



GLOBAL JOURNAL OF HUMAN SOCIAL SCIENCE  
SOCIOLOGY, ECONOMICS & POLITICAL SCIENCE  
Volume 12 Issue 11 Version 1.0 Year 2012  
Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal  
Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA)  
Online ISSN: 2249-460X & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

# The Nexus of Collaboration Among the Horizontal Organs of Government in Nigeria: A Critical Analysis within the Context of Effective Service Delivery and Politics of Hope for Nigeria and Nigerians

By S. T. Akindele & Oluwadare O. Ayeni  
*Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria*

*Abstract* - This paper focuses on the nexus of collaboration among the horizontal organs of government in Nigeria in the context of effective service delivery and politics of hope for the nation and its citizens. While specifically examining the three organs of government and their institutional mechanisms of separation of powers and checks and balances in the process, it elucidates the concepts of politics, budgets, servant leadership and, governance. It dichotomizes the latter into two (good and bad governance) with detailed analysis of the imperatives of both and, their implications for the pursuit of effective service delivery for the citizenry in any nation like Nigeria.

*GJHSS-C Classification : FOR Code: 160605*



*Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:*



# The Nexus of Collaboration Among the Horizontal Organs of Government in Nigeria: A Critical Analysis within the Context of Effective Service Delivery and Politics of Hope for Nigeria and Nigerians

S. T. Akindele <sup>α</sup> & Oluwadare O. Ayeni <sup>σ</sup>

**Abstract** - This paper focuses on the nexus of collaboration among the horizontal organs of government in Nigeria in the context of effective service delivery and politics of hope for the nation and its citizens. While specifically examining the three organs of government and their institutional mechanisms of separation of powers and checks and balances in the process, it elucidates the concepts of politics, budgets, servant leadership and, governance. It dichotomizes the latter into two (good and bad governance) with detailed analysis of the imperatives of both and, their implications for the pursuit of effective service delivery for the citizenry in any nation like Nigeria.

## I. INTRODUCTION

A cursory Internet search yields over 300 entries for "globalization". Yet, interdependence among individuals, among groups, among nations, has always been a reality. Since the 14<sup>th</sup> century, global interdependence has been increasing because of the constant reduction in economic distance due to improvements in transport technology, tariff cuts, creation of international institutions, telecommunications, etc. - but the acceleration witnessed in the last 10-15 years is spectacular. Thus, "globalization is more than just a catchy term for an old phenomenon....Gone, too, are the days when central government administration had the virtual monopoly of state power. As economic distance between any two areas is reduced, the "space" for the center naturally shrinks. Globally, the nation state occupies the "center", and the reduction in economic distance has meant a loss in effective national administrative autonomy (through the voluntary "uploading" of substantial powers)...But central governments have been squeezed from below, as well (thus, bringing) a number of public activities within effective reach of local governments.

*Combined with a stronger civil society and a more assertive population, these developments have led to pressures on the center to "download" authority and resources. As an overall trend, internal decentralization (that fosters collaboration) may be as unstoppable as globalization [underlined emphases are mine] (Schiavo-Campo and Sundaram, 2001).*

This statement, which, to some extent, shows both the genesis and the need for collaboration among units or agencies of government administration at both national and international levels of political, administrative and governance processes or actions by the relevant functionaries vis-à-vis the plights or fortunes or misfortunes of the citizenry, is deemed appropriate for commencing the analysis of the subject matter of this topic, the essence of which is located within the contextual purviews of governance and its goodness or otherwise. Governance itself, either good or bad, which forms the barometer for analyzing the essence of this topic, as articulated in this opening sentence, is, in turn, predicated on the wherewithal of politics as an art serving as a mechanism for the attainment and sustenance of human political happiness or otherwise depending on its practice in any given political landscape within the global political space.

Without any doubt, the architectural layout or topography of any nation's political practice has a lot of implications and challenges for its service delivery and the expectant responsiveness of services so delivered particularly in the context of its practical politicking and, its propensity or otherwise for the collaborative efforts of its horizontal organs of government namely: the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary within the purviews of its process of governance. In fact, the nature of the political space in terms of its propensity for good governance, to a larger extent determines the point of location of the average citizenry along the continuum of "politics of hope and politics of hopelessness". In other words, the extent of

Author <sup>α</sup> : Department of Political Science, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria. E-mail : sxakindel@yahoo.com

Author <sup>σ</sup> : Department of Public Administration, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria.

collaboration or lack of it among the legislative, executive and judicial organs in the context of effective public service delivery vis-à-vis the fortunes or misfortunes of the citizenry can only or actually be measured in terms of the nature of the political system and its governance structure or process.

This being the case, we found it imperative within the context of this paper, to, following the introduction, begin with the discourse of the concept of governance as a prelude to the explication of the three horizontal organs of government whose collaboration or lack of it, will, to a significant extent, determine the nature of the public service delivery and, the hopefulness or hopelessness of the political landscape for the nation and its citizens particularly within a polity like Nigeria.

## II. CONCEPT OF GOVERNANCE

The issue of governance and its processes are deep-seated and, rooted in the history of humanity. Thus, the governing of human beings using the requisite techniques of governance is as old as the history of mankind itself as it affects the totality of the universe or global political community. Thus, like most concepts of its kind, the concept of governance, due to its complex weaving of “economic, political and social aspects of a nation” (Shehu 1999), has not been amenable to easy or simplistic definition. In other words, the concept has not been an exception to the volatility and eclecticism for which the disciplines in the Social Sciences have been globally noted.

This explains Esman’s (1997:1) claim that “no two political scientists would agree on what the concept of governance is or what it means”. In fact, as Hyden (1999) once noted, “only few authors (have) define(d) it (the concept of governance) with a view to serving analytical purpose” hence, “governance as a concept has not been extensively used (or defined) in the political literature until very recently when it gained currency” (Nkom and Sorkaa, 1996).

This notwithstanding, as Hyden (1999:24) once argued, “the concept of governance has come to occupy a more prominent position in the discourse of international development”. If this is correct or, should be taken to be correct, the question needs to be asked that: what exactly or actually is governance?

World Bank (1989) defines governance as “the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country’s economic and social resources for development”. According to the World Bank (1993), governance has three dimensions. These dimensions which, Eyinla (1998) equally noted are: “the nature of political regimes; the exercise of authority in the management of social and economic resources and, the capacity of government to design and implement policy and to discharge its functions”.

These dimensions were specifically identified and concretely elucidated by Olowu and Erero (1997), who both conceptualized governance as relating to the “rule-ruler-ruled relationship”. Specifically, Olowu and Erero (Ibid) identified the three dimensions of governance in the context of “rule-ruler-ruled relationship” as inclusive of “functionalism, “structuralism” and “normativism”. According to them, functionally, governance deals with “rule-making, legitimization, and enforcement” while it structurally comprises three distinct institutions: the “ruler or the state”, the “ruled or the society” and, the “rule of law”. In this regard, Olowu and Erero (ibid) viewed governance as the “relationship between state and society institutions”. In the same vein, they claimed that “normatively, this relationship highlights the values associated with good governance”. These values according to them include: “transparency, organizational effectiveness, accountability, predictability, legitimacy, popular participation and plurality of policy choices”.

Within the same context, Boeninger (1992) defines governance as the ‘good government of society’. According to this scholar, governance has three dimensions: political, technical and institutional. Nkom and Sorkaa (1996) synopsisized the interrelatedness of these dimensions thus:

*The political revolves around the commitment to exercise authority or public control in a just, legitimate and rule oriented fashion. The technical concerns issues of efficiency, competence or the capacity to manage public affairs effectively to solve problems, and to produce good results in resource mobilization and public management. The institutional involves options, choices and growth – enhancing activities by the public while ensuring honest or good conduct on the part of the public officials.*

In the same vein, Landell-Mills and Serageldin (1992) argued that governance encompasses two interrelated dimensions: political and technical both of which consist of the government’s “will to govern well and the capacity to efficiently and competently handle public management”. Governance, according to Gould (1972) refers to the act of exercising control over others, inducing others to behave in specified ways as required by law. It is “policy making and policy execution regulated by systems of law and guidelines which are segregated into specific operations to achieve specific national objectives (Shehu, 1999:1). To Brautigam (1991) and Ikpeze (1999:73), governance connotes “the exercise of power and authority in both political and economic spheres”. Thus, as Ejituwu (1997), argued, “governance implies the exercise of power by a person or group of persons for the benefit of the populace” because, as he equally later claimed, it is through

governance, that “the government in power dictates the form of relationship it establishes between it and the people as well as the goal of the state in economic, political and social terms” (Ibid).

Implicit in the foregoing conceptual analysis of governance is the fact that, the latter connotes “the use of political authority and exercise of control over a society and the management of resources” (Wai, 1995). Hence, according to Obadan (1998:24), governance - (in this sense) – includes:

*Institutional and structural arrangements, decision-making processes, policy formulation, implementation, capacity development of personnel, information flows, and the nature and style of leadership within a political system.*

In his contribution to the conceptual discourse on governance, Idowu (1998:74) had this to say:

*Governance refers to the functions undertaken by a government maintaining a unified state, defending its territorial integrity and running its economy... It (equally) means the effective and efficient functioning of government towards securing the well-being of its citizens.*

Jega (1999:101) analysed the concept of governance in relations to the “person entrusted with political power and authority”. In this regard, governance according to him, involves the following:

- *Responsibility and responsiveness in leadership and in public service;*
- *Accountability in the mobilization as well as in the utilization of resources;*
- *Discipline, effectiveness and efficiency in handling public (as well as personal) affairs;*
- *Selflessness and impartial service to the people; and*
- *Popular participation and empowerment of the people in the conduct and management of their common affairs (Ibid).*

For governance as the “duty of government to see to the orderly and stable management of the economy” (Ukpong, 1999), to have the foregoing attributes and, be effective, efficient and beneficial for democratic political arrangement, it has to be good. This is more so, since we can, as well, have bad governance.

### III. BAD GOVERNANCE

The possibility of bad governance could be said to be what the World Bank had in mind in 1989, when it began to dichotomize between good and bad governance by “advocating a political reform approach to government as a way of ensuring positive economic growth” (World Bank, 1989, Idowu, 1998).

In fact, the World Bank (1992) identified the features of bad governance as follows:

- *Failure to make a clear separation between what is public and what is private, hence a tendency to divert public resources for private gain;*
- *Failure to establish a predictable framework for law and government behaviour in a manner that is conducive to development, or arbitrariness in the application of rules and laws;*
- *Excessive rules, regulations, licensing requirements, etc, which impede the functioning of markets and encourage rent-seeking;*
- *Priorities that are inconsistent with development, thus, resulting in a mis-allocation of resources;*
- *Excessively narrow base for, or non-transparency, decision-making.*

This explains Obadan’s (1998:25) characterization of bad governance as a system dominated by “ugly problems like pervasive corruption, lack of public accountability and “capture” of public services by the elites among others”.

