

Public Administration, Governance and Socio-Economic Development in Nigeria

Okon Effiong Enemi, PhD

Department of Public Administration, University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria

Email: enemiokon@gmail.com

+234-8138844931, +234-8054135993.

Abstract

This paper seeks to assess and analyze how public administration and governance promote socio-economic development in Nigeria. Balogun (1983) defined public administration to mean the Marshalling of human and material resources in order to achieve the set goals and objectives of public policy. It is through public administration and good governance that needs and aspiration of the people can be met in order to improving living standard and well-being of the populace. Good governance therefore, creates enabling environment for socio-economic development to thrive. The adoption of elite model aided in expatiating policy making process which reflects the values of the governing elite as against the values of the masses. However, it was noticed that corruption and inconsistencies in government programmes grossly affected socio-economic development from past to present governments. Therefore, the objective of this paper is to examine how public administration and governance can translate into or bring about sustained socio-economic development in Nigeria. Nevertheless, descriptive method was found appropriate for this paper. In conclusion, it was found out that since 1960 till date, social investment programmes initiated by past and present government failed to achieve its objectives of improving people's standard of living, reduce poverty, creates employment opportunities and economic inequalities due to high leveled corruption, lack of accountability, politicization, elites influence, inconsistency in government programmes and political instability among others. It was recommended that; government should pay more attention to human capital development as a factor that drives any socio-economic development processes. However, corrupt practices at all strata should be diminished because corruption is anti-development.

Keywords: public administration, governance, socio-economic and development.

Introduction

This paper aims at considering how public administration and governance facilitate processes of socio-economic development in Nigeria. An assessment of the past and present government's policies and programmes from 1960 till date would be considered and their impact in improving living standard of Nigerians (Beneficiaries). However, the first section deals with defining key concepts such as public administration, governance and socio-economic development and used elite theory to expatiate issues for clearer understanding. Finally, a review on the impact of past and present government policies and programmes on citizenry with regard to reducing poverty, unemployment and inequality and how these policies and programmes have translated into socio-economic developing as prerequisite to improving living standard of Nigerians.

Concept clarifications

Public Administration. By public, I mean what concerns or belongs to all the people in a society and is open to all and is well known by all members in the society, community or state which every member has access or right to enjoy. Such as public schools, public hospitals, markets, road, public water supply etc. Administration on the other hand is simply to manage, control and coordinate individuals and groups with the aim of achieving a desire or set out goal Akpama (2004). It is a determined action taken in pursuit of a conscious purpose and it is the systematic ordering of affairs and the calculated use of resources aimed at making those happen which one wants to happen. Administration could be seen as the process of getting

thing done through people in a corporate system. It involves planning, organizing and directing groups of people to achieve desired goals... the goals for which the organization is set up. Ngu (2014). Administration also involves aggregate processes such as planning, organizing, coordinating, directing, controlling and budgeting.

Public administration therefore, is defined as the co-ordination of individual and group effort to carry out public policy. Piffner and Presthus (as cited in Akpama (2004). Leonard White (1986) noted that public administration consists of all those operations having for their purpose the fulfillment or enforcement of public policy. Balogun (1983) defined public administration as the marshalling of human and material resources in order to achieve the set goals or objectives of public policy. Woodrow Wilson (1887) noted that public administration is a detailed and systematic application of law. It deals with bringing to bear the intention and programme of government to address aspiration and needs of the people in society using available resources either internally or externally to accomplish them. This inter-plays the relationship between politics and administration. While the former (politics) deals with who gets what, when and how, administration on the other hand concerns itself with the implementation of policies and programme of government through the bureaucrats.

According to UNDP governance is “the exercise of economic, political and administrative authority to manage a country’s affairs at all levels. This comprises all mechanisms, processes and institutions, through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations and mediate their differences. This implies and involves the activities of stakeholders such as government agencies, private sectors and civil society organizations (CSOs) in management of resources to facilitate process of meeting needs of citizenry. Eminue (2005) refers to governance to mean “the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country’s economic and social resources for development”. However, World Bank and International agencies now prefer to use the concept good governance. Hence, Saito, (2021) sees good governance as governing systems that are capable, responsive, inclusive, and transparent. It refers to the set of principles, policies and institutions that manage the economic, political and social aspects of a society, through interactions between the state, civil society and private sector.

Public administration and governance therefore, are closely related because both evolve around the activities of Legislature, Executive and Judiciary. The legislators make laws or formulate public policies while Executive (bureaucrats) implement such policies and programmes on the other hand Judiciary (Judges) interprets the law. So, effective and efficient public administration or governance at all levels (National, State and Local Government) seek to promote socio-economic development. In view of this, the civil societies and other powerful groups or individual play key roles in influencing and or shaping public policy (Public administration) and strengthen governance structure by ensuring maintenance of status-quo for socio-economic development.

