TRANSPARENCY AND THE QUALITY OF PUBLIC MANAGEMENT IN NIGERIA (2000-2015)

Dr. Musa *Idris fcia*
Department of Public Administration
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
Email: musaidrisaa@,gmail.com

Abstract

The issue of transparency in the conduct of government business has more than ever before become an issue of grave public concern in spite of efforts made by successive administration especially following the return to democratic governance in Nigeria. Equally worrisome has been the effect of the reforms of the government towards public management. The study examined the significance of the relationship between the level of transparency in the public service and the quality of public management in Nigeria for the period 2000-2015. The research design was content analysis of secondary data from Transparency International and the Mo Ibrahim Foundation. The data was presented in tables and analysed using frequencies and percentages as well as Pearson Correlation Coefficient to test the hypothesis. The study confirmed the very low level of transparency in the Nigeria public service with an average of 20.94%. The quality of public management in Nigeria was also only 46.51%. From the hypotheses tested, the study concludes that there was a very significant positive relationship (.901) between transparency and the quality of public management in Nigeria. This implies that that an improvement in the level of transparency in the Nigeria public service will improve the quality of public management. In view of these findings, the study recommended for existence of virile civil society organizations, enlightment of citizens on their right to information as well as severe punishment for breach of transparency acts to serve as deterrent among others.

Keywords: Transparency, public management, agency theory, good governance.

Introduction

The issue of transparency in the conduct of government business has in the twilight of the twentieth and one and a half decade of the twenty first centuries gained much currency in public debate and academic discourse. After several years of successive military dictatorships, citizen quest for transparency in governance gained prominence following the return of democratic governance to Nigeria in 1999. The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 in chapter II, Section 13(2a), states that "sovereignty belongs to the people of Nigeria from whom government through this constitution derives all its power and authority". Section 15(5) of the Constitution also provides that "the State shall abolish all corrupt

practices and abuse of power". The National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) which was the major focus of the Federal Government's Reform Agenda has the issues of transparency and accountability as core concerns (National Planning Commission (NPC), 2004).

In response to the citizens' quest and pursuant to the provisions of the Constitution, the Federal Government of Nigeria in addition to the extant rules enacted laws and established institutions in the service of transparency and accountability in the conduct of government business. These include the Independent Corrupt Practices and other Related Offences Commission (ICPC) established through the ICPC Act 2000 and the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) created by the EFCC Act, 2003. Others include the Public Procurement Act 2007, the Fiscal Responsibility Act 2007, the Nigeria Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative Act 2007 and the Freedom of Information Act, 2011.

The socio-economic and political dynamics of late twentieth and early twenty first centuries also brought a paradigm shift in public administration. The change was a shift from Traditional Public Administration that lay stress on policy-administration dichotomy, rules, meritocracy, career orientation, impersonality, division of labour and hierarchy (Islam, 2015) to New Public Management. The new paradigm is based on a government that is catalytic, competitive, mission-driven, results oriented, customer-driven and enterprising (Sharpe, 2012). In response to this global trend and the desire for change, the Federal Government of Nigeria embarked on series of reforms aimed at re-orientingand re-inventing government. The reforms include privatization, and commercialization of public enterprises, deregulation of telecommunication sector and removal of subsidies. Other highlights of the reform include; policy management reform, improvement in budget management and fiscal responsibility, focus on change, better people management, pay reform and reinvigorating accountability, due process and transparency (Olaopa, 2008).

In view of these efforts, the research questions worth asking are; how transparent has been the conduct of government business in Nigeria?And is there any significant relationship between the level of transparency and quality of public management in Nigeria? The objectives of this study are to examine the level of transparency and the quality of public management in Nigeria for the period 2000-2015. The study also seeks to examine the significance of the relationship between the level of transparency and the quality of public management in Nigeria. The hypothesis postulated for this study states that; there is no significant relationship between the level of transparency and quality of public management in Nigeria.

