

The Effects Of High Cost Of Governance On National Development In Nigeria's Fourth Republic

Fasasi Abiodun Wakeel

Department of Public Administration, University of Benin,
Nigeria

Azeez Adenrele Lukman

Department of Local Govt. and Development Studies, The
Polytechnic, Ibadan, Nigeria

Abstract: *This paper aims at examining the effects of high cost of governance on National Development in Nigeria's Fourth Republic.*

The methodology adopted by the researchers involves the quantitative data which was generated from the reliable reports. The major findings of the research work shows that cost of governance in Nigeria has greatly increased due to unnecessary increase in the number of government agencies, high numbers of special advisers, special assistants and personal assistants, jumbo pay of political office holders, payroll fraud as a result of ghost workers, high number of official vehicles, irrespective of the monetization policy of the government etc. and all these have negative effect on national development in Nigeria.

The paper concludes that Nigeria has a democratic system of government but the cost of governance in Nigeria is high and the stakeholders in the nation's economy expressed concerns as regards how best the prevalent wastage by government could be curtailed and translated to national development in Nigeria. Finally, the paper recommends that efforts should be made to make sure that all the ministries that have similar roles should be merged together to save cost of governance especially on recurrent expenditure.

Keywords: *Governance, Transparency, Accountability, Development, National Development.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Nigerian presidential democracy is said to be one of the most expensive in the world. This assertion is evidenced by the country's soaring recurrent expenditure in its successive budgets, prompting negative rating and damning verdicts on the future of the Nigerian economy. Korikiye et al (2016). A great portion of the country's income goes to political office holders, even as the constitution recognizes only 36 federal ministers, now there are more than 40 federal ministers and dozens of special advisers and many agencies and parastatals which have negative effects on national development in Nigeria. According to Adeolu and Evans (2007), every government, be it federal, state or local government, is established with a view to providing social services that would improve the general well-being of its citizenry. For every government, therefore, to achieve its objectives which centers on national development, it is required to adopt measures

which would ensure effective revenue generation, as well as, judicious utilization of resources at its disposal.

In recent years, everyone in and out of government in Nigeria seems to agree on the need to cut the cost of governance, by eliminating areas of wastages in the budget and the unexplored opportunities of entrenching prudence. Many Nigerians want governments across the three tiers to reduce the cost of governance so that more resources could be channeled towards development projects that impact positively on the quality of lives of the citizenry. But the call for cutting the cost of governance became more pronounced during the protests that greeted the removal of fuel subsidy in January 1 2012. (Agagu, 2013).

According to Enwegbara(2013), The National Assembly has been haunted by several scandals linked to corrupt enrichment of members, making critics to conclude that the legislators may be showing more interests in personal rather than national development. Since the commencement of the

current democratic dispensation in 1999, the federal legislature has recorded many low moments including the Faruk Lawan saga, Professor Fabian Osuji bribe-for-budget passage and Mallam Nasir El-Rufai bribe-for-ministerial clearance scandals. For more than 18 years, the budget of National Assembly was shrouded in secrecy and in 2010, Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) governor, now Emir of Kano, Sanusi Lamido Sanusi, alleged that 25 percent of the overhead cost of the Federal Government goes to the National Assembly. The former Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) governor, Lamido Sanusi in 2011 accused the National Assembly members of consuming 25.41 percent of the national budget. Using data from the budget monitoring and evaluation department to support his position, he had explained that the lawmakers vote in 2011 stood at N136 billion against a national overhead of N536.2 billion. According to him, "if the pattern of expenditure continues without the necessary revenue generations from capital, it could lead to a crisis in the near future" (Sanusi 2010). It is therefore not surprising that the lawmakers allocated to themselves, N125 billion in the current 2017 budget, which they raised from N7.28 trillion proposed by Buhari to N7.44 trillion. (The Guardian: 26 May, 2017).

The leadership of the 8th Assembly had promised before the passage that it would make its budget public for the first time in 18 years. The breakdown of the estimates showed that N23.7 billion would go for personnel cost, N85.8 billion for overhead and N14.9 billion for financing capital projects. The Assembly management has N14.9 billion with the Senate taking N31.3 billion and the House of Representatives N49 billion, while the National Assembly Service Commission gets N2.4 billion. The budget provides N9.6 billion for legislative aides, while the Senate Public Accounts Committee takes N118.9 million and that of lower chamber Reps, N142.7 million. N12.5 billion has been earmarked for general services; N4.3 billion for the National Assembly Legislative Institute and N391.3 million was earmarked for service wide vote. (The Guardian: 26 May, 2017). Since the 2017 National Assembly budget detail was made public, mixed reactions have continued to trail it. While the lawmakers have tried to justify the allocation, many Nigerians have continued to query the rationale behind it in the face of glaring economic challenges in Nigeria. Making the total sum of N207 billion, compared to the N233 billion that was allocated to the federal lawmakers. Describing the Nigerian legislators and by extension, political office holders as the highest paid in the world, Professor Ita Sagay notes that the pay of Nigerian legislators is more than the annual salaries of United States President (\$400,000) and that of British Prime Minister (£190,000). Corroborating Sagay's position, the London Economist Magazine report on legislators' salaries in the world as reported by Punch Newspaper on August 2013, Nigerian legislators earned the highest paid salaries in the world; according to the report, the basic salary excluding allowances of a Nigerian legislator is 116 times the nation's GDP per individual of \$1.600. The basic salaries of Nigeria lawmakers and some other countries are as follows:

