cogent
social
sciences

**POLITICS & INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS | REVIEW ARTICLE**

# Governance paradigm in public administration and the dilemma of national question in Nigeria

Okey Marcellus Ikeanyibe[1]*, Ogbonnaya Eze Ori[1] and Arinze Emmanuel Okoye[1]

*Corresponding author: Okey Marcellus Ikeanyibe, Department of Public Administration and Local Government, University of Nigeria Nsukka, Nsukka, Nigeria
E-mail: Okey.ikeanyibe@unn.edu.ng

**Abstract:** This paper reviews the developmental oscillations in the field of public administration or what scholars usually describe as paradigm shifts up to the one of the current emphasis described as the governance model, which subscribes to the use of stakeholders, networks, collaboration, and partnerships in policy and government processes. This paper examines how this core principle or tenet of the model relates to the broad issues of governance in Nigeria, a multi stakeholder, ethnically constituted polity. It is argued that the idea of quota, federal character and other means of power sharing for inclusive government that have been tied to administrative law and practice from the Nigerianization policy of late 1950s till present have not properly doused the aspirations of some major stake holders (ethnic groups) of the country. Hence, the recurrent calls for political and economic restructuring of the country. As a result of this, far-reaching governance and public service reform measures in the country have remained ineffective. The paper suggests that the sticky point in a country like Nigeria about governance challenges is how to build a consensus around some enduring socio-political and economic organisation and interrelationship of various groups or stakeholders.

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Okey Marcellus Ikeanyibe PhD, is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Public Administration and Local Government, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, and a Visiting Research Fellow of the School of Public Policy, Central European University Budapest Hungary.

Ogbonnaya Eze Ori is a PhD student being supervised by the corresponding author.

Arinze Emmanuel Okoye is an MSc student also being supervised by the author.

This research is part of the corresponding author's engagement with the balance between administration, society and politics in developing countries especially the Sub-Saharan Africa. In this paper, together with two of his post graduate students, he examines how the governance paradigm shift in public administration, which subscribes to the use of stakeholders, networks, collaboration, and partnerships in policy and government processes could be useful to deal with governance issues in Nigeria, where the issue of national/governmental structure popularly known as national question has remained critical for effective public administration.

## PUBLIC INTEREST STATEMENT

The implication of the governance paradigm for public administration in a multi-ethnic group. country like Nigeria is that all groups should be made to willingly identify with one nation project through open discussion and implementation of agreed basis of nationhood. This article traces the key milestones in the historical development of public administration up to the emergence of the governance paradigm in the 1990s. The authors extend the core governance principle, which is the need to involve all stakeholders in administrative processes to that of resolving the recurrent challenge of national question and self-determination in Nigeria. No nation can properly exist and develop if stakeholders do not believe in the national project. The practical relevance of this article therefore is to draw attention to the conflict between the concern for conservative sovereignty (just like traditional governance model in public administration that places importance on governance by government institutions) and the new governance orientation that is open to involvement of other views and contributions from non-governmental groups.

cogent - oa

**Subjects: Area Studies; Politics & International Relations; Development Studies**

**Keywords: governance paradigm; national question; ethnic groups; Nigeria**

## 1. Introduction

As the debate on the autonomy status of public administration as a field of study, and whether it is more of management or political science remains unresolved, the discipline has continued to establish itself in every intellectual stream of the social sciences since its emergence as field of study. Thus, since Woodrow Wilson's (1887, 1953) seminal essay on politics-administration dichotomy, the field has witnessed a handful of paradigm shifts which, preoccupations without exception has been how to rationalize government administrative system to make it more efficient despite whether a scientific managerial approach or a political valuational approach is emphasized. It must be said that the paradigm shifts in public administration or what we see more appropriately as paradigm oscillations, continue to play out along a continuum in which Management and Politics are the two extreme poles. The pioneer epistemic community in public administration (e.g. Goodnow, 1900; Wilson, 1953) who underscored the dichotomy between politics and public administration, and their immediate successors (e.g. Gulick and Urwick, 1937) who moved further from separation to propound the principles of administration, had envisaged a science of administration fully separated from politics, which shall seek to straighten the paths of government, to make its business less unbusinesslike, to strengthen and purify its organization, and to crown its duties with dutifulness (Gale, 1968). But the other side to the contestation for the soul of public administration had argued that those who propose a separation of public administration from politics failed to appreciate that their rough separation of politics from administration did not preclude a valuational component in many things they presumed they were treating scientifically. In fact, their principles typically represented a conflation and a confusion of the two elements of fact and value (Simon, 1947).

Since its emergence as a separate field of study, various approaches or emphases have competed, but none has succeeded in winning the general acceptance of scholars identified with the discipline; no new synthesis has been achieved; no new orthodoxy has replaced the old, rather, public administration has grown tremendously in the sense of accepting data, concepts, and perspectives from many sources, chiefly the various social sciences; but it has discarded little, and no organizing framework into which everything will fit has been achieved—or, if achieved, has not been recognized and accepted as such (Gale, 1968). The epistemology of public administration has also been driven by the practice, which consequentially emanate from the existing challenges facing the world countries' economic, political and socio-cultural changes. For instance, in the context of globalizing pressure that became very encompassing from the 1970s, governments of both industrialized and less developed nations engaged in extensive administrative reforms and reorganizations to streamline their public sectors by shrinking their size, function, and activities (Farazmand, 2002). Thence emerged the neoliberal paradigm shift with its concomitant strand of New Public Management (NPM) in public administration. Today, the NPM approach is far spent as many countries, notably championed by "the Latin American and some Asian nations, are realizing the fallacies of the pure marketplace ideology and the private sector efficiency model" emphasized by NPM. Invariably, the importance of values are once again tilting the balance as "the central issues of equity, fairness, and market failure are resurfacing as government after government realizes that the lives of the majority, the ordinary citizens, cannot be ignored in favor of the few, the powerful particularistic interest group elites" (Farazmand, 2002, p. x).

The new governance paradigm calls for use of stakeholders, networks, collaboration, and partnerships. How does this core tenet relate to the broad issues of governance in Nigeria? How does the paradigm correlate with the multi-ethnic nature of Nigeria and the recurrent calls for restructuring? This paper basically reviews the global trends in public administration paradigms up to the emergence of the new governance paradigm. It then examines how this paradigm correlates with broad issues of governance in Nigeria especially in the recurrent calls for restructuring of the country as a way to improve on its developmental, political and administrative failures.