On the other hand, the concept of socio-economic means the interaction between the social and economic habits of a group of people. Socio refers to the study of the behaviour of people, including the ways they interact with one another or their family structure while economic refers to the economy such as people’s income and finances. <https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/socioeconomic> Development in this context is seen as a state in which things are improving. Development is a term that can be interpreted in different ways and in various fields such as social sciences, biological science, arts and technology, and others. However, in the socio-economic context, development refers to the enhancement of people's standards of living through better education, higher incomes, skills development, and employment opportunities. It is a process of economic and social

transformation that is influenced by cultural and environmental factors. According to Todaro (as cited in Ujo 2000 and Ngu 2014), ‘Development is a multidimensional process involving the reorganization and reorientation of the entire economic and social system. This involves, in addition to improvement of income and output, radical changes in institutional, social and administrative structure as well as in popular attitudes, customs and beliefs’.

It is a positive process of comprehensive transformation of economic, political and socio-cultural values and or institutions towards substantial amelioration of societal vales Ngu (2014) Socio-economic development, therefore, is the process of social and economic development in a society. It is measured with indicators, such as gross domestic product (GDP), life expectancy, literacy and levels of employment. Olukayode (2014) Socio-economic development is also a sustained or concerted actions of policy makers and communities aimed at promoting the standard of living and economic health of a specific area. Such actions include the development of human capital, critical infrastructure, regional competitiveness, health, safety, literacy and other initiatives.

In view of the above, public administration is a machinery through which government performs its functions and renders social services to the populaces. It details out the intentions and programmes of government and the means available internally and externally to accomplish them. Hasan (2019) noted that governance and public administration are two key concepts that are intertwined. The traditional use of “governance” and its dictionary meaning is synonym with “government” signifying the exercise of authority over a territory or system, or in an institution, a state, or an organization. It is an act or state of governing a place. It refers primarily to government, and one of the pillars of government is public administration. The relationship between public administration and governance is expressed in policy making and implementation process that ought to meet the needs and aspirations of the public. Ideally, the process of policy making supposed to be all inclusive as inputs from relevant stakeholders are necessary. However, the making of public policies and the decision of who gets what, when and how are embedded in political actors while the implementation of such policies rest on the bureaucrats/executive with impact transcending to beneficiaries (public). It is the administrative process that is sensitive, transparent, inclusive and accountable to the people that can be termed good governance. Therefore, good governance means producing results that meet society's needs and make efficient use of resources. The concept of good governance implies that, principle of inclusiveness, participation and accountability among others are what the electorates desire from their leaders at national, states, and local governments. It is disappointing that in Africa and African countries one cannot pick out outstanding leaders that are transparent and accountable to the electorate but the characteristics of bad governance overwhelmed that of good governance because of leadership or administrative idiosyncrasy.

Theoretical framework

Elite Theory: According to elite theory (elitism) public policy can be regarded as the value and preferences of the governing elite. The elite theory assumed that there are two classes or groups in the society. The group that governs and the governed or rules and the ruled. Those that rule is few and perform all political functions while those that are ruled constitute the masses. The significant issue about the elite theory is that power is in the hands of the few who are the governing elites and they impact greatly in policy making process. Based on this, it posits that public policy is a reflection of the value and preferences of a governing elite meaning that policy making processes by the political elites is not a reflection of the interest of the governed but the governing elites. Woodrow Wilson (1887) in Eminue (2005) gave a clear dichotomy between policy and administration, that administration lies outside

the sphere of politics and ‘that administration questions are not political questions. According to Goodnow politics is the expression of the will of the state while administration is the execution of that will. Ejue (2001). This is why, politics determines who gets what, when and how while administration deals with getting things done (ie implementation of public policies). Hence, administration and governance are systems that translate government programmes’ objectives into improving the living standard of the people. The relevance of this theory to this work therefore is that, it aids in understanding why government policies, projects and programmes first address the preferences of the policy makers (the elites) because policy makers consider their values and preferences as against that of the masses resulting to failures of the programme at implementation stage. Hence, the political elites ignore the principles of inclusiveness and participation of other stakeholders like CSOs that would have represented interest of the masses or governed.

However, the functions of public administration ranges from provision of essential social services (health, education, provision of safe drinking water etc.) maintenance of law and order, security/protection of life and property among others. The dysfunctionality, inefficient and ineffective public administration and governance in Nigeria are products of corruption, lack of accountability and transparency by political elites including lack of participatory governance, insensitivity of government on issues relating to social welfare such as education, health and security among others. According to transparency international corruption perception index, Nigeria has been consistently rated among the most corrupt countries in the world. In 2011, Nigeria was ranked 143 out of 183 countries. In 2012, Nigeria was rated 139 out of 176 countries and in 2013, Nigeria was ranked 144 positions out of 177 countries. In 2014, Nigeria was rated 136, In 2015 Nigeria was rated 136, in 2016 rated 136 out of 170 countries, 2017 rated 148, in 2018 Nigeria was rated 144 out of 180 countries, 2019 Nigeria was rated 146, 2020 rated 149, in 2021 Nigeria was rated 154 out of 180 countries while in 2022 Nigeria ranked 150. These rating are attributed to corruption and bad leadership which grossly affected socio-economic development of Nigeria.