Nigeria \$189,500, United States \$174,000, Canada \$154,000, Japan \$149,700, Germany \$119,500 Source: (Ameh et al. 2013)

The growing cost of governance has been inimical to the development of Nigeria because funds that would have been used for development purposes are used to pay political office holders at the expense of the nation's development. Industries are closing shop at an alarming rate; the army of unemployed continues to spiral. The Nigerian Federal Government in 2010 admitted there was a crisis in its recurrent expenditure profile. The former Finance Minister, Olusegun Aganga revealed that there was a need for a committee to work and reduce the rising cost of governance because of its impact on national development in Nigeria. Successful governments since the returned of democratic rule in 1999 have initiated moves in reducing Nigeria high cost of governance. However, according to Enwegbara (2013) rather than reducing the cost of governance, every new government is delighted in increasing cost of governance that does not reflect national development further than it inherited from its predecessor. This study seeks to examine the rising cost of governance in Nigeria and its implication for national development.

II. THE CONCEPT OF GOVERNANCE

According to Agu (2013), Governance is seen as the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country's economic and social resources for development. It is the use of political authority and exercise of control over a society, and the management of its resources for socio-economic development. This entails that governance has to do with sound management of public resources of which public fund is a crucial component. Good governance, therefore, is pre-occupied with how to achieve a high standard of living for its populace by employing every strategy within the constitutional provision. It is in this vein that Section 16 (1) of the 1999 Constitution states that, "the state shall, within the context of the ideals and objectives for which provisions are made in the constitution: (a) harness the resources of nation and promote national prosperity and an efficient, dynamic and self-reliant economy; (b) control national economy in such a manner as to secure the maximum welfare, freedom and happiness of every citizen on the basis of social justice and equality of status and opportunity; and (c) that suitable and adequate shelter, suitable and adequate food, reasonable national minimum living wage, old age care and pensions, and unemployment, sick benefits and welfare of the disabled are provided for all citizens." From this discourse, it is clear that the essence of governance is the socio-economic development of a state and the improvement of the general wellbeing of the citizenry.

III. COST OF GOVERNANCE

Fluvian (2006) defined cost of governance as any expenditure in maintaining government administrative structures. Drucker (2007) opines that cost of governance is government budget allocated to both capital and recurrent expenditures on maintaining government administrative structures. Adewole and Osabuohien (2007) also break down cost of governance into two: recurrent administrative expenses

and capital administrative expenses. According to Agu (2013), Public expenditure refers to the expenses which government incurs in the performance of its operations. With increasing state activities, it may be easy to judge what portion of public expenditure can be ascribed to the maintenance of government itself and what portion to the benefit of the society and the economy as a whole.

Government expenditure is broadly divided in to two (2) main categories, namely recurrent expenditure and capital expenditure. Recurrent expenditure is the type of expenditure that happens repeatedly on daily, weekly or even monthly basis. This includes for example payment of pensions and salaries, administrative overheads, maintenance of official vehicles, payment of electricity and telephone bills, water rate and insurance premiums etc. Capital expenditure on the other hand refers to expenditure on capital projects. This includes construction of houses, roads, schools and hospitals, human capital development (expenditures on education and health), purchase of official vehicles, construction of boreholes and electrification projects, etc.

Public finance literature in consensus that cost of governance is associated with current expenditure, which is the expenditure ascribed to the maintenance of government itself and not for the benefit of the society and the economy as a whole. Some scholars argue that increase in government expenditure on socio-economic and physical infrastructures encourages economic growth. For example, government expenditure on health and education raises the productivity of labour and increase the growth of national output. Similarly, expenditure on infrastructure such as roads, communications, power, etc. reduces production costs, increases private sector investment and profitability of firms, thus fostering economic growth (Nurudeen and Usman, 2010).

A point of consideration is to consider how the State governments' budget is divided strictly between recurrent and capital expenditures. Where a rising proportion of government budget, at whatever level, is used to support the administrative structure of government, poverty is bound to be pervasive as economic growth slows down or even stagnates (Adeolu and Evans, 2007). What this implies is that maintaining government administrative structures comes at gargantuan costs to the economy, as available funds are barely sufficient to finance projects in vital sectors of the economy. Enormous administrative expenditure is not only used to finance an unusually large, inefficient and corrupt civil service personnel, but also a larger than optimal executive cabinet, and an ineffective legislature.

However, citizens would perceive government as a burden when its recurrent expenditure is repeatedly higher than its capital expenditure, which should impact positively on the economy, especially in the areas of employment generation, investment and other activities that induce growth.

IV. CAUSES OF HIGH COST OF GOVERNANCE IN NIGERIA

Korikiye (2016) affirms that the causes of high cost of democratic governance in the country vary from individual to individual and it is multidimensional in nature. The factors

ranges from the number and allowances earned by legislators, cabinet members in the executive arm (political office holders) to corruption and the large number of ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs) in the country. In this research work of the study, some of the causes are identified and discussed.

