

Nigeria And The Dilemma Of Global Image: A Comparative Analysis Of Goodluck Jonathan And Muhammadu Buhari Administrations' Foreign Policy (2011-2019)

Abdulkadir Saleh Ph.D
Department Of Political Science
Gombe State University, Gombe, Nigeria

Adamu Muhammad
Department Of Political Science
Gombe State University, Gombe, Nigeria.

ABSTRACT

Over decades Nigeria have being battling with image crises among the comity of nations which in turn prevent it from pursuing a dynamic and robust foreign policy. This is because a nation's ability to benefit in its interaction with other nations is determine by its acceptance internationally. This study therefore, employed a comparative analysis and approach to Nigeria's foreign policy relations. It analyses the impact of Nigeria's foreign policy on its global image with a significant comparison between Jonathan administration (2011-2015) and that of his successor, Muhammadu Buhari administration (2015-2019). The study used secondary data such as journals, magazines, articles, textbooks, as well as Internet-base sources. Content analysis and comparative method were used in data analysis. Traits Theory propounded by Byrd 1940, was used to explain the roles of the personality of leaders in building positive image of their respective country. A comparative look at both Jonathan and Buhari administrations attested to the fact that, their foreign policy thrust is almost the same, the little difference is that while Jonathan's foreign policy of "shuttle diplomacy" emphasized on Transformation agenda which centered on macroeconomic framework, Niger Delta, power sector, etc. Buhari's "shuttle diplomacy" focused more on foreign direct investments (FDI) and seeking collaboration and cooperation of international community to help Nigeria in its fighting against insecurity particularly Boko Haram insurgency. A comparative look at both administrations revealed that, Buhari's foreign policy has more impact on Nigeria's global image than that of Jonathan administration because of his crackdown fight against corruption and decisive effort he showed in fighting against Boko Haram in the Northeastern region. As such, he have some acceptability by the international community and received more financial support and cooperation from them, even through there are many challenges that still are downgrading the country's image which include: persistent corruption, police brutality, farmers-headsmen clashes, kidnapping, among others. Therefore, the paper recommends among other things that: conscious attempts/efforts should be made to curb insecurity, crime and corruption through invigorated institutions of governance and effective surveillance anchored on resource provision and prudent management.

KEY WORDS: Foreign Policy, Global Image, Muhammadu Buhari administration, Goodluck Jonathan administration, and comparative analysis.

Date of Submission: 08-11-2020

Date of Acceptance: 23-11-2020

I. INTRODUCTION

Positive image-building and good image sustenance are among other determinants that dictate the level of influence and relevance of a nation in the international politics. Favorable image ensures a level of credibility and respect for a nation in the comity of nations. Contrarily, bad image and suffering of integrity and credibility crisis deny a nation the required respect by other states, and portrays the concerned nation as a pariah state, which does not deserve to be respected and honored by other civilized states (Ajayi, 2005). Since every sovereign state exists and operates within a much larger community of states, it has to relate with other sovereign members of that community. Therefore nation-states necessarily design and implement foreign policy in order to guide their actions and inactions in the external environment. The international system is symbiotic in nature, leading to the notion that no country can exist as an island. Since no state can avoid relation with others, states must frame their interactions systematically to aid the advancement of national interests in its

relations with other states. Foreign policy is therefore an integral part of the activities of the modern state. A state without foreign policy therefore can be likened to a ship without a sailor (Abdul & Ibrahim, 2013). In as much as a state want to be relevant among other nations, state must have a dynamic and articulated foreign policy. It is one of the most important task of public relations practitioners to pursue a viable and robust foreign policy abroad and they must protect and promote its national interest. Nigerian foreign policy- relations has been pursued by various administrations under almost the same objectives. The only difference, according to Obi (2006) "while the style tend to differ, thereby reflecting the idiosyncrasies of the president or head of state and his foreign minister, the substance has remained basically the same".

National image both at home and abroad is an ethical issue, it may appear intangible but the benefits and advantages following from good image are inestimably unquantifiable. The perception of a country by members of the international community, how a country pursues its relations with others and particularly the behavior of its citizens at home and abroad can affect a country's image thus, image making is essential feature of a country's foreign policy (Boma-Lysa et al, 2015). This explained the vital role of global image of a country in pursuing a dynamic foreign policy, this is because the more a country have good image in the international environment the more it will receive support from them be it investment or security support among others to tackle its problems. However, Nigeria's image, first at the domestic level, and later at the international level, was not something to be boastful. The political and socio-economic situations of Nigeria since Independence, debased it to assumed a pariah status among civilized countries in the world. The nation was plagued by abnormalities in almost every, if not all, facets of the national life which brought about some international sanctions and smeared global image. Particularly, her image has been threatened by the outburst of the 30 month civil war (1967-1970), the Niger Delta crises, the current Boko Haram terrorism, and the violent secessionist agitations of the Indigenous People of Biafra (IPOB). Added to these are corruption and crime which play key roles in giving the nation a bad perception. Akimboye, (2013) opined that Nigeria had indeed been battling with image crisis for the past three decades. He went further saying that terrorism and insurgency are source of the image crisis in Nigeria, alluding that until the fundamental domestic sources of Nigeria's image crisis have been tackled, Nigeria's aspirations to be regional influential nation will remain an illusion.

