	109	71	66	24.99	2.86	Accept
	144	278	303	304	76.45		
Percentage	17%	23%	45%	50			

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

From the above table 1, the respondents indicated that good road network is related to rural development. The information cited in the table above, revealed that the mean scores are less than the criterion mean of 2.50, therefore we accept that good road network is related to rural development. Respondents revealed that good roads attract investors, which will in turn bring about employment opportunities, physical infrastructure and education. This in essence will help eradicate abject poverty and bring development in rural areas.

Table 2: Relationship between Youth’s Empowerment and Rural Development.

Item	SA	A	D	SD	STD	Pool Mean	Remark
3	131	156	44	29	62.91	1.92	Accept
	131	312	132	116	93.12		
Percentage	22	29	20	32			
5	149	148	42	21	68.09	1.82	Accept
	149	296	126	84	92.18		
Percentage	25%	28%	19%	23			
6	178	106	44	32	67.03	1.81	Accept
	178	212	132	128	40.05		

Percentage	30%	20%	20%	35			
10	141	119	90	10	57.28	1.91	Accept
	141	238	270	40	103.83		
Percentage	24%	22%	41%	11			

Source: Field Survey, 2018

From the table above it can be observed that the respondents clearly indicated that youth empowerment is related to rural development.

The mean scores of 1.92, 1.82, 1.81 and 1.91 are all less than the criterion mean, therefore we accept the stated items. Youth empowerment involves exposure to and upgrading of relevant skills in order to increase their competency and efficiency. The youths of Nneato reported that empowering them will complement the development efforts of government. This finding supports the reports of Onyema (2012) which emphasized on youth empowerment as a framework for rural development.

Table 3: Relationship between Law Abiding Citizens and Rural Development.

Item	SA	A	D	SD	STD	Pool Mean	Remark
1	167	140	34	19	74.40	1.74	Accept
	167	280	102	76	90.94		
Percentage	23	27	25	28			
4	165	146	31	18	76.21	1.73	Accept
	165	292	93	72	99.33		
Percentage	23	28	23	26			
5	183	117	39	21	74.70	1.72	Accept
	183	234	117	84	67.10		
Percentage	26	22	29	31			
7	198	121	31	10	86.61	1.59	Accept
	198	242	93	40	92.98		
Percentage	28%	23	23	15			

Source: Field Survey, 2018

The above table shows that the criterion mean is greater than the mean scores, therefore we accept the items as stated. In support of the data revelation, some respondents who were interviewed said" ... *Of course, they go together, when there is good governance, there will be social order...social disorderliness in our community today, is because of bad governance"...when members of a society are not carried along and the basic amenities are not provided the citizens resort to crime and may also take laws into their hands causing disorderliness and disintegration..*"

Test of Hypotheses

H₀ There is no significant relationship between youth empowerment and rural development.

H₀ There is no relationship between good road network and development of rural areas.

H₀ There is no relationship between law abiding and rural development.

Hypothesis One

H₀ There is no significant relationship between youth empowerment and rural development.

Summary

<i>Groups</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Sum</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Variance</i>
SA	4	685	171.25	1801.583
A	4	465	116.25	207.5833
D	4	159	39.75	511.5833
SD	4	131	32.75	529.5833

ANOVA

<i>Source of Variation</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>F crit</i>
Between Groups	52373	3	17457.67	22.8928	0.0000	3.490295
Within Groups	9151	12	762.5833			
Total	61524	15				

The table indicates that there is significant relationship between youth empowerment and rural development in the area of study. The P-value is 0.00 which is less than the critical value of 0.05.

