

## **GOVERNANCE CRISIS IN NIGERIA: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF CO-PRODUCTION AS PANACEA FOR SERVICE DELIVERY**

**Femi POPOOLA, Ph.D.**

Department of Public Administration  
Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria  
E-mail: popefemi@yahoo.com

### **Abstract**

*In the wake of independence of Nigeria in 1960, hopes and expectations were high that the project Nigeria was on the threshold of good governance. However, within a few years, the high hopes and lofty expectations of independence were dashed and frustrated resulting in governance crisis which manifested in several ways including civil war, large scale corruption, prolonged military rule, poor service delivery etc. Social service delivery which, indeed, stands as one of the hallmarks of good governance has consistently and progressively declined qualitatively and quantitatively. Despite various policies and huge resources committed to service delivery, there have been little positive results. It is against this backdrop that this paper examines and analyses the progressive degeneration of crucial social services that dots the landscape of the country. The paper focuses on five key social services which are: road, water, electricity, health care and education. It also examines the bureaucratic institutions of state administration that have become so centralized with the citizens largely relegated and irrelevant in decision-making on service delivery matters that concern them. The paper further presents an empirical analysis of co-production as a possible solution to poor and inefficient service delivery in the country. The paper concludes on a note that co-production becomes inevitable if service delivery will become effective and efficient.*

### **1.0 Introduction**

In the wake of independence of the Nigeria in 1960, hopes and expectations were high that the project Nigeria was on the threshold of good governance. Within a few years however, these high hopes and lofty expectations of independence were dashed and frustrated. Good governance has since become a mirage. At the federal, state and local government levels, governance crisis of frightening proportion has become entrenched. McGinnis (1999) defined governance as the way society, as a whole, manages the full array of its political, economic and social affairs. By shaping the incentives facing individuals and local communities, governance either facilitates or hinders economic development. Nigeria's full array of political, economic and social affairs is poorly managed. Indeed, Nigeria's governance hinders her economic development. Oyovbaire (2007) observed that the crisis of governance has indeed, engulfed virtually every department and dimension of the Nigerian state and society. Incessant political crisis, with increasing intensity, most especially those of 1963, 1983, 1993 and the unending depressed and ailing economy have put, perhaps perpetually, Nigeria's governance in serious danger. The incursion of the military into governance has actually aggravated governance crisis in Nigeria.

The attendant consequences of governance crisis are far greatly felt in the area of social service delivery. What obtains today is that the crisis of governance has given birth to another crisis – the crisis of service delivery. There is increasing dysfunctional infrastructure at all levels of government in the country. Good governance is the effective exercise of power and authority by government in a manner that serves to improve the quality of life of the people. (Obadina, 2000). This declaration is also reinforced by Oyovbaire (2007) that governance is about the use of power and authority to affect the human condition. It enables society to maintain, sustain and improve the quality of life, as well as the transformation of the physical environment. Effective and efficient delivery of services is basic to qualitative living for all people. One definite responsibility of any government is to facilitate qualitative and quantitative service delivery to its citizenry. The ability of a government and its agencies to deliver services to its people effectively and efficiently has become one of the hallmarks of good and democratic governance. When social services are delivered, the development of various units and communities is enhanced and the quality of life is improved. Despite yearly budgetary allocations and formulation of various policies on service delivery, there has been little development and there seems to be a progressive degeneration of the existing social services.

It is disheartening to note that the observations of Olowu on the state of social services in Nigeria are still valid after thirteen years.

Olowu (1996) observed that the country's public utilities, as a social sector have virtually collapsed. The education system is epileptic; hospitals have degenerated into mere consulting clinics. Water which is the most elementary human need is very scarce in rural and urban areas. The services rendered by National Electric Power Authority (now Power Holding Company of Nigeria (PHCN) is a subject of continuous lamentation by the citizens. In year 2009, the decline in government's ability to deliver qualitative and quantitative social services has continued. Oyovbaire (2007) declared that:

“the roads, existing roads and not new ones, in spite of trillions of money supposedly expended on them by the three tiers of government, have, remained a caricature. Electric power supply to household, business, even to government and especially to the huge informal sector of our society and economy is a disaster and shame”.