This is because a country's standing in the international system although is dependent on some other factors, is highly dependent on her image perception being positive or negative. A good image results in respect, influence and prestige. While a bad or negative perception of a country's image implies that such a country lacks respect, influence and prestige in the international system (Egwemi, 2010). If this is the case, building positive image is very important factor that determines the benefits that any state drives from its relations with other countries. In this sense there is need for understanding the role that our administrations played in building our countries' image abroad. So what is the role played by Jonathan and Buhari administrations played in building Nigeria's image in their relations with other countries? To answer this question, this paper will imply comparative analysis of the both administrations in order to come out with a clear understanding on the reason why one administration achieve more than the other, this of course will help other leaders to learn lessons from both of them and will contribute greatly to the body of knowledge.

CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATION

For the purpose of conceptual clarifications, the concept of foreign policy and that of global image are vividly explained in this section.

FOREIGN POLICY

Foreign Policy is a shippery and illusive concept. Despite intensifying interest in the phenomenon in the academic sphere over the years, like other concept in social science it has no universally acceptable definition. Thus, it has been defined differently by various scholars, historians and diplomats. For instance Okuchukwu, (2015), opined that foreign policy is "the external activities of a state pursued in order to promote its national interest and image in the international environment". It is that type of action a state embarks upon in it interaction with other member state in the international environment, in the process of striving to attain its goals and objectives (Idahosa and Adebayo, 2017). Ota & Ecoma (2015) identify foreign policy as a strategy that is properly articulated and designed in a coordinated manner by institutionally-designated decision-makers in a bid to manipulate the international environment to achieve identified national objectives. This conception presents foreign policy as an instrument of power via which states can react to events in the international environment by its actions or inactions for the purpose of advancing national goals. Equally, we can define foreign policy as set of principles design by decision-makers of a state in order to guide the country's action or inaction while projecting its positive image among the comity of nations.

GLOBAL IMAGE

Image can be seen as the perception of a country by other actors in the international arena (both states and non-state actors), which can be a result of objectivity or subjectivity of purpose. The global image of a country, therefore, provides a basis for self-reappraisal in the event of any bad perception (Chidozie, Ibieta & Ujara, 2014). Global image, Boma-Lysa et al (2015) purported that, it relates to how a country is seen by other global actors when it pursues its relations with others and particularly, the behaviour of its citizens at home and abroad. A country's standing in the international system although is dependent on some other factors, is highly dependent on her image perception being positive or negative. A good image results in respect, influence and prestige. While a bad or negative perception of a country's image implies that such a country lacks respect, influence and prestige in the international system (Egwemi, 2010).

Akinboye, (2013) opined that Nigeria had indeed been battling with image crisis for the past three decades. He went further saying that terrorism and insurgency are source of the image crisis in Nigeria, alluding that until the fundamental domestic sources of Nigeria's image crisis have been tackled, Nigeria's aspirations to be regional influential nation will remain an illusion. Therefore, building positive image is one of the most important tasks of public relation practitioners.

II. METHODOLOGY

For the purpose of data collection and analysis this study employed historical method with emphasis on secondary data source, while data were analysed qualitatively. The study also adopted a comparative approach with a comparison of Jonathan administration's foreign relations (2011-2015) and that of his successor, President Muhammadu Buhari (2015-2019).

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

The birth of the Nigerian state in 1960 marked the beginning of conscious efforts as a country to position itself on a pedestal relative to the world. From 1960-1966, the foundation of what we know have as Nigeria's foreign policy is directly owned to the vision of Alhaji Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Nigeria's first Prime Minister and Head of government, October 1960 to January 1966 (Fawole, 2003). Balewa's address in the House of Representative on 20th August, 1960; Independence Day address on 1st October, 1960 as well as his acceptance speech on the occasion of Nigeria's accession to membership of the United Nations in New York on 8th October, 1960 fundamentally point out the objectives of Nigeria's foreign policy and which others are anchored is the promotion of the national interests of the federation and of its citizens. This in essence means that Nigeria's foreign policy, like that of any other country is out to be fundamentally guided by her national interest. Nigeria's foreign policy objectives as outlined by Balewa was summarized by Enikanolaiye (2013), they include in no particular order: respect for territorial integrity, good neighbourhood, sovereign equality of states, commitments to the colonisation and eradication of racist minority rule from Africa, promotion of the rights of the black man under colonial rule, promotion of pan-Africanism and African unity, respect for the principles of the united nation charter and non-alignment. This foreign policy orientation was however been criticized for being conservative and pro-west. This is apparent as Nigeria was responsible to British in many of its affairs.