The article is organised in four sections, including this introduction. Section two briefly examines the key paradigm shifts in public administration to provide a background for the emergence of the governance paradigm. The third section examines various models of the governance paradigm, concluding with the new governance paradigm of collaboration, and what it stands for in public administration. The fourth section considers the governance paradigm in relation to Nigeria's national question, arguing that effective governance should derive from mutual consensus of stakeholders not just in terms of organizational processes, but fundamentally in relations to the fundamental basis of nationhood. The next section concludes the essay.

## 2. Paradigmatic milestones in public administration

Scholars to some extent agree on some distinguishable path in the development of public administration (Basheka, 2012; Henry, 2007; International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 1968; Peters, 2003). Nicholas Henry has severally updated his 1975 Review article where he acknowledged four paradigms to the acknowledgement of six paradigms in a latter publication (Henry, 2007). Peters (2003) however, argues that the development stages might not all have achieved the status of a paradigm as described in the philosophy of science but did have some of those characteristics (for both good and ill). Thus for him clear paradigm shifts are distinctively three. For Henry (1975) recognizable paradigms in public administration are:

(1) Paradigm 1: the politics-administration dichotomy, 1900–1926.
(2) Paradigm 2: the principles of administration, 1927–1937.
(3) Paradigm 3: public administration as political science, 1950–1970.
(4) Paradigm 4: public administration as management, 1956–1970.
(5) Paradigm 5: public administration as public administration, 1970–present.
(6) Paradigm 6: governance, 1990–present.

Each of these paradigm or stage of development entails an emphasis of what should constitute the focus and the locus for the study of public administration.

### 2.1. The politics administration dichotomy (1900–1926)

The major assumption of the Politics Administration Dichotomy paradigm was the idea of separating politics and the administration functions of government as a strategy for promoting efficiency and effectiveness. This was the era of generic administration model that promotes that administration or management should have scientific principles that could work whether in public or private setting. Basheka (2012) remarks that Woodrow Wilson who pioneered this paradigm with his seminal article of 1897 earmarked four requirements of effective public administration, namely, (1) Separation of politics and administration, (2) Comparative analysis of political and private organizations, (3) Improving efficiency with business-like practices and attitudes toward daily operations, and (4) Improving the effectiveness of public service through management and training of civil servants, as well as encouraging merit-based assessment, (Basheka, 2012). It is appreciated that this paradigm debuted the field of study by providing a solid foundation for the theorization and pedagogy of public administration. More importantly, it gave the field its scientific orientation by seek to distinguish facts from values. As Henry (1975, p. 379) remarks,

> The net result of Paradigm 1 was to strengthen the notion of a distinct politics/administration dichotomy by relating it to a corresponding value/fact dichotomy. Thus, everything that public administrationists scrutinized in the executive branch was imbued with the colorings and legitimacy of being somehow "factual" and "scientific," while the study of public policy making and related matters was left to the political scientist

### 2.2. Paradigm 2: the principles of administration, 1927–1937

It was followed by the principles of administration paradigm that was an advancement to the management orientation through the elevation of public administration, nay, administration/management to status of science. As such, there was the belief that there existed certain scientific principles of administration that could be relied upon to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of government, and these principles by their scientific characteristic, could work in any administrative setting regardless of sector, culture, function, environment, mission or institutional framework. Gulick and Urwick (1937) identification of seven principles of administration—planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting (POSDCORB)—was the climax of this stage (Basheka, 2012).

The above two early paradigms represent what is usually described as the traditional public administration model that focuses on the career, neutrally competent civil servant working within a structure of hierarchical authority as the best means, in both normative and empirical terms, of translating policies into action (Derlien, 1999; Peters, 2003). Walsh and Stewart (1992) as represented by Peters (2003, pp. 8–9) more elaborately provide the features or assumptions of the traditional model as consisting in:

(1) *An assumption of self-sufficiency*: government is a self-sufficient actor that can act autonomously on the economy and society.

(2) *An assumption of direct control*: government is internally structured by authority and hierarchy, so that the individuals at the top of organizational pyramids were assumed capable of exercising control within their own organizations.

(3) *An assumption of accountability upward*: Accountability was to flow upward, with career officials answering to their political "masters" and those ministers answering to legislatures. This mode of accountability was to be the principal form of connection of administration with the political system, and with the surrounding social system.

(4) *An assumption of uniformity*: Government was supposed to treat all citizens equally and to provide the same benefits and deprivations to all similarly situated people. This was seem as a fundamental conception of fairness.

(5) *An assumption of a civil service system*: That is, standardized establishment procedures, in which the personnel in the public sector were to be governed through a formalized civil service for recruitment, pay, grading, and other aspects of internal management.

These assumptions and their fallouts for public administration have been challenged by other paradigms starting with the next two stages.

### 2.3. Paradigm 3: public administration as political science, 1950–1970

Paradigm three, which Henry (1975) describes as the paradigm of public administration as political science (1950–1970) saw the revolt of political scientists to reclaim public administration. At the same period, there were increasing effort for management theorists to also claim the discipline. Basheka (2012) describes the period as the era of deflating the dichotomy and puncturing the principles. Thus, politics-administration dichotomy was refuted on the grounds of inseparability of administration from politics in the real world of government. Politics according to Basheka which had initially meant partisan and corrupt politics expanded in scholarly meaning by 1930s to include public policy-making. At this point, it became obvious that the dichotomy is practically untenable. For scholars like Gaus (1950), a theory of public administration means in our time a theory of politics also. It was also contended that there was no such thing as "principle of administration". Herbert A. Simon's *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-making Processes in Administrative Organization* (1947) was probably the most important source of challenge at this period. His work contained a searching critique of the older Public Administration, particularly of its use of "principles." These so-called principles, he observed, are similar to maxims of folk wisdom and, in fact, given the loose and unscientific way in which they have been derived and stated, cannot be

regarded as more than proverbs (International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 1968). Public administration at this phase of its development was merely defined as an emphasis' or "area of interest" or even as a "synonym" of political science (Landau, 1962). The approach continued to emphasise the bureaucratic approach, but certainly led to the over-bureaucratisation and the diffusion of public administration to virtually every aspect of government ranging from policy determination to its implementation, services and the economy. Farazmand (2002, p. ix) remarks that public administration during this period "emphasized institution building, bureaucratization, nationalization, and a wide variety of organizational and administrative capacity building for national and economic development." The end product was the enthronement of the welfare state.