Corruption

Seymour & Gabriel cited in Ojo 2014) described corruption as ‘efforts’ to secure wealth or power, through illegal means, for private gain at the public expense; or a misuse of public power for private benefit. Victor (2007) noted that corrupt practices include behavior such as bribery, nepotism and misappropriation (illegal appropriation of public funds or resources for private uses). Nigerian leaders in position of power, often times tend to dehumanize, oppress and influence the judicial system as well as law enforcement agencies to avoid arrest and or prosecution through adoption of immunity clause. It is worthy to state that, corruption has a multifaceted dimension under which it operates and this grossly affects or destroys socio-economic development in Nigeria. For instance, every financial year Nigeria’s budget is projected and or allocated in trillions at both National and state levels to key sectors of the economy such as Agriculture, health, education, power/energy, transport, water supply among others. Including international loans borrowed or looted funds refunded but at releases and or implementation stages, nothing substantial is shown to justify the budget. Is it not why our educational system and health sector are collapsing? what happens to procurement processes especially education and health sectors facilities? what happens to resources allocated to road construction in Nigeria, what happens to the power/energy sector that a Nigerian child born today can unconsciously shout NEPA when there is power outage blackout? poor road networks across South-South, South-East regions are deathtraps, let alone public water supply and sanitation. what stop political elites treating common ailment in Nigeria’s hospital but travel abroad? Is this not the process of corruption and bad leadership? why unemployment, poverty, inequality in the midst of plenty? why housing problem? why insecurity in the land?

These are few questions that our leaders or public administrators must answer. If the above questions are unanswered, it means Nigeria's government has failed or political elites have equally failed. However, the process of socio-economic development is feasible when all these are put in place.

1. **Immunity clause.** This is one of the backbones to corruption in Nigeria, immunity clause as enshrined in the constitution is enjoyed by our political leaders or office holders in Nigeria. It is a serious political loophole that serves as a conduit pipe for looting our treasuries for personal gains at the detriment of the public or masses. This immunity clause is a cover to Mr President, Vice President, Governors, Deputy Governors and other political elites to loot public treasury and use resources within their power without sanction while in office.

2. **Inefficient service delivery.** This has impact on human and socio-economic development, considering the basic services such as education, health, electricity, water and sanitation among others. This refers to poor performance of key sectors of the economy that truncated viability of socio-economic services. According to Nash and Nash (2003 cited in Essien 2015), effective service delivery entails the provision of basic social services and amenities to the citizenry in such a way that their expectations are met. Effective service delivery therefore is rendering services that correspond to the citizen's desires, needs and expectations. Failure to this, is inefficient service delivery, as can be seen in poor performance of government parastatal and agencies in Nigeria such as defunct National Electric Power Authority Now Port Harcourt Electricity Distribution Company (PHEDC) with dilapidated power supply. The inefficient service delivery by NNPC to sufficiently supply petrol and kerosine to Nigerians to drive their small-scale business enterprises remain a big challenge. Poor road networks maintenance affects movement of goods/services from one point to another, at the state level, such agencies as Cross River State Water Board, Calabar Urban Development Agency (CUDA) are ineffective and inefficient in-service delivery and are performing below expectations. However, their existence and impacts are not felt.

3. **Lack of Accountability:** This implies none/lack of accountability by public holders/political elites to render account of their stewardship to the citizenry. The looted funds from Nigeria's treasury by past leaders and refunds made by Swiss Bank cannot be accounted for appropriately. The elected, selected or appointed public office holders have refused and failed to be accountable to electorates from the National, States and Local Government Areas. According to Lawal & Owolabi (2012) cited in Essien (2015) "The problem of Africa's Development is a crisis of governance; because state officials have served their own interests without fear of being called to account. This can be exemplified by the amount of money looted from the country's treasury from leaders and public officers.

4. **Insensitivity of government.** This applies to unresponsiveness of leaders to the plight and yearning of the citizens who elected them. For instance, high cost of living due to hike in prices of petroleum product (petrol, kerosine and cooking gas and epileptic power supply). These adversely affected socio-economic activities of Nigerians and have crippled economic growth as prices of goods and services tripled. The insensitivity of government became so obvious when no attention or concern is paid to ASSU and Nigerian students as educational system collapses due to frequent strike actions by labour unions including ASSU about their earn allowances, poor funding of the tertiary institutions and dilapidated facilities or infrastructure in health sector. Government remains insensitive about constant brain drain in both academic and health sectors. Medical Doctors and other health workers are daily living the country for greener pasture in foreign countries due to underemployment and underpayment with inadequate health facilities being provided while our leaders still travel to USA, UK, India etc. for medical check-ups. It might happen that Nigerian elites who embark on medical tourism may be attended to by the same Nigerian health personnel. This result is usually attributed to the characteristics of a failed state.