With the incursion of military into Nigerian politics however, the direction of its foreign policy tilted its focus from conservative to assertive. From 1966-1979 was the goalding era of Nigeria's foreign policy. At this time Nigeria plays a significant roles in the Organization of African Unity, undisputed leadership of the sub-region and the formulation of the Economic Community of West African States in 1975, during this period, Nigeria also made tremendous efforts in liberating many African States (Odubajo, 2017). The period of 1979-1984 however, because of the conservative nature of Shagari, Nigerian foreign policy experienced a verow profile look. The relation of Nigeria and British like that of Balewa's regime became cordial again. Even though the regime witnessed a setback, Shagari administration maintained African affairs through giving aids to many African countries. However, with the oustation of Shagari from power by Buhari, even through the regime has record of human rights violation among other things, the new regime has been credited by some for its effort in receiving the economic problems of the country, the debts incurred by Shagari's administration have also been paid, the regime also embarked on anti-drugs and anti-corruption policy and closing of borders etc in it's effort to restore the bartered image that Nigeria experienced during Shagari regime as result of pervasive corruption and mismanagement among others (Idahosa and Adebayo, 2017; Folarin, 2013 and Ali, 2013). Although, Buhari/Idiagbo regime have bad record of human rights violation, its effort relatively restored bartered image of Nigeria in the international environment. During Babangida regime, Nigeria played a vital role in both continental and global affairs. Babangida was re-elected to be the chairman of both ECOWAS and OAU. During his tenure he visited many countries in Europe, Asia and Africa, the borders that were closed during Buhari he reopened them and assist many African countries, because of the Nigeria's positive image abroad during this era, many Nigerians were appointed to a high international position such as appointment of

Joseph Garbage as president of the 44th session of the United Nations General Assembly, election of Chief Emeka Anyaoku as the secretary general of the Common Wealth in 1989, election of Mr. Rulwan Lukman as secretary general of OPEC, etc (Ogidan P. Damilola, 2012).

Nigeria experienced decline of its international image during late General Sani Abacha. Because of his dictate nature, Abacha disbanded all democratic institutions, killed many opponents and protesters, violated human rights, etc. Consequently, Nigeria was suspended from Common Wealth, his regime was at odds with the United Nations and European Union. Arguably, Nigeria suffered the worst period of her foreign policy during this regime of Abacha because of the many sanctions imposed on Nigeria (Folarin, 2013 and Onoja, 2006). Following General Abacha's sudden death in June 1998, General Abdulsalami Abubakar, his successor, initiated a ten month transition programme that resulted in the coming to power of President Olusegun Obasanjo on 29 May, 1999. Though short and brief, the period of the regime of Abdulsalami Abubakar was significant in the history of Nigeria's foreign relations, as he was able to convince the international community of the sincerity of his transition program, which reverse the negative trend that Nigerian had had. Nigeria, consequentially gain great recognition in the comity of nations and some major sanctions were lifted (Idahoza and Adebayo, 2017). The period of President Olusegun Obasanjo between 1999-2007 witnessed the president numerous trips oversee, which saw high profile foreign policy pursuit. Obasanjo made efforts to build the country's image and re-integrate Nigeria into the world while regaining her lost glory through shuttle diplomacy. Under his leadership, Nigeria assumed leadership of several international organizations like the ECOWAS, African Union (AU) and G- 77. Nigeria also hosted several international summits including those of the Commonwealth Heads of States and the AU in 2004, the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) in 2005 and ECOWAS since 1999 (Boma-Lysa et al, 2015). Although the country and her leadership enjoyed accommodation and tolerance by the international community but the ordinary citizens are often made to suffer personality pillage, inhumane treatments and abuse of fundamental human rights at embassies and off-shore. However, this administration is noted for its success at restoring the battered image of Nigeria globally in spite of the internal challenges it encountered (Ujara and Obietan, 2017).