### IV. GOOD GOVERNANCE

It is decipherable from the chronology of the discussion in this paper so far on the concept of governance, that, the issue of the latter (i.e. governance), its goodness and utility to mankind cannot be taken for granted without severe consequences. This is particularly so, in that, as Ogunba (1997:1), once noted “the way a people are governed is of paramount importance in determining the quality of life of the people”. It is equally more so, if as Esman (1997:1), opined, “governance is a process that requires a viable authority” through which “the leaders are expected to exercise the power that resides with them in the interest of the state” (Ejituwu, 1997 op cit: 37). The need for good governance is not far fetched looking at the fact that:

*If governance is arbitrary, oppressive and capricious, the collective psyche of a people can be damaged and individuals within the community can suffer various forms of disorientation. If, on the other hand, governance is open, democratic and humanistic, a people can experience a sense of rejuvenation and fulfilment which can lead to highly positive achievements (Ogunba 1997 op cit: 1).*

This explains Obadan’s (1998:39) position that, “it is the responsibility of citizens to demand good governance” because “it (i.e., good governance) may not be forthcoming from the political leaders without prodding”.

Commenting on good governance, Esman (1997:1) argued thus:

*before governance can be considered good, government has got to be effective. It must first command the respect and allegiance of the people over whom it exercises governance and, must satisfy certain basic collective needs.*

He went further to identify some minimal elements and/or essentials of effective (good) governance as inclusive of: "provision of security for the people", "defence of the territorial borders of the state", "protection of lives and property", "enforcement of laws to enhance predictability" and, "economic development". According to this scholar, "governance requires the ability to ensure the wherewithal of sustained government". He equally asserted that "effective (good) governance requires that public authority be able to raise the revenues necessary to pay for services that must be provided". The essence of this argument is that, "effective governance must be able to make possible the performance by the state of certain basic services" – transportation, communication, education and health services – "relatively cheaply and reliably" (Erero, 1996, Esman Ibid).

This is more so, since effective governance means the capacity of the state, through its power of determinism or, authoritative allocation of scarce critical societal resources – to deliver the basic necessities of life to the governed and, equally "facilitate the process of economic development".

These lines of argument tally with those of Obadan (1998:25) and Amoako (1997:10), who have posited that:

*good governance implies efficient and effective public administration, good policies and sound management of natural resources. It calls for the ability of a state to anticipate challenges to its well-being, provide core services with people and then argument these services, act as a catalyst of change, and guide the various forces in a society toward harmony (and national development) devoid of ideological imperialism and multi-dimensional genocidal tendencies) (Emphasis mine).*

Pursuing the same line of argument, Obadan (Ibid), further claimed that:

*Good governance implies ruling on the basis of equity and social justice, and an end to corruption, nepotism and political manipulation of public institutions. Only when citizens have the belief that their government operates on their behalf, in an open and accountable manner, will government be able to obtain their willing co-operation in, for example, mobilizing resources for development.*

Driving home this line of argument, Obadan (Ibid: 34), emphasized that, through good governance, a government should be able to effectively perform, among others, the following tasks:

- *Establishing a foundation of law;*
- *Maintaining a non distortionary policy environment, including macro- economic stability;*
- *Investing in basic social services, infrastructure,*
- *Protecting the vulnerable group in the society; and*
- *Protecting the environment.*

Other scholars have considered good governance vis-à-vis the raison d'être of statehood in this manner as well (Kaufman, Kraay and Zoido-Lobaton, 1999; Corkery and Bossuyt, 1990; Healey and Robinson, 1992, 1994; Bello – Imam, 1997; Ayo and Awotokun, 1996, 1997; Nkom and Sorkaa, 1996; World Bank, 1989, 1992, 1993). These scholars' works on the concept of good governance treat the latter as a system of rulership that is devoid of political expediency and antidemocratic political ends. It is deducible from their works that, good governance stands for dignified existence of all political animals in democratic political settings within the global political community. According to Obadan (1998:24) "good governance consists of five fundamental elements". He listed them thus:

- *Accountability of government officials (political leaders and bureaucrats) for public funds and resources;*
- *Transparency in government procedures, processes, investment decisions, contracts and appointments. Transparency is a means of preventing corruption and enhancing economic efficiency;*
- *Predictability in government behaviour. This is particularly critical to the carrying out of economic transactions between individuals and in taking investment decisions: governments and public institutions should not be capricious in their behaviour and actions;*
- *Openness in government transactions and a reliable flow of the information necessary for economic activity and development to take place. Without information, rules will not be known, accountability is low, and risks and uncertainties are many. With these the cost of committing capital is also huge. An open system should, thus, be encouraged to release information to stakeholders and promote dialogue among the people as well as ensure their active participation in the socio-economic development of the country.*
- *Observance of the rule of law must be adhered to by government and its citizens; this means that governments and institutions should be subject to rules and regulations which are understood by everyone in the society (Ibid).*

The attainment and continuous sustenance of good governance as articulated above, and, the propensity of same for effective public service delivery to the citizens and, creation of a worthy national road map to economic development in any country and, particularly, in a country like Nigeria, require a friction-free political landscape the type of which can only be attained and nurtured to fruition through collaboration among the requisite units, agencies or organs of government most especially the traditionally acclaimed organs of government-Legislature, Executive and Judiciary the collaboration among which forms the nucleus of the subject matter of the topic of this paper. Given this, the next section to which we now turn, synoptically though, concretely examines these organs as mechanisms put in place to enable the government as the instrument of the state to make and enforce its decisions as well as the catalyst-(**doctrine of separation of powers**)-for their existence and, mechanism-(**doctrine of checks and balances**)-put in place to ensure the success of the existence.

## V. THE THREE ORGANS OF GOVERNMENT IN FOCUS

The three organs of government are: the legislature, the executive and the judiciary. The functions assigned to and performed by each of these organs vary from one political system to another but, then each of them perform certain basic functions within virtually all political systems within the global political community. The specificities of these functions on organ by organ basis are as follows:

### a) The Legislature

Law making is the primary function of this organ of government. Its other functions include the following:

- *Determination of ways and means of raising and spending public money.*
- *Checking of executive arbitrariness.*
- *Ratification of treaties.*
- *Approval of appointments (e.g., ambassadorial, ministerial and judicial appointments).*
- *Depending on the system of governance in practice, legislature may be unicameral or bicameral.*

### b) The Executive

The powers of implementation of public policies; enforcement of laws passed by the legislature or the parliament are vested on this organ of government which equally performs the functions of: **appointing government functionaries (e.g., judges, ministers, ambassadors, board members etc.); granting of state pardon and; assenting of bills passed by the legislature before becoming laws.**

### c) The Judiciary

Interpretation of the laws of the land as passed by the legislature is the principal function of this organ of government. It is equally the function of this organ of government to ensure strict adherence to the principles of rule of law and sanctity of the constitution of the nation. This organ equally performs the following functions:

- *Punishment of offenders.*
- *Adjudication of disputes between individuals and the state, and disputes between and among different tiers of government.*
- *Appraisal of the acts of both the legislature and the executive and possible declaration of such acts as null and void in cases of aberration.*
- *Administration of oaths of office to public officers both elected and appointed.*
- *Making of laws through judicial precedents.*

The catalyst put in place for the independent but expected collaborative existence of these organs of government is the doctrine of separation of powers. This is discussed below.

## VI. THE DOCTRINE OF SEPARATION OF POWERS

This doctrine, according to which powers refer to the legislative, executive and judicial powers of the government, happens to be an essential feature of constitutional government. It was first expounded by a French political philosopher, Jean Bodin in the sixteenth century in his book entitled "*The Republic*" (Khan et al, 1972 Akindele et al, 1998, 2000).

A variant of this doctrine was later in the seventeenth century expounded by the first English philosopher, John Locke, who, at that time was concerned with making sure that only one power-**the legislative power be divided between the king and the parliament**. Even, before John Locke, another seventeenth century political theorist, James Harrington in his "*Academia*" (1634) had advocated a more abstract notion of a necessary balance of power.

It was this doctrine of the separation of powers which created the incentive to diverge from the orthodox or conventional method of combining monarchy, aristocracy and democracy which had been the practice or common political thought since the times of Aristotle and Polybius. Moreover, this doctrine was actually and formally propagated and popularized by Montesquieu in his eighteenth century "*Esprit des Lois*" (i.e., The Spirit of Laws) (1748). Montesquieu drew a sharp and logical distinction between and among the legislative, executive and judicial powers, and insisted that they should be handled by distinct and independent bodies of government.

Following his propagation of this doctrine, it was given institutional expression in many constitutions. The precursor in this area at that time was the United States of America. The United States' constitution of 1787 was a landmark in the practical adoption of the doctrine of separation of powers to governmental institutional arrangement. But, it was most fully elaborated in the United States by John Adams who, in a refined manner, adopted it through the flexible doctrine of checks and balances in the quest for much desired collaboration among the three organs without any undue erosion of each other's powers or areas of relevance in the governance process. Also the French constitution of the revolutionary era as well as various Monarchical constitutions of Western Europe in post-Napoleonic period gave recognition to the doctrine of separation of powers.

The doctrine of the separation of powers rests on the notion that powers and functions of government may be divided into three-(Legislative, Executive and Judicial)-in order to remove the possibility of a situation whereby any of the organs will be too strong for the other in the execution or performance of their respective governmental functions or duties. The rationale for this separation was predicated on the assumption that if the powers exercised by each of these organs are concentrated in one hand, tyranny would be the result and this would jeopardize the civil rights. Thus, the central core or idea of the doctrine of separation of powers has since being that the same person or body should not make the laws, enforce them and pass judgment on violators.

The need to ensure the effectiveness and/or productive collaboration among these organs for effective public service delivery and, without erosion of each other's relevance in the governance and service delivery processes brought about the political mechanism of the doctrine of checks and balances.

## VII. THE DOCTRINE OF CHECKS AND BALANCES

This doctrine is a complement to the doctrine of separation of powers. How it became a complement of this doctrine is traceable to the idea that each organ should and will be a check on the others. Thus the idea of checks and balances became a provision of the means through which the different organs of government can check the powers of one another and balance them in such a manner that tyranny, despotism, oppression, domination, violation of fundamental human rights and civil liberties are not encouraged.

Doctrine of checks and balances usually exists between the Legislature and the Executive in the areas of legislative control of the Executive namely: budget approval; appointments; declaration of wars; ratification

of treaties, amendment of the constitution; impeachment; accountability and transparency; refusal, delay or approval of measures proposed by the Executive. Even though, the Executive cannot impose its views in most cases, on the Legislature, it has some measures of control over the Legislature in the areas like the passage of bills into laws. In fact, the Executive can always refuse its signature to a bill or any bill it considers to be unconstitutional or too harsh for the citizens.

The Judiciary as the third organ can also check both the Executive and the Legislature if and whenever their actions are deemed illegal. And the Judiciary is also vulnerable to both the executive and the legislative control if not in all respects but, in the areas of appointment and promotions of Judges. The abuse of this control mostly by the Executives in most developing polities, have brought about some further measures serving as inhibitors to some extent to ensure that the Judiciary is clearly allowed to function as the last hope of the common people. An example of such measures was the establishment in Nigeria of the Nation Judicial Commission which, has to some extent, performed creditably to justify the confidence of Nigerians as far as the independence and fairness of the judicial organ are concerned.