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES OF PUBLIC OFFICE HOLDERS: Abe (2010) posits that so much money is spent on maintaining both the executive and the legislators at the national level and even at the state and local government levels. Similarly, the large cabinet maintained by the Federal, State and Local governments has also been identified as a contributing factor to increasing cost of political administration in Nigeria. For example, EI-Rufai identified government spending on the public office holders as the major cause of the problem. He put this succinctly when he stated that, This is because our entire oil earnings for the year cannot pay the salaries and allowances of politicians and public sector workers and their overheads- their teas, coffee, travels and estacode, while the federal government spends over N381 million on behalf of Nigerians on its staff, offices, vehicles and the like, and none of this goes to build power plants, roads or railways (EI-Rufai,2011: 2).Generally political office holders in Nigeria at all levels constitute less than 5% of the entire population of the country. They are just about 17,500 persons but they corner and pocket close to 80% of our public finances on annual basis in the areas of allowances and overheads (Nigeria Master web News, 2013). These public officers including 12,788 elected LGAs Chairmen, their deputies, and Councilors of the constitutionally recognized 774 local councils, the 1, 695 elected officials at the 36 States and Federal levels including 72 Governors and their deputies, the 469 Federal lawmakers and 1,152 state lawmakers and the President and his deputy. Also included in the list of the 17, 500 are the 3, 062 appointed executives at Federal and State's levels including about 472 Federal executives excluding the President and his deputy , added also is 2,664 State executives excluding the 36Governors and their deputies, 792 State' judges and 142 Federal judges are also included. Based on their allowances and salaries as provided by the 2008 PAY ACT enacted by the National Assembly, the 17,500 top political office holders in the country goes home with the sum of N1.13 trillion (\$7 billion) naira every fiscal year with over 90% or over N900 billion going as allowances (Nigeria Master Web News, 2013:1).

THE MAINTENANCE OF LARGE NUMBER OF AIDES BY GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS: Besides the allowances and overheads, there are over 35,000 personal aides working for the 17,500 public office holders on average of two per political office holder (Nigerian Master Web News, 2013). Sometimes, as many as six (6) aides are working for a political appointee or elected member. These over 35,000 aides are serviced monthly through allowances included in the budget. Each of these aides received between N30, 000.00 to N100, 000.00 and sometimes even more monthly. It is estimated that between N1 billion and N3.5 billion is spent monthly in the maintenance of these personal aides of public office holders, and between N12 billion and N42 billion a year to foot the bills of this set of people (Nigerian Master Web News, 2013). By the provision of the Federal Constitution of 1999, it is only the position of Special Adviser for the Governor, the President

and their deputies that are recognized by the constitution. But in practice there are Special Advisers for Legislators, Ministers, Commissioners, Chairmen and Heads of some key Parastatals, Departments and Agencies of Government etc. There are also motley of "Senior Special Assistants", "Special Assistants", "Executive Assistants", "Personal Assistants" and so on. The salaries and allowances of these people somehow find its way into the budget of LGAs, States and the Federal Government which invariably increases the cost of general administration.

THE CONDUCT OF ELECTIONS: According to Korikiye (2016), an important area that has contributed to the high cost of governance in Nigeria is the conduct of election and the resultant litigations in tribunals and courts. It should be stated that the conduct of open, free, fair and competitive election is sine qua non in a democratic society. Democracy as a form of government is costly to run as it demands the commitment of huge financial resources for successful operation whether in Nigeria or elsewhere. Most of the cost of democracy as a governing phenomenon occurs in the area of the conduct of elections. For example, the system demands the conduct of periodic elections as prescribed by the country's constitution. In Nigeria, general elections are conducted in every four years for State Governors, State Assemblies, National Assembly members and the President of the Federal Republic. Therefore, the conduct and management of elections in a vast country like Nigeria requires huge sums of money. Nevertheless, such elections should not be costly both to the government and the individuals. In a situation where the administration of elections and the subsequent litigations becomes a burden to the parties involved, it becomes a problem both on the economy and the electoral process. However, our observation indicates that at the individual level, elections are very costly as candidates often spend huge sums of money to contest an election. Amuchie (2015) for example, observed that in the South-East of Nigeria, governorship election campaign in 2007 cost between N1.5 billion and N2.0 billion, in the Northern part, the same position cost between N1.0 billion and N1.1 billion, while in the South West and the South/South the figure is between N1.0 billion and N1.5 billion (Amuchie, 2010:5). This amount excludes the high fees charged on nomination and expression of interest forms of the various political parties. Some political parties charge as high as one million naira (N1million) for nomination form. The prohibitive cost of elections now scares Nigerians as it could derail democracy in the country. Besides, it has excluded honest and sincere Nigerian citizens from participating in elections. The important implication here is that, while the cost may not have direct impact on the physical development of the country, honest and sincere Nigerians who could have use their wealth of experience to contribute to the development of the country are usually denied the opportunity to serve their own country as political godfathers controls the machineries of the country. Secondly, the cost of running an election tends to determine, to a large extent, the outcome of the type and direction of a given government. As it has clearly played out in the Nigeria's Fourth Republic, the high rate of corruption in the country has been attributed partly to the high cost of elections. This argument is premised on the reasoning that most Nigerians who have interest in politics do not

usually have the financial resources and the necessary connections at high levels to achieve their political ambitions do to the high cost of elections. For this reason they often times relied on a godfather who sponsor them into office and in return asked for juice contracts which they often times do not carry out and yet nothing happen to them.