Looking into the fact that Nigeria has not benefited tangibly from most of her dealing with other nations, for this diplomatic calculation, president Yar'adua's foreign policy tilted its focus significantly from conventional practice of blind economic diplomacy to citizenship diplomacy in a bid to identify with the interests of Nigerian citizens and the protection of the welfare of citizens both at home and abroad. However, due to his ill health, he could not see the policy to fruition (Imoukhede, 2016). It was worthy of note that his health had been severely threatened. While he was trying to manage his ill-health, Yar'Adua made no provisions for the Vice President to act in his absence. Thus, the consequence was that the ship of the Nigerian state was sailing rudderless on the international waters of foreign policy. Without functional institutions and without a leader, Nigeria's foreign relations and indeed the State of Nigeria also went into coma when Yar'Adua went into coma in Saudi Arabian hospital. Nigeria failed to show up at important international meetings, lost many positions in multilateral associations, forsook obligations, and found herself in a situation where many of her allies started wondering what had gone wrong with Nigeria. This eventually led to the death of late Yar'Adua on May 5th 2010, his Vice, former President Jonathan was appointed acting president of Nigeria until the 2011 election where he won the seat of the president of Nigeria (Boma-Lysa et al, 2015). Therefore, Yar'adua's foreign policy of citizen diplomacy was built on citizen protection and welfare, it is apparent that this foreign policy was unique and laudable but it was affected by Yar'adua's terminal illness and subsequent demise.

THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

In the analysis of a country's foreign policy, there are various international relations theories that can be helpful, as they provide us with schemes and frameworks upon which one can try and fit the actions of a country, thus been able to classify them as one or another kind. In short, theories allow us to label a country's foreign policy. Interpreting foreign policies are some basic theoretical traditions in international relations. In this case, Traits theory propounded by Byrd (1940), will be used to explain the role of the personality of leaders in attaining success or failure of a nation.

Traits theory was propounded by Byrd (1940) to explain the role of personality traits of a leader in running successful administration. Generally speaking, there are so many approaches and theories that define the requisite attributes and ideal personality to be expected of an achieving leader. Byrd (1940) in his trait theory research provides a long list of what the ideal traits of a leader should be. A sample of traits desirable and generally embodied in a leader, for example, include: outspokenness, self-confidence, intelligence, dependability, moral straightness, fairness, firmness, initiative, sensitivity, extroversion, decisiveness, assertiveness, tact, enthusiasm, supervisory ability, willingness to assume responsibility, self-assurance, individuality and good appearance (Nwankwo, 2009). This simply means that a leader is expected to have the mentioned qualities. Although possessing all of them is difficult if not impossible, the more these qualities appear on a leader the more likely he will achieve a desired goals. In this case, this theory assume that if the

leader is man of integrity and workaholic then he will drive the country to the expected place and build its positive image in the international environment.

On the contrary, the study of Jennings (1967) concludes that fifty years of experiment have failed to produce one personality trait or set of qualities that can confidently be used to distinguish between leaders and non-leaders. This finding therefore makes Byrd's categorization of little or no importance. Further studies on leadership diverted significant attention from this original premise towards identifying various types of leadership. While an authoritarian leader, for instance, is expected to employ force in advancing his goals, a democratic leader is expected to democratize the decision making machinery to accommodate and allow his followers participate actively in policy formulation and implementation of domestic and foreign policies.

Traits theory argue that the nature of leader (weather indefatigable, workaholic and patriotic or lackadaisical and weak) determine the success or failure of the administration. For instance, during military regime Nigeria pursued a very viral and dynamic foreign policy because of the fearless and determinant nature of military. Contrarily, under civilian regime reverse is the case as Nigeria's foreign policy became retrogressive. Therefore, building Nigeria's according to this theory depend on the character of Nigerian leaders. Meaning that if the leader was patriotic, workaholic, non-corrupt and show decisive effort in tackling problems of image crises of Nigeria, then the bartered image of Nigeria will be revived and vice versa.

AN OVERVIEW OF JONATHAN ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY (2011-2015)

Following death of late Yar'Adua on May 5th 2010, his Vice, former President Jonathan was appointed acting president of Nigeria until the 2011 election where he won the seat of the president of Nigeria, he maintained to a large extent Yar'Adua's foreign policy goals but also adopted the instruments of shuttle and economic diplomacy in rebranding Nigeria's image in a bid to attract foreign investments (Adeola & Ogunnoiki, 2015 and Boma-Lysa et al, 2015). Convinced that a lot of changes had taken place during the 50 years of existence of Nigeria's foreign policy thrust, President Jonathan ordered a review of the Foreign Policy document in line with his administration's domestic policy thrust – popularly called the "Transformation Agenda". The foreign policy position of the Jonathan administration was generally perceived as a continuation of the foreign policy thrust of his predecessor. This nonetheless, specifically, the administration's foreign policy endeavours were embedded in the attainment of the administration's Transformation Agenda. This Transformation Agenda, according to Ituma (2012), was aimed at addressing the following: macroeconomics frame work and economic direction; job creation; public expenditure management; governance; justice and judiciary; legislature; education; health sector; labour and productivity; power sector; information and communication technology; Niger Delta; transportation; foreign policy and economic diplomacy.