Put together, the idea behind the principles of checks and balances is the protection and safeguarding of individual liberty and freedom through its discouragement of and prevention of nepotism, tyranny, despotism and abuses of power. This doctrine was and still not meant for solving personal, ideological and political scores as most dead-wood and free-loading political actors may wish to believe in their quest for illicit and idiosyncratic political ends.

The practical reality or utility of these mechanisms-(Doctrines of separation of powers and checks and balances) in ensuring the true workability of the organs -(Legislative; Executive and Judicial) - of government in the quest for effective public service delivery and politics of hope for the people varies from one political system to the other depending on the nature and exigencies of each polity's practical politics and understanding of it as a means for improving the lots of the citizenry rather than those of the political actors as it has being in most developing polities Nigeria inclusive due to the dangerous adherence to apolitical understanding of politics or the perception of the latter in the context of what it is not in spite of the need for the opposite. This is put into perspective by the analysis of the subject matter of what is politics and what it is not politics in the immediate section below.

## VIII. THE CONCEPT OF POLITICS: WHAT IT IS AND WHAT IT IS NOT

The concept of politics can be multidimensionally analyzed. It can be looked at as an art and, at the same time looked at as a discipline. But, whichever way one looks at it, politics is a concept which has not been free from disputations ranging from academic, ideological to philosophical. Thus, one can argue that one of the multifaceted problems often encountered is the lack of consensus regarding the actual conception of politics.

This tendency has generated different typifications of politics (as an art and one of the central concerns of political science). These typifications range from "*politics is a dirty game*", "*government by deceit*" to its conception as the "*process at work everywhere*". In short, the concept of politics and, its study (political science) have never been free from both ignorant and intellectual disputations. Generally, the historical development of politics as an art and as a discipline can be retrospectively traced to the ancient Greek period of city-states during which Plato, Aristotle and some of their Greek contemporaries deemed the affairs of the polis – (due to the then intricacies of human political relationship) - worthy of a master science – (Political Science). During this classical period, Aristotle claimed that human Self realization is dependent on political relationship. On the same token, he claimed that "*man is a political animal*" and that politics form the bases of human Social existence because the *interaction of two or more people is synonymous to Political relationship*. Various scholars of international repute have equally addressed the issue of politics vis-à-vis human existence in the Society.

In spite of these disputations, it is an empirical fact that politics (as an art) *structures our lives, explains man's existence as a member of organized human society*, determines our socio-political, psycho-socio-economic, geo-political and ethno-cultural positions and dictates our options due to its embracing characteristics. This being the case, it is the belief here that politics is very embracing and that it involves *competition for public goods, authoritative decisions, compliance and distribution and use of power over human activities in our societies*. Hence, as afore elucidated, many Scholars have defined politics (as an art and as a discipline) in the attempt to provide understanding to our practical involvement in the art of governance and our regard for the institutional paraphernalia of democracy. For an example, Williams Crane and Bernard Moses (1983) have analytically and practically defined politics. To them, analytically, politics deals with the "State as an organism for the concentration and distribution of political powers of the Nation" and, practically, it deals with the "form and substance of actions".

On his own, Alfred de Grazia (1965), defined politics (as an art) as the events that happen around the decision-making centre of government while the study of these connotes his (De Grazia) own definition of Politics as a discipline. In addition to the foregoing, David Easton (1957), defined politics (as an art) as the authoritative allocations of scarce societal values for the society while Harold Lasswell (1958), defined it as the determination of who gets what? When? Where? How? and Why? The materialists on the other hand viewed politics as the struggle between social classes for the control of the state or institutions of the state. The structure within which the struggle takes place is regarded as the political. This conception of politics tends to emphasize the role of economic interest and class conflict in the practice of politics and in the actions of political actors.

Politics is empirical and it deals with the shaping and sharing of power hence, it is studied and analyzed by political scientists. Not minding the divergent views, politics is omnipresent and, it is actually the relationship between the "*rulers and the ruled*" that ranges from conflict to compliance. It does not exist in a vacuum but within a *political system*. It is on this basis that *political life* is taken to mean a *system of activities* ranging from *support and demands or feedback* from the *environment to policy outputs or governmental decisions*. The concept of power is very crucial to the ordering of priorities involved in politics. This explains why David Apter (1977), claimed that "politics requires the learning of power because *human lives take shape and meaning within authoritative boundaries*. This shows that politics includes "*the procedures through which governments, groups and individuals decide how to spend the money of the state and how behaviour will be limited*" (Danziger, 1994: 5). Generally, common definitions of politics are:

- Politics is the exercise of power
- Politics is the public allocation of things that are valued
- Politics is the resolution of conflict
- Politics is the competition among individuals and groups pursuing their interests
- Politics is the organizations and people who make and implement public policies
- Politics is the determination of who gets what, when, how, (where, and why) (Ibid).

These orthodox and universally acclaimed conceptions of politics on both fronts, and, particularly on the practical front notwithstanding, its understanding and practice in Nigeria had, and, continues to take disturbing exceptions. This assertion finds a deep-seated solace in the past and contemporary developments within the Nigerian body politic or political landscapes which had constantly, in spite of its ruins, taken politics to be what it is not and what it can never



be. These apolitical syndromes, to some extent, were principally responsible for the cyclic civil-military-civil rulership political developments in Nigeria and the resultant periodic faulty planning transitions and, their accompanying heart aches, a major example of which was the annulment of June 12, 1993 Presidential Election and its debilitating effects on Nigeria and Nigerians which began to wane though, not at the expected speed, since the commencement of the Fourth Republic in May, 1999.

A retrospective historical analysis of political events in Nigeria shows a disturbing picture in terms of the poverty of political wisdom and constant disregard for the conventional mannerism of practical politicking. Concretely, this analysis shows that ignorance, indifference, parochialism, conservatism, political brigandage, blind ideological persuasion, intolerance, parasitic political philosophy, megalomania syndromes, treatment of political opponents as nonentities, feelings of hereditary-political supremacy by some political actors, political arrogance as a combination, had, and, continues to consistently dictate the character and pace of political activities in Nigeria.

In Nigeria, the concept of government and opposition which has traditionally formed the core of practical politics and, which has gained international or universal acclamation has been unrepentantly abused. Instead of embracing this international or universal acceptance in Nigeria, it is tied to regionalism, ethnicity, cultural heterogeneity, cultural polarization, ostracism and tribal loyalties. The nation's politics and its accompanying activities have been characterized by political vendetta, corruption, son of the soil philosophy, politics of expediency, enthronement of regional loyalties, conferment of pseudo-legitimacy, institutionalized disrespect for economic and financial solvency of the nation, unprovoked liquidation of human lives, political shenanigans, arson and wanton destruction of properties, contractor-controlled political machinery, election rigging, annulment of election, unethical impeachment of elected political actors, stifling of judicial independence and its accompanying cooptation of the judiciary, politics of hopelessness and many other vices.

These disturbing characteristics existed unabated during the first three democratic Republics in Nigeria which were interrupted and dotted by military regimes and their aberrations. They even existed up to the commencement of the fourth Republic in 1999 the fourth phase of which commenced on 29 May, 2011 with the election of President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan and the inauguration of the 7<sup>th</sup> National Assembly (Senate and the House of Representatives) (Akindele and Adeyemi, 2011(a); Akindele and Adeyemi, 2011(b)). These apolitical values are yet to be fully understood as inimical to the pursuit of politics of hope and creation of a healthy road map for economic development in

Nigeria by some of our political actors even, at this time of the third phase of the fourth Republic in spite of the seeming good, patriotic and nationalistic intention and, commitments of some of them to the need for servant leadership and its accompanying benefits.

These apolitical developments must be dealt with and taken care of for the Nigerian state to be amenable to politics of hope and attainment of the requisite mechanisms for effective public service delivery to the Nigerian people. This can be done through real commitment by the political actors and the Nigerian people who must always insist on doing things through appropriate mechanisms and routes. What to do in this regard forms the core of the discussion below.

## IX. WHAT TO DO TO ENSURE POLITICS OF HOPE AND EFFECTIVE PUBLIC SERVICE DELIVERY FOR NIGERIANS

The attainment and sustenance of politics of hope and its accompanying effective public service delivery for the Nigerian people are contingent on the needed existence of certain variables and values which are germane to the healthy authoritative allocation of scarce and critical societal values and resources. Certain things must be done to put these variables and values in place for the betterment of the people. Such things include: existence of good governance; budgetary sanity; professionalism of the public bureaucracies/administration and, collaboration among the three organs of government among. These are respectively discussed below.

## X. EXISTENCE OF GOOD GOVERNANCE

The concept of governance and its goodness or otherwise have been fully discussed in section two of this paper above hence, it is unnecessary to duplicate such analysis here. The points that need to be stressed here is that, to avail the Nigerian nation and its people the indispensable values of politics of hope and effective public service delivery, there must be a total commitment to good governance. With the pursuit of good governance in place, every other thing will follow.

## XI. BUDGETARY SANITY

The need for budgetary sanity in Nigeria and its relevance to the attainment and sustenance of politics of hope and provision of effective public service delivery are compelled by the problems that have been associated with the budgetary process in Nigeria as a result of the lackadaisical attitudes of our political actors to financial probity, accountability and transparency vis-à-vis the fiscal policies of the Nigerian state.

This way of life as it relates to the budget as a whole is very disturbing. There is the need to respect the budget as a tool of national fiscal control. It is our belief that, it is after the recognition of the budget as the only

translator of financial resources into human purposes that, its sectoral allocation could be specifically analyzed in terms of adequacy or otherwise, because once the whole is disregarded as we are now used to in Nigeria, it would be meaningless to dissipate energy on its components.

Our contention here, is grounded on the fact that, in Nigeria, emotional extra budgetary spending by Nigerian leaders at national, state and local levels has made it impossible for the past budgets to perform their predictive functions for the Nigerian economy despite their typifications as “budget of hope” “budget of reconstruction”, “budget of determination” and “budget of consolidation” among other euphemistic terminologies. These problems, apart from those associated with the undemocratic nature of the military regimes when they existed in Nigeria, are more pronounced during the democratic dispensations the nation has had so far due to Executive-Legislative rifts which have disregarded the needed collaboration between them. This way of life is greatly disturbing when viewed against the subject matter of the concept of budget within any given political system (Akindele and Adeyemi, 2010). As a matter of fact, the ability of the Nigerian state to inculcate the values of sane budgetary process and adopt the participatory budgetary method through political mechanism explainable within the context of the functional relevance of the three organs of government is, in part, dependent on the professionalism of the public bureaucracies and the practitioners within them. This is discussed below.

The Professionalism of Public Bureaucracies and Administration in Nigeria: *Its nexus with effective public service delivery and politics of hope.*

To start with, it is our contention that the issue of professionalism of the public bureaucracies and administration in Nigeria and, the determination of who is a professional public Administrator or Bureaucrat can be addressed and/or done through the dichotomy of “self-seeking bureaucrats” and “dedicated civil Servants”. The former usually called “the empire-building bureaucrats”, according to Musgrave and Musgrave (1973:123) “seek to maximize their power and/or income as determined by the size of their bureaus” while the latter “seek to contribute to an efficient operation of the public sector and to the public”. The self-serving bureaucrats (i.e. non professional public administrators) will:

- Ask for more funds than needed to perform a given function.
- Overstate the benefits to be derived from a given level of services.
- Inflate the total budget in anticipation of expected cutbacks (Ibid).