The decline in service delivery is perhaps, felt more at the local level. This stems from the fact that Local Government (LG) which is the closest to the citizens has failed in meeting the basic needs of the people – good roads, potable water, regular electricity supply, qualitative healthcare delivery and education. Close on the heels of this is poor or non-maintenance of existing social services. Indeed, in some instances, the responsibility of maintenance of facilities is often left to the community where they are located.

With this prevailing decline in governance capacity and consequent decline in the delivery of social services, community people are using their organizational capability to evolve strategies of meeting their own basic needs. Since there has been increasing realization that government appears unable to deliver and maintain social services for the people on a sustainable basis, people in various communities of the country, especially at the local level, have been organizing themselves into town/village unions and community development associations with the intent of delivering social services to their communities. However, finance has been their major constraint. The need for various community-based organizations to collaborate with their local and state governments, using synergy and co-production strategy, has become imperative.

It is against this backdrop that this paper presents an empirical analysis of co-production as a solution to poor and inefficient service delivery. The paper focuses on five basic social services which are: road, water, electricity, healthcare and education. The paper is organized into five sections. While the first section is the introduction, the second section reviews relevant literature. The third section presents an empirical data of co-production as a solution to poor and inefficient service delivery-at the local level in Nigeria, followed by section four which is the analysis and interpretation of the data. Section five concludes with discussion of findings and some recommendations.

## **2.0 Literature Review**

Berry (2004) identified the single most important challenge to development facing fierce and other difficult environments today as the challenge that the state does not have the capacity to supply services to poor people. The formal structures of government both in rural and urban areas have increasingly become a fiction in governance. This is because the services they are providing have declined in quality and quantity (Erero, 1996). Wunsch and Olowu (1995) ascribed the crisis of governance to the failure of centralized state. The pattern of governance – centralization. – put in place by the colonial masters and which was transferred to the ruling elites in the country has consequently led to a centralized strategy of delivering social services even at the local level. The genesis of the crisis of service delivery is traceable to the exclusion of the citizens from participating actively, either in decision-making process or at the implementation stage, or both. The relevance of community-based groups in the management of their own affairs has been relegated virtually. It will however be a hyperbolic position to attribute the failure of poor service delivery to centralization. Other factors have equally contributed to it. These include corruption, lack of accountability and poor responsive leaders at the various levels of government.

Plattner (2004) in one of his major works declared that a state, through its form of government, has to be able to deliver the benefits expected of it ranging from economic growth, to education, to personal and national security. A state that is incapable of discharging these functions effectively is regarded as a failing state. Rabinovich (1996) and Akinola (2004) observed that local governments are perhaps, the most relevant government to the local people given the fact that it is the closest to the grassroots, hence most effective conduit for the public's problems. They noted that however, rather than improving the lots of the local people and respond to their needs through effective delivery of social services, LGs appear to have failed in this respect.

This failure can largely be attributed to mismanagement of resources, lack of responsiveness and poor accountability together with bad leadership. The increasing realization of the insensitivity and unresponsiveness of the LGs to the plight of the community with regards to effective social services, community-based organizations are springing up into what Osaghae (1994) called “alternative state structures in the civil society (ethnic unions, religious and regional groupings) which provide the succour needed at a time like this”. These community-based organizations play very important and active roles in the social and economic development of their communities such as generation of revenue and labour mobilization for community projects, building of schools and health centres, construction of roads and bridges as well as providing security. Despite the commendable roles of the CBOs, they are not without challenges, weaknesses and limitations. Paramount among these is what Olowu, Ayo and Akande (1991) identified as “the free-rider problem” which means that some communities’ members do not contribute anything (financially or morally) to the delivery of social services. They only benefit from such social services when they are delivered. They also identified financial problem as another major limitation which is largely due to the nation’s dwindling economy from the mid 1980s. This financial problem is seriously hindering community-based organizations in delivering more social services. The implication of this is that several CBOs are looking on to their LGs for financial assistance.