These agendas even though Jonathan made some efforts to achieve them, but however they were not accomplished because of the internal insecurity particularly that of Boko Haram insurgency, in fact this era is the most dangerous period of insecurity that Nigeria experienced ever. To be clear, Ishiekwene (2016), revealed that, Indeed it appears that 'the chickens have come home to roost', because at this time, Nigeria is facing perhaps, the most difficult internal security problem in its history, coupled with the challenge of the worst economic recession in twenty-five years. The activities of Boko Haram and other terrorists have turned the affairs of this country to seems retrogressive. In the same vein, Jacob and Akintola (2014), have asserted that the terrorist activities of Boko Haram sect have greatly affected Nigeria's external relations on international economic relations with serious consequences for the country's economic development.

This really affected the government's reception of foreign investments and military aids. Foreign investors got it difficult to invest in Nigeria as a result of insecurity and pervasive corruption, those that are here are even running. On the side of international support to help Nigeria to fight against terrorists of Boko Haram, Nigeria was not highly welcomed because of its lacadesical nature its showed in eradication of insecurity in the country. In fact, the administration's relationship with America left much to be desired. Little wonder the American government refused to sell arms to Nigeria to aid in the fight against Boko Haram, thus prompting Nigeria to turn to Russia. More so, increased poverty in Nigeria has also smeared Nigeria's global image. Consequently, Nigeria's image abroad under the Jonathan administration was not one that was very palatable because of the government's weak and somewhat ineffective and inefficient ties with others nations (Duke et al, 2017). Also, the inability of the government to crush the Boko Haram insurgents cast a dark cloud on the Jonathan administration's domestic and foreign policy agenda, though the government worked assiduously to ensure the delisting of Nigeria from the US terror list (Odubajo, 2016).

AN OVERVIEW OF BUHARI ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY (2015-2019)

After general election of March 28, 2015 presidential election, president Muhammad Buhari emerged victorious having defeated incumbent Dr Goodluck Jonathan of the People's Democratic Party. Nearly 30 years after he was ousted from power, and after three failed attempts to return, President Buhari, one of Nigeria's oldest former Army Generals and Heads of State, who embraced democracy and politics at the break of the 21st

century, was sworn into office as the nation's 15th political leader. He assumed office during one of the most critical time in Nigerian history, it was faced by challenges of insecurity and economic deterioration. Like his predecessor, president Buhari also adopted "Shuttle Diplomacy" which concentrated on foreign direct investment. In his effort to curb insecurity and economic reaccession that tarnished the image of Nigeria, president Buhari made a series of trip to abroad particularly world great powers like China, USA, Russia, Britain and United Arab Emirate. In these trips, Buhari seek assistance and cooperation of international community to help him fight against insecurity especially Boko Haram, in this regard United States of America helped Nigeria immensely to fight insecurity, the selling of arms to Nigeria by US which are 12 Ember A-29 Super Tucano aircraft apparently appeared that Buhari was able to restored US-Nigeria relations, which had deteriorated considerably during Jonathan administration when Nigeria was blacklisted. Buhari administration also renewed its cooperation with US in fighting against corruption which led to the repatriation of recovered looted monies and assets stashed in the US (Iroegbu, 2016 and Geonal, 2017).

In his attempt to tackle Nigeria's economic problems, the president has been visible on the world stage, attempting to sell Nigeria as a haven of business opportunities to governments and corporations around the world. Indeed, the president has left the space wide open by not discriminating against any part of the world, either on the basis of ideology or religion. This according to Duke et al, (2017), has yielded a positive result as he made bilateral and multilateral agreements with the United States of America, China, United Arab Emirates, Germany, France, Saudi Arabia and other friendly nations. In line with the nation's economic foreign policy thrust, Buhari administration can be applauded for invitations to G7 and G20 Summits, receptions in world capitals and the lack of a major foreign policy mishap. It is commendable that Buhari administration was able to signed bilateral agreement with China, where China agreed to spend over \$34.222 Billions in Nigerian infrastructures (Tanimu, 2016). Under Buhari administration, Nigeria also signed agreement with United Arab Emirates (UAE) on landmark identification and repatriation of illicit funds, in his trip to Saudi Arabia in October 28-November 1, 2019, Buhari and Prince Muhammad Ibn Salman, agreed to set up a joint Saudi-Nigeria Strategic Council, to focus on economic growth and development, investment in oil and non-oil sectors, insecurity and cooperation. Indeed many countries like Japan, Russia among others have invested in Nigeria. In 2019 Prime Minister Abe of Japan, pledged a \$300,000 support for Nigeria's Defence College as well as 12 billion Yen for Nigeria's public health sector; On side-lines of TICAD IV, Nigeria and the European Union signed a €50 million Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to support humanitarian and development efforts in Nigeria's North East region (Premiumtimesng.com). This definitely confirmed that, Nigeria's bad image have been relatively restored because of the friendly relations that its engaged with other countries of the world.