Conversely, the dedicated (professional) civil servants will provide technical expertise in the designing

of programs so as to enable decision – makers (elected government officials) to make intelligent choices, implement and operate programmes once they are enacted, provide an element of continuity to the governmental process, introduce a sense of rationality with the operation (of the governmental process). Given the foregoing, professional public administrators and their development in a democratic culture like Nigeria cannot be taken for granted without severe consequences for effective public service delivery and pursuit of politics of hope for the Nigerian people.

## XII. NEED FOR PROFESSIONALISM OF PUBLIC BUREAUCRACIES AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATORS IN NIGERIA

Gerth and Wright Mills (1972) once opined that the services of the “dedicated civil servants” or “civil service perspective civil servants” are very crucial to the functioning of the modern state and, to the designing and implementation of public policy”. The need for the development of professional public Administrators in Nigeria can be understood within the context of their instrumentality for the attainment of democratic benefits by ways of policy orientation that can address the inadequacy of our current democratic dispensation.

Through the attainment of professionalism our public bureaucrats will clearly be aware of the constant basic misconceptions of democracy, which may have hitherto, been negatively affecting the performance of their duties. More important, the need for the professionalisation of our Public Administrators in today’s democratic culture can be appreciated within the context of a perturbed Nigerian’s apprehension about what the civil servants (whom he referred to as those who work government) have now become:

*We grew up in the colonial days to know those who work for the government as servants of the public. On considering the current attitudes and role of the bureaucracy, we now find to our regret that the traditional but correct posture of government workers has disappeared. Within any known philosophy, bureaucracy exists to provide the congenial atmosphere for the promotion and survival of economic activities. Let government concentrate on the main business of running the government. Divest itself of over involvement in business operation for which it is ill-equipped. Reach-out and take entrepreneurs into confidence in their formulation of economic policies so that the views they formulate in their air conditioned rooms could be translated into reality by the entrepreneurs who are the risk takers (Oshobi, 2000:22).*

Not only this, the need for the development of professional administrators or professionalisation of the civil service at this time, can be further understood within

the parameters of the humiliation which the public administrators suffered in 1975 in the process of the government's deflation of its ascendancy as a potent social force whose perceptions, interests and actions were determinant in shaping policies and strategies under military rule" (Omoruyi, 1992: 10). This scholar's characterization of the civil service purge of 1975 gives credence to the detestation which the military at that time, had for the public Administrators. This can be seen within the context of his claim that:

*The 1975 purge of the Public Services gave a lie to the "commonality of characteristics and interests" explanation of military-civil service coalition government. What perhaps was significant about the massive purge of the Civil Service is the inference that the service was politically responsible for what General Murtala Muhammed characterised as the 'drift and indecision' of the later years of the Gowon administration which led to his overthrow. Put differently, the Civil Service was no longer considered neutral in political decision-making. If political bosses fall, then, their civil service advisers must equally fall. In this regard, the requirement of the civil service reforms that permanent secretaries should retire along with the regime which appointed them would appear to have laid its precursor in raison d'être of the 1975 purge (Ibid: 10-11).*

It can be reasonably, to some extent, deduced from the foregoing, that the issue of the development of professional Public Administrators for coping with the values of good governance and/or democracy is not alien to the Nigerian polity. Even though, its pedigree and, abrogation/deflation can hardly be examined in isolation from the policy initiatives of the military Regime of General Yakubu Gowon's Udoji Commission Report/Civil Service Reform of 1974 and Babangida's 1988 civil service reform, it held sway during the ill-fated third Republic which was never a full fledged democratic Republic because of its subservience to the military oligarchy. It equally almost came to fruition during the first two phases of this fourth Republic under the Obasanjo administration if not for its dilly-dallying and lack of real and purposeful commitment to such reform. The reform was equally abolished not minding its military pedigree by the same military though, under a different leader-General Sanni Abacha in 1995 (Imhanlahimhim and Edosa, 1999:521).

The development of professional public Administrators for the new democratic culture or democratic culture in Nigeria can only be understood and/or appraised within the context of the political character of the public service progenized by the new thinking that "politics is synonymous with public administration" or "public administration as politics". In other words, the challenges of this new thinking as earlier discussed in this paper have to be understood in

terms of the concrete dilemmas they have created for our Public Administrators.

Strangely, some of Public Administrators, ignorantly too, still cling to the outdated belief that they are neutral, anonymous, and impartial and above all, apolitical in the conduct of their official duties as Public Servants. In other words, the Political character of Public Administrators must not be taken for granted in the process of striving to make them true professionals. This is particularly so in that as Musgrave and Musgrave (Op. Cit: 124) once articulated.

*Civil servants not only are aids to elected representatives but they themselves affect the (policy outputs) and outcomes. In the conduct of government, as anywhere else, knowledge is power. Public programmes are complex and elected officials may have neither the time nor the expertise to analyse them. That branch of government which is backed by technical experts is thus at a greater advantage. Moreover, in rendering advice, the technician can hardly avoid (and may not wish to avoid introduction of his or her policy judgement. Similar considerations apply when it comes to the role of the civil servants in implementing policies after their enactment. Legislation is typically passed in more or less general terms and, its application to specific cases requires interpretation (usually in most cases, done by the civil servants who can hardly avoid and, may not wish to avoid the introduction of their values and personal policy judgement) – (Emphasis mine)*

There is no gainsaying the fact that Nigeria's public administration (or public Service) needs transformation into one that will be most efficient and professional in the real sense of it. The need for this transformation is decipherable from the standpoint of what Olowu (1989:62) termed the general perspective on the public service in Nigeria. According to this perspective:

*The public service of Nigeria will be transformed into one of the most efficient of its kind in the world. On the other hand the general perspective is that the public service has not justified the huge resources made available to it to transform the country. The poor performance of major public utilities, the failure of major government projects and the poor maintenance of governmental institutions as well as the growing incidence or knowledge of bureaucratic corruption have contributed to denude the public service of its grandeur. (ibid 62-63)*

This perspective among other things, led to the depiction at one point in time of Nigeria's public service thus:

*The civil service today is a battered institution which has virtually lost its vital attributes of anonymity,*

*neutrality and security of tenure; an institution in which morale has reached its nadir, in which excessive caution, undue bureaucratic practices and interminable delays have become the hall-marks of an institution seemingly resistant to dynamic changes, an institution which has become the object of constant public criticism. (ibid: 63).*

The need to reverse the foregoing makes it mandatory for our Public Administrators of today to be professional in all ramifications. The Public Administrators have to be professional in that, as Takaya (1985:151) once opined, they possess the “instruments of Public Administration” which are “the main agents of change that preconceive, designs, implements and coordinates the process of change in the society. Without doubt, they cannot but be professional because they are involved in “social engineering” that deals with “the action part of government, the means by which the purposes and goals of government are achieved. Not only this, they have to be professional because the social engineering in which they are constantly involved deals with:

- *Designing the process of the change from old to new (ideal) society*
- *Creation of new institutions*
- *The planning and regulation of the economic system.*
- *Rendering advice to and guiding the leaders of the political system and*
- *The setting of new norms and standard of morality to guide the society (ibid).*

### XIII. PROFESSIONALISM OF PUBLIC BUREAUCRACIES AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATORS IN NIGERIA: THE REQUIREMENTS

The professionalization of the Public Bureaucracies and the Practitioners within them, demands that certain requirements must be met and put in place. In other words, there are varieties of things to be done in this regard. This is more so considering the fact that the core of the environmental expectations from the bureaucracies and their functionaries occurs within the political space and, most especially in today's new democratic culture. Thus, we would contend that the discussion of the expectations from the professional Public Bureaucracies and the Bureaucrats within them rightly falls within the concept of democracy, its relevance and, indispensability in today's world of public administration. Thus, in order to be professional, our Public Administrators must, to begin with, understand what the challenges of democracy in the context of politics of hope and its propensity for effective public service delivery and, creation of the necessary road map

to economic development are today in Africa and, indeed, in Nigeria. As Kaunda (2002:1, 2), recently opined:

*The challenges of democracy in Africa are great because of the nature of the continent, its people, and its history. Africa is a complex continent requiring complex solutions in order to enable a democratic and fruitful life for its citizens to develop. Africa is not only the big continent it is, but has diverse cultures and experiences. At the same time, Africa has similarities Democracy and development are closely linked. We find that the ideal components of democracy, development, and peace are common in all these terms. Indeed, one is in the other. They are partial terms of the desired holistic state of human and world harmony.*

Arguing further, Kaunda (ibid: 2) claimed that:

*Democracy is a living process. In general, all over the world, democracy is enhanced or constrained by systems and practices found in a society. Ideally, for progress, these systems and practices must also be working effectively, at all times, and in all areas of human endeavour. Democratic systems and practices should involve all institutions and sectors of society. Included are the legislature, the executive, judiciary, the media, business, and civil society. The more independent and thoughtful a sector is the better for society. The quality of participation and enjoyment of human rights in a society is affected by how integrated and active the members are with the systems and practices of that society. A measurement of democracy is also how a society responds to the view of its members who are trying to be involved in deciding the collective direction of their society at a critical point.*

Our public Administrators must consider many factors to be able to meet the challenges of democracy. These challenges according to Kaunda (ibid:3), include: “physical geography of the place”, “population and density”, “ethnic diversity”, “Religion and spirituality”, “culture”, “language”, “colonial links”, “economic situation”, “political system”, and “people on the margins”. The issue of the “people on the margins” which is one of the factors identified in the immediate paragraph above is very important and relevant to the Nigerian political space and its administrative landscape. Thus, our public Administrators to be truly professional must understand and continue to strive to do so because:

*Governance and democracy is affected by how many people on the margins become actively involved in society's affairs. People on the margins have gone onto those areas because social and*

*governance systems have ejected them. They include women, the young the elderly and people from ethnic groups not favoured by others. The situation varies from culture to culture and from place to place. As in other parts of the world people on the margins are from various backgrounds, including those with disability and other special groups. Democratic practice requires the active involvement of all members of society (ibid: 4).*

The essence of this position is that our Public Administrators, to be called and regarded as real Professionals, must, in the performance of their duties, recognize that democratic culture calls for the protection of the minority rights. This is particularly so, in that as Buendia (1994:373), once stated; “the outcome of economic vulnerabilities, induced by global integration, (usually becomes) a local economic conflict with ethnic colour.” Kothari (1989:36) had once advanced the reasons for this thus:

*Developmentalism, as economism, has become a source of new economic vulnerabilities, and new inequalities. In multi-ethnic societies, where overlap has existed between religious and regional identities and economic functions, issues of economic insecurity and contradictions are very conveniently transformed by the elite into issues of ethnic, caste and religious issues.*

Given the foregoing, to be able to deal with this kind of issue, our Public Administrators (if they are professional) must understand the asymmetrical aspirations of the people in the democratic environment. This is particularly desirous of their understanding because:

