

INTER-ETHNIC RELATIONS AND POLITICAL MARGINALIZATION IN KADUNA STATE: A STUDY OF CLAIMS OF DOMINATION IN THE STATE CIVIL SERVICE

Mohammed, Shuaibu

Department of Political Science and International Studies
Faculty of Social Sciences, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
e-mail: mohammedshuaibu76@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigates the validity of agitations against marginalisation in the Kaduna state civil service by the southern Kaduna ethnic groups. The Southern Kaduna Peoples Union (SOKAPU), which claimed to represent the ethnic groups in southern part of the state argues that the ethnic composition of the public service is top heavy with people from the Northern part of the state, while the bottom is heavy with those from the Southern part of the state. Therefore, integrated threat theory is used as a theoretical guide. Furthermore, the study relies on secondary sources of data which was generated from the relevant literature, memos, official documents, Kaduna state pay-roll and other relevant materials. Also, the Federal Character Formulae was used to analyse the Kaduna state civil service workforce using the Kaduna State Budget and Treasury Management Information System (BATMIS). The study reveals that the case presented by SOKAPU over marginalisation of the southern part of the state in the public service contradict the data generated for this study. It has been empirically proved that southern parts Kaduna dominates the central and the northern parts in the state's Civil Service. Out of the 24931 staff covered, the Southern Kaduna Zone has 12, 872 representing 51.63% while Central Zone has 4, 843 and Northern Zone has 7, 216 representing 19.43% and 28.94% respectively.

Keywords: Inter-ethnic, political, marginalisation, domination, civil service

Introduction

There is no doubt that no ethnic group can live in isolation of the other. No community or region can completely ignore its neighbours. Group relations imply a series of contacts between different identities, communities and peoples, usually in the form of trade, sports and conflict, among others. The need for such intergroup relations was to ensure good relations with one another. Inter-group relations in developing nations are often characterised by one form of agitations and conflict or the other. The relationship between groups based on ethnicity, for example, provides the context for everyday life. Intergroup relations frame the way people define themselves and others, the way they behave and how they treat and think about others. It profoundly affects their everyday life in which the relationship can either be harmonious and peaceful, or conflictual and hostile.

Since 1960, there have been several agitations against perceived marginalisation and domination by various ethnic groups in the Nigerian Federation. Several issues keep reoccurring in these agitations, among which are mobilisation and opposition by various groups against their

perceived marginalization and subjugation; most especially in terms of political appointments, composition of state civil service and rapid infrastructural development.

For example, one of the major political organisations in southern part of Kaduna state, the Southern Kaduna Peoples Union (SOKAPU), which is a socio-cultural and political union that claims to represent the interests of the peoples and ethnic groups of the southern part of the state, claims that the southern part of Kaduna is not properly represented in the state's governance structure and that they are disadvantaged in relation to their more populous Hausa and Fulani Muslim neighbours. That, the ethnic composition of the public service in the state makes for the splitting of the state, as the top is heavy with people from the Northern part of the state, while the bottom is heavy with those from the Southern part.

Literature Review

Group relations imply a series of contacts between different identities, communities and peoples, usually in the form of trade, sports and conflict, among others. The need for such intergroup relations was to ensure good relations with one another. Inter-group relations in developing nations are often characterised by one form of conflict or the other. Tajfel (1982) defines intergroup relations as the process whereby individuals belonging to one group interact collectively or individually with another group or its members. The relationship between groups based on religion, ethnicity, etc. for example, provides the context for everyday life. Intergroup relations frame the way people define themselves and others, the way they behave and how they treat and think about others.

It profoundly affects their everyday life in which the relationship can either be harmonious and peaceful, or conflictual and hostile. Nnoli (1978, p.5) looks at inter-ethnic relations in terms of ethnicity which he defines as "a social phenomenon associated with interaction among members of different ethnic groups". He further argues that due to the issues of we and they, ethnicity carries with it the potential for conflict as well as for cooperation and accommodation. The deployment of ethnicity for competitive purposes in the face of scarcity tends to assume conflict or cooperative dimensions among the various ethnic groups, depending on the social situation. Moreover, conflict becomes inevitable under the conditions of inter-ethnic competition for power and scarce resources.

Contrary to the conception that Nigeria is a mere geographical expression, the diverse peoples of the country had variety of links and contacts with one another before colonialism. These contacts sometimes took the form of war and enslavement, diplomacy, treaties, the visits of wandering scholars, the diffusion of political and religious ideas, the borrowing of techniques and above all, trade. The links can also be classified into geographical (condition of their physical environment and secondly, by their level of development), socio-cultural (migrations, language and folklore, religion, philosophy and cosmology; art, dance and music, marriage, customs and modes of dressings), Economic (trade and commerce, the predominance of markets where goods and services and so on were (are) exchanged) and Political factors (wars and diplomacy). All these promoted inter-group relations between the peoples of Nigeria before and after colonialism (Okpeh, 2007).