While the Buhari administration displayed elements of determination and commitment in deploying foreign policy to solve the various challenges at home, the government has equally been alive to its responsibility to the sub-region, in line with the underlying principles of the national interest. This is evidenced in the material and technical support provided for the following countries during their elections; Benin Republic, Burkina Faso, Chad and Guinea Conakry. Most recently, the Nigerian government played a significant role as a leading member of ECOWAS to solve an impending political imbroglio in Gambia. The group ensured that the recalcitrant former President Yahya Jammeh vacated office for the democratically elected President Adama Barrow (Freeman, 2016). Because of the Nigerian relevance in the international environment, Buhari championed anti-corruption campaign of African Union in 2018. He was also invited to many international conference, these include United Nations General Assembly, African Union Heads of States and Government meeting, ECOWAS meeting, Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting, the COP21 Climate Summit, the China-Africa Conference, the Nuclear Security Summit, among numerous others (Akwaya, 2016). From all indication, although Buhari administration did not achieved a convincing impact on Nigerian image-building because of the challenges of insecurity like that of Boko Haram, kidnapping, etc. Its foreign policy seems to be relatively effective on Nigeria's global image because of the acceptance he received from international community.

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE TWO ADMINISTRATIONS

A comparative look at both Jonathan and Buhari administrations' foreign policy attested to the fact that, the style and method tend to differ, thereby reflecting their idiosyncrasies as Jonathan foreign policy focused on Transformation Agenda. While Buhari foreign relations was shuttle diplomacy which focused on attracting Foreign Direct Investments (FDI) and seeking collaboration and cooperation of international community to help Nigeria in fighting against insecurity especially Boko Haram insurgency. The similarity here is that both Jonathan and Buhari administrations foreign relation is centred on almost the same foreign policy objectives.

The idiosyncrasies of both leaders i.e Jonathan and Buhari has to be compared and requires assessment. This will give a clear understanding on the reason why one administration achieve more than the other, this of course will help other leaders to learn lessons from both of them and will contribute greatly to the body of knowledge.

Jonathan came into power in May, 2010 following the death of president Yar'adua and he was reelected as Nigerian president in 2011 general election. He maintained the foreign policy of his predecessor Yar'adua's which is "citizenship diplomacy" but he also adopted shuttle and economic diplomacy which is Transformation Agenda. This Transformation Agenda according to Ituma (2012), was aimed at addressing the following: macroeconomics frame work and economic direction; job creation; public expenditure management; governance; justice and judiciary; legislature; education; health sector; labour and productivity; power sector; information and communication technology; Niger Delta; transportation; foreign policy and economic diplomacy. However, Jonathan was not able to achieve this agenda because of many challenges that confronted his administration particularly Boko Haram insurgency and economic retardation. Consequently, Nigeria's image among the comity of nations was somehow bad. Infact Nigeria under Jonathan had been blacklisted and putted into US terror list. To be clear, Duke et al, (2017), concluded that Nigeria's image abroad under the Jonathan administration was not one that was very palatable because of the government's weak and somewhat ineffective and inefficient ties with others nations. The inability of Jonathan administration to crush the Boko Haram insurgency also semered Nigeria's image abroad. This inturn denied Nigeria to have many foreign direct investments. Even those that have been invested the insecurity and pervasive corruption compelled many to leave the country.

On the other hand, Buhari who emerged victorious in May, 2015 general election as Nigerian president, adopted also a foreign policy of "Shuttle Diplomacy" which focused on foreign direct investments and seeking coloboration and cooperation of international community to help Nigeria in its fighting against insecurity particularly Boko Haram insurgency. This study revealed that, Buhari's foreign policy have relatively impacted on Nigeria's image abroad as he had been highly welcomed by international community and signed many bilateral and multilateral agreements with them. For instance, he signed agreement with China to invest over \$34.222 billions, his good contact with other nations like Japan, Russia, European Union, United Arab Emirates among others is commendable as they assisted Nigeria from different angle. All these shows the level of Nigerian positive image globally. In addition, the selling of military weapons to Nigeria by US which include 12 Ember A-29 Super Tucano aircraft apparently appeared that Buhari was able to restored US-Nigeria relations, which had deteriorated considerably during Jonathan administration when Nigeria was blacklisted.

This no doubt attests to the fact that President Muhammadu Buhari was able to build positive image of Nigeria among the comity of nations more than Jonathan because of the respect and reputation he (Buhari) earned in the international community. Although, Bihari is yet to achieve a convincing impact on the international community in terms of image-building and respect for the nation and Nigerians abroad, in comparison of these two personalities, the distinction is however clear.