*Evidently, it is not simply diversity which is responsible for strife in view of the fact that divergent groups have existed, had lived for centuries but conflicts did not reach the grandiose scale and intensity as it has attained in the age of post-industrialism. However, what is new in the current era of post-modernism are the processes involved which made cultural identity incompatible with diversity and made cultural identity a means to gain economic survival and power. Ostensibly, the sharpened conflicts, not between classes as the Marxists expected but between ethnic grouping - one who holds political and economic power on one hand, and those marginalized who aspire to redeem their lost power on the other hand - are reactions against the centralism of the state which tries to homogenize the entire polyethnic society under a single dominant culture held by the power-wielders in order to effectively respond to the imperatives of world capitalism (Buendia: op cit 373-374).*

Kothari (op cit: 16) further puts this into perspective thus:

*Ethnicity is a response – including reaction – to the excesses of the modern project of shaping the whole humanity (and its natural resources base), around the three pivots of world capitalism, the State system and a ‘world culture’ based on modern technology, a pervasive communications and information order and a ‘universalising’ educational system. The project of modernity entails a new mode of homogenising and of straight jacketing the whole world.*

More important, our public Administrators, to be professional within our democratic culture must understand that “the application of standards embodying the values of only one culture over the other cultures is indeed an affront to the latter” (Buendia, op cit). Thus, they should have at the back of their minds, the need to redress some of the pitfalls of the fundamental assumptions of democracy in the performance of their official duties because, as Clark (1999:2) contends “democracies around the world are being swept by a new form of politics guided more by issues than by traditional distinction between liberal and conservative positions”. Concretely, their own interpretation of democracy must understand the need, due to the increasing complexities of our societies, to redefine the fundamental assumptions of mass democracy. They should and must understand that democracy:

*Must not only guarantee the democratic rights of the majority but assure the minority of their rights to differ from the majority. These are without any obligation on the part of the former to yield their rights and abide by the he erosion of identity and survival of ethnic groups. Otherwise, the minority would simply be persecuted by the majority.*

*The persistence of a mosaic of ethnic groups who operate in accordance with their own rules and perseveres in their legitimate rights to self-governance either outside or within the realm of the State is slowly giving rise to “mosaic democracy” as distinguished from mass democracy. Mosaic democracy appears to correspond to the mosaics in the economy and diversified or “de-mystified” peoples needs and political demands. (Ibid: 382).*

To be professional, our Public Administrators today must fully imbibe the code of conduct of their professional bodies (e.g. the Institute of Public Administration of Nigeria), set in line with the undercurrents and demands of contemporary trends in public administration. By virtue of their training, they must continuously strive to ensure public accountability as a sine-qua-non to their administrative behaviour.

They must, and, should not allow themselves to be captured by the temptations of the now obviously erroneous and deliberate view or doctrine that they are apolitical and neutral tools of policy implementation for the ruling class (i.e. political Actors) on behalf of the citizenry. Captivity by this belief would make them to unfortunately take for granted the possibility of another tomorrow or post retirement problems that may arise should the need develop for the public to revisit the balance sheet of their conducts while fully engaged. Our public Administrators, today, to be professional in our democratic political culture must understand that, as Appleby (1952) articulated:

*Personal Ethics in the public service is compounded of mental attitudes and moral qualities. Both ingredients are essential, Virtue without understanding can be quite as disastrous as understanding without virtue.*

*The three essential mental attitudes are: (1) a recognition of the moral ambiguity of all men and of all public policies, (2) a recognition of the contextual forces which condition moral priorities in the public service, and (3) a recognition of the paradoxes of procedures. The essential moral qualities of the ethical public servant are: (1) optimism, (2) courage, and (3) fairness tempered by charity. These mental and moral qualities are relevant to all public servants in every branch and at every level of government. They are as germane to judges and legislators as they are to executives and administrators. They are as essential to line officers as to staff officers. They apply to state and local official as well as to national and international officials. They are needed in military, foreign, and other specialized services quite as much as they are needed in the career civil service and among political executives. They, of course, assume the virtue of probity and the institutional checks upon venality which Appleby has so brilliantly elaborated. They are the generic attitudes and qualities without which big democracy cannot meaningfully survive.*

To be professional in the new democratic culture, our Public Administrators must, and, should do away with corruption and proclivities for it which are closely linked with capital flight that is, an unethical leakage of capital from one country to another (PA-Net, 2000). It is necessary for them to do this, because, corruption is a threat to democratic culture. As Kukah (1995:96) once argued "corruption remains the most invidious obstacle to stability in Nigeria both under the military any civilians.

The attainment of professionalism within the landscapes of the institutional and practical public service in Nigeria will definitely enhance effective public service delivery for the Nigerian people subject to the existence of politics of hope within the Nation's political

space. However, given the issues and/or factors that have been variously identified and articulated in this paper, the attainment of the goals of effective service delivery; politics of hope and, creation of a worthy road map to economic development within the Nigerian state is anchored on the collaborative nature of the relationship among the relevant units or agencies of the state particularly the three organs of government. Thus, it is our contention that collaboration among the three organs of government in Nigeria is needed because it is very important and crucial to the attainment and sustenance of politics of hope and effective public service delivery for the Nigerian people and, creation of useful economic road map for the Nation.

There is no doubt that the ability of any nation to do this, and, get out of policy issues/problems can hardly be explained or analyzed in isolation from administrative competence, and politically responsive policy implementation in the fullest sense of democratic practice and process. Holistically relevant and indispensable policies have been more often than not implemented by public servant/Administrators in most polities of the (developed) world. Thus, Nigeria cannot and must not be an exception or, remain behind. The ability of her public service to meet the challenges associated with the efforts these duties often demand is a key to her existential relevance today and beyond. To be able to exist beyond today, Nigeria's public service and its practitioners must hasten to grasp with the "most important feature of contemporary public administration" which, as recently noted: "is the declining relationship between jurisdiction and public management" (Fredrickson, 1999:1).

It has equally been further argued that:

*"Jurisdictions of all types-nation-states, states, provinces, cities, counties, and special districts – are losing their borders. Economic activity, which was once at least somewhat "local" in the sense of being contained within the borders of a jurisdiction, is increasingly multi-jurisdictional or non-jurisdictional. Investments, production, and consumption are seldom geographically contained, and this trend is destined to increase. The new global economy is sometimes described as "the end of geography." The revolution in telecommunications has forever altered the meaning of physical space and thereby forever altered the importance of borders and boundaries, a primary element of the idea of jurisdiction. These changes in economics and telecommunications have changed human social relationships, particularly relationships between those who are educationally, economically, and politically significant, and their "residence" or their "citizenship." These people are linked less and less to a single specific locale or jurisdiction and are*

*linked more and more bicoastally, transnationally, and globally (Frederickson, 1999 and Strange, 1996).*

Not only this, “public administration is steadily moving away from theories (of clash of interests, of electoral and interest group competition) toward (theories of) co-operation, networking, governance and institution building and maintenance (Frederickson 1999). To some extent now, in the contemporary period, public administration is referred to as public management with a broad based redefinition of “what it means to be public”: In the history of traditional public administration, the public was usually understood to mean “government.” Public management is now understood to include government but also all of those organizations and institutions that contract with government to do governmental work, those institutions and organizations that are essentially public serving--the so-called nongovernmental organizations--and the wide range of organizations and institutions that are essentially quasi-governmental in their relationship with citizens--such as privately held utilities. The distinctions between institutions that are essentially public in character and institutions that are private and profit making are now fuzzy. Modern public management has developed a nuanced conception of institutions that are governmental, nonprofit, and corporate, but also primarily public serving, on the one hand, and institutions that are clearly profit making and in an identifiable market, on the other hand” (Frederickson, 1999).

There is no gainsaying the fact the foregoing issues have created “contours of modern management and a specter of problems quite beyond the capacity of those (public servants) expected to cope with them. Nigeria’s public service to be relevant for today and survive for tomorrow and beyond must first of all be knowledgeable about the problems and their linkage with the disarticulation of the state as already elucidated here-in. They must be particularly abreast of “new institutionalism” “network theory” and “governance theory” as mechanisms specifically designed to solve, ameliorate or “at least address the issues associated with the disarticulation of the state, high jurisdictional and disciplinary fragmentation and diminished bureaucratic capacity” (Ibid: 4). Generally and specifically, the public service in Nigeria at this time of the new millennium, must be knowledgeable about the current trends and the position of Public Administration in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (Schiavo-Campo and Sundaram, 2001) particularly within the context of globalization and its “impact on most dimensions of government administration in most countries and constraints or the ability of national governments to act independently”, which, we have earlier highlighted in this paper. Above all, the future of the public service in Nigeria, even

though, specifically and concretely dependent to a significant extent, on compliance with the dictates and complexities of the technologically based villagized world and its thesis and/or constitution, can actually be guaranteed by the adherence of the practitioners (i.e., the Public Servants/Administrators) to the ethical obligations and codes of conducts” which from our perspective remain the indispensable pillars of the public service. These ethical obligations include the following (which are far from being exhaustive): loyalty, accountability, courtesy and respect, discipline and integrity, honesty and impartiality and, confidentiality” (Shellukindo and Baguma op cit: 26).

It is through respect for these obligations, that the degeneration and/or erosion of public service ethics which has been variously contextualized in terms of the ascendancy of corruption and proclivities for Kleptocracy by public officials in the course of performing their official duties can be reversed for the sustainability of the Nation’s public service for today and the future. The sustainability is equally dependent on the provision of enabling environment by the State for the realization of what has been termed practical agenda for promoting ethics and accountability in contemporary African public service (Rasheed, 1993:289). These include: fostering and promoting enabling conditions of service to enhance professional and ethical standards; advancing and affirming sound policies on recruitment, training and public personnel management, encouraging public service occupational associations to play a leading role in institutionalizing professional values and defending occupational interests; promoting a psychology of service in political and public life; upholding the integrity and effectiveness of public institutions of accountability; fostering popular participation to ensure the accountability of governance (Ibid).

We found the provision of this enabling environment germane to the success and future of the Nigerian public service because, as Ake (1993) once observed:

*Our problem is not so much a problem of character defect or ethical failure as it is one of misunderstanding arising from decontextualizing and dehistoricizing social phenomena. We are making judgments based on false analogies and false comparisons on the separation of meaning from social context, behaviour from cultural milieu, and action from social structures. Our judgments are based on representations especially the perception that the Western State, and its correlates, market society and bureaucratic organization exist in Africa or ought to exist. They are not based on the realities on the ground.*

To our mind, the realities on ground do not exculpate the political angle of the policy process in our

democratic culture where, politics according to Ake (Ibid: 15), is not a peaceful competition for the control and exercise of state power ostensibly in the public interest but rather a bitter struggle among political factions for the appropriation and privatization of state power". This type of bitter struggle and competition can be minimized if not totally removed from the Nigerian political space or landscape through purposeful collaboration among the organs of government that will not be an end in itself but a means to a people-oriented ends that will benefit all and sundry and, which will create room for economic development. This collaboration which is needed among the three organs of government in Nigeria for the betterment of the Nigerian people is the subject of analysis below.