According to Sanda (1976), certain circumstances appeared to have charted the form taken by the ethnic identification and inter-ethnic relations in Nigeria. He asserts that the first was the

style of British acquisition of territory. The areas subsequently to be classified under one political administration as Nigeria were occupied at different times and with different techniques by the British. The whole societies were brought under one unified political administration in 1914. Second, the introduction of indirect rule by Lugard and his successors, and the policy of regionalisation indulged in by the subsequent colonial governors, both led to the recognition, preservation, and in some cases, the making of tribal chiefs. British policies led to the erroneous regard for the three dominant ethnic and cultural groups in Nigeria- the Hausa and Fulani in North, Igbo in the East and Yoruba in the West- to the neglect of others. The other significant factor that influenced the formation of ethnic identification, and in fact directed it in Nigerian at this time, was the growth of or formation of cultural associations in the urban areas. The development of urban ethnic associations in colonial Africa has been attributed to the atomising effect on the town way of life, which induced Africans to seek other avenues for reaping the benefit of group life.

Similarly, Dibua (2011) argues that it was the colonial policy of divide and rule that promoted and sustained the phenomenon of ethnicity, and this, in turn, fostered ethnic citizenship. Ethnicity, therefore, became the major consideration in the allocation of offices and resources, thereby promoting inter-ethnic rivalries, with the attendant adverse consequences for inter-group relations.

Furthermore, the inter-ethnic struggle for political power in Nigeria was encouraged by the colonial administration. The passage of the Macpherson Constitution in 1951 fostered the ethnicisation of Nigerian politics. The concentration of regional government over regional affairs and the increase in regional powers to legislate on some local matters such as local government, town planning, agriculture, forestry among others resulted in the emergence of ethnic-based political parties, namely NCNC, AG and NPC. When it became obvious that independence would be achieved in 1960, the inter-ethnic struggle for political power became radically politicized and cultural unions that had hitherto played the role of catering for the welfare of their members gained political significance. Thus, each tribal union supported its leaders in the struggle for political power at the center. Consequently, the inter-ethnic struggle for political power is often characterised by nepotism, corruption and victimisation as well as intimidation of political opponents. These situations have often degenerated into violent repression, widespread massacre of the civilian population and bloody civil war (Aliagan, 2014).

One of the fundamental consequences of colonialism, as it relates to intergroup relations in Nigeria, was the creation of the two publics that contested for the loyalty of the Africans. The two publics according to Ekeh (1975) are:

- i. The primordial public which is made up of ethnic unions, community associations and other primordial groups, established in the colonial period to meet the welfare needs that were denied by the colonial state; and
- ii. The civic public whose genealogy begins with the colonial state apparatus and encompasses the symbols and institutions of the post-colonial state.

While the primordial public enjoyed the affection of the people who always thought of what they could do to it without asking for anything in return, the civic public is inundated by avaricious citizens with a notion of citizenship that begins and ends in the realm of rights. Ekeh argues that ethnicity has flourished because the Nigerian elites who inherited the colonial state had

and still have conceptualised development as transferring resources from the civic public to the primordial public. The civic public is thus a contested terrain where representatives of the primordial public struggle for their share of the national cake. In this struggle, politics is amoral and the end justifies the means. The state is seen as alien, exploitative and oppressive. Ekeh cites as evidence of the dichotomy between the two publics, the fact that the same bourgeois elements that evaded taxes and pilfered public funds contributed generously to community projects and, when called upon, exhibited the highest level of probity in the management of community finance.

The minority question in Nigeria can be found within the context of inter-ethnic relations, which is also directly linked to ethnicity. Suberu (1996, p.5) argues that ethnic minority problems are related to ethnicity, which leads to ethnic conflict. According to him, there is a lot of ideological confusion surrounding the concept of minority. Most writers agree that minorities are culturally distinctive and relatively cohesive groups, which occupy a position of numerical inferiority and/or socio-political subordination vis-a-vis other cultural sections in the society. But it is not in all cases that the minorities experience inferiority and socio-political subordination. In some cases, the minority dominates the majority.

In Kaduna state, there have been agitations against marginalisation the Southern Kaduna Peoples Union (SOKAPU) argues that the ethnic composition of the public service in the state also makes for the splitting of the state as the top is heavy with people from the Northern part of the state, while the bottom is heavy with those from the Southern part of the state. Representation at the federal level is dominated by those from the North. It should be observed that such discrimination and unhealthy attitudes have mostly due to persons in power acting out of their caprices (Memorandum submitted to National Assembly on the creation of South-Kaduna State by SOKAPU, 2002).