Hypothesis Two

H₀ There is no relationship between good road network and development of rural areas

Summary

<i>Groups</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Sum</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Variance</i>
SA	4	599	149.75	408.9167
A	4	529	132.25	558.9167
D	4	220	55	545.3333
SD	4	92	23	96.66667

ANOVA

<i>Source of Variation</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>F crit</i>
Between Groups	44276.5	3	14758.83	36.67171	0.0000	3.490295
Within Groups	4829.5	12	402.4583			
Total	49106	15				

The table indicates that there is relationship between good road network and development in rural areas in the study area. The P-value is 0.00 which is less than the critical value of 0.05

Hypothesis Three

H₀ There is no relationship between law abiding and rural development

Summary

<i>Groups</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Sum</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Variance</i>
SA	4	713	178.25	238.25

A	4	524	131	200.6666667
D	4	135	33.75	14.25
SD	4	68	17	23.33333333

ANOVA

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	71848.5	3	23949.5	201.0451207	0.000	3.490295
Within Groups	1429.5	12	119.125			
Total	73278	15				

The table indicates that there is relationship between law abiding and rural development in areas of study. The P-value is 0.00 which is less than the critical value of 0.05.

Discussion of the Findings

The First specific objective of this study is to examine how Good Governance brings about social order. The findings of this study indicate that there is a positive relationship between good governance and social order. Good governance fosters participation, ensures transparency, demands accountability and promotes efficiency. Prince (2000) opined that good governance is the process whereby public institutions, conduct public resources and guarantee the realization of human rights in a manner essentially free of abuse and corruption, and with due regard for the rule of law. The interviewees argued that the provision of basic amenities for the citizens will go a long way in reducing the incessant cases of social upheavals.

It was revealed that citizens resort to crimes when there is bad governance. This finding agrees with Akpomera (2015) who pointed out that weak government institutions may results in failure to protect the environment through strict environment laws and ultimately leads to environmental degradation; this gives room for host community leaders and influential people to support the youths to vandalize crude oil pipelines in the name of liberating the region from government neglect. Furthermore, the data from table 3 revealed that good road network is related to rural development. Good road network is vital to development agenda. It brings economic and social benefits to rural areas. This supports the findings of Onyema (2000) which revealed that the level of industrialization of any economy depends largely on the condition of its road network.

In one of the interview sessions an interviewee said,..."*Good road network is a catalyst for industrial growth... It allows market to operate by enabling the seamless movement of goods and people..*". From the foregoing, it can be deduced that good road network stimulates rural development and enhances the quality of life for all. This also supports the view of Prince (2000) who envisaged that a well-functioning and integrated road system promotes economic development by increasing access to labour and physical resources thus facilitating the realization of rural development.

Table 2, further revealed that there is a positive relationship between youth empowerment and rural development. The respondents revealed that the empowered youths will act as responses to failures in the public and private sectors in rural areas, providing basic services; they will complement the development efforts of government and they can help to make the development process more accountable, transparent and participatory. This finding agrees with Onyema's (2000) finding, which revealed that, youth empowerment programs can improve development in rural areas. He argued that the youth represents human capital

resource, which could propel a nation to a higher and enviable economic height. Youth empowerment, beyond formal education, will involve exposure to, and up-grading of relevant skills, instilling core values, increasing competence and efficiency and creating an environment for the implementation and sustainability of acquired skills, amongst others. This means that to help develop a rural area, empowerment of the youths through training and education should be given a priority.

Finally respondents reckoned that obedience to rules and regulations brings development to rural areas.

Conclusion

It is no doubt a reality that good governance and social order remain useful instruments to achieve development in any local community. Based on this, successive governments have initiated one rural development programmes or the other which has not yielded much fruits due to lack of good governance and social order. This stems from the fact that it is only when a social environment is conducive enough which allows members of the area to carry out their social, economic and political activities that the laudable policies of the government towards developing rural areas could be actualized. In addition, the desire for members of rural society to keep faith with their leaders is dependent on the extent to which their socio-economic, political and cultural aspirations are met.