With the increasing realization of the failure of government and its agencies and the limitations of the CBOs, the critical question is: what is the way forward? Several scholars have proffered some possible solutions. Mamadou Dia (1996) recommended the convergence of both the formal government institutions and community institutions as the “viable option”. According to him, if the two could come together, they would make meaningful impact on development. To some, the answer lies in polycentricity (McGinnis, ). To Wunsch and Olowu (1995) the answer is in breaking the monopoly of the provision and delivery of goods and services by centralized bureaucracies through effective decentralization. Presumably, such decentralization would have a greater potential for co-production (collaborative production of goods and services by producers and users) in the areas of healthcare delivery, education and socio-economic infrastructure. Co-production strategy is not altogether a new phenomenon in Africa in general and Nigeria in particular. Indeed, it had been in operation since the colonial and post-independence periods. Olowu (2002) declared that in the colonial and immediate post-independence periods, governments and non-governmental organizations were involved in the production of major services like health and education services. Scholars of public administration have been showing renewed interest in co-production since the 1980s. It is also the argument of some of these scholars that social services are best delivered by the government and people jointly.

Thomas (1999) observed that by the early 1980s, co-production had become the concept of choice for discussions of citizen participation in public administration. Many public services are best produced not by government alone but by government and citizens jointly. For instance, the police by themselves cannot prevent crime. Crime prevention is possible only if citizens actively collaborate with the police, in effect co-producing crime prevention. Olowu (2002) also reinforced this view when he observed that many African governments are forging strong partnership with people’s organization for the delivery of public services. Schools and health clinics are being returned to their original proprietors, mainly religious institutions and communities, and they are being encouraged to build new ones, with the governments providing policy guidelines and support in some cases. The full benefit of co-production strategy needs to be intellectually explored and exploited to engender effective delivery of services. The study undertaken by this researcher revealed that the strategy is warmly acceptable to the people at the local level.

### **3.0 Theoretical Framework**

This paper adopts Governance Theory as the framework for analysis. According to Hyden and Court (2002), governance refers to the formation and stewardship of the formal and informal rules that regulate the public realm, the arena in which state as well as economic and societal actors interact to make decisions. They explained that governance deals with the constitutive side of how a political system operates rather than its distributive or allocative aspects that are more directly a function of policy. Good governance is characterized by accountability and transparency in the conduct of public affairs most especially in the execution of policies and decisions on public goods and services. In Africa, the crisis of development has been described as a “crisis of governance” by the World Bank (2003). Africa’s democratic experience grapples with its form of political leadership which is characterized by corruption, authoritarianism and violence. This, it is believed is visible in varying degrees in virtually all African countries and this has contributed to the present economic and political violence, repression and famine in Africa.

To the World Bank, good governance is synonymous with sound development management while bad governance has lack of accountability and transparency as its elements. Taken together, good governance is linked to socio-economic performance. The crisis of governance has affected negatively the quantity and quality of public goods and services delivered in Africa. The crisis of governance has generated the crisis of service delivery. Effective and efficient delivery of social services forms a part of the features of good governance. The success or failure of government is measured by its ability to deliver social services to the people effectively and efficiently. One strategy of service delivery which some public administration experts and scholars have promoted is co-production strategy. It is believed that if the capacity of community-based groups is supported and reinforced by governance structures, they will be motivated and development will highly likely become sustainable.

#### **4.0 Empirical Data of Selected States of Southwestern Nigeria Scope of the Study**

An empirical study was conducted in nine (9) local government areas of three (3) selected states of Southwestern Nigeria. The study did a comparative analysis of local government and community-based organizations (CBOs) in the delivery of social services in selected states of Southwestern Nigeria. In all, three (3) states were purposively selected from the six (6) states that make up Southwestern Nigeria. The states were: Ogun (created in 1976); Osun (created in 1991) and Ekiti (created in 1996). The selection of the states was informed by their years of creation and the cultural affinity of those states. For instance, the selected states from each axis can fully represent other states in terms of historical background, cultural affinity and language. Nine (9) local government areas (one per senatorial district) were covered by the investigation in the three states.

Data were generated from the leaders of Community Development Councils (CDC), the umbrella body for all CBOs in the selected LGAs, and from the senior staff of local government on GL 07-15. The CDC leaders were the coordinators of service delivery (road, water, electricity, health care and education) in their respective LGAs. The senior staff of local government on GL 07-15 sampled was directly involved in the delivery of social services in the selected LGSs. Four hundred and forty (440) copies of questionnaire (Set A) and five hundred and eighty two (582) questionnaires (Set B) were administered to the leaders of CDC and the senior staff of LGAs respectively. Interview method and observation technique were employed to reinforce the questionnaire method.