The Southern Kaduna group further argues that in general, there has never been enough mutual respect between Northern and Southern parts of Kaduna state and therefore, inter-ethnic relations have usually been characterized by an assumed cultural superiority of the North leading to a resentment by the south (Memorandum submitted to National Assembly on creation of South-Kaduna State by SOKAPU, 2002, p.3).

James (2002), Zagi (2008) and Nock (2007) argue that the creation of a South Kaduna state out of the present Kaduna state would address the present marginalization suffered by various communities, bring development in the area in terms of feeder roads, the provision of educational institutions, health institutions as well as addressing the lop-sidedness in terms of representation and political appointments experienced in the past in both state and federal establishments, provide economic empowerment for the people of the area among others. James 2002. p.47) went further to add that “the only way ethnic minority groups can extricate themselves from economic and political domination was through state creation”.

In addition, there have been two consistent strands of discord from the area coming from some of the local ‘minority’ ethnic groups who are fearful of their future in a proposed state alongside local ‘majority’ groups like the Jaba, Atyab and Bajju on the one hand (Yahaya, 2012), even though there seems to have emerged a working consensus among groups. On the other, most members of the Hausa and Fulani ‘*settler*’ communities are equally skeptical of a proposed state that would further expose them to what they feared as intense discrimination and mutilation of

their rights. Furthermore, they claimed that in the whole business of the pursuit of state creation they were hardly consulted. This to them is clear evidence that they are still not considered Southern Kaduna by the dominant interests in the area (Yahaya, 2012).

To solve this problem of diversity, a federal system of government has been adopted by the Nigerian state. In this study, inter-group relation is examined in terms of inter-ethnic relations, most especially the agitation against domination in Kaduna state civil service which has been ignored by the available literature.

Theoretical Framework

The study adopted Integrated Threat Theory which is also known as intergroup threat theory as a theoretical guide. The proponents of the theory are Walter G. Stephan and Cookie White Stephan. The theory attempts to describe the components of the perceived threat that lead to prejudice between social groups. It applies to any social group that may feel threatened in some way, whether or not that social group is a majority or minority group in the society. It also deals with a perceived threat rather than an actual threat. The perceived threat includes the threats that members of a group believe they are experiencing, regardless of whether those threats exist or not. For example, people may feel their economic well-being is threatened by an out-group stealing their jobs even if, in reality, the outgroup does not affect their job opportunities. Still, their perception that their job security is under threat can increase their levels of prejudice against the outgroup.

In addition, the theory has four major components, which are: (1) the realistic threats-threats that pose a danger to the in-group's well-being. These can include threats to physical safety or health, threats to economic and political power, and threats to the existence of the group. (2) the symbolic threats-these arise where there is a perceived difference between the values and worldview of an in-group and out-group. The difference can make the in-group feel that the out-group poses a threat to their group morals, standards, beliefs, and attitudes. These threats are thus strongly tied to a group's sense of identity. (3) Intergroup anxiety-this refers to the expectation that interacting with someone from a different group will be a negative experience. People with intergroup anxiety fear that they will feel uncomfortable, embarrassed, unsafe, or judged, either by members of the outgroup or by people of their own in-group. (4) Negative Stereotypes-Stereotypes are a strategy of simplifying a complex situation by relying on popular pre-set judgments. Integrated Threat Theory predicts that negative pre-set judgments about another group can lead to prejudice. This component of the theory draws from research that found that belief in negatively-rated stereotypical traits was linked to higher levels of prejudice against the stereotyped group. Thus, it seems that, while general stereotypes assume some positive things about other groups, only the negative aspects of stereotypes are relevant to prejudice.

In 2002, Stephan and Renfro proposed an updated version of the theory which reduced the four components to two basic types: realistic and symbolic threats. The categories of negative stereotypes and intergroup anxiety were removed from the basic framework of the theory because they were found to be better understood as subtypes of threat. They can lead to either realistic or symbolic threats rather than standing as their separate categories. For example, intergroup anxiety can be based on expectations of physical danger, a realistic threat, as well as on expectations of damage to one's identity, a symbolic threat.

Negative stereotypes, which were initially considered to be a separate type of threat, now seem to be a cause of threat involving characteristics of the outgroup that could harm the ingroup (e.g., aggressiveness, deviousness, immorality). Indeed, negative stereotypes are a significant predictor of both realistic and symbolic threats (Stephan et al., 2002).