### 2.4. Paradigm 4: public administration as management, 1956–1970

Henry (1975) 4th paradigm refers to public administration as management (1956–1970). It virtually coincides with the 3rd showing that it was not a win-win victory for political science as some scholars consolidated the management outlook of public administration. Clearly, in stages 3 and 4, the two disciplines contending for the soul of public administration almost left no locus and focus for the newly acclaimed science and field of study canvassed by the pioneer scholars. Yet as shown by Henry (1975), the discipline was to survive this onslaught as the next paradigm was described as that of Public Administration as Public Administration, or Public Administration as Public Management (from 1970 to 1990).

### 2.5. Paradigm 5: public administration as public administration, 1970–present (NPM)

At this stage, there was effort to reestablish the discipline as an autonomous field of study. While doing this however, the focus which, was identified to be on the hierarchical, bureaucracy was shifted to markets and private sector organisations. In other words, there was a move from the traditional, conventional public administration model to the NPM model. Indeed against the various paradigms or stages of public administration development recognised by Henry (1975), this was the clear genuine paradigm shift for Peters (2003, p. 9). He argues that the five assumptions of traditional model listed by Walsh and Stewart (1992) as shown above, are a worthy collection of ideas describing how governments performed their tasks in the pre-NPM reform public sector. Thus, the critical paradigm shifts are not in the more detailed stages identified by Henry (1975), but in three distinct streams of the Conventional or Traditional paradigm, the NPM paradigm and the Governance paradigm.

NPM like approaches or paradigms before it, emerged to confront the same problem of inefficiency in administrative system. It originated from the fusion of economic theories and private sector management techniques. Its teachings were anchored on state withdrawal. Other assumptions of the traditional public administration such as the claim of the Weberian bureaucracy as the most appropriate structure for effective administration were all challenged by this paradigm.

The traditional or Conventional public administration basically regards the government alone as the autonomous and authoritative actor through its bureaucratic, hierarchical structures and processes as far as public service is concerned; the NPM paradigm was a shift to use the private sector. For Peters (2003), the whole idea of generic management portends the NPM paradigm. The paradigm shift to this approach was from the Conventional Public Administration and it gradually gave way for the Governance paradigm. In fact, he has also argued that many practitioners tend to include the Governance paradigm as part of the NPM. He avers, (Peters, 2003, p. 8):

> I should also point out here that although much of the change in public administration can be characterized as the NPM, some changes also have arisen from a rather different set of practices and ideas. At the same time that some practitioners were moving public sector management in the direction of that found in the private sector, with an implicit business model of administration in mind, other practitioners were moving toward a very different conception of relationships with the private sector. This relationship between the public and private sectors has come to be known as "governance"

A number of facts can be underscored at this stage: (1) it is not always clear to draw a timeline for the emergence of the governance paradigm which according to Henry (1975) chronology, began from 1990 to present; (2) some would regard the governance paradigm as part of the NPM, and (3) Paradigm shifts in public administration are usually driven by practice rather than ideas, while ideas that reside at the heart of the practical changes are teased out later (Peters, 2003). In all, the governance paradigm, has become a distinctive era or more appropriately orientation in public administration practice and scholars have clearly provided intellectual explanation for why it should currently be the preferred paradigm in public administration theory and practice.

### 2.6. Paradigm 6: Governance, 1990–present

It is rather ironical to talk about a shift to governance paradigm, whereas the very objective of government and its public administration is governance. It is a term that is usually used as a synonym to the word government or to qualify its activity. The concept is not new but had acquired new meaning and application from the late 1980s and 1990s. It can be defined as the *exercise of power or authority by political leaders for the well-being of their country's citizens or subjects,* the complex process whereby some sectors of the society wield power, and enact and promulgate public policies which directly affect human and institutional interactions, and economic and social development (Tamayao, 2014).

However, the governance paradigm, which is the focus of this paper has similar origin and conceptual connation with the NPM which it is believed to succeed. Both were public administration streams of the neoliberal ideology that most Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries embraced in the late 1970s and early 1980s. The two paradigms according to Peters (2003, p. 18) in some ways do fit together well, both attempting to break down the hierarchical, top-down system of governing inherited from the past. Thus,

> Some of the recommendations coming from the two approaches are almost exactly the same, e.g. the decentralization of government functions. Further, the two versions of change make some recommendations that are compatible, and even complementary. For example, the ideas in the NPM about the performance management and an emphasis on the measurement of outputs from government may facilitate the use of non-governmental actors to deliver programs.

Some scholars though, believe that the governance approach came much later and marks an important break with neoliberalism. For instance, Archer (1994) argues that whereas neoliberalism recognizes that markets are the whole answer, the governance approach does not. It rather recognizes the importance of collaboration of government and other sectors including the private and civil society or the third sector in service provisioning (Ikeanyibe, 2016). In this instance, while the NPM can be said to be the core administrative stream of neoliberalism, governance was a reaction against the excesses of this approach. Peters (2003, p. 18) provides a more clear distinction between the NPM and the Governance paradigm thus:

> In the NPM world the use of non-governmental actors is to reduce costs, increase efficiency, and limit the power of the State. In the governance approach there are some elements of efficiency but the principal justification is to involve the civil society, enhance participation, and recognize the capacity of networks in civil society to provide at least a certain degree of self-management in their policy areas.

Let it be known at this point that the reaction against the NPM has first emerged as what Moore (1995) has articulated as public value. While some scholars regard the Public value as a separate paradigm in public administration, we are inclined to view it as the mainstream paradigm of which governance belongs. The core argument that pervades the entire public value paradigm including the governance orientation is that the reform initiatives guided by NPM have undermined other fundamental values in governing public affairs, such as fairness, justice, representation, and

participation, in the name of improving efficiency (Wu & He, 2009). For instance, among the orientations in the public value is the rekindling of interest in the "old" bureaucratic paradigm (Wu & He, 2009). Indeed, all the paradigmatic oscillations in public administration is to and fro the traditional bureaucratic paradigm. As noted by Lane (1994) as cited by Wu and He (2009, p. 21), "while various "new" paradigms may introduce new dimensions, the bureaucratic paradigm continues to provide an indispensable foundation in the field. The governance orientation therefore, provides the new dimension of participation and working with various networks. The government therefore governs through collaboration of the hierarchical bureaucracy and networks to achieve not only efficiency but other important values that should be the concern of government.