ELECTION LITIGATIONS: The failure of the umpire body INEC for instance, to conduct credible elections have given rise to series of election litigations by aggrieved candidates and parties. According to Amuchie (2010) after the 2003 general elections, over 300 suits were filed at various election tribunals across the nation. This number rose to 7,000 in 2007, but dropped to a little above 1,000 cases after the 2011 elections. With all intents and purposes, these figures are high as such cases in tribunals became very expensive as the candidate who pays the highest amount of money wins the case. Judges and other members of election tribunals jettisoned "natural justice" based on point of law for "jungle justice" based on the highest bidder. Many tribunal members saw it as an opportunity to join the millionaire or billionaire club. They are ready to collect bribe from parties and candidates who are desperate to win petitions in courts.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS: According to Korikoye (2016), the Federal Government usually gives out grants to regulatory bodies such as the Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC), and also gives grants to the various political parties during elections. The Nations Newspaper observed in 2010 that between 1999 and 2009, the Federal government disbursed over N133.27 billion to INEC and over N4.2 billion has also been disbursed to the various political parties over the same period (The Nations, 2010:2). Meanwhile, in the 2010 Appropriation Act the sum of N630million was earmarked for disbursement to the political parties for the purposes of that year's general elections. The idea of government grants to political parties in a democratic system is meant to prevent the emergent of the control of political parties by few wealthy people "money bags" in society. In other words, is to ensure greater participation of the citizenry in party democracy. The reason is that when political parties are owned and sponsored single-handedly by an individual or a few persons mass participation becomes difficult as the individual or the few who controls the machinery of the party decides who becomes a candidate on the platform of the party to contest election. In this regards, many political parties in Nigeria and elsewhere, usually resort to undemocratic methods of selecting candidates to contest elections on the platforms of their parties. However, it should be noted that in spite of government grants to political parties in Nigeria, parties are still been controlled by very powerful and influential persons (godfathers). Thus, the reason for financial support to political parties has not achieved the purpose in Nigeria. However, this phenomenon has contributed to high cost of political administration in the country. What need to be known is that government grants to INEC, and party spending as well as individuals who invest their money on election campaigns and litigations goes into the non-productive sector of the economy. Thus, it increases the cost of governance.

THE HIGH LEVEL OF CORRUPTION: It is presumed that successive governments in Nigeria have been corruption

friendly (Korikiye: 2016). And corruption is one of the major factors or causes of high cost of governance. Corruption has eaten deep into the fabrics of Nigerian society. It is visible in everywhere and at all levels of government. Since the country has returned to democratic governance in 1999, every successor government has proved more corrupt and has become a greater financial burden to the nation than its predecessor. This is worsen once a particular administration is given a second chance (second term) in office. According to Korikiye(2016),the over \$400 billion that has accrued to the country through the sale of crude oil and gas from the 1960s to date, Nigeria remains one of the poorest in the world and indebted to multilateral financial agencies such as the world Bank and International Monetary Fund. The First and Second Republics collapsed essentially do to corruption. The various military regimes have not fared better and the current civilian dispensation is also bedeviled and infested by the same virus of corruption. In 2011, Nigeria was rated 143 out of 183 most corrupt countries in the World by Transparency International (TI) (2011). The corruption scourge has largely retarded social development, undermines economic growth, discouraged foreign investment and reduced the resources for infrastructural development, public services, and poverty reduction. Thus, corruption is a crucial factor for high cost of governance in Nigeria as resources for development is persistently siphoned into personal pockets by the leadership class.

THE MULTIPLICATION OF MINISTRIES AND EXTRA-MINISTERIAL BODIES: Besides corruption, the large number of ministries, Departments and Agencies of government has also been identified as a major problem of the high cost of governance in the country Korikiye (2016). The establishment of numerous parastatals and the appointment of political loyalists into the boards of these organizations cost additional burden to the government. The history of public corporations and other agencies of government started in the colonial era. These bodies were established to provide essential services (e.g. water, electricity, railway, health, etc.) to the people. However, the post independent era witness a watershed in the increase in these agencies and ministries. For instance, there were only about 50 of these corporations at independence in 1960. But by1991 the number of corporations has increased to over 1500 including those of the Federal Government, the State and the Local Government (Obikeze and Anthony, 2004: 252). At present, there are about 541 public corporations and agencies owned by the Federal Government.

Therefore, the Federal government will have to appoint over 5,000 persons into the over 541 corporations and agencies. And all the salaries and allowances are paid through the provision made in the annual budget. Worst still is the fact that some of these parastatals are duplicated as they perform the same or similar functions (e.g., WAEC and NECO, ICPC, EFCC and the Code of Conduct Bureau, Minister, Minister of State, etc.). However, the creation of more corporations and parastatals somehow provided employment for few persons. Ake (1981) advanced the argument that the national petit-bourgeoisie which inherited political power from the colonial masters only used these organizations to accumulate wealth to consolidate their political power. Thus, they use the instrumentality of the state to empower themselves

economically. As it was in the early post-colonial time, so also it is even today. These parastatals and corporations remain a conduit pipe in the hands of the political class to loot the treasury of the Nigerian State. In Nigeria, it is not uncommon for a political leader to channel more financial resources to corporations where he or she has collaborators even when such organizations are not performing. The aim is to siphoned money into their private pockets. It all adds to the cost of governance.