Intergroup anxiety, which involves the anticipation of negative outcomes from intergroup interaction, was also initially considered to be a separate threat but now seems to us to be a subtype of threat centering on apprehensions about interacting with outgroup members. These apprehensions arise from different sources, including concerns that the outgroup will exploit the in-group, concerns that the outgroup will perceive the in-group as prejudiced, and concerns that the outgroup will challenge the in-group's values (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). In the revised theory, realistic group threats are threats to a group's power, resources, and general welfare. Symbolic group threats are threats to a group's religion, values, belief system, ideology, philosophy, morality, or worldview. Realistic individual threats concern actual physical or material harm to an individual group member such as pain, torture, or death, as well as economic loss, deprivation of valued resources, and threats to health or personal security. Symbolic individual threats concern loss of face or honour and the undermining of an individual's self-identity or self-esteem.

In the first revision of integrated threat theory, it was argued that the degree to which people perceive threats from another group depends on prior relations between the groups, the cultural values of the group members, the situations in which the groups interact with one another, and individual difference variables. Under some conditions, perceptions of threat may also be high when the in-group and outgroup are believed to be relatively equal in power. When equal power groups are in open conflict or are competing with one another for valued resources, their equal power makes them evenly matched as opponents

Finally, there are three major consequences of perceived threats, which are: (1) Cognitive Responses-threats that include changes in perceptions of the outgroup such as changes in stereotypes; ethnocentrism, intolerance, hatred, and dehumanization of the outgroup changes in attributions for the outgroup's behaviour; perceived outgroup homogeneity; and an increased likelihood of perceiving threat-related emotions (e.g., anger) in others. (2) Emotional Responses-the emotional reactions to threats are likely to be negative. They include fear, anxiety, anger, and resentment; contempt and disgust; vulnerability; collective guilt; and in all likelihood other emotions such as rage, hatred, humiliation, dread, helplessness, despair, righteous indignation, and panic. Also, a threat may undermine emotional empathy for outgroup members and increase emotional empathy for in-group members. The relationship between threat and (lack of) empathy for outgroups is corroborated by a set of studies showing that threats to a group's status lead group members to feel *schadenfreude*, or pleasure at the suffering of an outgroup. (3) Behavioural responses-these are withdrawal, submission, and negotiation to aggression (direct or displaced), discrimination, lying, cheating, stealing, harassment, retaliation, sabotage, protests, strikes, warfare, and other forms of open intergroup conflict. In some cases, threat leads to direct hostility against the outgroup that is closely related to the source of the threat. However, in other cases, a threat may lead to displaced hostility against an outgroup that is unrelated to the source of the threat. In an experiment illustrating this point, psychology students whose status was threatened by an outgroup subsequently discriminated against another, lower status outgroup.

In summary, intergroup threat is experienced when members of one group perceive that another group is in a position to cause them harm. We refer to concern about physical harm or a loss of resources as a realistic threat, and a concern about the integrity or validity of the in-group's meaning system as a symbolic threat. The primary reason intergroup threats are important is that their effects on intergroup relations are largely destructive. Even when a threat from an outgroup leads to non-hostile behavioural responses (e.g., negotiation, compromise, deterrence), the cognitive and affective responses to threats are likely to be negative (Nelson, Stephan, Ybarra, & Morrison, 2009). Integrated threat theory is used in this study to describe how the southern Kaduna people perceive their northern counterpart as threat to their social existence which in many cases leads to prejudgment between them.

Methodology

Kaduna state can be described as a culturally diverse state. It is politically classified as belonging to the North-Western part of Nigeria with a projected population of 7, 102,88 million people (National Bureau of Statistics, 2012). The population of the study is the state civil servants. A total of Twenty-Four Thousand Nine Hundred and Thirty-One (24, 931) civil servants were enumerated from Kaduna State Human Resource and Payroll Management System.

Also, the study used a mixed approach. That is, both the quantitative and qualitative methods. The data were generated from the relevant literature, memos, official documents and aggregate data from Kaduna State Public Service Pay-Roll which was analysed using simple percentages as identified by the Federal Character Commission's formulae for civil service workforce distribution.

As such, the work looks at the Kaduna state civil service workforce by focusing on the three main staff categories (Junior, Senior and Managerial staff) in the state. Fifty-Four (54) Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) were covered which comprised Ministry of Rural and Community Development, Ministry of Economic Planning, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Land and Survey, Ministry of Water Resources, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Local Government and Chieftaincy Affairs, Ministry of Women Affairs, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resource, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Youth and Sport Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Ministry of Works, Government House, Kaduna State Media corporation, Kaduna State Emergency Management Agency, Bureau for Pension Board (state), Assembly Service Commission, Public Service Institute, Civil Service Commission, Local Government Service Commission, Public Work Agency, Bureau for Statistics, Kaduna State Library Board, Kaduna State Private School Board, Kaduna State Urban Planning and Development Agency (KASUPDA), Office of the Secretary to State Government, Due Process Office, Kaduna State Pilgrim Board, Office of the Head of Service, Bureau for Pension (LG), State Independent Electoral Commission, Kaduna State Agricultural Development Project (KADP), Kaduna State Traffic and Environmental Law Enforcement Agency (KASTELEA), Agency for Mass Literacy, Kaduna State Teachers Service Board, Government Printing Department, Industrialisation & Micro Credit Office, Poverty Alleviation Office, Kaduna State Aid Control Agency, Kaduna State Legislature, Bureau for Establishment, Office of the Auditor General (State), Office of the Auditor General (LG), Kaduna State Forestry Management Programme,