#### **Objectives of the Study**

The specific objectives of the study were to

- (i) compare local government delivery of social services with community delivery of social services in selected states of Southwestern Nigeria between 1997 and 2005; and
- (ii) examine the relevance of co-production strategy in the delivery of social services in the study area.

#### **Data Presentation and Discussion of Findings**

##### **Hypotheses Testing**

The hypotheses formulated for the study were tested. Respondents' (CDC Leaders and Local Government Senior Staff) views were sought on the hypotheses formulated. The two categories of respondents were made to respond in terms of strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree and strongly disagree to the questions set on the hypotheses.

##### **Hypothesis 1**

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There is no difference between local government and community-based organizations in terms of social service delivery in the areas of study.

**H<sub>1</sub>:** There is a difference between local government and community-based organizations in terms of social service delivery in the areas of study.

In testing hypothesis one, three (3) items in Section B, Part B of Questionnaire (Sets A and B) were used and subjected to Chi-square analysis at 0.05 level of significance. The results obtained are presented in Table 1.

From table one, the results revealed that the trend is towards the same direction. There was a significant difference among the groups. Therefore, the hypothesis which stated that there is no difference between local government and community-based organizations in terms of social service delivery in the areas of study was accepted.

**Table 1: Table Showing Chi-Square Analysis of Hypothesis 1**

S/N	Item	Category of Respondents	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Chi-Square Value (X <sup>2</sup> )	Degree of (df) Freedom	Probability Value (P)
1.	The degree of relationship between local government and CBOs is mutual.	CDC Leaders	8	94	62	139	95	118.206	4	0.000
		LGSS	27	97	154	211	33	239.149	4	0.000
2.	Local government and CBOs deliver social services in your local government area.	CDC Leaders	7	32	45	229	85	390.492	4	0.000
		LGSS	29	67	98	224	104	205.261	4	0.000
3.	Community-based organizations deliver social services more than local government at the local level.	CDC Leaders	77	81	44	142	54	73.181	4	0.000
		LGSS	112	104	88	164	54	61.487	4	0.000

**Source:** Fieldwork

It was earlier stated that the bulk of the CDC leaders and LG senior staff reported that they disagreed with the assertion that the degree of relationship between local government and CBOs is mutual. Majority also disagreed that local government and CBOs only deliver social services in their LGAs. We also have the bulk of these respondents disagreeing that community-based organizations deliver social services more than local government at the local level. Further analysis using one sample chi-square statistic showed that the opinions differ significantly. We therefore, uphold the null hypothesis which stated that there is no difference between local government and community-based organizations in terms of social service delivery in the areas of study. Further observation into the responses on the items used in hypothesis 1 revealed that majority of respondents in the two categories of respondents converged on the negative affirmation that:

- i. the degree of relationship between local government and CBOs is not mutual.
- ii. not only local government and CBOs deliver social services in their local government area.
- iii. community-based organizations do not deliver social services more than local government at the local level.

### Hypothesis 2

**H<sub>0</sub>:** Adoption of co-production strategy between local government and community-based organization will not lead to a more effective approach in the delivery of social services.

**H<sub>1</sub>:** Adoption of co-production strategy between local government and community-based organizations will lead to a more effective approach in the delivery of social services.

In testing this hypothesis, four (4) items in Section B, Part B of Questionnaire (Sets A and B) were used and subjected to Chi-square analysis at 0.05 level of significance. The results are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: Table Showing Chi-Square Analysis of Hypothesis 2**

S/N	Item	Category of Respondents	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Chi-Square Value (X <sup>2</sup> )	Degree of (df) Freedom	Probability Value (P)
4.	Local government and CBOs should deliver social services jointly to the people.	CDC Leader	183	164	19	10	22	372.477	4	0.000
		LGSS	251	170	30	19	52	396.257	4	0.000
5.	Local government and CBOs make operational rules for joint delivery of social services.	CDC Leader	58	132	82	64	62	47.377	4	0.000
		LGSS	45	109	173	158	37	150.107	4	0.000
6.	There is a need for collaboration between local government and CBOs in the delivery of social services.	CDC Leader	121	254	15	2	6	599.764	4	0.000
		LGSS	252	224	24	6	16	575.203	4	0.000
7.	Collaboration between local government and CBOs in the delivery of social services ensures effectiveness and efficiency in the delivery and maintenance of social services.	CDC Leader	110	259	24	3	2	604.136	4	0.000
		LGSS	215	259	22	9	17	571.487	4	0.000