The timeframe for this study is 2000-2015. The choice of this period can be justified on ground of being a period of return to sustainable democratic governance to Nigeria after many years of military dictatorships. Democratic regimes are expected to be more transparent and reform oriented than military regimes. This study also has a national rather than regional, state or local government coverage for

maximum utility. Transparency in this study is limited to the public sector without under valuing the need for the practice in the private sector. Transparency in the public sector is of greater than to governmental studies. Contextually, the indicators of public management in this study are adopted from an Afrocentric source, the Mo Ibrahim Foundation of African Governance. These are the effectiveness of government in designing and implementing policies, delivery of public services and management of human resources, statistical capacity and the extent of diversification. It also include budget management, ratio of total revenue to total expenditure and prudence of fiscal policy. Others include ratio of external debt to exports, revenue mobilization and extent of access to financial records of state owned companies online or offline to journalists, auditors and citizens in a timely and cost efficient manner (Mo Ibrahim Foundation, 2016).

In spite of its recent development, extensive literature exist on new public management. These include those of Busch, Hechinger, Johnsen, Klausen, Murdock and Vanebo (2013),Denhardt and Denhardt (2000), Fatemi and Behmanesh (2012), Federickson, Smith, Larimer andLicari (2012), Gray and Jenkins (2006), Gruening (2001), Hague (nd), Henry (2006), Hope (2001), Olaopo (2008), Prombergerand Raeeskala (2003), Savio (2006) and Sharpe (2012) most of the literature is however, western-based and the studies were mainly conceptual and qualitative rather than quantitative.They also centred on either the criticism of the traditional administrative approach and the need to embrace the new public management as a framework of government (Busch, 2013 et al, Fatemi's&Behmanesh, 2012, Frederickson et al, 2012, Gray & Jenkins's 2006, and Hope, 2001 among others). Others focused on a skeptical view of the so called new public management (Danhardt&Denhardt, 2000, Gruening&Savio, 2006 among others). Studies closely related to this study are those of Fatemis and Behmanesh (2012) who focused on "New Public Management Approach and Accountability" and Ibietan (2013) that examines "New Public Management and Public Service Effectiveness in Nigeria. This study seeks to examine the significance of the relationship between transparency and the quality of public management in Nigeria. It is also mainly Afro-centricand quantitative in nature rather than qualitative.

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

Transparency

Attempts at conceptualizing transparency trace it as a pre-requisite to its twin concept of accountability and as the major element of the Agency Theory. According Hood (2006) as cited by Abu Hassan (2013), transparency has established some kind of quasi-religious authority and also as a doctrine of good governance. Transparency from accounting perspective is seen as the obligation to disclose an organization's financial position to the owners. In a governmental setting, it makes institutions and office-holders trusted and trustworthy. Hassan (2012) adds that transparency is positively related to performance as exposure to

public view acts as stimulus.The scholar however, observed that in measuring transparency using some index may pose a transparency illusion gap between nominal transparency and effective transparency.

The United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) operationally defines transparency using three criteria. These are that; the decisions taken and their enforcement by public servants are done in a manner that conforms with known rules and regulations, information is freely available and easily accessible to those who will be affected by such decisions and their enforcement; and enough information is provided in easily understable forms and media. Olowu (2002) asserts that the level of transparency in governance is determined by the degree of citizens' access to valid and regular information about how they are governed. It is our ability to exhibit clearness in action which put such actions above question (Elaigwu, 2015).

Transparency simply refers to clearness and openness in the conduct of government business through the provision of adequate, regular, valid and accessible information to the citizens on how they are governed. Transparency in relation to accountability represents means-ends relationship as transparency facilitates accountability. Transparency is also ineffective without accountability. However, as Bovens (2006) observes, transparency is not enough to constitute accountability. Global integrity in its (2004) and (2006) Integrity reports identifies some of the necessary pre-conditions for transparency to exist in the public sector. These include existence of Verde civil society organisations, citizens right of access to information on procurement and access to information on the activities of whistle blowers and anti-corruption agencies.

The New Public Management

Vast literature exist on the origin, meaning, rationale and principles of the New Public Management. Savio (2006) however, describe it as a flawed concept while Laurence and Lynn (2006) were skeptical of the concept. Gruening (2001) sees nothing new about the New Public Management. The New Public Management scholars and associates Fatemi&Behmanesh (2012), Islam (2015) Hope (2001), Klausen (2013), Promberger and Rauskala (2003) Gray and Jenkins (2006), Sharpe (2012) justify the emergence of public management on the failure of traditional public administration.