IV. CONCLUSION

A nation's ability to interact with other nations is a reflection of its acceptance internationally, and evaluation of its level of civility in terms of behavioral conformity with international legal principles. Nigeria has over decades been trying hard to resuscitate its battered image abroad. The Jonathan and Buhari shuttle diplomacy is yet to achieve a convincing impact on the international community in terms of image-building and respect for the nation and Nigerians abroad. The challenges of the nation's foreign policy is how to overcome its image and integrity crisis, and thereby securing the desired respect for its citizens internationally. This study revealed that Buhari's foreign policy has more impact on Nigeria's image among the comity of nations than that of Jonathan administration, even through there are many challenges that still are downgrading the country's image which include : Boko Haram insurgency, unemployment, farmers-headmen crises, kidnapping, police brutality, etc.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

Base on the foregoing discussion the following recommendations are provided:

- I. For Nigeria to promote a viable national interest and image abroad it must pursue and promote a dynamic and assertive foreign policy, one that protect Nigerians in the Diaspora and promote Nigeria's positive image;
- II. Conscious attempts/efforts should be made to curb insecurity, crime and corruption through invigorated institutions of governance and effective surveillance anchored on resource provision and prudent management. The ultimate effect of these on Nigeria's image cannot be overemphasised;
- III. Nigerian government should pursue goals of democracy, good governance and respect for human rights at home to ensure that its leadership role is credible abroad;
- IV. The federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs in conjunction with the Federal Ministry of Information and Communications should urgently mount image and reputation management campaigns in the international media and project the good works, achievements and the humanitarian efforts of the country.

REFERENCE

- [1]. Abdul, S. & Ibrahim, M. (2013). *Interrogating Nigeria's Foreign Policy in the 21st Century: Reflections on the Gains and Challenges of Obasanjo's Administration 1999-2007*. Bassey Andah Journal, 6, 31-51.
- [2]. Adeola, G. L.& Ogunnoiki, A. O. (2015). *The Pursuance of Nigeria's Domestic and Foreign Policy in the Fourth Republic: Complementarity or Contradiction*. Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 1 (4), 434-444.
- [3]. Ajayi, K (2005). "Nigeria's Foreign Policy and Image Crisis", African Journal of Public Administration and Management, Volume XIV (2), July, pp. 50-63.
- [4]. Akinboye, S. (2013). *Beautiful Abroad but Ugly at Home: Issues and Contradictions in Nigeria's Foreign Policy*. An Inaugural Lecture delivered at University of Lagos, Nigeria, July 17th.
- [5]. Akwaya, Cletus. 2016. "One Year of Buhari's Foreign Policy: Between Change and Continuity". Leadership. May 29. <http://leadership.ng/news/531426/one-year-buharis-foreign-policy-change-continuity>.
- [6]. Ali, A. (2013). "Leadership and Socio-economic Challenges in Nigeria", Singaporean Journal of Business Economics and Management Studies, Volume 1 (9), pp. 1-8
- [7]. Boma-Lysa, D. A., Terfa, T. A., and Tsegysu, S. (2015). *Nigerian foreign policy and global image: A critical assessment of Goodluck Jonathan's administration*. Mass Communication & Journalism, 5(10), 1-10
- [8]. Campbell, J. (2017, September 20). *Biafra is Back*. Council on Foreign Relations. Retrieved from: <https://www.cfr.org/blog/biafra-back>.
- [9]. Chidozie F, Ibietan J, Ujara E (2014) *Foreign Policy, International Image and National Transformation: A Historical Perspective*. International Journal of Innovative Social Sciences and Humanities Research 2: 49-58.
- [10]. Duke et al, (2017). *Nigerian Foreign Policy Posture And Global Image: An Assessment of Nigeria's Foreign Policy in the Goodluck Jonathan And Muhammadu Buhari's administration (2011-2017)*. Journal of Humanity and Social Science. Vol. 23(9) pp. 58-73.
- [11]. Egwemi, V. (2010). "Managing Nigeria's Image Crisis: Akunyili's Rebranding Programme to the Rescue(?)" Current Research Journal of Economic Theory, Vol. 2(3), pp.131-135.
- [12]. Enikanolaiye, S. (2013, September 22). *Nigeria's African Policy: An Overview* (1). This Day, p.19. Foreign Policy in Nigeria's Fourth Republic.
- [13]. Freeman, Colin. (2016). "West African leaders arrive in Gambia to convince Yahya Jammeh to step down as soldiers 'take over election building'." The Telegraph. December 13. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/12/13/west-afri-can-leaders-arrive-gambia-convince-yahya-jammeh-step/>.
- [14]. Fawole, A. W. (2003). *Nigeria's External Relations and Foreign Policy Under Military Rule 1966-1999*. Ile-Ife: Obafemi Awolowo University Press.
- [15]. Folarin, S. (2013). "Nigeria and the Dilemma of Global Relevance: Foreign Policy under Military Dictatorship (1993-1999)", Covenant Journal of Politics and International Affairs (CUPJIA), Volume 1 (1), Maiden Edition, September, pp. 15-33.
- [16]. Gional, F. (2017) *Nigeria's war on Boko Haram gets US armament boost*. Africa Conflict Monitor 2017 (5) 29-33.
- [17]. <https://media.premiumtimesng.com/outcomes-and-gains-of-president-buhais-foreign-travels-2015-2019/>
- [18]. Ituma, O. S. (2012). *The dynamics of Nigerian foreign policy and President Jonathan's transformation agenda*. Multi-Disciplinary Journal of Research & Development Perspectives, 44-51.
- [19]. Ishiekene, Tony. 2016. "Worst Economic Crisis in 25 Years: What Nigeria Can Do To Get Out of Recession". Sahara Reporters. October 5. <http://saharareporters.com/2016/10/05/worst-economic-crisis-25-years-what-nigeria-can-do-get-out-recession-tony-ishiekwene>.
- [20]. Idahosa and Adebayo, (2017). *An Analysis of the Nigerian Foreign Policy: A Narrative*. Worldwide Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development. Vol.3(10) pp. 215-221.
- [21]. Iroegbu, S. (2016, May 17). *Obama Mulls Visit as US Okays Sale of 12 Attack Aircraft to Nigeria*. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/zRZ8zD>.
- [22]. Jennings, E. (1967) *The Mobile Manager*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- [23]. Nwankwo, R.N. (2009) *Elements of Public Administration*. Onitsha: Bookpoint Educational Books.
- [24]. Jacob, J. and Akintola O. E (2014). "Foreign policy and terrorism in Nigeria: An impact assessment of the activities of the Boko Haram sect on Nigeria's external relations." In C. N. Nwoke and O. Oche (eds.) *Contemporary Challenges in Nigeria, Africa and the World* (Pp. 201-216). Lagos: The Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA).
- Ota, E. N. & Ecoma, C. S. (2015). *Nigerian Foreign Policy in a Globalising World: The Imperative of a Paradigm Shift*. Journal of Asian Development, 1 (1), 55-65.