In all, good governance requires accountability, responsiveness, participation, and transparency which create a conducive environment for commitment and support of members of the society to assist the government to realize its developmental policies. Thus, from the discussion, it should be clear that development in rural setting cannot be achieved without good governance and social order. It must be concluded that there is absence of good governance and social order in Nigeria considering the violation of the principle of good governance and these adversely retard development quest of rural communities.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made:

1. Since leadership is about positive effect on the people's life, more priority should be placed on implementation and policy statement or paper work.
2. Accountability, responsibility, responsiveness and transparency should be the guiding Principle of our leaders in keeping with principle of good governance theory.
3. Both the judiciary and EFCC should be alive to their responsibility to ensure that the perpetrators of bad governance duly face the consequence of the law irrespective of who is involved without selective justice.
4. The money recovered from the loots from the present and past leaders could be reinvested to the development of rural areas which are the worst hit in development backwardness.
5. Priority attention should be paid to human development which includes youth empowerment through job opportunity and entrepreneurship education which make them become economically self-dependent and self-reliant..
6. Let there be a new policy on national reward to any leader who has good track of records in a measurable terms on both human and environmental development.
7. If government determines to developer rural communities it will go a long way to checkmate the problem of rural-urban drift and its attendant social problems.

References

- Abacha, S. (1994). Abacha speaks. An Address on the Occasion of Swearing Ceremony of Inauguration of the National Constitutional conference commission, 18th January, 1994 *In the compendium of Selected Speeches of General Sani Abacha from November 1993-January, 1998*. (Blue Haven Communication and Publicity Company Limited).
- Abacha, S. (1993). Abacha speaks. An Address at the Swearing-in ceremony of State Sole Administrators, 9th December, 1993. *In the compendium of Selected Speeches of General Sani Abacha Nigeria, 9th Head of State from November 1993-January, 1998*. (Blue Haven Communication and Publicity Company Limited).
- Abdellatif, A.M. (2003). Good governance and its relationship to democracy and economic development. *A Paper Presented at the Global Forum III on fighting Corruption and Safeguarding Integrity, Deoul, 20-31 May (GF 31-wal iv-3/sl)*.
- Akpa, P.A. (2011). Poverty and good governance: The challenge for development. *Nigerian Journal of Political Administrative Studies, 2(2)*.
- Akpomera, E. (2015). International crude oil theft: Elite predatory tendencies in Nigeria. *Review of African Political Economy, 42*, 156–165. 10.1080/03056244.2014.988696
- Alozie, C.C. (2012). Imperatives of good governance for progress in Nigeria In Justin I. Onuoha and scholastic N. Nzeribe (eds.). *Issues in contemporary social Discourse*. Owerri: Liu House of Excellence Ventures.
- Anyanwu, J.C. (2012). Accounting for poverty in Africa: *Illustrations with survey data from Nigeria*. African Development Bank.
- Babawale, T. (2003). *The State ethnic militia and challenges of democratic governance in post military Nigeria in urban violence democratic consolidation in Nigeria*. Lagos: Mallthouse Press Limited.
- Benson, E.T., Biggs, S., Bass, T., Geoghegan & Watson, M. (2013). International development goals who want what and why. Retrieved online, 20th October, 2018.
- Chukuezi, C.O. (2018). Poverty and youth restiveness in Nigeria: Implications for national development. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/22891671>. Retrieved 30th October, 2018.
- Cobbinah, P.B., Black, R., & Thwaites, R. (2013). Dynamics of poverty in developing countries: Review of poverty reduction approaches. *Journal of Sustainable Development, 6(9)*, 25-30 DOI 10.5539/jsd.v6n9p25. Retrieved 25th October, 2018.
- Cornwall, A. & Brock, K. (2005). What do buzzwords do for development policy? A critical look at participation, empowerment and poverty reduction. *Third World Quarterly, 26(9)*, 1043-1060. DOI 10.1080/01436590500235603.
- d'Agostino, G., Dunne, J. P., & Pieroni, L. (2016). *Government spending, corruption and economic growth*. *World Development, 84*, 190–205. 10.1016/j.worlddev.2016.03.011
- Ekundayo, W.J. (2017). Good governance theory and the quest for good governance in Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and social Sciences, 7(5)*, 154.
- Hyden, G. & Court, J. (2002). Comparing Governance Across Countries and Overtime: Conceptual Challenges in D. Olowu and S. Sako (eds) *Better Governance and Public Policy. Capacity Building for Democratic Renewal in Africa*. Kumarian Press
- Grindle, M.S. (2007). Good enough governance revisited. *Development Policy Review, 25(5)*, 533- 574.