Sharpe (2012) blames public monopolies for the inefficiency, top-down centralized bureaucracies in a period of rapid change. Islam (2015) adds that traditional public administration emphasizes policy-administration dichotomy, rule base administration, meritocracy, career system, impersonality, division of labour and hierarchy of authority.This hand of bureaucracy according to Islam (2015) leads to rep-tape, unpleasant officials, poor service delivery, centralized bureaucracies, waste and inefficiency in resource use and inadequate mechanism for accountability. These problems of the traditional public administration are what the new public

management seeks to tackle (Promberger&Rauskala, 2003). Haque (nd) asserts that the failures of the traditional state bureaucracy can be attributed to its monopolistic nature, unmanageable size, managerial inefficiency, public inaccessibility, economic inertia, excessive corruption and self-serving agenda which necessitated the paradigm shift to public management.

Attempts at conceptualizing the new public management leads to the operational definition of the concept by making reference to its elements (Promberger&Rauskala, 2003; Hope, 2001; Gruerwng, 2001' Sharpe, 2012; Klausen, 2013, Olaopa, 2008, &Haquend). Others explain the concept in contradistinction with traditional public administration (Denhardt&Denhardt, 2000; Frederickson, et al 2012, Islam, 2015, Sovie, 2006). Sharpe (2012) in his review of the Osbornes (1993) classical write up "Reinventing Government" reiterates Osbornes (1993) six principles of the New Public Management as the practice of a government that is catalytic, competitive, mission-driven, result oriented, customer driven and enterprising.

A catalytic government according to Osborne (1993) is one that stears rather than row. A competitive government discards monopoly and encourage competition among government, for profit and nonprofit organizations as well as between governmental units. Mission-driven public management unlike the traditional public administration minimizes focus on rules but is more concerned with mission to be achieved. A result oriented government shifts accountability by managers from inputs to outcomes and results. A government that is customer-driven empowers citizens with the means and allow them to choose who to patronize rather than provide for them through services. An enterprising government is much more concerned with the idea of earning rather than spending.

Gruening (2001) identifies what he classifies as undisputed and debatable characteristics of the New Public Management. The undisputed elements are identified by most observers. These comprise of budget cuts, vouchers, accountability for performance and performance auditing, privatization, citizens as customers and decentralization. It also include strategic planning and management, separation of politics from administration and use of information technology. The other elements of the New Public Management which Gruening (2001) describes as debatable include rationalization of jurisdictions, improved regulation, streamling of administrative structures, democratization and citizen participation among others.

In a more script approach, Klausen (2013) asserts that NPM entails including reforms in government in the direction of privatizing, outsourcing, and incorporating market like mechanisms in the public sector. Hope (2001) reiterating the view of Kett (2000) summarizes the elements of the NPM as; efficiency in service delivery, marketisation and service orientation that is responsive to the needs of the citizens. Others are decentralization, improvement and policy capacity and accountability for result.

In a more detailed approach,Promberger and Rauskala (2003) identifies the doctrines the NPM as well as their meaning and justification. The first element of the NPM according to Promberger and Rauskala (2003) is hands-on professional management. This means that visible managers are at the top of the organization and are free to manage by use of discretionary power and justified on the bases that accountability requires clear assignment of responsibility and not diffusion of power. Another element of the NPM to Promberger&Rauskala (2003) is setting of explicit standards and performance measures. This entails that goals are clearly defined targets which are specific measurable, achievable, relevant and time bond are established. This is because accountability means clearly stated aims and that efficiency requires a hard look at objectives.Others elements of the NPM are emphases on output controls, shift to decentralization, competition, private-sector styles of management practice and greater discipline and economy in the use of resources.

Araujo, Joaquin, Follipe, Ferraz and Esterves De (2011) cited by Islam (2015) contrasted traditional public administration from the NPM in terms of the organization of government, control of public organizations, control of output measure, management practices and discipline in the use of resources. Under the Traditional Public Administration the organization of government is that services are provided on a uniform bases operating as a single aggregate unit while the traditional structures are broken-up into quasi autonomous units under the NPM. The control of public organizations is through the hierarchy of authority in the traditional public administration but is based on professional management with clear statement of goal and performance measure under the NPM. In addition, the NPM stress on results and output control rather than procedures which is the concern of traditional public administration. The traditional public administration uses bureaucratic practices while NPM adopts private sector management styles. Discipline on resource use in traditional public administration is based on due process and practical entitlements. While NPM check demands and strives to do more with lesser resources.