The term governance is, therefore, employed to describe some fundamental processes of modern government that are distinct from the way "governments" traditionally operate. It consists of broad political processes where citizen and group participation in government policy and programmes is vital (Ikeanyibe, 2016). Stoker (1998) explains that the Anglo-American administrative culture uses the term government to refer to the formal institutions of the state and their monopoly of legitimate coercive power, while governance reflects a shifting pattern in styles of governing in which the boundaries within and between public and other sectors have become blurred. Like the NPM, the role of government still rests on steering not rowing (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992). This, according to Ikeanyibe (2016), entails the use of other sectors (profit and not-for-profit) for the actual rowing of the boat (provision of services) while the government steers (regulates and coordinates). Significantly, the operating mechanism in governance orientation does not rest on the recourse to sanctions and authority and suggests that the institutional/constitutional governing perspective is limited and misleading (Ikeanyibe, 2016). Unlike the NPM however, the governance orientation rather than rely solely on the efficacy of the private sector and business managerialism, focuses on the role of non-governmental actors and networks in producing public goods and services. It seeks to reconfigure the role of the public sector through citizen participation and network governance (Wu & He, 2009). The perspective challenges conventional assumptions which focus on government as if it were a "stand-alone" institution divorced from wider societal forces, and draws attention to the increased involvement of the private and voluntary sectors in service delivery and strategic decision-making, responsibilities that were previously the near exclusive responsibility of government have been shared.

In all, governance entails a devolved (decentralisation/sharing of power and functions) mode of service delivery, the unit of analysis of which is a network of nonprofit organizations, private firms and other governmental units or levels (Ewalt, 2001). Essentially, governance involves partnership in carrying out governmental functions. Such partnerships include local residents, community/regional-serving organizations, the public sector, and the private sector (Gibson, 2011, p. 4). Stoker (1998, p. 18) has advanced five critical and dilemmatic propositions that have largely become like principles of the governance paradigm. These are:

(1) A network of institutions and actors from within and beyond government.

(2) The blurring of boundaries and responsibilities for tackling social and economic issues. This shift in responsibility goes beyond the public–private dimension to include notions of communitarianism and social capital.

(3) Power dependence among institutions involved in collective action. Organizations are dependent upon each other for the achievement of collective action, and thus must exchange resources and negotiate shared understandings of ultimate program goals.

(4) The autonomous self-governing networks of actors.

(5) The capacity to get things done which does not rest on the power of government to command or use its authority.

These more or less reflect in various orientations that are qualified as governance. However, in spite of this generalised conception of governance, it will be academic incontinence to admit consensus

in usage of the term governance or even practical applications, hence the variants of governance in such strands like good governance, network governance, and collaborative governance.

## 3. Models of governance

As noted above, despite the agreement about a shift to the governance paradigm and what it entails, the term has appeared in literature with a number of meanings. This is on account of the diverse views of analysts (as well as practitioners) of how the basic thrust of governing or steering the economy and society should be done and the range of possibilities for providing that steering (Peters, 2003) and the background of the various usages of the term which cut across most social sciences. The literature contains a number of significant models of governance as applied to public administration. Indeed, in the tradition of NPM some analysts have sought to apply various usages of the term in private sector usually discussed as corporate governance) to the public sector. For the public sector specifically, Gibson (2011) observes that multitude of additional forms of governance are documented in the literature, including good governance (Leftwich, 1994; Weiss, 2001), partnership, collaboration and networks (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Stoker, 1998), and contemporary governance (Magnette, 2003). Each model of governance proposes a slightly different emphasis, which makes the models more or less appropriate depending on the local context. We share briefly explain the following:

(1) Governance as government.
(2) Good governance.
(3) Governance as good enough governance.
(4) Collaborative, partnership, network governance.

### 3.1. Governance as government

It may still be argued that there is little difference between government and governance. Most dictionaries define the two terms as synonymous. What government has been doing is governance and indeed you cannot have governance without a government. In this context, the meaning or explanation of governance as "government without government" by some scholars (e.g. Al-Habil, 2011) is unacceptable. It becomes easy to grasp that the existence of civil society and the third sector and their involvement in government processes have been there even in the most traditional era of public administration. Also, even in the shift to governance approach, the government is still central taking the initiative to integrate other actors towards achieving the purpose of government. Thus while admitting a paradigm shift in which the meaning of governance cannot be regarded as synonymous again with government (Rhodes, 1996), it is important to recognise basic model of governance from which the paradigm shift is proceeding. Despite the changing notion of the term, today many would still use governance to gauge how the basic institutions of government performs and how much services are provided to the citizenry, without so much implying the use of networks or communities. Kauzya and Balogun (2005, p. 2) for instance used the term to refer to reinvention of government and public service reforms in Africa. They posit that

> In recent years, several African countries have implemented far-reaching governance and public service reform measures. These measures have touched almost every aspect of the continent's political life—from the way governments are elected and changed, through the workings of the three (i.e. the executive, the legislative and the judicial) branches of government, to the role that civil society plays in holding state functionaries to account. The reforms have not stopped with the expansion of the political space, but have moved further to promote and/or accelerate the revitalization of the public service.

## 4. Governance as good governance

In his preface to the World Bank (1994, p. xii) study on Sub-Saharan Africa, the then President of the Bank, Barber Conable explains "good governance" as a "public service that is efficient, a judicial system that is reliable, and an administration that is accountable to its public." The term was subsequently popularized by International Organisations and donors from this period in their bid to chart

a developmental path for countries of the Sub-Saharan Africa and the new countries that emerged following the disintegration of the Soviet Union in Europe. Maldonado (2010) recalls that the collapse of the Berlin wall on 9 November 1989 set off the disintegration of the Soviet Union which as a consequence thereof also led to the decay of the political and economic alliances of the Eastern bloc. These political changes created the breeding ground and gave way for a serious discussion on how a state has to be designed in order to achieve (economic) development, i.e. a discussion on good governance. Similarly, he posits that in the 1980s, the economic performance of the countries in Sub-Saharan Africa had worsened despite the implementation of the World Bank's Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAP) leading to a shift in the Bank's and other international donors' lending policy. These conditions essentially stressed the importance of political leadership, democracy, human rights and transparency and accountability reforms. Maldonado (2010) remarks that the term "governance" was first used to describe the need for institutional reform and a better and more efficient public sector in Sub-Saharan countries. It was not just less government as pushed by the SAP and NPM reform paths but better government. The term therefore appeared mainly as a political and technocratic reform term and suggests that governance should be "good" and not "bad" (Ladi, 2008). To realise this "goodness" requires adopting certain principles, some of which have been tested in developed Western countries. These principles according to The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) and the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC) (2013) consist the following:

(1) Acting in the public interest: government entities should act in the public interest at all times, which entails strong commitment to integrity, ethical values, and the rule of law and openness and comprehensive stakeholder engagement.