V. CONCEPT OF NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Development as a concept is a victim of definitional pluralism. It is a difficult word to define. However, attempts have been made by erudite scholars to conceptualize development. Some of these definitions will be explored for the purpose of this study. Gboyega (2003) captures development as an idea that embodies all attempts to improve the conditions of human existence in all ramifications. It implies improvement in material well-being of all citizens, not the most powerful and rich alone, in a sustainable way such that today's consumption does not imperil the future, it also demands that poverty and inequality of access to the good things of life be removed or drastically reduced. It seeks to improve personal physical security and livelihoods and expansion of life chances.

Naomi (1995) believes that development is usually taken to involve not only economic growth, but also some notion of equitable distribution, provision of health care, education, housing and other essential services all with a view to improving the individual and collective quality of life (Naomi, 1995). Chrisman (1984) views development as a process of societal advancement, where improvement in the well-being of people is generated through strong partnerships between all sectors, corporate bodies and other groups in the society. It is reasonable to know that development is not only an economic exercise, but also involves both socio-economic and political issues and pervades all aspects of societal life.

National, according to Longman dictionary of contemporary English, refers to a phenomenon that embraces a whole nation. National development therefore can be described as the overall development or a collective socio-economic, political as well as religious advancement of a country or nation. This is best achieved through development planning, which can be described as the country's collection of strategies mapped out by the government.

VI. NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS IN NIGERIA

We have had series of development plans in Nigeria. Nigeria is permanently hunted by the spectra of development. Its forty-nine years of independence actually are rolling by daily in search of development. The myth of growth and development is so entrenched that the country's history passes for the history of development strategies and growth models from colonial times up to date. No term has been in constant flux as development. This seems the only country where virtually all notions and models of development have been

experimented (Aremu, 2003). Two years after independence, the first National Development Plan policy was formulated between 1962 and 1968 with the objectives of development opportunities in health, education and employment and improving access to these opportunities, etc. This plan failed because fifty percent of resources needed to finance the plan was to come from external sources, and only fourteen percent of the external finance was received (Ogwumike, 1995). Collapse of the first Republic and the commencement of civil war also disrupted the plan. After the civil war in 1970, the second national development plan 1970 to 1974 was launched, the plan priorities were in agriculture, industry, transport, manpower, defence, electricity, communication and water supply and provision of social services (Ogwumike, 1995). The third plan, covering the period of 1975 to 1980 was considered more ambitious than the second plan. Emphasis was placed on rural development and efforts to revamp agricultural sector.

The fourth plan 1981 to 1985 recognized the role of social services, health services, etc. The plan was aimed at bringing about improvement in the living conditions of the people. The specific objectives were: an increase in the real income of the average citizen, more even distribution of income among individuals and socio-economic groups, increased dependence on the country's material and human resources, a reduction in the level of unemployment and underemployment (Ogwumike, 1995).

During these periods, Nigeria's enormous oil wealth was not invested to build a viable industrial base for the country and for launching an agrarian revolution to liquidate mass poverty. For instance, the Green Revolution Programme that replaced Operation Feed the Nation failed to generate enough food for the masses. In the recent past, various strategies for development have also been tried with little or no result; among these were the structural adjustment programme (SAP), Vision 2010, national economic empowerment and development strategy (NEEDS), creation of development centers, etc. currently, seven point agenda of the present administration with vision 2020 without any clear methodological approach towards achieving them. It is obvious that the current results so far are not what development connotes.

VII. CORRUPT TENDENCY OF COST OF GOVERNANCE AND ITS CHALLENGES TO NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA

Since May 29, 1999, political activities across the country have assumed different dimension in Nigeria and this is why politics has virtually become the most lucrative business in the polity. It is therefore, not surprising that in some parts of Nigeria politics has become a do-or-die affair. It is no longer unusual to see aspirants and candidates for political offices being assassinated over tussle for political positions; in many cases properties were destroyed due to clashes between two opposing camps. This defines the level of desperation of Nigerian politicians to get to public office and earn stupendous wealth.

The outcry over high cost of governance in Nigeria was the case of Bauchi state in 2015, when the then Governor Mallam Isa Yuguda appointed 1,070 political aides to assist him in running the affairs of the State. These political aides were in addition to members of the Bauchi state Executive Council, members of various boards and statutory corporations and governing councils of institutions of higher learning. Governor Yuguda was not alone in this decision to appoint a large number of aides purportedly to run state affairs. His counterparts in Adamawa and Imo States, Ex-Governor Murtaga Nyako and the current Governor Rochas Okorocha also appointed a large retinue of aides which included special assistants and special advisers (Okeke and Eme, 2015).

Corruption is a by-product of underdevelopment. In Nigeria, funds that are allocated for the development of the country after the installation of democratic governance since 1999 have been mismanaged by political office holders. According to Ngwube and Okoli (2013) corruption leads to the use of resources to finance elephant projects at the expense of infrastructural development such as schools, hospitals, roads, water supply and electricity supply. Osoba (1996) cited in Alemika (2012) posits that financial corruption dent a nation's capacity to provide the basic necessity of life for the populace.