**Source:** Fieldwork

The results in Table 2 revealed that there was a significant difference among the groups on the items. By implication, the hypothesis that stated that adoption of co-production strategy between local governments and community-based organizations will not lead to a more effective approach in the delivery of social services was rejected. Earlier, it was stated that the bulk of the CDC leaders and LG senior staff reported that they strongly agreed with the assertion that Local Government and CBOs should deliver social services jointly to the people. A good number of respondents also felt that local government and CBOs make operational rules for joint delivery of social services. Furthermore, the bulk of the CDC leaders and LG senior staff strongly agreed to the assertion that there is a need for collaboration between local government and CBOs in the delivery of social services. Also, majority of respondents among the CDC leaders and LG senior staff agreed with the assertion that collaboration between local government and CBOs in the delivery of social services ensures effectiveness and efficiency in the delivery and maintenance of social services. Further analysis using one sample chi-square showed that the views of respondents on whether collaboration between local government and CBOs will ensure effectiveness and efficiency differ significantly. Hence, the null hypothesis which stated that adoption of co-production strategy between local government and community-based organizations will not lead to a more effective approach in the delivery of social services is rejected. The alternative hypothesis, which stated that adoption of co-production strategy between local government and community-based organizations will lead to a more effective approach in the delivery of social services, is accepted.

Further observation into the responses on the items used in hypothesis 2 revealed that majority of respondents in the two categories of respondents affirmed that:

- i. local government and CBOs should deliver social services jointly to the people;
- ii. local government and CBOs make operational rules for joint delivery of social services;
- iii. there is a need for collaboration between local government and CBOs in the delivery of social services; and
- iv. collaboration between local government and CBOs in the delivery of social services ensures effectiveness and efficiency in the delivery and maintenance of social services.

### Interview

The interview method was utilized to complement information from the structured questionnaires. In all, 27 people were interviewed. Of these respondents, 18 were Community Development Councils' Leaders. These leaders were nine chairmen and nine secretaries. The CDC is the umbrella body for all the CBOs in the selected LGAs. The CDC leaders serve as link between CBOs and Local Governemnts. Their responsibilities, among others, include holding of meetings with their respective CBOs, monitoring of on-going projects and presenting the requests and required assistance of the CBOs to the LGs. On the other hand, nine (9) LG Senior Staff—Chief/Principal Community Development Inspectors-- in all the selected LGAs were interviewed. They headed their various Community Development Departments/Units in all the nine (9) selected LGAs. They not only serve as link between the LGs and CDCs, they also liase between them on all Community Development projects being implemented by the LGs or the CBO.

**Table 3: Table Showing Analysis of Respondents Interviewed**

	State	Local Government Area	Community Development Councils' Leaders (Chairmen and Secretaries of CDCs)	Local Government Senior Staff (Chief/Principal Community Development Inspectors)
1.	Ekiti	Ado LG	2	1
		Ido-Osi LG	2	1
		Ikere LG	2	1
2.	Ogun	Abeokuta South LG	2	1
		Sagamu LG	2	1
		Yewa North LG	2	1
3.	Osun	Olorunda LG	2	1
		Atakumosa West LG	2	1
		Egbedore LG	2	1
	<b>Total</b>		<b>18</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Overall Total</b>			<b>27</b>	

Source: Fielwork

### Discussion of Findings

Service delivery in all the LGs involved the Federal, State and Local Governemnts.

However, LGs whose statutory responsibility is to deliver social services to the people at the local level have not been able to meet the requirements of the people. There was a preponderance of response that LGs alone could not shoulder the responsibility. According to the respondents, communities would have to wait endlessly if they are expecting the LGs to meet their basic needs. Majority of the respondents agreed unanimously that the CBOs should be actively involved for they are the ones who would identify their pressing needs. Apart from this, the CBOs would not only appreciate any social services delivered but would also ensure their safety. The researcher discovered that a form of relationship existed between the LG and the CBOs. Though they complement each other in service delivery, the relationship however was a superordinate- subordinate one. Majority of the respondents stressed that the relationship had become greatly politicized. Politicians had rubbished the cordial relationship that existed earlier. They claimed that LG officials had shifted attention from the CBOs to the politicians. In Ekiti and Ogun States, respondents stated categorically that the work of LG had been based on politics and politicians were the ones undertaking everything.