(2) Defining outcomes in terms of sustainable economic, social, and environmental benefits;

(3) Determining the interventions necessary to optimize the achievement of intended outcomes;

(4) Developing the capacity of the entity, including the capability of its leadership and the individuals within it;

(5) Managing risks and performance through robust internal control and strong public financial management; and

(6) Implementing good practices in transparency and reporting to deliver effective accountability.

Thus while recognising the need for stakeholder engagement or involvement of non-governmental bodies in government processes as the other models of governance, the good governance model emphasizes the importance of the role of government officials to act in the public interest through effective and visionary leadership, integrity, transparency and accountability. Hence the definition of the term by World Bank (World Bank, 1994, p. vii) as follows:

> Governance is epitomized by predictable, open, and enlightened policymaking (that is, transparent processes); a bureaucracy imbued with a professional ethos; an executive arm of government accountable for its actions; and a strong civil society participating in public affairs; and all behaving under the rule of law.

Most good governance measures enforced by international donor agencies through their lending conditions therefore required the establishment of democratic ethos, corruption fighting measures, accountability and transparency reforms. These more than anything else, have driven the sundry reforms that are witnessed in most of these countries since the 1990s. The good governance model has some relationship with the traditional meaning of governance as the responsibility of government. It only re-accredits important ingredients for this role in a new world order of triumphant liberal democracy and markets.

## 5. Governance as "good enough governance"

Following the introduction of a new concept and model of governance by Merilee Grindle in a paper prepared for the World Bank in 2002, an emerging trend in development practice and studies recommend "the good enough governance" as an alternative to the good governance emphasis. Thus in the face of ample difficulties to sufficiently achieve the good governance principles in developing countries, Grindle (2010) observes that the popularity of the idea of good governance has far outpaced its capacity to deliver and muddied the waters of thinking about the development process. She (Grindle, 2002, p. 1) had ruminated that

> Getting good governance calls for improvements that touch virtually all aspects of the public sector—from institutions that set the rules of the game for economic and political interaction, to organizations that manage administrative systems and deliver goods and services to citizens, to human resources that staff government bureaucracies, to the interface of officials and citizens in political and bureaucratic arenas. Getting good governance at times implies changes in political organization, the representation of interests, and processes for public debate and policy decision-making. Not surprisingly, advocating good governance raises a host of questions about what needs to be done, when it needs to be done, and how it needs to be done

Achieving these tasks are overwhelming in the complex environment of most of the countries requiring speedy development especially where "there is little guidance about what's essential and what's not, what should come first and what should follow, what is feasible and what is not." (Grindle, 2002). Yet development, service delivery, policy formulation and programme management, and poverty reduction cannot wait until all these reform necessities are put in place. Experts and donor agencies therefore, have come to recast the good governance as the good enough governance, a "condition of minimally acceptable government performance and civil society engagement that does not significantly hinder economic and political development and that permits poverty reduction initiatives to go forward" (Grindle, 2002, p. 2). She (Grindle, 2010, pp. 4–5) further advises that:

> Good governance is a useful concept. It calls needed attention to the institutional underpinnings of effective economic and political management. Yet this laudable idea has become conflated with the capacity to generate growth, alleviate poverty, and bring effective democracy to peoples in poor countries. Rather than discarding it because it has become inflated, scholars and practitioners should instead seek a reasonable understanding of what good governance can deliver—and what it cannot. They should also assume more realistic expectations about how much good governance can be expected in poor countries struggling with a plethora of demands on their capacities to pursue change.

The World Bank (see Fritz, Kaiser, & Levy, 2009) and other international donor agencies have begun to appreciate in good measure the need for incremental problem-driven solutions to the multifarious challenges facing public policy and development generally in the poorer countries of the globe. Fritz et al. (2009, p. viii) on behalf of the World Bank advance what they describe as "Good Practice Framework" (GPF) or the Governance Political Economy (GPE) Analysis which in the main recognises that "politics and political economy influence whether and how reforms happen—in developing as well as developed countries" and therefore, fast tracking development in developing countries requires not quick fixes but problem driven approach that focuses on particular challenges. Grindle (2007, p. 554) equally explain "that not all governance deficits need to be (or can be) tackled at once and that institution and capacity building are products of time … Good enough governance means that interventions thought to contribute to the ends of economic and political development need to be questioned, prioritized, and made relevant to the conditions of individual countries." The good enough governance, does not necessarily provide any short circuit to development, policy development, programme implementation or service delivery or to issues of good governance. It is merely advocating for the use of incremental and contingent approach and prioritization in the pursuit of good governance given the reality of limited resources of money, time, knowledge, and human and organizational capacities. Grindle (2005) tries to bridge the gap between the good governance model and the good enough governance model by suggesting that the utility and feasibility of particular

governance interventions can be assessed by analyzing the context for change in governance and the implications of the content of the intervention being considered. The model aligns with the political economy approach which according to Brown (2009), matters more than technical issues. He explains that a political economy analysis is not the same as the conventional good governance considerations which look at *how* a country is doing, whether it has transparent finances, respects human rights or the rule of law, and whether it provides access to justice. While these issues may be important, they do not constitute essential conditions for the success of governance. What does is politics. In his insightful remark regarding aid grants and administration to poor countries, Brown (2009, p. 1) avers,

> Development *changes* the ways in which wealth and resources are produced, used and distributed. In doing so, development *transforms* existing social and power relations; it creates winners and losers. Pro-poor development challenges vested interests and interest groups. Countries seldom urbanise and industrialise without political conflict and ideological struggles. And as countries "develop", new classes are formed, new expectations are created and new political settlements are wrought. Given this political context, effective aid is politically savvy aid. Our development programmes, projects and policies will deliver *more development*, help *more people escape poverty* and help *more people realise their rights if* we embed our engagement in the political economies of the countries in which we work.

The good enough governance model therefore does not only advocate for paying attention to condition of minimally acceptable government performance and civil society engagement that does not significantly hinder economic and political development as Grindle (2002, 2007, 2010) proposes, it underscores the importance of contextualizing the content of governance or development issues by "asking more politically astute questions" (Brown, 2009). The model therefore, further underscores the relevance of politics and value issues as vital elements of public administration.