5. Failed State. This applies to when government can no longer protect life and property of the citizens (insecurity) provide adequate health and educational facilities, provide enabling environment for business to thrive, fails to maintain good sanitation, effective waste management which doubled diseases burden as well as address high unemployment, poverty and inequality rates.

Effects of bad governance

First, it created the conditions such as rampant corruption, violation of human rights and absence of rule of law. It leads to insecurity such as insecurity challenges in the North East, North West, Plateau and Benue states including kidnapping, activities of herdsmen that claimed lives, ritual killing and robbery etc. Others are lack of transparency and accountability which resulted to the END-SARS youths protest that started in October 2020 across the country. poverty, unemployment and inequality.

However, good governance has the following characteristics:

1. Participation. This means that citizens have rights irrespective of gender to participate in decision making or is represented by person or persons capable of representing their interest, especially most vulnerable groups.
2. Rules of law. This implies impartial legal system that protect human right, fair and just to all citizens irrespective of status
3. Responsiveness. this involves institutions responding to their stakeholders within a reasonable period of time to serve their needs and aspiration appropriately
4. Consensus orientation. Good governance considers different interest and reach consensus to foster unity in diversity for the best interests of all especially when it concerns policies and matters of public interest.
5. Equity and inclusiveness. Here, every person is expected to be included and empowered to improve his/her human person
6. Effectiveness and efficiency. Institution produces result needed and optimal use the available resources
7. Accountability. By this, every institution is accountable to people, whether it is government, private sector or non-governmental organization. They are accountable to their relevant stakeholders
8. Transparency. This means leaders are expected to be opened to citizens, so that they understand means and manners which resource allocated and decisions are made and have access to information.

As highlighted above, good governance supposed to be participatory, observes rule of law, be transparent and responsive, be consensus, adopt principle of equity and inclusiveness, effective, efficient public administration and governance.

The major functions of public administration/governments all over the world are; Maintenance of law and order, protect lives and properties, provide social infrastructural facilities such as education, basic health care, provide water and good road etc. According to World bank (1997) as cited in Eminue (2005) good advisers and technical experts would formulate good policies, good governments implement such policies for the good of society. So, good and sustainable policies are necessary for economic development of any country. Diamond cited in Aly (2014) noted that good governance requires political will rather than material. Every government can create an independent administration, and every parliament can pass counter corruption commission and electoral laws, giving citizens freedom of information and requiring that officials declare his/her assets. He noted that, governance is more than a governmental activity; it is a new social contract based on partnership between

government, private sector and different civil society organizations which entails better mobilizing for society's capabilities, and more rationality for public administration affairs. Governance embodies diversity, multitude, public accountability, respect of law and human rights; and also promotes visibility, integrity and people participation (Affandi, 2008 cited in Aly 2014). Good governance therefore is the prerequisite for socio-economic development of any nation. Midgley (2014 cited in Ndangwa (2015) sees social development as a process of planned social change designed to promote the well-being of the population as a whole within the context of a dynamic multifaceted development process. According to New Brunswick (2008-2009) Social development means investing in people. It requires the removal of barriers so that all citizens can journey toward their dreams with confidence and dignity. It is about refusing to accept that people who live in poverty will always be poor. It is about helping people to move forward on their path to self-sufficiency. On the other hand, economic Development is the creation of wealth from which community benefits are realized. It is more than a jobs program, it's an investment in growing economy and enhancing the prosperity and quality of life for all residents. CALED (2020) Seidman (2005) summarizes economic development as "a process of creating and utilizing physical, human, financial, and social assets to generate, improve and broadly share economic well-being and quality of life for a community or region. It implies the process by which a nation improves the economic, political, and social well-being of its people. Socio-economic development, thus, is a process of improvement in a variety of ways. It has to influence all aspects of human life in a country. It is measured with indicators, such as GDP, life expectancy, literacy and levels of employment/ income, unemployment level, environment. Changes in less-tangible factors are also considered, such as personal dignity, freedom of association, personal safety and freedom from fear of physical harm, and the extent of participation in civil society. Socio-economic development generally means the sustained or concerted actions of policy makers and communities aimed at promoting the standard of living and economic health of a specific area. Such actions include the development of human capital, critical infrastructure, regional competitiveness, health, safety, literacy and other initiatives (Ukpong & George, 2012).it means the various authoritative efforts, initiatives, policies and programmes aimed at improving the quality of social life and economic well-being of the majority members of the society. Skills acquisition, poverty alleviation programmes, equality, provision of quality education, health facilities, employment and security, constant water and electricity supply, roads, agricultural facilities are the major factors determine the level of socio-economic development of a country. Socio-economic development; in terms of improvement in the living standards of the citizenry, is perhaps the basic expectation and reward for the citizens in the social contract agreement between the governors and the governed.