Political corruption is the main factor responsible for Nigeria underdevelopment in all sectors (Egharevba and Chiazor, 2012). "This is significantly so because the greatest challenge to Nigeria's development are Nigerians themselves as represented by the political leaders who should be held responsible for the present pathetic state of underdevelopment in the country" (Falola, 2005). Since the rebirth of democracy in Nigeria in 1999, bad governance as a result of corruption has constituted a major hindrance to development in the country. For the past 15 years, budgetary allocations for infrastructure development have not yielded positive result to a large extent. For instance, billions of dollars were allocated for the Turn Around Maintenance (TAM) of the four refineries yet, the refineries are not working to full capacity. The health and the power sectors are in comatose due to bad governance and its unnecessary cost influenced by corruption. Furthermore, majority of the federal roads are dead traps because funds that are allocated for the maintenance of these roads are mismanaged. The former governor of Abia State, Orji Uzor Kalu once accused the former Minister of Works Tony Anenih of the embezzlement of N3 billion that was meant for the maintenance of federal roads. Corruption in Nigeria has been blamed for the high-rate of poverty in the country, for example, the official released of poverty profile of Nigeria by the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) revealed that 112 million Nigerians live in relative poverty. This data was supported by the confirmation of the United Nations Development Programmes (UNDP) representative in Nigeria that said 100 million Nigerians live in destitution. Just of recent, the World Bank named Nigeria as the third country in the world with a large number of poor people. Poverty is a by-product of insecurity. The security challenges that are facing Nigeria have been blamed on the high level of corruption, unnecessary cost of governance without proper attention given to poverty eradication or alleviation in the country. Despite the

governments' effort through the two anti-corruption agencies to curtail corruption, the menace still continues unabated. The Economic and Financial Crimes Control (EFCC) has been accused of not doing enough to prosecute corrupt politicians who only supported the increase of their allowances and salaries.

According to Adesote and Abimbola (2012 cited in Agu, 2013), "there is a correlation between financial corruption and national development in Nigeria. The essence of financial corruption is bribery and illegal and greedy acquisition of public funds into private pockets, which otherwise would have been invested for the public good. Financial corruption undermines democracy and the legitimacy of the state, reduces the potentials for economic growth, and threatens the freedom and security of citizens, altogether constitutes impediment to national development". Mohammed (2013) gave a summary of how political corruption hinders development in the new democratic dispensation in Nigeria:

- ✓ Poor social welfare
- ✓ Loss of public trust and legitimacy by the government
- ✓ Increased insecurity
- ✓ Increased poverty and unemployment
- ✓ Low investment

Aside all these, one main area that corruption has affected is the area of infrastructure. For instance, health services, water supply, power supply, good roads, sound education are a mirage in the Nigerian fourth republic, despite the promises made to Nigerians during electioneering campaigns that all these areas will be addressed by the new democratic government. Fifteen years after, the story remained the same or even getting worse and this is one of the reasons Nigerians have turned India to their medical tourism because of inadequate medical facilities and manpower at the government hospitals.

However, it is not too late for Nigerian political office holders to reconsider their actions by reducing to the barest minimum, the number of their political aids. This is in the interest of their states and ultimately the people. Public sector should under no circumstances be seen as a vehicle for wasteful spending on large retinues of appointees. Nigeria at the moment can ill-afford such profligacy and therefore, need not to operate the most expensive democracy in the world.

VIII. THEORIES OF GOOD GOVERNANCE AS MEANS OF REDUCING HIGH COST OF GOVERNANCE FOR NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PARTICIPATION

This is an essential element of good governance theory. It entails the involvement of every adult in the politics of his or her society. It could be either direct participation by individual citizens or indirect participation by their accredited representatives. Kaufman, Kraay and Mastruzzi (2006) echo the World Bank's view on the principle of participation as a principle of good governance theory. According to them, participation is the degree of involvement of the citizens of a country in the election of their political leaders and ultimately their representatives in government. Participation, as a core characteristic of good governance, stipulates every adult must

have a say in the process of making decisions either by him or her directly or by his or her accredited representatives (Osmani, 2007; Rotberg, 2004; Weiss, 2000).

RULE OF LAW

This is an important principle of good governance theory, which guarantees equity, fairness and justice in the society. Good governance theory stipulates complete entrenchment of individual and group rights and unbiased observance of the laws which in turn require an independent judiciary as well as an impartial and incorruptible Police Force (Harrison, 2005; Moloney, 2009; Oestreich, 2004; Sheng, 2012). The rule of law also emphasizes that it is the law that rules not man. Therefore, the laws of the land should be fair, impartial and no respecter of any body. There must be emphasis on fairness to all as well as impartial enforcement of laws and rights. According to Kaufmann, Kraay and Mastruzzi (2006), rule of law is one of the World Bank's six principles of good governance theory. It is the degree of confidence that citizens have in the rules of the society and extent by which they abide in them. Rule of law emphasizes that it is the law that rules and nothing else. It is also the impartial enforcement of transparent laws, regulations and codes in the society.

TRANSPARENCY

Another key element of good governance theory is transparency. It emphasizes that the process of decision making, the ultimate decisions reached and the observance of such decisions must be carried out in conformity with rules and regulations. It stipulates that sufficient information is freely disseminated in such a way and medium that can easily be understood and directly to the people that will be affected and who will ensure compliance (Sheng, 2012). The principle of transparency is predicated and built on free information flow and dissemination. Institutional processes and information are to be made easily available to the people affected and adequate information in particular should be accessible in understandable form. To guarantee good governance practice, therefore, government policies are to be openly disseminated to the entire citizenry and the policies should be such that citizens can easily develop confidence in their intentions. In fact, the processes of decision-making, the ultimate decisions reached and government actions taken are expected to be made open and subject to check by other organs of government and other non-governmental organizations (Andrews, 2008; Apaza, 2009; Gisselquist, 2012).