With respect to the need for collaboration between LG and CBOs, in the delivery of services, all the respondents unanimously agreed that there should be collaboration. They asserted that collaboration between them would foster meaningful and sustainable development. It would also ensure effective implementation and management of social services delivered, and efficient maintenance. They stated categorically that the LGs owned the communities organized into CBOs and CBOs owned the LG. The two would not function properly without the other, hence they must collaborate. Majority of respondents opted for counterpart funding. In Ogun State, counterpart funding has been introduced. According to the Principal Community Development Inspector, Abeokuta South LG, counterpart funding would operate on this formula: State Government – 50%, Local Government – 30%; and CBOs – 20%. To facilitate this arrangement, the Ministry of Community Development and Co-operatives had been established in Abeokuta, the State capital. This step would ensure formal recognition for the CBOs and would be seen by the LG as worthy partners in progress.

In Ekiti State, counterpart funding has not only been introduced but implemented. For instance, the Erifin Community Water Scheme in Ado-Ekiti LGA of Ekiti State was delivered through counterpart funding by Ekiti State Community-based Poverty Reduction Agency (EKCPRA)/Local Government and CBOs. The agency received fund from the World Bank and the Federal Government of Nigeria and was operating in five other states in Nigeria. The water scheme was maintained with great efficiency judging from the observation of the researcher. The fetching of water from the numerous taps was supervised by a permanent staff. Each family wanting to fetch water was made to pay a token of five naira daily regardless of the volume of water fetched. The taps were opened for use at two particular periods of the day-morning and evening. Proceeds were used for regular maintenance purpose. The arrangement guaranteed regular supply of potable water. The researcher observed that community members welcomed and supported the arrangement. Majority of the respondents recommended that a consultative committee comprising LG senior staff and CDC leaders should be set up in each LGA. This committee, according to the respondents would spell out the specific roles of each group. They would hold constant consultations regularly on what social services should be delivered, provision of a suitable place to site the project, funding, labour, logistics, manpower and maintenance arrangements. In summary, all the respondents subscribed to the co-production strategy as panacea for effective and efficient delivery of the five basic social services (road, water, electricity, healthcare and education) in particular and all other social services in general.

### **5.0 Concluding Remarks and Policy Implications**

The paper discussed governance crisis in Nigeria and its attendant consequences on social service delivery most especially at the local level. It also presented an empirical analysis of co-production as a way forward in ensuring effective and efficient delivery of social services, most especially, road, water, electricity, healthcare and education. Governance crisis has not only engendered poverty and hardship; it has also robbed people of their happiness and left them hopeless. In concluding this paper, some suggestions are offered that will stem the tide of governance crisis and launch Nigeria on the path of effective and efficient delivery of key social services to the citizenry most especially at the local level. The recommendations are:

- i. The crisis of governance that gave birth to the crisis of service delivery has to be tackled headlong and with sincerity. There is need to embark on effective decentralization policy that would discourage over-concentration of power and resources in the central government. Centralization has to be jettisoned. Concentration or over-concentration of power in the central government relegates the relevance of community-based organizations that incidentally have organizational abilities to get things done.

Institutional structures must be put in place that will empower CBOs and bring them into governance especially at the local level.