#### XIV. THE NEED FOR COLLABORATION AMONG THE THREE ORGANS - (LEGISLATURE, EXECUTIVE AND JUDICIARY) - OF GOVERNMENT IN NIGERIA

In order for Nigeria and Nigerians to attain and benefit from "**politics of hope**" and its usually accompanying provision of "**effective public service delivery**" and, creation of workable road map to economic development there must be unity of purpose among the nation's horizontal organs of government. This unity calls for collaboration among them. This collaboration can be brought about through many means depending on the nature of the political system and its exigencies from time to time. However, what we consider relevant for attaining this in Nigeria forms the subject matter of discussion in this section.

The first thing to be done in this regard is to truly understand and embrace the need for collaboration and, where relevant actors both at the governmental/political and citizenry levels stand in the scheme of things within the landscape of the political system. This is more so because, the indispensability of the criteria of "*good governance*", "*good economics*", "*sane budgetary process*", "*participatory budgeting*", "*professionalism of the public bureaucracies and the practitioners within them*", "*cordiality of political actors and actions among the three organs of government*", to the attainment and sustenance of "*effective public service delivery*" and "*politics of hope*" for the Nigerian people compels the need for collaboration. This collaboration among various administrative and governmental units is in line with the imperatives of today's **existential globalism** which clearly constrains unproductive and arrogant independence, individualism or isolationism in preference for collaborative efforts can only be taken for granted at any nation's perils.

This need is further compelled by the quest for efficient and effective public policies and the need to sustain them for the benefits of the people in most

polities of today's global village. In fact, the constant erosion of the virtual monopoly of state powers and/or, the continuous shrinkage of such powers as a result of the thesis of globalization and its subscription to public sector networks calls for collaboration that is geared towards economic development and its mechanism of good governance which is clearly predicated on the **four pillars** of "*accountability*"; "*transparency*"; "*predictability*" and; "*participation*".

Generally, the developments across international borders which are not without their impacts on individual states' internal governmental structures and processes further compel the kind of collaboration under discussion here. It is interesting to note that today, public administration in the modern form is a key element in the effectiveness of government hence, the need for its professionalization in Nigeria as articulated above.

#### XV. THE NATURE OR TYPE OF COLLABORATION NEEDED AMONG THE THREE ORGANS OF GOVERNMENT IN NIGERIA

The collaboration needed among the three organs of government in Nigeria is expected to be positive particularly in the interest of the citizenry. In most developing countries Nigeria inclusive, collaboration among these organs has, in most cases, been very disadvantageous to the people in terms of policy decision and outputs.

This has been largely due to corruption and the unrepentant proclivities for same. Through such negative collaborations the hopes of the masses had often been dashed. None of the organs could be excused from this in some of these polities in the past. In such situations which had existed with arrogance in Nigeria to some extent, the Executive and Legislative arms have been known to have expediently connived to the detriment of the citizenry while the Judicial arm had, in the process been co-opted to dash the hope and aspirations of the people through deliberate misinterpretation(s) of the laws/constitution of the land and questionable judicial decisions/pronouncements.

The reverse of this negative trend which existed in Nigeria even up to the first phase of the fourth Republic is what is now required in today's Nigeria. And, to some extent, things appeared to have been moving in the positive direction with the commencement of the second phase of the fourth Republic though, not without some apparent hiccups in the legislative-executive relations which have had their impacts on the policy processes and their attendant outputs. More important, the judicial organ in Nigeria appeared to have clearly started the process of emancipating itself from the manacle of executive strangulation towards the end of the second phase of the fourth Republic. This is



exemplified by the landmark decisions or judgments particularly in the context of the deliberate misunderstanding by the executive of the pendulum of power and, the struggle for its possession within the executive arm (i.e., the Presidency) on the one hand and, in the context of the electoral process as it affected the franchise or suffrage of Nigerians and the political actors or gladiators.

Succinctly put, a positive collaboration among these organs of government is what is expected and needed in Nigeria. What to do in this regard to foster the attainment and sustenance of politics of hope, effective public service delivery and economic development forms the core of the analysis in the next section below to which we now turn.

## XVI. WHAT TO DO THROUGH COLLABORATION AMONG THE THREE ORGANS OF GOVERNMENT IN NIGERIA

In order for the Public Bureaucracies and the Practitioners within them to be relevant and provide the requisite guidance and technocratic road map for the political actors in the quest for effective public service delivery and politics of hope for Nigeria and the Nigerian people in the context of real economic development, the collaboration in focus must encompass friction-free existence among the three organs of government and, particularly between the Executive and the Legislative organs as it affects the fiscal policy and politics of the State.

To begin with, the Legislative and Executive organs of government as key decision makers on the budget have not been really able to perform their respective functions in the budgetary process due to the unwarranted problems of role and powers misconception and flexing of political muscles which has been to the disadvantage of the citizenry over the years. In the process, the issues of funds, its allocation and control have been expediently politicized. It appears that both actors in the budgetary decision making at all levels of the nation's political landscape (local, state and federal) do not really understand their roles, powers and, limitations. In most cases, these political actors (the Legislators and the Presidency) had, in the past and, even at present abused the system of democratic governance to the extent of using the mandate freely given to them by the citizens as a device for settling expedient political differences between and among themselves. These political gladiators have in most cases, abused the provisions of Chapter V Sections 80-89 (for the National Assembly) and Sections 120-129 (for the States Assembly) and, Chapter VI Sections 162-168 (for the Federal Executive) of the 1999 constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria as they affect the powers and control over public funds or public revenue.

These respective allocated constitutional powers have not been dispassionately used in most cases by the affected organs of government. None of these organs can actually be exculpated from these abuses. In most cases, the Executive arms at the National and state levels have been subjected to avoidable trauma by the legislative arms. The Executive arms are sometimes asked to seek approval for projects in all ramifications even when such projects have already been approved in the budget(s). This attitude is untenable in the sense that such unrestricted policing may lead to redundancy and double approval for some programmes/projects. Attachment of too much importance to words like "ratification", "authorization", "approving", "ensuring" etc by the lawmakers in some cases without the expected understanding of the fact that these words are only meant to provide for a balance of power in the nation's democratic landscape are contributory factors to these problems.

It is important to stress the fact that the lawmakers' ambiguous uses and interpretations of these words and words like "vetting" and "monitoring" as synonyms for the word "approval" are parts of the causal factors of these problems. The constancy of these problems within the Nigerian political space once led to an observation that:

*Monitoring is the appraisal of performance which takes place during various stages of execution...the primary motive of budget monitoring is to assess as the implementation progress, the degree of the achievement of original objective with a view to correcting any negative variance (and, as such, it does not call for fresh or any approval) (Adelowokan 1991).*

In other words, the Legislative organ in Nigeria at the three-tier levels must be allowed to perform their constitutional roles or functions as they affect the "power of the purse" which is "an incontestable fundamental put in place to ensure that the revenue and spending measures it authorizes are fiscally sound" in terms of "matching the needs of the population with the available resources" so as not to engage in "a total waste of time" (Nzekwu, op cit). It must equally be allowed to perform its functions of checks and balances which "are necessary to ensure good governance in budgeting in the medium to long term, which requires the answerability of the executive to the legislative and, the ability of the latter to take appropriate actions in cases of poor performance" (Ibid.). The Legislative organ should equally be allowed to play its role of openness and transparency, participation and consensus building as well as that of budget policy impact.

These legislative roles call for Executive tolerance particularly on the required publicity of the drafting process which has traditionally elicited hostilities of the executive organ towards the legislative organ.

These roles equally call for legislative organ's provision of suitable *"platform for establishing broad based consensus"* on views and inputs into budget decisions *"with regard to difficult budgetary trade offs"*. It should equally be allowed to exercise a *"significant influence on budget policy"* instead of merely rubber stamping *"executive draft budgets without any changes"* which even up till now has characterized *"most state houses of assembly"* in Nigeria. If the Legislative organ in Nigeria is allowed to perform its roles and functions identified and analyzed above, the factors *(both internal and external)* like *"instability"*; *"deficiencies in the structures and processes of legislative budgeting"*; *"inadequacy of technical advisory capacity"*; *"deficient legislative budget research capacity"*; *"presidential arrogance/nature of the political system"*; *"over reliance of/on executive decisions"*; *"skewed electoral incentives"*; *"fragmented political party system/structure"*; *"fuzzy delineation of government-party lines"*; *"defective legislative oversight and external auditing"* (Ibid. *Some of my own emphases are included*) would be minimized if not totally removed.

Generally, in the performance of their roles, the executive and the legislative organs must ensure that they strive for the balancing of their struggles and/or, "impulses for independence with the need to be fiscally responsible". The extent and nature of the executive-legislative relations is largely dependent on the nature of this balancing act and its maintenance. The essence of this has been summed up thus:

*Strengthening parliaments' (legislatures') fiscal capacities and budgetary responsibilities would certainly help parliaments (legislatures) enhance their role and influence in the budgetary process in a fiscally responsible way, including streamlining legislative procedures, reforming the committee system, strengthening party caucuses, or reinforcing advisory and research capacities (Ibid. Emphases are mine).*

As for the Judicial organ, both the Executive and Legislative organs should allow it to perform its constitutional role without political arrogance or, stifling the organ with their constitutional leverage over it in terms of appointments of the Judges, their remunerations, enactment of laws and, enforcement of judicial decisions/judgments, most of which have happened and continued to happen and/or, take place on a daily basis within the Nation's political landscape. More importantly, both the Executive and Legislative organs should and must learn to abide by and obey all judicial decisions/judgment not only those that affect them positively or, help them to do their apolitical bids either ethical or unethical within the Nation's political space.

## XVII. CONCLUSION

We have examined the nexus of collaboration among the three organs of government with the provision of effective public service delivery and politics of hope for Nigeria and the Nigerian people in this paper. In the process, we elucidated the concept of governance and dichotomized it into two (good and bad governance) with detailed analysis of the imperatives of both and, their implications for the citizenry in any nation like Nigeria.

We argued that good governance is central to the attainment of a healthy political system erected on positive collaboration among the three organs of government in the quest for finding political fulfillment for the citizens in any country like Nigeria. And, that for this fulfillment to be attained and sustainable there is need for sane budgetary process and professionalization of the public bureaucracies and the practitioners within them in addition to the existence of good governance. The essence of these – *(sane budgetary process and, professionalism of the public bureaucracies and the bureaucrats within them)* – for effective public service and, politics of hope was respectively analyzed.

Against this analytical background, it is our contention that, for effective public service delivery and politics of hope to be attained in a polity like Nigeria, there is need for collaboration among the three organs of government. This can only meaningfully come to fruition in the absence of political arrogance, arrogance of powers which are backed or supported with commitment to a holistic pursuit of national aspirations and/or, agenda. In other words, the attainment of effective public service delivery and politics of hope in Nigeria can be actually enhanced through the catechism of servant leadership. The essence of this can be appreciated against the thesis of servant leadership which has seen many organizations to greatness within many polities of the world which is synoptically analyzed at this concluding part of the paper.