Public administration, Governance and Socio-Economic Development: An overview of past administration

Since independence in 1960 various governments (Military and democratic rule) have come with different social investment policies and programmes in a bid to improving the living standard of Nigerians as well as boost the economy. These policies and programmes have either recorded minimal successes and or failed woefully. Sequel to this, unemployment among youths, poverty, high crime rate, insecurity, poor health and poor educational standard became matter of concern to every succeeding government. For instance, the periods between 1962 -1968, 1970 – 1974 various youth programmes were initiated to facilitate social investment among youth in agricultural sector including River Basin Development Authority (1973). Olusegun Obsanjo accelerated agricultural development, power generation, navigation, rural development among other development indicators. National Accelerated Food Production Programme (NAFPP) in 1976 with Agro-service centers to assist farmers, Operation Feed The Nation 1976-1979 under Genera Olusegun Obasanjo, Green Revolution of President Shagari

(1979-1983), Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP 1986) designed by IMF and aimed at diversifying the economy of the state. Restructuring the government, formations and functionaries. Reduced the heavy reliance on mono-economy status of the oil sector, promote the economic growth in non inflationary manner. The Better Life Programme (BLP) was established by late . (Mrs.) Maryam Babangida in 1987 to engender local women, improve quality of life and standard of living of local women mostly in economic and agricultural sector. This programme failed during implementation due to over dominance by elite women and those in corridor of power. National Directorate of Employment (NDE) was established in 1986 by Ibrahim Babangida to reduce massive unemployment among the productive youths in Nigeria. This Directorate geared towards strengthening self-employment, skill acquisition and labour-intensive potentials. NDE introduced four major programmes such as Agricultural Sector Employment Programmes, National Open Apprenticeship Scheme, Special Public Works Programme and Small Scale Industries and Graduates Employment programme. Lamidi & Igbokwe (2021). The programmes stimulated provision of employment and helped improved standard of living among Nigerian. In 1987 Mass Mobilization for Social Justice, Economic Recovery and Self- Reliance (MAMSER) was also established including the Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI) in 1996. All these were directed to reduce unemployment, promote agricultural food production, improve quality of life of rural dwellers among others. It is worthy of note that the failure of DFRRI was due to administrative deficiency and has created a number of gaps in rural development in Nigeria. Ohagwu (2010). Family Support Programme (FSP) was established in 1994 by Maryam Abacha as a direct response to the United Nation which declared 1994 as the International Year of the Family and Family Economic Advancement Programme (FEAP) was established by General Sani Abacha in 1997 to create opportunities for employment at various strata of the local communities. It also induces the planning and setting up manufacturing industries, plants, machineries and equipment at the grassroots levels, the basic infrastructure, diversify the economy, reduce the level of unemployment, achieve dynamic self-sustaining. These programmes failed due to lack of monitoring and corrupt practices due to inflating cost of purchasing equipment needed for the beneficiaries and procurement of sub-standard machinery for the training.

National Agricultural Land Development Authority (NALDA) established in 1993 with the intent of providing strategic, tactical and operational supports for the development of land and its resources. As noted by Eminue (2005) NALDA failed because some states could not provide needed infrastructural resources especially land in a continuous location. Other notable programmes linked to this development authority were Agricultural Development Programmes (ADP) and the Strategic Gains Reserves Programmes (SGRP). In 2000, Poverty Alleviation Programme (PAP) was introduced. Bakare (2010) noted that the problems of the programme were excessive politicization, administrative centralization, unbalanced payment, awkward management as well as high- profile level of corruption. This led to the set-up of National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) in 2001. NAPEP formation was holistic involving both formal and semi-formal institutions, Federal, State and Local Governments, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), the organized private sector, research institutions, women groups and concerned individuals (Okoye and Onyukwu, 2007).

Nevertheless, another chronicles of government policies and programmes kicked start from 29th May 1999 when Nigerians witnessed a new democratic dispensation of President Olusegun Obasanjo. Although, the devastating effect of the long military rule in Nigeria had affected economic planing, policies and implementation processes. Corruption, fraud and general mismanagement of resources experienced in these dispensations have seriously impacted on socio-economic development. The agricultural sector during Obasanjo administration witnessed decrease in prices of the product. According to Central Bank of Nigeria report, the dollar prices of the commodities recorded declined during 1999. The decrease in prices ranged