## 6. Governance as partnerships, collaboration, networks

The new governance model refers to the emphasis on the use of networks, partnerships, collaborations and very many other terms that underscore governance as an external engagement rather than an internal processes of organisations. This model involves public organisations engaging with stakeholders in collective decision-making processes in a formal, consensus-oriented and deliberative way (Berkett, Challenger, Sinner, and Tadaki (2013). Scholars studying governance and collaboration see the importance and merit of using networks in studying a new governance paradigm where public administrators work across the sectors and judicial boundaries (Hwang & Moon, 2009). The model is defined by Ansell and Gash (2008, p. 2) as an "arrangement where one or more public agencies directly engage non-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage programs or assets". The key tenet is that the work of government, whether in terms policy formulation, implementation, service delivery, at various levels—global, national or local—should be a product of inclusive partnership of government, private sector and civil society. The various applications constitute nuances of usage which generally do not deviate much from this core tenet. Tim Cadman (n.d., p. 2) integrating the views of other scholars, explains this paradigm thus:

> Modern governance is portrayed as essentially social political in nature, and defined as "more or less continuous processes of interaction between social actors, groups and forces and public or semi-public organizations, institutions or authorities". Interaction is key, and is identified as a series of "co"-arrangements between state and non-state actors, more oriented towards collaborative approaches to problem solving. In such models the transmission of information and knowledge and its valuation by those involved plays a central role; and deliberation rather than directives has become an alternative mechanism of dealing with the complexity and ambiguity of political and social problems.

Important highlights include the following:

(1) The collaborative governance forum is initiated by public agencies or institutions,

(2) Participants in the governance forum include non-government actors,

(3) Participants engage directly in the decision-making process, not just consulted,

(4) The governance forum is formally organized and meets collectively,

(5) The governance forum aims to make decisions by consensus, and

(6) The focus of collaboration is on public policy or public management.

The Partnership Governance and Accountability General Report (Accountability, 2006, p. 7) shows that the reasons for the use of governance partnerships or networks include:

(1) Improved efficiency, such as: optimizing the division of labor or delivering on development impacts of scale;

(2) Improved effectiveness, such as: leveraging skills and resources and innovating on methods and means of delivery of public goods;

(3) Increased equity in process and outcome such as: building community-level institutional structures, networks and capacities to enable local control, as examples.

Thus, partnerships, offer the potential to deliver outcomes that single organizations cannot, or to do so more efficiently. Like other governance models, the aim of governance partnership is to achieve good governance or effective and efficient public administration. Processes aim at securing defined mission by participatory decision-making of all stakeholders, *accountability directly linked to performance standards and assessments*, accountability of partners to their own stakeholders; partner to partner accountability and accountability of the partnership to its stakeholders and beneficiaries (Partnership Governance and Accountability General Report, 2006). This is essentially why these new approaches are also described as the public value management model (Moore, 1995). Public value can be created in different ways, but more importantly, by starting with the group of people in question and involving them in discussing and defining how they can contribute to and benefit from the creation of public value (Todorut & Tselentis, 2015). The model fundamentally emphasize the fact that public administration is insufficiently flexible, innovative and creative. And this missing link could well be realised through use of networks, collaboration and partnerships. The perspective reflects the perception that the previous organizing models of the public sector neglected the civil society and public positioning as a passive receiver of public goods or as a simple consumer on a huge market (Todorut & Tselentis, 2015).

## 7. Governance challenges and the Nigerian national question

The Nigerian nation has experienced various leadership changes which have also explored various political and administrative reforms to achieve some measure of development. Most analysts would however, agree to a failed expectations in developmental strides despite abundance of human and material resources. Invariably, governance at its various models has not impacted on development. A number of factors account for this governance failure. The objective of this work is not to add to the vast quantity of literature on poor developmental strides of the country and its failed political and administrative leadership, but to identify the practice or not of the new governance paradigm. This paradigm of course is represented by the last model discussed above - governance as partnerships, collaboration, networks. It will be over-generalization to say that it is practiced or not yet practiced in Nigeria. This is because Nigeria is made up of different public administration systems including in principle one federal government, 36 seconds tier or state government administrations and 774 supposedly autonomous third tier local government public administrations. Invariably, some of these autonomous public administration systems in one way or another engage non-state actors for governance purposes (see Ikeanyibe, 2016). It is also obvious that a good number of

Development Programmes funded by International Donor Agencies since the 1990s operate in accordance with this international fad. See for example the collaborative governance of Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) programmes in some states in the country by World Bank and WaterAid Nigeria (World Bank, 2000; WaterAid Nigeria, 2013).

Nigeria is a very complex country with intense diverse ethnic constitution and diverse interests. Of course accommodating the interests of all these sundry groups in policy and government processes and services is no mean task. The idea of quota and federal character as means of power sharing and employment have been tied to administrative law and practice from the Nigerianization policy of late 1950s. Yet this fundamental approach towards inclusive government have not provided adequate benefits of participatory governance. According to Kendhammer (2014, p. 1), both quota and federal character principles "enforce a highly discriminatory 'indigeneity' system that privileges ethnic origins over federal citizenship". Despite the efforts made by the military elite during the long military rule in the country to diffuse the importance of ethnic origins by artificially structuring the federation according to some arbitrarily created states and local governments, primordial cleavages still dominate government processes. The cries of marginalization along ethnic lines persist and the calls for resolving what has become commonplace as the national question much more frequent than even in the early history of the country as an independent nation. Yet, a governance as collaboration/partnership model should aim at integrating all these cleavages. Though governance within the realm of public administration applies to organizational processes, we are prone to believe that if the political structure of government cannot be settled, then the challenge of the structure of governance at the organizational level could be at risk. This is because it is still the interest of those stakeholders that have not seen themselves as being part of the nation that the government organisations are to preserve and serve. Governance practice should be seen to radiate from the very foundation in which a state is structured down to the processes and methods employed by state institutions. Just as the new governance paradigm entails the involvement of private sector organizations and civil society actors as crucial elements of service delivery and permits the actors involved to have some say over the manner in which the services are delivered, if not necessarily in the actual content of the services to be delivered (Peters, 2003), so should the government of a country or state/provincial level recognise the involvement of all the groups that are part of the constituents. A key question about the issue of governance in Nigeria therefore is whether the willingness and collaboration of all parties and stakeholders to the country's sovereignty have been properly secured? To what extent has the federal structure been accepted by all stake holders in respect of the recurrent call for the restructuring of the country?