## XVIII. THE THESIS OF SERVANT-LEADERSHIP

The concept of servant leadership is not all that new in our organizational world or to the lexicon of organizational discourses. As a matter of fact, its pedigree can be traced back to about four decades. Specifically, the concept was developed in 1970 by Robert K. Greenleaf ([www.greenleaf.org](http://www.greenleaf.org); [www.leadersdirect.com/servantleadership](http://www.leadersdirect.com/servantleadership)). Servant leaders provide services – through committed stewardship spirit – to the people. They serve the people they lead. To a servant leader, employees/subordinates are an "end in themselves rather than a means to an organizational purpose" (Ibid.). Specifically, servant leaders have been taken to mean people or leaders who:

*devote themselves to serving the needs of organization members, focus on meeting the needs those they lead, develop employees to bring out the best in them, coach others and encourage their self expression, facilitate personal growth in all who work with them, listen and build a sense of community*

([www.leadersdirect.com/servantleadership](http://www.leadersdirect.com/servantleadership)).

According to Greenleaf (1970, [www.greenleaf.org](http://www.greenleaf.org)):

*The servant-leader is servant first... It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. The conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. That person is sharply different from one who is leader first, perhaps because of the need to assuage an unusual power drive or to acquire material possessions... The leader-first and the servant-first are two extreme types. Between them there are shadings and blends that are part of the infinite variety of human nature.*

This scholar went further to identify the difference between the “servant-first leaders” and “leader-first leaders” thus:

*The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant-first to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served. The best test, and difficult to administer, is: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society? Will they benefit or at least not be further deprived*

([www.greenleaf.org](http://www.greenleaf.org));

[www.leadersdirect.com/servantleadership](http://www.leadersdirect.com/servantleadership)).

Without doubt, looking at the thesis of servant-leadership, it can be articulated to some extent that its undercurrent philosophy is critically relevant to the attainment of organizational goal and; as a matter of fact, the concept of servant-leadership has enhanced the ability of organizations to reach their full potential. Through it “servant leaders” are felt to be effective because the needs of followers are so looked after that they (often) reach their full potential”. Even though, the concept of servant leadership has been criticized through the assertion that “serving people’s needs creates the image of being slavish or subservient” and/or “that it is not a very positive image”, the principles of servant leadership has been characterized as admirable

([www.leadersdirect.com/servantleadership](http://www.leadersdirect.com/servantleadership)).

The criticism of servant-leadership notwithstanding, it has become one of the operational cornerstones of most organizations today. This has been largely so because servant-leaders “view others (subordinates) as friends not as servants and, they

interact with them in a spirit of openness, humility and vulnerability” (YHDC, 2009).

The creed of servant leadership is that the size of true leadership is determined by how many persons he has served and will be served contrary to the philosophy of other leadership styles whose measuring-rod of size and values of leadership is determined by the number of people serving the leader (Ibid.). The success or attractiveness of servant leadership is further put into a clearer perspective by its “credo” which Greenleaf (1970, [www.greenleaf.org](http://www.greenleaf.org) [www.leadersdirect.com/servantleadership](http://www.leadersdirect.com/servantleadership)), articulated thus:

*This is my thesis: caring for persons, the more able and the less able serving each other, is the rock upon which a good society is built. Whereas, until recently, caring was largely person to person, now most of it is mediated through institutions – often large, complex, powerful, impersonal; not always competent; sometimes corrupt. If a better society is to be built, one that is more just and more loving, one that provides greater creative opportunity for its people, then the most often course is to raise both the capacity to serve and the very performance as servant of existing major institutions by new regenerative forces operating within them.*

It is clear from this “credo” that “**the servant leader serves others, rather than others serving them**” and that “serving others comes by helping them to achieve and improve their conditions” (Ibid.). Thus; the basic assumptions of servant leadership are that:

1. The leader has responsibility for the followers.
2. Leaders have responsibility towards society and those who are disadvantaged and;
3. People who want to help others best do this by leading them

([http://changingminds.org/disciplines/leadership/style/servant\\_leadership.htm](http://changingminds.org/disciplines/leadership/style/servant_leadership.htm)).

As a concept developed and/or coined for the attainment of organizational goals and, accomplishment of mission statement, servant-leadership has some principles oiling the wheels of its success. These principles are:

- **Transformation** as a vehicle for personal and institutional growth.
- **Personal growth** as a route to better serve others.
- **Enabling environments** that empower and encourage service.
- **Service** as a fundamental goal.
- **Trusting relationships** as a basic platform for collaboration and service.
- **Creating commitment** as a way to collaborative activity.
- **Community building** as a way to create environments in which people can trust each other and work together.

- *Nurturing the spirit as a way to provide joy and fulfillment in meaningful work (www.greenleaf.org).*

These Principles clearly serve as the foundation and/or pillar of and/or for the characteristics of a servant-leader which include amongst others the following:

- *Service to the people.*
- *Avoidance of self promotion/publicity.*
- *Open acceptance of all people that come his/her way.*
- *Non-favouritism.*
- *Avoidance of nepotism.*
- *Honesty.*
- *Self confidence.*
- *Trust.*
- *Meekness/Patience.*

Given the immediate foregoing, it is our conclusion therefore, that for Nigerians to be able to truly have a sense of belonging and, be seen to be hopeful of having “politics of hope” within the Nigerian body politic, the indices of “*true leadership*”; “*servant leadership*”; “*listening/performing leadership*”; “*people-oriented leadership*” must become the nucleus of the practical political catechism in Nigeria. These indices must be fused to give birth to a true rather than a “*cosmetic servant leadership*”. That is, a leader that will not idiosyncratically/expediently take for granted the always seeming gullibility and/or easily trusting predispositions of Nigerians on the issues of their political and policy preferences and general governance. This is more so because there is no other way through which a real and dedicated road to economic development can be realistically constructed at this point of the Nation’s existence.

## REFERENCES RÉFÉRENCES REFERENCIAS

1. Ake, C, (1993) “Deeper into Original Sin: The context of the Ethical Crisis in Africa’s Public Services” in Rasheed, S and Olowu D (eds) 1993. Ethics and Accountability in African Public Services, Addis-Ababa: United Nations Economic Commission for Africa: pp12-23.
2. Akindele, S. T. (1998) “Concept of Democracy and Governance: A Theoretical and Empirical Examination” Nnamdi Azikiwe Journal of Political Science, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp 42-58.
  - a. Akindele, S. T.; Obiyan, A. Sat; and Owoeye, J. (2000). The Subject matter of Political Science, Ibadan. College Press and Publishers Ltd. (First published in 1998).
3. Akindele, S. T. (2000) “Legislative-Executive Relations under the 1999 Constitution with special reference to the control of public funds”, A paper presented at the Workshop organized by Osun State Investment Company Limited in conjunction with the Osun State House of Assembly on “Appropriate handling of budgeting by the Legislature” at Miccom-Golf Resort, Ada, Osun State, on Monday 17<sup>th</sup> January, 2000.
4. Akindele, S.T., Gidado, T.O. & Olaopa O.R. (2002). Globalisation, Its Implications and Consequences for Africa. Globalization: [iucode:http://www.icaap.org/iucode?193.2.1.1]
5. Akindele, S.T., Asaolu, T. O., and Oladele, P. O. (2005) “Public Administration and the Issue of Professionalism in the New Democratic Culture: A focus on the Nigerian Political Space” European Journal of Scientific Research Vol. 11, No 3, November pp 309-363.
6. Akindele, S.T., Asaolu, T. O., and Oladele, P. O. (2006) “The Nigerian Public Service yesterday and today: What hope for tomorrow” Research Journal of International Studies, Issue 2, February pp86-131
7. Akindele, S. T. (2007) “Democratic Governance and Participatory Budgeting”, A paper presented at the Five-Day Workshop on “Legislative budget and negotiation” organized by the Policy Analysis and Research Project (PARP), National Assembly between Monday 19<sup>th</sup> and Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> March, 2007 at the Crystal Garden Hotel, Isa Kaita Road, Kaduna, Nigeria.
8. Akindele, S. T., and Adeyemi, O. (2010) (Eds). Managing Interruptions in National Development: A Discussional Analysis of the menace of Time Robbery, Financial-Sector Mis-Management, and Militancy in Nigeria. Saarbrucken, Germany: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing GmbH & Co. KG.
9. Akindele, S. T., and Adeyemi, O. (2011a) (Eds). Corruption and the Nigerian State: A Critical Discourse. Saarbrucken, Germany: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing GmbH & Co. KG.
10. Akindele, S. T., and Adeyemi, O. (2011b) (Eds). “Challenges and Impediments to the Legislature in Nigeria, 1999 – 2011”. In Alabi, Mojeed O. A & Ajayi, O (2011) (Eds), Unbroken Legacy of Service: Speaker Bello’s Twelve Years under Three Administrations in Osun State. Ilorin: Intellectual Research Institute.
11. Alfred De Grazia (1965): Political Behaviour, New York: Free Press.
12. Amoako, K.Y, (1997): “Speech by Dr. K.Y. Amoako: The Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission, No 3 (December).
13. Appleby, P.H (1952) Morality and Administration in Democratic Government Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press cited in Bailey, S.K. “Ethics and the Public Service” in Stillman, R.J (Ed) (1976) Public Administration: Concepts and Cases Boston: Houghton Mithing Company pp 313-322.
14. Apter, David. (1977): Introduction to Political Analysis. Cambridge: Winthrop Publishers.