- Harrison, G. (2005). The World Bank, governance and theories of political action in Africa. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 7(2), 240-260.
- Igbo, E.M. (2008). *Basic sociology*. Enugu: CIDJAP Publishing & Press.
- Ikotun, Z. (2002). *Strategies for promoting integrated rural development in Nigeria: Theory and practice*. Lagos: Nuga Litho Production.
- Izukanne, M. I. (2009). Leadership problem and national development in Nigeria: A Historical perspective In Obiora Anichebe (ed). *Issues in Nigerian People's and Culture*. Nsukka Enugu: Afro-Orbis Publications Limited.
- Jobowo, G. (2000). *Essentials of rural development*. GbemiSodip Press. Abeokuta.
- Lemos, M. & Agrawal, A. (2006). Environmental governance. 'Annual Review of Environmental Resources 31, 297, 325
- Leone, S. (2010). *Dynamics of trade between Nigeria and other ECOWAS countries*. Retrieved online 20th October, 2018
- Mololney, K. (2009). Public administration and governance: A sector-level analysis of World Bank aid. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 75(4), 609-627.
- Nchukwuwe, F.F. & Adejuwon, K.D. (2012). The challenges of agriculture and rural development in Africa: The case of Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 1 (3), www.hrmars.com/admin/pics. Retrieved 18th September, 2018.
- Nwosu, I.E. (2015). Making development the centre piece of development policies in Nigeria In Iheanyi E. Nwosu (ed). *Contemporary Issues in Local Government Administration and Challenges for rural Development*. Owerri Imo State: Springfield Publishers Ltd.
- Nwoye, K.O. (2005). *State, government and democratic process in Nigeria (199-2004)*. Enugu: Jendiks Nig Ltd.
- Obasi, O. (2005). Women in rural development in Nigeria In Nwachukwu I and Onuekwusi, G.C. (eds). *Agriculture; extension and rural development (2005)*. Enugu: Snaap Press Ltd.
- Obetta, K.C. & Okide, C.C. (2012). Rural development trends in Nigeria: Problems and prospects, <http://www.academicexcellencesociety.com/ruraldevelopmenttrends in Nigeria.html>. Retrieved 14th June, 2018.
- Ogidefa, I. (2010). *Rural development in Nigeria: concept, approaches, challenges and prospects, in socybertt.com/issues*. Retrieved 14th September, 2018.
- Okorie, P. (2010). National budget watch. *Association for Public Policy Analysis (APP- Nigeria)*, (1).
- Oladipo, S.I. (2014). Achieving sustainable poverty reduction and rural development in Nigeria through local economic development strategies. *American Journal of Rural Development*, 2(1), 13-19. DOI 10.12691/ard-21-3.
- Ott, J.C. (2009). Good governance and happiness in nations: Technical quality precedes democracy and quality beats size. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 11(3), 353-368. DOI 10.1007/s10902-009-9144-7. Retrieved 24th October, 2018.
- Patrick, P. (2013). Development of rural Nigeria: A springboard to accelerating poverty reduction. *Kaduna Journal of Sociology*, 1(1), 68-75.
- Thomas, M.A. (2010). What do the worldwide governance indicators measurquest. *European*

Journal of Development Research, 22(1), 31-54

Rosenau, J.(1992). Governance, order and change in world politics. In *Governance without Government* Eds J Rosenau, E-O Czempiel. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Sheng, Y.K. (2012). What is good governance? United Nations Economic and social commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP). Retrieved October 6, 2018 fro

<http://www.unescap.org>.

Shettima, K (2012). The Imperative of Peace and Development: The Challenges of Insecurity in

Borno State. A Paper Presented at the Occasion of International Security Summit on Terrorism and other related Crimes. Organized by Sun Newspapers Limited Holding at Transcorp Hilton, Abuja from 17th-19thApril, 2012.

United Nations Development Report (UNDP). (2006). *Niger-Delta Development Human Report*. Abuja: United Walter & Pettigrew.

United Nations Development Programme (2007). *Governance indicators: A user's guide*. New York: Document Library.