Environment Protection Agency, Kaduna State Universal Basic Education, Kaduna State Scholarship, Board, Kaduna State Science & Technical School Management Board and Kaduna State Rehabilitation Board.

Furthermore, to analyse the state workforce, the research adopts the formulae for the distribution of all cadres and posts according to Federal Character Principles Part III Section 6(1b) of the application of general principles for the distribution of public cadres and posts. It states that, the local governments shall equitably be represented. Thus, the formula for sharing and distribution of posts among the local government areas shall be as specified below: (Federal Character Commission Handbook, 2011, p.18). Table 5.2.2 below gives the summary of the formulae:

Table 1: Federal Character Formula for Sharing and Distribution of Posts among the Local Government Areas in Kaduna State

S/N	Status	Percentage
1	Under-represented	Below 3%
2	Adequately Represented	Between 3% and 5%
3	Over-represented	Above 5%

Source: Federal Character Commission Handbook, 2011.

The table indicates that each L.G.A should have not less than 3% and not more than 5% of the total workforce in the state. As such, if a local government has below 3% of the total workforce in the state, it means the LGA is under-represented, between 3% and 5%, which means the LGA is adequately represented. If an LGA has above 5%, it means it is over-represented in the state civil service.

Result and Analysis

This section explains the authenticity of the claims over marginalisation in the state Civil Service by the Southern Kaduna Peoples Union. The state is divided into three zones. Northern zone was the LGAs claimed by the Movement for the Creation of Zazzau State. The Southern zone comprised the LGAs claimed by Southern Kaduna Peoples Union and the Central Zone comprises Kaduna North, Kaduna South and Birnin. The reason for grouping the central zone is that both the southern and northern groups included Kaduna North and Kaduna South LGAs and left Birnin Gwari out of their claimed areas. As such, the two controversial areas and Birnin Gwari were grouped together. It also deals with the presentation, interpretation and analysis of the aggregate data (Kaduna state civil service workforce). The state workforce is divided into Junior Staff (those on Grade Level 1-6), Senior Staff (those on Grade Level 7-13) and Management Staff (those on Grade Level 14-18). Also, 54 Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) were covered covering 24, 931 civil servants as thus:

Table 2: Distribution of Staff on Grade Level 1-6

S/N	LGA	GL1-6	%
NORTHERN ZONE			
1	Sabon Gari	71	1.44
2	Zaria	580	11.74
3	Giwa	90	1.82
4	Makarfi	120	2.43
5	Kudan	82	1.66
6	Ikara	96	1.94
7	Igabi	277	5.61
8	Soba	111	2.25
9	Kubau	135	2.73
	Total	1562	31.61
SOUTHERN ZONE			
1	Kajuru	113	2.29

2	Lere	188	3.80
3	Chikun	137	2.77
4	ZangoKataf	450	9.11
5	Jema'a	235	4.76
6	Kachia	283	5.73
7	Kagarko	206	4.17
8	Kaura	258	5.22
9	Kauru	83	1.68
10	Jaba	171	3.46
11	Sanga	111	2.25
	Total	2235	45.23
CENTRAL AND BIRNIN GWARI ZONE			
1	Kaduna South	445	9.01
2	Kaduna North	523	10.58
3	BirninGwari	176	3.56
	Total	1144	23.15
	Grand Total	4941	100.00

Source: Compiled from Kaduna State Human Resource and Payroll Management System, Budget, Accounting and Treasury Management Information System (BATMIS) Data Centre, 2017

This table is a display of the distribution of staff according to Zones in Kaduna State public service on Grade level 1-6. It shows that Northern Zone has 31.61%, Southern zone has 45.23% while Central and Birnin Gwari has 23.15. This reveals that the Southern zone dominates these levels.