The issue of restructuring the Nigerian federation has been recurrent. Some constitutional conferences have been commissioned by government to address some of the issues, albeit with the usual caveat of "no go areas", that is, issues that cannot be discussed by such conferences. We consider this caveat and even the failure to take serious the recommendations of such conferences as hindrance to the governance question in general, and more restrictively to governance as network/partnership/collaboration in Nigeria. Governance model advocates for responding to stakeholders' concerns in a legitimate way. A key challenge of the country's government and governance processes has been that pre-colonial autonomously living groups were welded together as one country through the brute power of colonialism and had since then been forcefully kept as such with little room for negotiation of the basis of unity and governance under the long military rule and its legacy of no negotiation to the unity of the country. The military distorted the federal structure of the country. While the creation of states and local governments are meant to enhance the country's federalism by granting autonomy to various groups beyond the three major regions defined under the colonial government, the truth remains that this approach has succeeded in balkanizing and worsening the cleavages in the country by compounding the problem of boundaries (Ikeanyibe & Njoku, 2006). The new federalism in Nigeria based on multiplicity of states and local governments was defined under the centralising rationale of various military regimes. Now the contention of constitutional supremacy between the federal government and states over the local governments have not helped matters. Despite the so called third tier status of local government, experts still find the

Nigerian local governments as better described as an arm of the state governments. This is a fallout of the military style of centralized decentralisation where it is assumed that it is the federal government that can properly delegate and decentralize powers, functions, and resources. In a federation, this is supposed to be negotiated rather than unilaterally doled out by a federal government that was formed from bottom-up conscription of groups.

Invariably the federal structure of Nigeria, which is constantly challenged by the call for restructuring draws attention to the poor foundation of governance base for the country. Ryan Gibson (2011) avers that governance, whether in rural or urban areas, emerged principally from the criticism of large central governments' inability to accommodate the preferences of diverse communities or regions. The multiplicity of opinions represented throughout rural communities in large jurisdictions, such as a province or country, has proven difficult for central governments to address. At the local and regional level, residents, community-serving organizations, and the private sector have sought new forums of decision-making. The Nigerian governance dilemma not just in terms of the most recent paradigm oscillation in public administration but in terms of broad issues of governance of the country, must be founded on clear principles of consent and inclusiveness.

Kauzya and Balogun (2005) observe that though several African countries, Nigeria inclusive, have implemented far-reaching governance and public service reform measures in recent years (these measures have touched almost every aspect of the continent's political life—from the way governments are elected and changed, through the workings of the three (i.e., the executive, the legislative and the judicial) branches of government, to the role that civil society plays in holding state functionaries to account), much more remains to be done to reposition governance and public administration institutions for the emerging challenges. Our take is that a major governance issue that needs to be attended to is to re-negotiate the basis of most states in Africa.

## 8. Conclusion

Despite the use of the term governance to refer to the new approach to public service processes since the 1990s that entail the use of networks and partnerships in public service delivery, the concept remains key to understanding the foundation of the relationship between the government and the citizens of a country. Governance and public administration systems hinge on a number of things including leadership, especially, the capacity of the leadership class to build broad-based national and regional coalitions and channel energies towards the realization of the citizens' welfare (Kauzya & Balogun, 2005). The paradigmatic shifts in public administration depicts various efforts of governments to adopt and adapt to new and better ways to satisfy the yearnings of their public and the scholarly attempts to rationalize those approaches. The new governance paradigm does not say less. As Kauzya and Balogun (2005, p. 9) further remarks, "the sticky point, as far as governance reform is concerned, is how to build a consensus around some enduring socio-political values and traditions." Building this consensus as we have shown in the case of Nigeria in this essay requires open discussion about the basis of nationhood. While sovereignty of a nation remains sacrosanct, freedom of an individual or any group of people seems to be a higher value. That is why an individual has a right to seek for citizenship of another country. Similarly, the right to self-determination should be available to various groups that became members of the Nigerian federation by sheer force of exploitative colonial project. Perhaps, a re-visit of the colonial balkanization and restructuring of the basis of statehood of the country, which had remained a recurring decimal in the history of the country could be a radical way to lay a solid governance foundation. If the relationship of Scotland with England since the twelfth century and the eventual unification of England, Scotland, and Wales in 1707 as the Great Britain could still be revisited through the Scottish Independence Referendum of 2014, then it is too early to start paying attention to the cries of self-determination going on in parts of Nigeria, Africa and the rest of the world as a way to resolve persistent governance crisis in these countries.

**cogent** •• social sciences

**Author details**
Okey Marcellus Ikeanyibe[1]
E-mail: Okey.ikeanyibe@unn.edu.ng
Ogbonnaya Eze Ori[1]
E-mail: ezeori.ogbonna@gmail.com
Arinze Emmanuel Okoye[1]
E-mail: arinzeokoye1@gmail.com
[1] Department of Public Administration and Local Government, University of Nigeria Nsukka, Nsukka, Nigeria.

**Citation information**
Cite this article as: Governance paradigm in public administration and the dilemma of national question in Nigeria, Okey Marcellus Ikeanyibe, Ogbonnaya Eze Ori & Arinze Emmanuel Okoye, *Cogent Social Sciences* (2017), 3: 1316916.

**Corrigendum**
This article was originally published with errors. This version has been corrected. Please see Corrigendum (http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2017.1334294).

**References**
Accountability. (2006). *Partnership governance and accountability: Reinventing development pathways.* London: The PGA Framework PGA General Report. Retrieved from www.pgaframework

Al-Habil, W. (2011). Governance and government in public administration. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research, 3*, 123–128. Retrieved from http://www.academicjournals.org/jpapr

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18*, 543–571.

Archer, R. (1994). *Markets and good government: The way forward for economic and social development.* Geneva: UN Non-Governmental Liaison Services.

Basheka, B. C. (2012). The paradigms of public administration re-examined: A reflection. *Journal of Public Administration, 47*, 8–25.

Berkett, N., Challenger, I., Sinner, J., & Tadaki, M. (2013). *Values, collaborative processes and indicators for freshwater planning.* Auckland: Auckland Council National Policy Statement Freshwater Management Implementation Programme.

Brown, T. (2009). Politics matters: Political economy and aid effectiveness. *The IDL Group.* Retrieved November 12, 2014, from www.theidlgroup.com/.../Politics_Matters_final_NORAD_talk.pdf

Cadman, T. (n.d.). *Evaluating the quality of contemporary global governance: A theoretical and Analytical framework.* Retrieved October 20, 2016, from http://www98.griffith.edu.au/dspace/bitstream/handle/10072/49003/82273_1.pdf?sequence=1

Derlien, H.-U. (1999). On the selective interpretation of Max Weber's concept of bureaucracy in organization theory and administrative science. In P. Ahonen & K. Palonen (Eds.), *Dis-Embalming Max Weber.* SoPhi: Jyväskylä.

Ewalt, J. A. G. (2001). *Theories of governance and new public management: Links to understanding welfare policy implementation.* Paper Prepared for presentation at the Annual Conference of the American Society for Public Administration Newark, NJ. Retrieved April 11, 2016, from http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/ASPA/UNPAN000563.pdf

Farazmand, A. (2002). *Preface. Administrative reform in developing nations.* Westport: Praeger.