15. Ayo, S.B., and Awotokun (1996): "Governance of Cities and Village Communities in Nigeria: Ilawe and Awo Ekiti as Case Studies" *African Journal of Institutions and Development (AJID)* Vol. 2. No 1, pp. 56.
16. Ayo, S.B., and Awotokun (1997): "Governance of Cities and Village Communities in Nigeria: Ilawe and Awo Ekiti as Case Studies" in Olowu, D and Erero, J. (eds) (1997). *Indigenous Governance System in Nigeria, Ile-Ife: Research Group on Local Institutions and Socio-Economic Development, Department of Public Administration, Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria.* pp.
17. Bailey, S.K (1976) "Ethics and the Public Service" in Stillman, R.J. (Ed) (1976) *Public Administration: Concepts and Cases* Boston: Houghton Miffling company pp 313-322.
18. Bello-Imam, I.B (1997): "Introduction" in Bello-Imam, I.B (Ed) (1997): *Government in Nigeria: Politics, Economy and Society in the Adjustment Years, 1985-1995.* Ibadan: Stirling-Hoden, Nigeria Ltd.
19. Bello-Imam, I.B and Agba, A.V. (2004) 'Fiscal Federalism, The National Question and Resource Control: Practice and Prospect" in Bello- Imam, I.B and Obadan, M.I. (2004) (Ed): *Democratic Governance and Development Management in Nigeria's Fourth Republic 1999-2003.* Ibadan: Centre for Local Government and Rural Development studies, Chapter 4, Pp52-74.
20. Boeminger, E. (1992): "Governance and Development: Issues and Constraints" in *Proceedings of the World Bank Annual Conference on Development Economics.* Washington D.C: The World Bank
21. Brautigam, D (1991): *Governance and Economy: A Review* World Bank Working Papers (WPS 815).
22. Buendia, R. G. (1994) *Ethnicity and Empowerment: Looking Beyond the Theory of "Democracy" in Governance* Philippine Journal of Public Administration Volume XXXVIII, October, Number 4, pp 365-384
23. Corkery, J, and Bossuyt, J (Eds) (1990): *Governance and Institutional Development in Sub-Saharan Africa, Europeans Centre for Development Policy Management, Seminar Report 28-30, March.*
24. Clark, T.N. (1999) "University of Chicago Sociologist defines new political culture" *The University of Chicago News, Illinois: University News Office.*
25. Crane, William W. and Moses. B. (1983): *Politics,* New York and London, Pp. 1-2.
26. Danziger, J.N. (1994): *Understanding the Political World: A Comparative Introduction to Political Science,* New York: Longman.
27. Easton, D (1968) *The System Analysis of Political Life* New York: vile.
28. Easton, D. (1959) "An Approach to the Analysis of Political System" *world politics* vol. ix, April.
29. Ejituwu, C.N. (1997): "Electoral Process and Governance: Rigging of Elections in U.S.A. and Nigeria" in Ogunba O. (1997) (Ed) *Governance and the Electoral Process: Nigeria and the United States of America;* Lagos American Studies Association of Nigeria, Pp. 37-50.
30. Erero, J., (1996): "Introduction: Return to the Source: Towards Improved Governance in Nigeria". *African Journal of Institutions and Development (AJID)* Vol. 2, No 1 pp1-5.
31. Esman, M.J. (1997): "Good governance and devolution of power" in *Africa Notes,* May, pp 1-3.
32. Eyinla, B.M. (1998): "Prospects for Democracy and Good Governance in Nigeria" in *Governance, Democracy and Civil Society: Conference Proceeding, Ife: Ife Social Sciences Review (July).* pp 70-82.
33. Fabayo, J. A., and Akindele, S. T. (2005) "Harmonizing political and economic objectives towards achieving balanced resources mix and coping with administrative constraints", *European Journal of Scientific Research* Vol. 11, No 4, December, pp497-524.
34. Feridun, M. and Akindele, S. T. (2005) (Eds) *NIGERIA ECONOMY: Essays on Economic Development,* Morrisville, North Carolina, U.S.A., Lulu Publishers Inc.
35. Fredrickson, H. G. (1999) "The repositioning of American Public Administration (<http://www.findarticles.com>)
36. Gerth, H. H. & Wright Mills, C. (1972) *From Max Weber,* New York Oxford University Press
37. Gould J. (Ed) (1972): *A Dictionary of Social Sciences.* New York: UNESCO Publication.
38. Greenleaf, R. K. (1970): ([www.greenleaf.org](http://www.greenleaf.org); [www.leadersdirect.com/servantleadership](http://www.leadersdirect.com/servantleadership)).
39. Guy Peters, B and Rose, R 1980: "The Growth of Government and the political Consequences of economic overload" in Levine, C. (Ed) (1980) *Managing Fiscal Stress: The Crisis in the Public Sector,* New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers Inc. pp 33-51
40. Healey, J. and Robinson, M. (1992 Reprinted in 1994): *Democracy, Governance and Economic Policy: Sub-Saharan African in Comparative Perspective,* Overseas Development Institute.
41. Hyden, G. (1980): *Beyond Ujama in Tanzania,* Berkeley, University of California Press.
42. Hyden, G. (1995): "Conjectures and Democratisation" in Olowu, D., Soremekun, K., and Williams, A., (eds) (1995). *Governance and Democratisation in Nigeria: Spectrum Books Limited.* pp. 49-64.

43. Hyden, G. (1999): "Rethinking the Study of African Politics" in Olowu, D., Williams, A. and Soremekun, K. (eds) (1999): *Governance and Democratisation in West Africa*. Senegal: Codesria. pp. 9-27.
44. Hyden, G. and Bratton, M (eds) (1992): *Governance and Politics in Africa*, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
45. Idowu, A.A. (1998): "Effective Realization of Enduring Democracy, Good Governance and Protection of Human Rights in Nigeria: Why, How and When? In *Governance, Democracy and Civil Society*" Conference Proceedings: *Ife Social Sciences Review* (July) pp 264-274.
46. Ikpeze, N.I (1999): "Forms of Government and Economic Policy in Nigeria" in *Governance and the Nigerian Economy: Proceedings of the One-Day Seminar Held on January 19, 1994* first published in 1999 by The Nigerian Economic Society (NES) pp. 71-87.
47. Jega, A. (1999): "Governance and the Nigerian Economy" in *Governance and the Nigeria Economy: Proceedings of the One-Day Seminar Held on January 19, 1994* first published in 1999 by The Nigerian Economic Society (NES) pp 101-104.
48. Jega, A. (2000) "Keynote Address delivered at the 22<sup>nd</sup> Annual Conference of NPSA, Zaina, January" in *The Nigerian Political Science Association (NPSA) Newsletter*, Volume 1 No. 1 (July) pp. 3-10.
49. Kaunda, K.D (2002) "Democratization, Development, and the challenges for Africa" *Africa Notes*: New York: published by Institute of African Development, Cornell University July/August) pp. 1-5
50. Kothari, R. (1989) "Ethnicity" in Kumar David and Santasilam Kadirgamar, (eds) (1989) *Ethnicity, Identity, Conflict and Crisis*, Kowloon, Hongkong: Arena Press
51. Landel-Mills, P. and Seragelding, I., (1991): "Governance and the Development Process", *Finance and Development* (September).
52. Landel-Mills, P. and Seragelding, I., (1992): proceedings of the World Bank Annual Conference, "Governance and External Factors" in *Op.Cit.*
53. Levine C. (Ed) (1980) *Managing Fiscal Stress: The crisis in the public sector* New Jersey: Chattam House Publishers, Inc.
54. Levine, C (198) "Organizational Decline and cutback management" in Levine C, Ed (1980) *op cit* Pp 13 – 29.
55. Levine, C. (1980) "The new crisis in the public sector", in Levine C (Ed) (198) *op cit* Pp 3 – 12
56. Musgrave, R.A. & Musgrave, P.B. (1980) *Public Finance in Theory and Practice* New York: Oxford McGraw Hill Book Company.
57. Musgrave R.A. and Musgrave P.B. (1998) *Public Finance in theory and Practice* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
58. Niebuhr, R (1944) *The Children of light and children of Darkness* New York: Scribners cited in Bailey, S.K. (1976) "Ethics and the Public Service" in Stillman, R.J. (Ed) (1976) *Public Administration: Concepts and Cases* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company pp 315-322.
59. Nkom, S.A., and Sorkaa, A.P. (1996): "A Comparative Analysis of Grassroots Governance in Two Nigerian Communities: A Case Study of Samaru and Abwa-Mbagen" in *African Journal of Institutions and Development (AJID)*, Vol. 2. No 1. pp 41-55.
60. Nzekwu, G. (2007) "Institutional arrangement for budget accountability and control" A presentation to the workshop on Legislative Budgeting and Negotiation organized by the Policy Analysis and Research Project (PARP) National Assembly between Monday 19<sup>th</sup> and Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> March, 2007 at the Crystal Garden Hotel, Isa Kaita Road, Kaduna, Nigeria.
61. Obadan, M.I (1998): "The State, Leadership, Governance and Economic Development" (Monograph) Presidential Address Delivered at the Annual Conference of the Nigerian Economic Society, Kano, July 22-24.
62. Obadan, M.I. 1993. "The Workings of Free Enterprise Economy in the Nigeria Economic Society "Managing a Free Enterprise Economy: Proceeding of a National One-day Seminar Lagos: Nigerian Institute of International Affairs February 17.
63. Ogunba, O. (1997): *Governance and the Electoral Process: Nigeria and the United States of America*, Lagos: American Studies Association of Nigeria.
64. Olowu, D. (1989) *Bureaucracy and Development: Implication for Public Service Improvement in Nigeria*, in Sandal et al: (1989) *Managing Performance in Nigeria's Public Sector*, Ife: Faculty of Administration, O.A.U. Ile-Ife, pp52-68
65. Olowu. D. and Rasheed, s. (1994): "Ethics and Accountability in African Public Services" AAPAM
66. Omoruyi, O. (1993): "Democratisation: The Nigeria Model in Comparative Perspective" in *Role Enhancement Training Programme for Youth Party Activists*. Abuja: Centre for Democratic Studies.
67. PA-NET 2000. *Capital Flight in Nigeria: Effecting a change of Direction* Ibadan: Development Policy Centre January Volumes 8.
68. Rasheed, S. (1993) *Conclusion: Towards an Agenda for Action in Enhancing Ethics and Accountability in African public Services*" in Rasheed, S and Olowu D, (eds) (1993). *Ethics and Accountability in African Public Services*, Addis-Ababa:

69. Schiavo-Camp, S., and Sundaram, P (2001) "Public administration in the 21<sup>st</sup> century" Excerpted from "improving public administration in a competitive world", Asian Development Bank pp 1-23.
70. Shellukindo W.N. & Baguma, R (1993): "Ethical Standards and Behaviors in African Public Services" in Rasheed, S and Olowu, D (Eds) (1993), Ethics and Accountability in African Public Services. Addis Ababa, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa. Pp.25-39.
71. Strange, S. (1996): The retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
72. Ukpong, I.I. (1999): "The Problems of Governance in Nigeria" (Keynote address) in Governance and the Nigerian Economy: Proceedings of the One Day-Seminar Held on January 19, 1994 published in 1999 by The Nigerian Economic Society (NES) pp. 1-9.
73. Wai, D. (1995): "Capacity Building in Policy Analysis and Development Management in Africa". Presentation to the Forum of ACBF – Supported Institutions, Kampala; Uganda; January 23-25.
74. Wildavsky, A (1976): "Public budgeting: The concept of budgeting as the political art of compromise and strategy" in Stillman II, R. J. (ed) (1976): Public Administration: Concepts and cases. Houghton Mifflin Company.

### XIX. SPECIAL PUBLICATIONS

1. Adelowokan, (1991): Public Speech as the Secretary to Osun State Government.
2. Federal Republic of Nigeria: Public Service Review Commission Main Report. Lagos; Ministry of Information (1984) Sect ([http://changingminds.org/-disciplines/leadership/style/servant\\_leadership.htm](http://changingminds.org/-disciplines/leadership/style/servant_leadership.htm)).
3. Nigeria Common Country Assessment (NCCA), Published by United Nations System in Nigeria (2001).
4. The 1979, 1989 and 1999 Federal Republic of Nigeria's Constitutions. Lagos: (Daily Times Publications).
5. What is Servant Leadership? ([www.leadersdirect.com/servant-leader](http://www.leadersdirect.com/servant-leader); [www.greenleaf.org/whatissl](http://www.greenleaf.org/whatissl)).
6. Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.
7. World Bank (1989): "Sub-Sahara Africa: From Crisis to Sustainable Growth: A Long Term Perspective Study": (IBRD) Washington, D.C.
8. World Bank (1992): "Governance and Development". International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), Washington, D.C.
9. World Bank (1993): "Governance: The World Bank's Experience" (IBRD Washington D.C., Operations Policy Department).
10. Youth Heritage Development Centre (YHDC), (2009). "Styles of Leadership", Leadership Training, Part I.