Similarly, Denhardt and Denhardt (2000) assert that the NPM differs from Traditional Public Administration in terms of theoretical foundation, prevailing rationality, to whom the public servants are responsible and conception of public interest. Other areas of differences include the mechanisms for achieving policy objectives, approach to accountability, the extent of administrative discretion, assumed organizational structure and motivational bases of public servants Frederickson et al (2012) use; the extent of scale where Traditional Public Administration is centralized while NPM is decentralized, direct services provision under Traditional Public Administration and contract in NPM; specialization by characteristics of work, process and purpose under Traditional Public Administration in contrast to specialization by Clientele and location under the NPM. Others are control by professional practice standards inputs, outputs and

processes traditional public administration in contrast to competition and outcomes under the NPM. Other differences in doctrine between Traditional Public Administration and the NPM include exercise of discretion which is by law, regulations and professional latitude under Traditional Public Administration and by deregulation and risk taking under the NPM; employment and leadership based on merit, affirmative action and technical skill mutual competence and professional expertise and same in NPM. However, leadership is based on entrepreneurial spirit under the NPM. In terms of purpose, Traditional Public Administration seeks to carry out the law, manage orderly and reliable institutions while the NPM seeks to facilitate change and create public value.

Sovie (2006) explains that; the philosophy of the NPM is based on the conviction that private sector management is superior to NPM; that the solution to the problems of governance is to transfer activities to the private sector through privatization and contracting out.He adds that the NPM is dynamic and decisive, concerned with empowering citizens, providing service to clients or customers, shifts emphasis on processes to performance and the need to earn rather than spend. Traditional Public Administration on the other hand emphases rules and regulation, it is lethargic in decision making and is concerned with processes and spending.

From the views of Promberger and Rauskala (2003), Hope (2001), Gruening (2001), Klausen (2013), Olaopa (2008), Denhardt and Denhardt (2000), Islam (2015) Frederickson et al (2012) and Sovie (2006), it is clear that the NPM is based on neo-liberal economic theory of public choice perspective and managerialism, it is also based on private sector philosophy and principles. The NPM condemned the Traditional Public Administration approach and over relied on the market as if market failure does not exist. In a much as the objectives of the state and its institutions are not same as those of the private organizations, it scale, functions and modus operandi will definitely differ from those of the market.Most importantly, the extent to which a government goes entrepreneurial and imbibe the principle of NPM largely depends on the provisions of the constitution of the country concerned.

As Haque (nd) asserts the emergence of the NPM in the United States of America under Reagen the United Kingdom under Thatcher as well as in Austria, Canada and New Zealand was a political agenda of the ruling parties to use the market-driven approach as an effective tool to boost support for un-bureaucratic public. The decreasing cases of public confidence in governance in major capitalist countries was another reason for the anti-bureaucratic rhetoric called the NPM since 1980s. In developing countries like Nigeria, external pressure exerted by international institutions play major role in often forcing these countries to adapt the NPM.

In this study, public management encompasses of the quality of public administration in terms of the effectiveness of civil administration in designing and implementing policies, delivering public services and managing human resources as well as statistical capacity. It also include the extent of diversification of the

economy, quality of budget discipline, ratio of revenue to expenditure, fiscal discipline, revenue mobilization and transparency in state-owned companies (Mo Ibrahim Foundation 2015).

Nexus between Transparency and Public Management

Literature on the NPM and transparency in governance though very extensive is mainly conceptual, theoretical and western based. These include the studies of Denhardt and Denhardt (2000), Islam (2015), Grueining (2001), Sharpe (2012), Haque (nd), Promberger and Rauskala (2003), Jone and Kett (2006), Klausen (2013), Gray and Jenkins (2006), Lynn Jnr. (2006) and Sovie (2006).Only a few empirical non-western studies exist (Hope, 2001, Ibietan, 2013 & Abu-Hassan, 2013).

Abu-Hassan (2013) examines how transparency, public trust and confidence in government agencies influences citizen participation and voting decisions in the United Kingdom using only the perception of respondents in a survey research not backed up by any secondary data. Ibietan (2013) discusses the role of the NPM in facilitating the effectiveness of public sector organizations in Nigeria without focusing on any specific aspect of the public sector. The study though claimed to have heavily relied on secondary data lacks any empirical data; thus suffering from methodological inadequacies. Similarly, Hope (2001) explores the relationship between the basic context of the NPM, as applied in practice in the reform of the public sector in Africa. The study was purely qualitative. This study seeks to cover the inadequacies of the previous studies by empirically examining the significance of the relationship between transparency and the quality of public management using afrocentric secondary data from the Mo Ibrahim Foundation.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study is the Agency Theory.