- ii. Accountability and transparency must be the watchword of all functionaries of government involved in service delivery. The fact remains that corruption, embezzlement and misappropriation of public funds are killers of service delivery. Public office holders, most especially at the local level caught in these nefarious acts should be punished severely to serve as deterrent to others. Anti-graft agencies like the EFCC and ICPC should move into LGAs to arrest public officials involved in these nefarious acts and make them to face the full wrath of the law. In fact, the researcher recommends that capital punishment should be brought into contemplation for killers of service delivery.
- iii. Local Governments and CBOs should collaborate and make their collaboration to be more effective through appropriate machinery using co-production strategy to delivery social services. The LGs own the communities and the communities own the LGs. Both need to come together to plan development better and ensure speedy and effective delivery of social services. They need to come together into partnership to deliver services jointly under a mutual agreement and arrangement. We recommend counterpart funding of projects-ninety percent (90%) for LG and ten percent for the CBOs.
- iv. Functional consultative committee that comprises senior staff of LGs and leaders of the CDC should be set up. This committee can also serve as monitoring committee on social services. This can be done by the Federal Government in conjunction with state and Local Governments. The committee should be charged with the responsibility of receiving regular reports from each LGA in the country on social services, inspection of social service projects and submission of proposals on the necessary actions to be taken. Actions could be political, economic or legal. The activities of each LGA should be published by the committee with accurate and timely information, and disseminated to the people. This will go a long way to ensuring effective delivery of social services.

The paper concludes that the solution for effective and efficient delivery of social services in Nigeria lies largely in effective adoption and implementation of collaborative approach between the government and community-based groups especially at the local level.

## References

- Akinola, S.R. (2004) "Local Self-Governance as an Alternative to Predatory Local Government in Nigeria" in *International Journal of Studies in the Humanities* Onitsha. International Association of Studies in the Humanities. Vol. 3. No. 1, pp. 47,58.
- Berry, C., Forder, A., and Moreno-Torres (2004) *Approaches to Improving the Delivery of Social Services in Difficult Environments*. U.K. Department for International Development. p. 5.
- Dia, M. (1996) *Africa's Management in the 1990's and Beyond: Reconciling Indigenous and Transplanted Institutions*. Washington D.C. The World Bank.
- Erero, J. (1996) "Return to the Source: Towards Improved Governance in Nigeria" in *African Journal of Institutions and Development*. Vol. 2. No. 1. Ile-Ife. Nigeria pp. 1-2.
- Hyden, G. and Court, J. (2002) "Comparing Governance Across Countries and Overtime: Conceptual Challenges" in D. Olowu and S. Sako (eds) *Better Governance and Public Policy. Capacity Building for Democratic Renewal in Africa*. Kumarian Press
- McGinnis, M.D. (1999) "Introduction" in Michael F. McGinnis (ed) *Polycentric Governance and Development*. Readings from the Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis. The University of Michigan Press. Pp. 1-3, 24.
- Obadina, Tunde (2000) "Africa's Crisis of Governance" in *Africa Economic Analysis* [www.afbis.com/analysis/crisis.htm](http://www.afbis.com/analysis/crisis.htm). p. 4.
- Olowu, D. (1996) "Bureaucracy and the People: The Nigerian Experience". Inaugural Address, Ile-Ife University Press.
- Olowu, D. (2002) "Public Service Delivery" in Ladipo Adamolekun (ed) *Public Administration in Africa*. Spectrum pp. 127-128,134,135.
- Olowu, D., Ayo, S.B. and Akande, B. (eds) (1991) *Local Institutions and National Development in Nigeria*, Ile-Ife. University Press.
- Osaghae, E.E. (1994) "Introduction: Between the Individual and the State in Africa: The Imperative of Development" in Eghosa Osaghae (ed) (1994) *Between State and Civil Society in Africa*. Dakar CODESRIA Book Series, pp. 10 and 13.
- Oyovbaire, Sam Ejite (2007) "The Crisis of Governance in Nigeria" A Convocation Lecture delivered on the 23<sup>rd</sup> Convocation Ceremony of the University of Port-Harcourt, Port-Harcourt, Nigeria on 15<sup>th</sup> March. pp. 5, 7, 21, 22.
- Plattner, M.F. (2004) "The Quality of Democracy. A Skeptical Afterword" in *Journal of Democracy*. The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore. Vol. 15, No 4. p. 108
- Rabinovitz, F.F. (1996) *City Politics and Planning*, New York, Atherton.
- Thomas, J.C. (1999) "Bringing the Public into Public Administration: The Struggle Continues" in *Public Administration Review*. Jan./Feb. Vol. 59. No. 1. p. 83.
- World Bank (2003) *World Development Report 2004: Making Services Work for Poor People*. Washington. World Bank.
- Wunsch, J. and Olowu, D. (ed) (1995) *The Failure of the Centralized State*. San Francisco, California. ICS Press.