Fritz, V., Kaiser, K., & Levy, B. (2009). *Problem-driven governance and political economy analysis: Good practice framework.* Washington, DC: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank.

Gale, T. (1968). *Public administration.* International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. Retrieved September 26, 2016, from http://www.encyclopedia.com/topic/Public_administration.aspx

Gaus, J. M. (1950). Trends in the theory of public administration. *Public Administration Review, 10*, 161–168.

Gibson, R. (2011). *A primer on collaborative multi-level governance, Canadian regional development: A critical review of theory, practice and potential.* Retrieved March 20, 2016, from https://cdnregdev.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/primercollaborativemultilevelgovernance-gibson.pdf

Goodnow, F. J. (1900). *Politics and administration: A study in government.* New York, NY: Macmillan.

Grindle, M. S. (2002). *Good enough governance: Poverty reduction and reform in developing countries.* Paper Prepared for the Poverty Reduction Group of the World Bank.

Grindle, M. S. (2005). *Good enough governance revisited: A report for DFID with reference to the governance target strategy paper, 2001.* Retrieved September 9, 2016 from https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/events-documents/1281.pdf

Grindle, M. S. (2007). Good enough governance revisited. *Development Policy Review, 25*, 533–574. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7679.2007.00385.x

Grindle, M. S. (2010). *Good governance: The inflation of an idea* (Working Papers No 202). Centre for International Development at Harvard University.

Gulick, L. H. & Urwick, L. F. (1937). *Papers on the science of administration.* New York, NY: Harcourt.

Henry, N. (1975). Paradigms of public administration. *Public Administration Review, 35*, 378–386. https://doi.org/10.2307/974540

Henry, N. (2007). *Public administration and public affairs* (10th ed.). New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India.

Hwang, S., & Moon, I. (2009). Are we treating networks seriously? *The Growth of Network Research in Public Administration & Public Policy.* Retrieved on October 21, 2016, from https://www.insna.org/PDF/Connections/v29/2009_I-2_P-4-17.pdf

Ikeanyibe, M. O., & Njoku, I. (2006). Conflicts and national unity: An appraisal of Nigeria's nation building policy and conflict management method. In D. G. Omotor, F. A. Sanubi, & A. I. Ohwona (Eds.), *Readings in conflict management and peace-building in Africa* (Vol. 1). Abraka: Faculty of Social Sciences, Delta State.

Ikeanyibe, O. M. (2016). Uniformity in local government system and the governance model in Nigeria. *Journal of Asian and African Studies.* 1–15. doi:10.1177/0021909616666105

International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. (1968). *Public administration.* Encyclopedia.com. Retrieved September 26, 2016, from http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1G23045001014.html

Kauzya, J. M., & Balogun, J. (2005). *Governance and public administration reforms and innovations in African countries: A Focus on Achievements, Setbacks and Future Directions.* Regional Forum on Reinventing Government in Africa: Repositioning the Public Sector for the Challenges of NEPAD. 17–19 January 2005. Sandton Convention Centre. South Africa, Johannesburg.

Kendhammer, B. (2014). Citizenship, federalism and power sharing: Nigeria's federal character and the challenges of institutional design. *Ethno Politics: Formerly Global Review of Ethno-politics, 13*, 396.

Ladi, S. (2008). *Good governance and public administration reform in the black sea economic cooperation (BSEC) member states.* Athens: International Centre for Black Sea Studies.

**cogent** ·· social sciences

Landau, M. (1962). Political science and public administration: 'field' and the concept of decision-making. In S. Mailick & E. H. van Ness (Eds.), *Concepts and Issues in Administrative Behavior* (pp. 1–28). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lane, J. E. (1994). Will public management drive out public administration? *Asian Journal of Public Administration, 16*, 139–151.

Leftwich, A. (1994). Governance, the state and the politics of development. *Development and Change, 25*, 363–386. https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.1994.25.issue-2

Magnette, P. (2003). European governance and civic participation: Beyond elitist citizenship? *Political Studies, 51*, 144–160. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.00417

Maldonado, N. (2010). *The World Bank's evolving concept of good governance and its impact on human rights*. Doctoral workshop on development and international organizations, Stockholm, Sweden, May 29–30, 2010. Retrieved October 3, 2016.

Moore, M. (1995). *Creating public value: Strategic management in government*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Peters, B. G. (2003). The changing nature of public administration: From easy answers to hard questions. *Viešoji Politika ir Administravimas, 5*, 1–1.

Rhodes, R. (1996). The new governance: Governing without government. *Political Studies, 44*, 652–667. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1996.tb01747.x

Simon, H. A. (1947). *Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making processes in administrative organization* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Stoker, G. (1998). Governance as theory: Five propositions. *International Social Science Journal, 50*, 17–28. https://doi.org/10.1111/issj.1998.50.issue-155

Tamayao, M. J. M. (2014). What is governance? *Law, Politics, and Philosophy*. Retrieved October 7, 2016, from https://tamayaosbc.wordpress.com/2014/08/21/what-is-governance/

The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) and the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC). (2013). *Good governance in the public sector—Consultation draft for an international framework*. Retrieved September 23, 2016, www.ifac.org

Todorut, A. V., & Tselentis, V. (2015). Designing the model of public value management. *Proceedings of the International Management Conference, 9*, 74–80.

Walsh, K., & Stewart, J. (1992). Change in the management of public services. *Public Administration, 70*, 499–518.

WaterAid Nigeria. (2013). *Annual Report 2012-2013*. Retrieved September 26, 2016 from www.wateraid.org/ng/~/media/Files/Nigeria/ANNUAL-REPORT-FY-2012-13.pdf?

Weiss, G. T. (2001). Governance, good governance and global governance: Conceptual and actual challenges. *Third World Quarterly, 21*, 795–814.

Wilson, W. (1887). The study of administration. *Political Science Quarterly, 2*, 197–222. https://doi.org/10.2307/2139277

Wilson, W. (1953). The study of administration. In Dwight Waldo (Ed.), *Ideas and issues in public administration* (pp. 65–75). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

World Bank. (1994). *Governance: The world bank's experience*. Washington, DC: Author.

World Bank. (2000). *Federal Republic of Nigeria: Water Supply & Sanitation Interim Strategy Note*. Retrieved September 26, 2016 from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/NIGERIAEXTN/Resources/wss_1100.pdf

Wu, X., & He, J. (2009). Paradigm shift in public administration: Implications for teaching in professional training programs. *Public Administration Review, 6*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227699058. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2009.02085.x