Agency theory rests on the notion that social and political life can be understood as a series of contracts in which one party referred to as the principal, enters into contract with another party referred to as the agent. In this case, the principal agrees to reward the agent on mutually agreeable terms. The principal might engage the services of the agent because of the specialized skills he poses or because the nature of task requires group effort. Initially, the agency theory was applied primarily to the problems associated with the difficulty of ensuring that managers act in the interest of the shareholders. However, in recent times, agency problems of this nature are seen to be a central feature of social and political life.

Agency theory like the public choice theory is premised by the early economic analysis of bureaucracy by Dawn (1967), Niskanem (1971) and Tullock (1965), who are regarded the bureaucracy as if it were a self seeking individual or firm in a market (Frederickson, Smith, Larimer and Licari, 2012). The theory assumes that individuals are rational self-interested utility maximisers, as such, the

interest of agents and principals conflict. The management of many principal-agent relationships is complicated by incomplete information, asymmetrical information and various uncertainties. As Olaopa (2008) explains, agents generally do have access to information that principals do not and have an incentive to exploit this advantage. As such, the behavior of agent is often difficult for principals to observe and usually, there are frequent uncertainties surrounding the way an agent's action is translated into outcome sought by a principal.

One important mechanism for controlling the bureaucracy in the modern form of accountability is the use of reporting in order to hold bureaucracies accountable for their performance (Dubrick, 2005 cited by Fredrickson, Smith, Larimer and Licari, 2012). Bovens (2006) identifies three different perspectives of the agency theory in the assessment of accountability relations. These are the; democratic perspective (popular sovereignty), constitutional perspective (prevention and abuse of power), and the cybernetic perspective (enhancing the learning capacity). This study is hinged on the democratic perspective. From the democratic perspective, the modern representative government could be described as a representation of principal-agent relationship. The citizens who are the ultimate principals and to whom sovereignty belongs to and from whom government derives its powers and authority delegates the sovereign powers to the elected representatives (National Assemble, Houses of Assembly and Local Government Legislative Councils) and Chief Executives who are popularly elected in Nigeria (President, Governor and Local Government Chairmen) (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999).

The Chief Executives at the Federal, State and Local Government levels delegates Minister, Commissioners, Supervisors as well as Special Assistants and Advisers who subsequently entrust the execution of their tasks to all other public servants in Ministries, Departments and Agencies of Governments. These public servants who are charged with the responsibility of serving the citizens selflessly are in custody of public resources and spends trillions of public monies, use their discretionary powers to furnish licenses and subsidies, impose fines, and for jailing people. Each principal in the chain of relationship seeks to monitor the execution of the delegated public tasks by calling on the agent to be transparent and accountable. At the end of the accountability are the citizens, who pass judgment on the conduct of government and expresses their pleasure of displeasure by continuing to vote for popular and against unpopular representatives and executives. Thus, to this perspective, transparency is essential for democratic processes, as it provides the people's representatives and voters alike with the information needed for determining the propriety and effectiveness or otherwise of the conduct of the government (Przeworki, Stokes and Marin, 1999) cited by Bovens, 2006.In relation to this study, the citizens require the government and its agencies to provide regular adequate and accessible information relating to public management as part of the broader good governance agenda.

Methodology

The research design for this study is content analysis of secondary data from Mo Ibrahim Foundation and Transparency International for the period 2000-2015. The Foundation is the most afro-centric non-governmental organization committed to making data available on the quality of governance in Africa for research purpose. It is also dedicated to preventing and rewarding good governance in Africa. The foundation's data in the most robust, relevant, up-to-date and user-friendly. The Ibrahim Index of African Governance (IIAG) is used in scoring and ranking the quality of governance measure in percentage (%). Four major categories, fourteen sub-categories and hundred indicators are used by the index (Mo Ibrahim Foundation, 2016, 2015 & 2014).

The four broad categories of good governance criteria consist of safety and rule of law, participation and human rights, sustainable economic opportunity and human development. While transparency is a sub-category of the safety and rule of law, public management is a sub-category of sustainable economic development.