- [25]. Obi EA, (2006). *Fundamentals of Nigerian foreign policy a study on the role of national interest in foreign policy making*. Onitsha: BookPoint Ltd.
- [26]. Okuchuku, (2015). *Nigerian Foreign Policy Relations (1999-2010): A Comparison of Obasanjo's (1999-2007) and Yar'adua's (2007-2010) Foreign Relations*. National Journal of Advanced Research. Vol.1(1)pp.38-41.
- [27]. Odubajo, T. (2017). *Domestic environmental variables and foreign policy articulation of the Buhari administration in Nigeria's Fourth Republic*. Austral: Brazilian Journal of Strategy & International Relations, 6(11), 73-96.
- [28]. Onoja, Adoyi. 2006. "Toward the East in Search of New Friends: 'General Sani Abacha Foreign Policy in Perspective'". Journal of the Historical Society of Nigeria 16: 111-121.32).
- [29]. Ogidan.P. Damilola, (2012). *Critical Analysis of the Continuity and Change in Nigeria's Foreign Policy* // Green Thesis.
- [30]. <https://greenthesis.wordpress.com/2012/10/23/criticalanalysis-of-the-continuity-and-change-in-nigeriasforeign-policy/>
- [31]. Imoukhede, B. K. (2016). *Repositioning Nigeria Foreign Policy for National Development: Issues, Challenges and Policy Options*. Afro Asian Journal of Social Sciences, VII (II), 1-14.
- [32]. Ujara and Ibietam, (2017). *Foreign Policy in Nigeria's Fourth Republic: A Critical Analysis of Unresolved Issues*. Journal of International and Global Studies. Vol.10(1) pp. 41-57.
- [33]. Tanimu, A.M.T (2016, April 10). *New Agreement and MOU Between Nigeria And China To Be Signed As President Buhari Visits China*. Retrieved from
- [34]. <http://www.nta.ng/news/investment/20160410-new-agreement-and-mou-between-nigeria-and-china-to-be-signed-as-president-buhari-visits-china/>

Abdulkadir Saleh Ph.D. "Nigeria And The Dilemma Of Global Image: A Comparative Analysis Of Goodluck Jonathan And Muhammadu Buhari Administrations' Foreign Policy (2011-2019)." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 25(11), 2020, pp. 05-13.