from 16.9 percent for soya beans to 30.8 per cent for cocoa. (CBN Annual Report, 1999). The manufacturing sub sector recorded a moderate recovery in 1999 and in 2000, the sector found it difficult to change the taste and orientation of the people for imported goods, the growth in the manufacturing sub-sector was impaired largely by low demand for locally manufactured goods occasioned by the influx of cheaper products into the country. Poor state of social and economic infrastructures, including erratic power and water supply, poor transport and communication systems also affected the manufacturing sector. The performance of social services in the economy was highly unsatisfactory in 1999 and 2000. Service delivery by key institutions designed to mitigate the living conditions of vulnerable groups was hampered by deterioration of basic facilities, poor funding, the unprecedented high incidence of industrial strikes especially in the education and health sub-sectors as well as civil strife and disturbances. The health sector witnessed poor and inadequate supply of health facilities resulting to high infant maternal mortality, and the prevalence of diseases in epidemic proportions. Suraj M & Olusola A (2001).

From 29th May 2007 which Alh. Umaru Musa Yar'adua was sworn in till 5th May 2010, Yar'adua's brought seven points agenda which includes; transportation, power and energy, food security, National security, Niger Delta and Energy Security, Education and Human Capital Development, Land Tenure Reforms and Home ownership. None of these policies agenda have remarkable progress and impact on citizenry especially food security considering the teeming population. Nigeria which was once an exporter of food relies so much on importation of food to sustain her growing population. (Gadzama 2013). By 5th May 2010, President Good Luck Johnathan came on board till 29th May 2015. He introduced Subsidy Reinvestment and Empowerment Programme (SURE:P). Major mission of SURE-P was to set up the Graduate Internship Scheme (GIS) with a view to reducing unemployment among graduates especially from higher institutions of learning, stimulate economic growth, raise the standards and opportunities for the actualization of vision 2020. The programme which was to build employable skills of graduates and improve health sector failed because of corrupt practices by public managers of that funds. As observed by Nwosu (2014) the National Assembly viewed the programme to be a mere waste of financial resources of the country and maintained that SURE-P has not either helped in reducing unemployment or provision of infrastructures in the country but experienced high level of politicization, exclusion of the vulnerable and corruption.

When President Buhari came to power in May, 2015, he initiated some economic policies with the view to improving the country's economy and livelihoods of Nigerians. Few of such programmes includes; Anchor Borrowers Programmes (ABP), Traders Moni, National Feeding Programme, N-Power Initiative:

a. The Anchor Borrowers Programmes (ABP) initiative was designed to boost Nigeria's food self-sufficiency and improve foreign exchange earnings to diversify the country's oil dominated economy to agriculture. Unfortunately, the investment in this sector failed and did not reflect in the country's food availability, affordability and accessibility rather there was a rising cost of food and poor income. Observably, the programme failed due to fraud, allegation of fraud and mismanagement.

b. The Trader Moni Programme: This was designed to assist petty traders expand their businesses by providing collateral free loan of #10,000 payable within six Months. Thereafter, if the beneficiaries can repay the #10,000 within the stipulated time frame, he/she can get up to #15,000 or #50,000. However, the result of this programme was not felt as political elites hijacked the initiative for their self interest and to pacify their followers. This programme equally was fraught due to poor selection criteria, lack of transparency and data unknown resulting to allegation of corruption and nepotism.

c. The National Social Investment Program was another social welfare initiative created by Buhari's administration in 2015 under the direction of the National Social Investment

office. This program sought to ensure a more equitable distribution of resources to vulnerable populations, including children, youth, and women. It created four programs to address poverty and help increase economic development. The N-power programme was sub-divided into four viz; N- Power Teach, N-Agro, N-Power Health and N-Power Community Health. These were designed to assist young Nigerians between the ages of 18 to 35 to acquire and develop lifelong skills for becoming change makers in their communities and players in the domestic and global markets with a stipend of N30, 000 Monthly Aminu, (2019), the impact of the N-Power was minimal.

d. The Conditional cash transfer program directly supporting the most vulnerable by providing cash to those in the lowest income group and helping to reduce poverty, improve nutrition, self-sustainability and support development through increased consumption.

e. The Government Enterprise and Empowerment Program (GEEP) was another micro-lending investment program targeting entrepreneurs with a focus on young people and women. This program also provides no-cost loans to its beneficiaries, help to reduce the start-up costs of business ventures in Nigeria.