Table 3: Distribution of Staff on Grade Level 7-13

S/N	LGA	GL7-13	%
NORTHERN ZONE			
1	SabonGari	432	2.62
2	Zaria	2019	12.26
3	Giwa	307	1.86
4	Makarfi	321	1.95
5	Kudan	150	0.91
6	Ikara	312	1.89
7	Igabi	635	3.85
8	Soba	266	1.61
9	Kubau	435	2.64
	Total	4877	29.60
SOUTHERN ZONE			
1	Kajuru	309	1.88
2	Lere	730	4.43
3	Chikun	344	2.09

4	ZangoKataf	1594	9.68
5	Jema'a	1112	6.75
6	Kachia	863	5.24
7	Kagarko	506	3.07
8	Kaura	1108	6.73
9	Kauru	413	2.51
10	Jaba	867	5.26
11	Sanga	543	3.30
	Total	8389	50.92
CENTRAL AND BIRNIN GWARI ZONE			
1	Kaduna South	1368	8.30
2	Kaduna North	1492	9.06
3	BirninGwari	348	2.11
	Total	3208	19.47
	Grand Total	16474	100.00

Source: Compiled from Kaduna State Human Resource and Payroll Management System, Budget, Accounting and Treasury Management Information System (BATMIS) Data Center, 2017

This shows the distribution of staff according to Zones in Kaduna State public service on Grade level 7-13. It indicates that Northern Zone has 26.60%, Southern zone has 50.92% while Central and Birnin Gwari has 19.47. This reveals that the Southern zone dominates these levels.

Table 4: Distribution of Staff on Grade Level 14-18

S/N	LGA	GL14-18	%
NORTHERN ZONE			
1	SabonGari	63	1.79
2	Zaria	417	11.86
3	Giwa	28	0.80
4	Makarfi	29	0.82
5	Kudan	23	0.65
6	Ikara	47	1.34
7	Igabi	50	1.42
8	Soba	50	1.42
9	Kubau	70	1.99
	Total	777	22.10
SOUTHERN ZONE			
1	Kajuru	71	2.02
2	Lere	115	3.27
3	Chikun	30	0.85
4	ZangoKataf	612	17.41
5	Jema'a	258	7.34

6	Kachia	209	5.94
7	Kagarko	85	2.42
8	Kaura	335	9.53
9	Kauru	58	1.65
10	Jaba	334	9.50
11	Sanga	141	4.01
	Total	2248	63.94
CENTRAL AND BIRNIN GWARI ZONE			
1	Kaduna South	205	5.83
2	Kaduna North	217	6.17
3	BirninGwari	69	1.96
	Total	491	13.96
	Grand Total	3516	100.00

Source: Compiled from Kaduna State Human Resource and Payroll Management System, Budget, Accounting and Treasury Management Information System (BATMIS) Data Center, 2017.

This displays the distribution of staff according to Zones in Kaduna State public service on Grade Level 14-18. It shows that Northern Zone has 22.10%, Southern zone has 63.94% while Central and Birnin Gwari has 13.96. This reveals that the Southern zone dominates these levels.

Table 5: Summary of Distribution of Staff in the State Public Service

S/N	LGA	GL1-6	GL7-13	GL14-18	TOTAL	%
NORTHERN ZONE						
1	SabonGari	71	432	63	566	2.27
2	Zaria	580	2019	417	3016	12.10
3	Giwa	90	307	28	425	1.70
4	Makarfi	120	321	29	470	1.89
5	Kudan	82	150	23	255	1.02
6	Ikara	96	312	47	455	1.83
7	Igabi	277	635	50	962	3.86
8	Soba	111	266	50	427	1.71
9	Kubau	135	435	70	640	2.57
	Total	1562	4877	777	7216	28.94
SOUTHERN ZONE						
1	Kajuru	113	309	71	493	1.98
2	Lere	188	730	115	1033	4.14
3	Chikun	137	344	30	511	2.05
4	ZangoKataf	450	1594	612	2656	10.65

5	Jema'a	235	1112	258	1605	6.44
6	Kachia	283	863	209	1355	5.44
7	Kagarko	206	506	85	797	3.20
8	Kaura	258	1108	335	1701	6.82
9	Kauru	83	413	58	554	2.22
10	Jaba	171	867	334	1372	5.50
11	Sanga	111	543	141	795	3.19
	Total	2235	8389	2248	12872	51.63
CENTRAL AND BIRNIN GWARI ZONE						
1	Kaduna South	445	1368	205	2018	8.09
2	Kaduna North	523	1492	217	2232	8.95
3	Birnin Gwari	176	348	69	593	2.38
	Total	1144	3208	491	4843	19.43
	Grand Total	4941	16474	3516	24931	100

Source: Compiled from Kaduna State Human Resource and Payroll Management System, Budget, Accounting and Treasury Management Information System (BATMIS) Data Center, 2017

The table shows the distribution of staff according to Zones in Kaduna State public service on Grade level 1-18. It shows that Northern Zone has 28.94%, Southern zone has 51.63% while Central and Birnin Gwari has 19.43. This reveals that Southern zone dominates these levels.