RESPONSIVENESS

Another important index is responsiveness, which requires that all institutional processes should serve all concerned citizens in the society within an appropriate period of time. Responsiveness, as a key principle of good governance theory, stipulates that a good government requires the ability and elasticity to accommodate rapid changes in the society, with due consideration to the views of civil societies on what should be the overall interest of the general public and

also with the will to constantly re-assess its activities in the society (Gisselquist, 2012). As a matter of fact, change is the only permanent feature of any society and it is inevitable. Therefore, good governance through the principle of responsiveness is required to accommodate this inevitable change. The capacity as well as the flexibility of the government to respond to and accommodate societal change is referred to as responsiveness (Nanda, 2006; Rotberg, 2004). This is an important principle of good governance theory.

BROAD CONSENSUS

In any given society, there are several view points as there are several actors (individuals or groups). Good governance practice requires consensus orientation, coalition building and mediation among the different interests and social forces in society in order to have a general agreement as far as a country's overall interest can be defined and achieved. In addition, it emphasizes general agreement on socio-economic and political issues, such as human development as well as its attainment. However, the principle of consensus can only be achieved through a proper knowledge of the history, culture and sociology of a society.

Thus, good governance theory emphasizes broad consensus or mediation among the contending groups in the society in order to reach a general agreement that will completely and satisfactorily accommodate the differing interests and views of the various groups, and where possible, on policies and procedures (Harrison, 2005; Shen

EQUITY AND INCLUSIVENESS

This is an important principle of good governance theory. The principle guarantees the following: dignity of the human person, equal rights and freedom from any discrimination. It is all embracing and encompassing for all members of the society. It also emphasizes the well-being of the society which is generally nurtured by the sense of belonging to the society by all citizens as well as a feeling of belongingness as stakeholders in the society. This principle stipulates that the various groups especially the most susceptible to attack must not only be protected but also given opportunity to enhance their well-being. This therefore stipulates or ensures that every citizen is given equal access to better his or her lot and also to enhance his or her well-being in the society (Grindle, 2004; Harrison, 2005).

EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY

Effectiveness is primarily the process of doing right things while efficiency is primarily the process of doing things right (Cole and Kelly, 2011). Therefore, the principle as it applies to good governance means doing right things and doing things right within the society by the government, using the resources available. It emphasizes that governance must come up with action plans which address the necessities of the society as the resources available are put into the best use. Whereas, efficiency as an element of good governance theory embraces the long-lasting use of God-given resources of the society and most especially environmental protection, the

principle of effectiveness emphasizes the good use of the natural resources of the society by the government (Doornbos, 2004; Grindle, 2004; Kurtz and Schrank, 2007; Nanda, 2006; Rotberg, 2004; Rothstein and Teorell, 2008).

ACCOUNTABILITY

The principle is the cornerstone of good governance theory. It emphasizes that all actors, particularly those in government, business, voluntary agencies, civil-societies, among others are to be made answerable to the society (Rotberg, 2004; Rothstein and Teorell, 2008). This principle differs from organization to organization and depends on the source of the decision which could be within or without. The principle stipulates that political actors and civil servants are to be made answerable to the society for their actions. Hence, public officials including elected and appointed, are to be accountable for their political actions and answerable to the source or organ from which their power originates. It also emphasizes that public officials invested with political power are to be answerable for their actions to the source or organ from where their mandate is derived (Williams, 2009). The principle of accountability in the real sense, emphasizes answerability for the use of state resources and assets earmarked for specific purposes, subject to the laws and their requirements (Grindle, 2004; Harrison, 2005; Kurtz and Schrank, 2007; Nanda, 2006). This principle is the degree by which political actors have the ability and willingness to demonstrate consistency between their activities and the constitution (Gisselquist, 2012).

STRATEGIC VISION

This is another important principle of good governance theory. The principle of strategic vision stipulates that the government should be liberal and futuristic in its thinking about governing issues. A government is said to be good, when it takes a liberal and futuristic direction on governing matters or issues, with the urgency required and also with the knowledge of history, culture and sociology of the direction. The principle emphasizes the need for a good government to envisage future challenges based on the present and future implications (Gisselquist, 2012). According to Koffi Annan (1997), this principle guarantees all subjects a stake in the future of their society in all ramifications. This is because the principle of strategic vision is all about securing the future and planning for the multi-various uncertainties and unforeseen contingencies attendant to it. A good government should be strategic and futuristic in its planning, direction and orientation (Doornbos, 2001; Grindle, 2004; Nanda, 2006; Williams, 2009).

IX. CONCLUSION

Nigeria has a democratic system of government that is patterned after that of the United States of America. However, the cost of governance in Nigeria recently attracted several comments from stakeholders in the nation's economy who expressed concerns as regards how best the prevalent wastage

by government could be curtailed and translated into generally improved living standards for the citizenry. Nigeria's democracy has been described as the most expensive in the world with minimal evidence in terms of infrastructure development, poverty level and pace of general economic growth. Ordinarily, high cost of governance should not have resulted to negative effects on national development, had it been the resources or public funds are effectively utilized by ensuring that capital expenditures are given larger percentages much more than that of recurrent expenditures. Surprisingly, Nigerian high cost of governance does not promote and accelerate level of development as resources are not channeled towards provision of infrastructural facilities that can promote national development but rather the resources are being used on recurrent expenditures that cannot promote and guarantee good governance and national development in Nigeria.