f. The Home Grown School Feeding Programme (HGSF) was or is another way government attempted to increase school enrollment by providing meals to school children, particularly those in poor and food-insecure regions. Taking a colossal look at these programmes, it may look applaud-able but its positive impact has not been felt by Nigerians, rather it is another dimensions of introducing corruption into the system and conduit pipes for embezzlement of funds. Many individuals who celebrated school feeding programme did so because of self-aggrandizement. School feeding is not the problems of parents. It is pertinent to state that, many schools in Nigeria do not have roof over pupils, some pupils have classes under trees, no books in the libraries, no classrooms and other educational facilities, teachers salary and other benefits are not paid timely among other challenges. Yet, Federal government claimed to spend so much on school feeding programme. As Sadiya Farouq (2022) admitted that Federal Government of Nigeria spent 1bn daily for homegrown school feeding programme in public primary schools for only 10 million children Okechukwu (Punch, February24, 2022). The effect of this programme is not translating into socio-economic development. The major issues government should have pump in money are provision of educational facilities or material to enhance quality education for pupils and students across Nigeria, provision of health care facilities among others with the view to improving individual or collective quality of life. These will help in reducing illiteracy, build human capitals, reduce poverty, unemployment and inequality.. However, without quality education and sound health, it is impossible to have socio-economic development because broadens the person's horizon and sound mind while health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being of a person. When human person who is the center of socio-economic development is not trained and transformed and is not physically and mentally fit, then, other components /strategies of development is thwarted,

g. Another major policy of President Buhari's administration that stifled socio-economic development towards the end of his administration was the redesigned Naira policy. The implementation of Central Bank of Nigeria's (CBN) new naira redesigned policy caused a widespread chaos across Nigeria as frustrated Nigerians launched serious protest amid poor banking operations. Although, Mr Godwin Emefiele the CBN Governor listed the benefits of the new naira policy to includes; enhanced security, greater durability, attractiveness and promotion of rich cultural heritage and also to curb vote buying during the last elections. These benefits outlined did not go well with Nigerians at the time because the policy was poorly implemented and this plunged millions of Nigerians into unprecedented hardship resulting to wanton destruction of public facilities by aggrieved Nigerians across the country. Abdulkareem (2023).

According to David Adonri (2023) reasons why Nigeria's Economy retrogress under Buhari's Administration was that by May 2015 when he took over power Nigeria's GDP was \$594 billion but in 2023, it falls to \$460 billion. Inflation rate by May 2015 was 8.7 percent but by April 2023 it rose to 22.22 percent. Monetary policy by May 2015 was 13 percent but increased to 18.5 percent by May 2023. Official exchange rate as at 2015 was #197/USD and the parallel market rate was #220/USD in May 2015 while in May 2023 it rose to 3465/USD and parallel market stood at #740/USD. Unemployment rate by May 2015 was 7.5 percent but in May 2023 was 33 percent. In May 2015 the total public debt was #12 trillion while in May 2023 was 77 trillion and #87.38trn in June30, 2023 including total domestic and foreign debts 75.29 percent. Crude oil price in May 2015 was #65 per barrel but in May 2023 it stood at #75 per barrel. In 2015 foreign investors participation at NGX was 54 percent. It fell to 17 percent in 2022. It is worthy of note that President Buhari left the country with debt burden of over #77 trillion and 87.38 trillion as at June 30th, 2023. This will grossly affect socio-economic development because President Bola Tinubu is yet to incur his own.

Conclusion: Public administration and good governance are precursor to socio-economic development. As noted, Public administration centers on mobilization of both human and material resources to achieve the set goal and objectives of government with the view to meeting the needs and aspiration of citizenry. Hence, good governance system is that which is transparent, accountable, inclusive, participatory and consensus among various organs and interest groups, devoid of features of bad governance which corruption is seen as a conduit pipe for looting national treasuries for self interest against public interest. Bad governance and policies have adverse effect and attendant consequences on socio-economic development and the country at large. On the whole, government policy making process should not reflect the values and preferences of the governing elites but the masses. However, projects/programmes goals and objectives of the past government policies failed due to corrupt practices, embezzlement, poor monitoring/evaluation, non consultation and non inclusion of relevant stakeholders especially civil society organization at the formative or planning stage. The debt burden of Nigeria vis-a-vis loans obtained or borrowed from foreign countries were not utilized judiciously for the interest of the populace but interest of political elites. However, stakeholders consultation is key policy formulation, planning and implementation to ensure good results.

Recommendations

1. Government should pay more attention to human capital development as a factor that drives any socio-economic development processes.
2. Corrupt practices at all strata should be diminished because corruption is anti-socio-economic development.
3. Principles of transparency, accountability and stakeholders participation should be upheld by the political elites
4. Government social policies and programmes should be directed towards meeting the needs and aspiration of Nigerians especially young people and women
5. There should be continuity of project and or programmes by the new administration to avoid projects abandonment as well as promote efficient and effective service delivery in the public sector
6. There should be effective and efficient monitoring and evaluation tools for public projects to avoid inconsistency and corrupt practices.