Table 6: Distribution of Staff on Director Category

S/N	LGA	DIR	%
NORTHERN ZONE			
1	SabonGari	14	1.68
2	Zaria	84	10.11
3	Giwa	10	1.20
4	Makarfi	10	1.20
5	Kudan	5	0.60
6	Ikara	8	0.96
7	Igabi	8	0.96
8	Soba	7	0.84
9	Kubau	18	2.17
	Total	164	19.74
SOUTHERN ZONE			
1	Kajuru	13	1.56
2	Lere	19	2.29
3	Chikun	8	0.96
4	ZangoKataf	167	20.10
5	Jema'a	77	9.27

6	Kachia	58	6.98
7	Kagarko	22	2.65
8	Kaura	92	11.07
9	Kauru	11	1.32
10	Jaba	99	11.91
11	Sanga	24	2.89
	Total	590	71.00
CENTRAL AND BIRNIN GWARI ZONE			
1	Kaduna South	32	3.85
2	Kaduna North	32	3.85
3	BirninGwari	13	1.56
	Total	77	9.27
	Grand Total	831	100.00

Source: Compiled from Kaduna State Human Resource and Payroll Management System, Budget, Accounting and Treasury Management Information System (BATMIS) Data Center, 2017

This is a presentation of the distribution of staff according to Zones in Kaduna State public service on Director Cadre. It shows that Northern Zone has 19.74%, Southern zone has 71.00% while Central and Birnin Gwari has 9.27. This reveals that the Southern zone dominates these levels.

Table 7: Distribution of Staff on Deputy Director Category

S/N	LGA	DD	%
NORTHERN ZONE			
1	SabonGari	8	1.54
2	Zaria	65	12.48
3	Giwa	2	0.38
4	Makarfi	5	0.96
5	Kudan	3	0.58
6	Ikara	15	2.88
7	Igabi	12	2.30
8	Soba	6	1.15
9	Kubau	8	1.54
	Total	124	23.80
SOUTHERN ZONE			
1	Kajuru	16	3.07
2	Lere	23	4.41
3	Chikun	4	0.77
4	ZangoKataf	104	19.96
5	Jema'a	32	6.14

6	Kachia	31	5.95
7	Kagarko	19	3.65
8	Kaura	52	9.98
9	Kauru	11	2.11
10	Jaba	43	8.25
11	Sanga	15	2.88
	Total	350	67.18
CENTRAL AND BIRNIN GWARI ZONE			
1	Kaduna South	15	2.88
2	Kaduna North	28	5.37
3	BirninGwari	4	0.77
	Total	47	9.02
	Grand Total	521	100.00

Source: Compiled from Kaduna State Human Resource and Payroll Management System, Budget, Accounting and Treasury Management Information System (BATMIS) Data Center, 2017

The table indicates the distribution of staff according to Zones in Kaduna State public service on Deputy Director Cadre. It shows that Northern Zone has 23.80%, Southern zone has 67.18% while Central and Birnin Gwari has 9.02. This reveals that the Southern zone dominates these levels.

Table 8: Distribution of Staff on Permanent Secretary/Managing Director Category

S/N	LGA	PS/MD	%
NORTHERN ZONE			
1	SabonGari	2	7.69
2	Zaria	2	7.69
3	Giwa	1	3.85
4	Makarfi	0	0.00
5	Kudan	0	0.00
6	Ikara	1	3.85
7	Igabi	1	3.85
8	Soba	0	0.00
9	Kubau	1	3.85
	Total	8	30.77
SOUTHERN ZONE			
1	Kajuru	1	3.85
2	Lere	1	3.85
3	Chikun	1	3.85
4	ZangoKataf	3	11.54
5	Jema'a	0	0.00
6	Kachia	0	0.00

7	Kagarko	1	3.85
8	Kaura	2	7.69
9	Kauru	0	0.00
10	Jaba	1	3.85
11	Sanga	3	11.54
	Total	13	50.00
CENTRAL AND BIRNIN GWARI ZONE			
1	Kaduna South	1	3.85
2	Kaduna North	4	15.38
3	BirninGwari	0	0.00
	Total	5	19.23
	Grand Total	26	100.00

Source: Compiled from Kaduna State Human Resource and Payroll Management System, Budget, Accounting and Treasury Management Information System (BATMIS) Data Center, 2017

This displays the distribution of staff according to Zones in Kaduna State public service on Permanent Secretary/Managing Director Cadre. It shows that Northern Zone has 30.77%, Southern zone has 50.00% while Central and Birnin Gwari has 19.23. This reveals that the Southern zone dominates these levels.