X. RECOMMENDATIONS

Arriving from the findings of the study and the conclusion, the following factors are recommended for the study:

Efforts should be made to make sure that all the ministries that have similar roles should be merged together to save cost of governance especially on recurrent expenditure.

There is need to reduce members of personal assistants (PAs) attached to political office holders so as to save cost and use the money meant for them for development.

The huge financial spending on salary and allowances of political office holders which led to economic crisis in Nigeria should be reduced and fixed like that of career officers to encourage those who wish to truly serve their people.

The menace of corruption that has become a tradition in Nigerian society should be discouraged by enacting a law that will punish any corrupt political office holders as well as career officers within limited time to serve as deterrent to others.

Nigeria should adopt unicameral legislature at the central to reduce high cost of governance in Nigeria as the bicameral legislature being used is quite costly, this will pave ways for national development.

The Nigerian constitution should be amended so that federal legislators can be on part time base to reduce huge amount of money being spent on 469 legislators at the Federal level.

Efforts should be made to make sure that the amount being spent on recurrent expenditure is reduced in order to increase the capital expenditure that will give room for national development Nigeria.

REFERENCES

[1] Abe T. (2010); Development Administration for National Development in Femi Omotoso et al. (eds) Governance, Politics and Policies in Nigeria, SONOU d'Africue PORTO NOVO.
[2] Adamu, A (2011); High Cost of Governance. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.

[3] Adejumo, A.A (2009); High Cost of Governance, Bad Governance: The Relationships. Akure, Kenet Publisher.
[4] Adeolu A.M and Evans, E.S.C (2007); "Analysis of the Cost of Governance and Options for its Reduction in Nigeria" Nigerian Journal of Economics and Social Studies, Volume 49, Number 1.
[5] Adesote, K. and Abimbola O. (1997); "The State" in Kolawole, D (ed) Readings in Political Science. Ibadan, Dekaal publishers limited.
[6] Agagu A.A. (2010); Governance; An Insider's Reflection on the Nigerian Polity, Ibadan: Terrific Publishers.
[7] Agu, O.C (2013); Democracy and Cost of Governance in Nigeria. Journal of Culture, Society and Development- An Open Access International Journal Vol.2 2013. Niser Research Institute, Ibadan.
[8] Akinyemi D. (2013); Cost of Democratic Government in Nigeria. International Journal Vol.1, 2013. BUK Bulletin.
[9] Ameh et al (2013); Leadership, Democracy and Development in Nigeria. Awka, Benson Publisher.
[10] Aremu, M (2003); Impediments to Democracy in Nigeria. Akure, Stebak Venture Limited.
[11] Bension, A (2010); The Substance of Politics in Nigeria. Owerri. Vrindal Publications Limited.
[12] Chrisman, E (1984); Class and State in Nigeria. Ibadan, Longman Publisher.
[13] Doornbos et al (2004); Legislator's Jumbo Pay, Cost of Governance and the State of Education in Nigeria: Issues and Contradictions. ISSN 2240-0524 Journal of Educational and Social Research Vol. 2 (4) January 2012. Pp 73-77.
[14] Eke R. (2011); Nigeria's Monolithic oil economy. Journal of Nigeria Institute of management Vol. 47 no 4.
[15] Enwegbara B. (2010); Government Expenditure and Economic Growth in Nigeria, 1970-2008: A Disaggregated Analysis. Business and Economics Journal, Volume 2010: BEJ-4 Pp1- 11.
[16] Fluvian M. (2006); Development and Political Stability in Kwanashie (ed) Politics and Political Power Relations in Nigeria. Lagos. Dat and Partners Logistic Ltd, 12: 248-262.
[17] Gboyega A. (2003); Democracy, Good Governance and Development in Nigeria. Ibadan, Spectrum Books Limited.
[18] Harrison T. (2005); Crisis and Contradictions in Nigeria's Democratization Process 1986-1993. Akure, Stebak Ventures Limited.
[19] Korikiye, M. W et al (2016); Causes and Effects of High Cost of Democratic Governance in Nigeria's Fourth Republic. Historical Research Letter (www.iiste.org)
[20] Ladan O. (2012); Public Administration in Nigeria: A Developmental Approach. Onitsha, Book Point Limited.
[21] Naomi O.(1995); Towards an Integrated View of Human Rights. Hunger Teach Net, 6(3): 6-7.
[22] Obadan G. (2003); The Global Village. Selected Topics on International Economic Relations. Osogbo, Olans Publishing Company, pp 4:6-7.
[23] Ogwumike F (1995); The Effects of Macro level Government Policies on Rural Development and Poverty Alleviation in Nigeria. Ibadan J. Soc. Sci., 1(1): 85-101.

[24] Seer T. (2012); "Understanding Dependency Theory: A Comparative Evaluation of Gender Frank's Seminal Work in Today's World".

[25] Sheng, J. (2012); The Effects of Fiscal Decentralization on Public Spending: The Korean case. *Public Budgeting and Finance* 23(4): 1-20.

[26] The Guardian Newspaper, 26th May 2017. Page 18-19;

[27] 1999 Nigerian Constitution, Federal Republic of Nigeria.

IJIRAS