References

Abdullahi, M & Usman, S (2018) Challenges of Buhari's Administration and its Implication on Socio-Economic Development in Nigeria (2015-2017) *Social Science and Law*

Journal of Policy Review and Development Strategies. Vol 6, No1 ISSN Print: 2315-8387 | ISSN Online: 2354-1628

- Abdulkareem M (2023) Report. <https://www.premiumtimesng.com>
- Agabi, C. (2013). How insurance can help solve hunger issues – *Swiss report. Daily trust, Tuesday, February 5, 31(42):19.*
- Akpama, A M (2004) Public Administration: A comparative view. *Jamel Publishers and Press, Calabar*
- Aly, W (2014) Bad Governance and Failure of Development Progress in Egypt. Causes, Consequences and Remedies. [Journal of Public Administration and Governance](#) 3(4):39. DOI:[10.5296/jpag.v3i4.4340](https://doi.org/10.5296/jpag.v3i4.4340)
- Aminu, S.N (2019) Effects of Social Investment Programme (N-Power) on Standard of Living of Business Education Graduates in Kano State. *European Scientific Journal. Vol.15, No.22 ISSN: 1857 – 7881.Doi:10.19044/esj.2019.v15n22p205*
- Bassey, C.O & Agbor, U.I (2015) Public Policy and Politics in Nigeria: A Critical Discourse. *Concept Publications Limited, Lagos*
- Das, A.K (2020) Governance and Government. In: Farazmand, A. (eds) *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy and Governance*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/987-3-31816-5_1796-1
- David, A (2023) Why Nigeria’s Economy Retrogressed Under Buhari. <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2023/06>
- Ebuka, O. (2019) The Role of Education in Economic Development in Nigeria. <https://infoguidenigeria.com>
- Ejue, F.O (2001) Principles of Public Administration: Introduction Studies. *Ojies Ojies Production, Calabar*
- Eminue (2005) Public Policy Analysis and Decision-Making: *Concept publications Limited. Lagos.*
- Essien, D.E (2015) The Challenges of Public Administration, Good Governance and Service Delivery in the 21st Century. *International Journal of Civic Engagement and Social Change.DOI: 10.4018/IJCESC.2015040104*
- Gadzama, I U. (2013) Effects of President Umaru Musa Yar’Adua’s 7-point Agenda on Agricultural Development and Food Security in Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal Vol.9, No.32 ISSN: 1857 – 7881*
- Hasan S. (2019) Governance and Public Administration. In: Farazmand A. (eds) *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_1820-1
- Lamidi, K.O & Igbokwe P. I (2021) Social Investment Programmes in Nigeria: Impact and Challenges. *African Journal of Social Work., 11(1), 1-11 ISSN Online 2409-5605*
- National Health Policy (2016) Promoting the Health of Nigerians to Accelerate Socio-Economic Development. *Federal Ministry of Health, Abuja*
- Ndangwa, N (2015) Introduction to the concept of social development. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/291832115>
- New Brunswick (2008-2009) Economic and Social Inclusion Corporation, *Canada.* <https://www.gnb.ca/poverty>
- Nigeria High Commission (2009) Overview of President Yar’adua’s Seven Point Agenda: Issues and policy challenges Information section, London
- Nwosu. O, Ugwuera, E (2014) Challenges of Subsidy and Reinvestment Programme (SURE-P) Towards Youth Employment In Nigeria 2012-2014 [Researchjournali's Journal Of Public Policy Vol I.No 2](#)
- Ngu, S.M (2014) Development Administration: A Theoretical and Pragmatic Disposition. *Ahmadu Bello University Press Limited, Zaria*

- Okechukwu, N (2022) FG increases school feeding cost to N100/child, spends N1bn daily. <https://punchng.com>
- Okoye U. C. & Onyukwu, E. O. (2007). Sustaining Poverty Reduction Efforts through Inter-Agency Collaboration in Nigeria, in K. Omeje (ed), *State, Society Relations in Nigeria: Democratic Consolidation, Conflicts and Reforms*. London:
- Patrick O, Friday, A & Ifedayo, E (2014) Governance and the Challenge of Socio-Economic Development in Nigeria.
Journal of Sustainable Development Law and Policy 3:1
- Saito, Y (2021) Is Good Governance a Necessary Precursor to Peace?.
<https://www.undp.org/blog/good-governance>
- Seidman, K .F (2005) Economic development finance DOI:[10.4135/9781452204550](https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452204550)
- Suraj M and Olusola A (2001) The Nigerian Economy Under Obasanjo. *Development Policy Management Network Bulletin Vol.8,:3*
- Ukpong, D. E. & George, I. N. (2012). Socio-economic development of Nigeria and youth employment in 21st century: Implication for Akwa Ibom State, *Academic Research International, 3 (3)*
- UNDP (1997) Governance for Sustainable Human Development. *United Nations Development Programme*
- Victor , D (2007) Corruption in Nigeria: A New Paradigm for Effective Control” African Economic Analysis.:www.africaeconomicanalysis.org
<https://www.premiuetimesng.com>
<https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/socioeconomic>
<https://www.vanguardngr.com/2023/02/nigeria-rank-150-on-corruption-perception-index-in-2022-cislac-transparency-international/>