Summary of Findings

The study reveals data contrary to the case presented by SOKAPU over marginalisation of the southern part of the state in the public service. It has been empirically demonstrated that contrary to SOKAPU's claim of domination of Southern Kaduna people by its Northern counterpart in the state civil, Tables 2, 3 and 4 show that southern Kaduna dominates the Junior Staff, Senior Staff and Management Staff Cadre with 45.23%, 50.92% and 63.94% respectively Table 6 show that Southern Kaduna Zone has 51.63% of the total workforce in the state

The data also reveals that Sabon Gari, Giwa, Makafi, Kudan, Ikara, Birnin Gwari, Soba, Kubau, Kajuru, Chikun and Kauru, are under-represented in Kaduna state public service (with less than 3% of the total workforce in the state). The number of adequately represented (with 4% to 5% of the total workforce in the state) local governments include Igabi, Lere, Kagarko, Sanga, and Kachia. The distribution also shows that Zaria, Zango Kataf, Jema'a, Jaba, Kaura, Kaduna South and Kaduna North are over-represented (with more than 5% of the total workforce in the state).

Also, Table 6 indicates that southern Kaduna dominates the Director Cadre with 71.00%. Table 7 indicates that southern Kaduna dominates the Deputy Director cadre with 67.18%, and Table 8 shows that southern Kaduna dominates the director cadre with 71.00%.

Conclusion

From the findings above, the study concludes that the demands made by both Southern Kaduna Peoples Union (SOKAPU) and the Movement for the creation of Zazzau State are not genuine. Southern part of Kaduna has more than its share in the State Civil Service and infrastructural development. The claim of political marginalisation in terms of the composition of the state public service and infrastructural development was just a perception that the northern part is dominating them. As such, they see them as threat to their social, political and economic wellbeing. Implementation of federal character formula for the distribution of staff in the state in which no local government should have less three percent of the total workforce and not more than five percent of the total workforce.

References

- Aliagan, I. Z. (2014). *Nigeria in Retrospect: The Story of the Africa's greatest country*. Ilorin, Nigeria: Fig and Olive Ltd
- Come to Nigeria. (2011, March 16). Retrieved from Come to Nigeria Web site: <https://www.cometonigeria.com/region/north-west/kaduna-state/>
- Dibua, J. I. (2011). Ethnic citizenship, federal character and inter-group relations in postcolonial Nigeria. *Journal of the Historical Society of Nigeria*, 20, 1–25.
- Ekeh, P. P. (1975). Colonialism and the two publics in Africa: A theoretical statement. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. 17(1)
- Federal Character Commission Handbook, 2011
- James, I. (2002, August). State creation is an inevitable necessity: Problems and prospects. SOKAPU Publication.
- Kaduna State Government. (2017, July 12). Retrieved from Kaduna State Government Website: <https://creativearts.kdsg.gov.ng/brief-history-of-kaduna-state/>
- Kaduna State Human Resource and Payroll Management System, Budget, Accounting and Treasury Management Information System (BATMIS) Data Center, 2017

- Memorandum submitted to National Assembly on the creation of South-Kaduna State by SOKAPU, 2002, p.3
- National Bureau of Statistics. (2012). Annual abstract of statistics. Abuja, Nigeria: National Bureau of Statistics. Retrieved from National Bureau of Statistics Web site: [https://nigerianstat.gov.ng/elibrary?queries\[search\]=population](https://nigerianstat.gov.ng/elibrary?queries[search]=population)
- Nelson, T. D., Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., & Morrison, K. R. (2009). Intergroup threat theory. In Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781841697772.ch3>
- Nnoli, O (1978) *Ethnic politics in Nigeria*. Enugu, Nigeria: Fourth Dimension Publishers
- Nock, I. H. (2008, January 19). SOKAPU 2007 Annual General Congress Speech. *New Impression Magazine*, pp. 17-18.
- Okpoh, O. O. (2007). Patterns and dynamics of inter-group relations in Nigeria, 1800 - 1900. *Journal of the Historical Society of Nigeria* 17, 123–137.
- Sanda, A. O. (1979). Ethnicity and student politics in Nigerian university”, in Sanda, A. O. (ed), *Ethnic relations in Nigeria: Problems and prospect*. Ibadan, Nigeria: Craxton Press (West Africa) Limited.
- Suberu, R. T. (1978). *Ethnic minority conflict and governance in Nigeria*. Ibadan, Nigeria: Spectrum Books Limited
- Tajfel, H. (1982:2). Social Psychology of Intergroup Relation. Vol. 13
- Yahaya, A. (2012). The politics of ethnic minorities in Nigeria: A study of the agitations of peoples of southern Kaduna”. Being a Ph.D. Thesis Submitted to the Department of Political Science, Bayero University, Kano.
- Zagi, C. (2008, August). Southern Kaduna on constitutional review/state creation. *The Mirror*.