Transparency International is the most credible global anti-corruption watch-dog based in Berlin, Germany. It uses its Corruption Perception Index (CPI) to measure the perceived level of transparency in governance. The CPI ranges from 0-1 and later with effect from 2012 converted to 10-100%.Transparency International uses the perception of knowledgeable country respondents, local and expatriate residents, business elites, scholars and country analysis gathering data from sources that span for three years in obtaining the CPI. Data on transparency and the quality of public management will be presented in tables and analysed using tables, averages, percentages and the Pearson correlatation coefficient in testing the hypothesis with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

Summary of Findings and Discussion

The independent and dependent variables for this study are transparency are quality of public management respectively. Data on these variables as obtained from Transparency International and the Mo Ibrahim Index of African Governance is presented in this section.

Table 1: Level of Transparency and Quality of Public Management in the Nigerian Public Service

Year	CPI (%)	Public Management
2000	12	42.8
2001	10	38.4
2002	16	37.2
2003	14	39.4
2004	16	44.0
2005	19	44.0
2006	22	48.1

2007	22	50.7
2008	27	50.2
2009	25	48.9
2010	24	48.5
2011	24	49.4
2012	27	51.8
2013	25	53.3
2014	27	51.3
2015	25	46.1

Sources: Transparency International Corruption Perception Index, 2000-2015 editions and Mo Ibrahim Foundation 2000-2016 editions.

Level of Transparency in the Nigerian Public Service

The data in table 1 indicates a generally low level of transparency in the Nigerian public service for the period 2000-2015. This range from the lowest of 10% in 2001 to a sluggish and undulating rise to the peak of 27% in 2008. This was neither maintained nor improved upon as the CPI fell to 25% in 2009 and further to 24% in 2010 and 2011 only to return to the peak (27%) in 2012 and 2014. Nigeria's average level of transparency for the period 2000-2015 was only 20.94%. This is contrary to the provisions of the agency theory and principles of transparency and accountability as contained in the constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999.

Quality of Public Management

Nigeria's scores on public management for the period 2000-2015 were relatively higher than those of transparency. This ranges from the lowest of 37.2% in 2002 to the highest of 53.3% in 2013. The marginal increases in the scores were not steady but undulating over the period. Remarkable progress was however, recorded from 2004-2007 only to slide back from 2008-2011 and rose again to 51.8% reaching the peak of 53.3% in 2012 and 2013 respectively. The scores later dropped to 51.3% in 2014 and further to 2006 figure of 46.1% in 2016. The total average score for Nigeria for the period 2000-2016 was 46.51% which can be rated very fair.

Test of Hypothesis

The H_0 postulated for the study states that; there is no significant relationship between the level of transparency and the quality of public management in Nigeria. The independent and dependent variables are level of transparency and quality of public management respectively. The hypothesis was tested using the data in table 2. The Pearson Correlation Co-efficient calculated value is presented in table 2.

Table 2; Pearson Correlation Coefficient

		Transparency	Quality of Public Mgt
Transparency	Pearson Correlation	1	.901**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	16	15
Quality of Public Mgt	Pearson Correlation	.901**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	15	15
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

The Pearson Correlation Coefficient value for the hypothesis tested is .901. This indicates a very significant positive relationship between the level of transparency and quality of public management in Nigeria for the period 2000-2015. Thus, the H_0 which states that there is no significant relationship between transparency and the quality of public management in Nigeria is rejected.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This study indicates that the level of transparency in the Nigerian Public Service has been very low for the period 2000-2015.Inspite of the establishment of many transparency institution. This negates the provisions of the agency theory and the constitution. Nigeria's quality of public management was not impressive as the average for the sixteen years was only 46.51%. The Pearson correlation coefficient value derived from the test of hypothesis was .901 thus, indicating a positive and very strong significant relationship between the level of transparency and quality of public management in Nigeria for the period 2000-2015. This indicates that the quality of public management in Nigeria varied with the level of transparency over the years. The policy implication is that for better quality of public management more efforts must to be made to make the public service more transparent.

In view of the findings and conclusions the study recommends for existence virdeof a civil society and enlightenments of citizens on right to information in accordance with the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act 2011. Others include more transparent budget management processes and accessibility to information on privatization of state owned enterprises as well as whistle blowers and anti-corruption agencies. A reform of the judiciary for speedy dispensation of cases relating to breaches of transparency laws will serve as deterrent to such breaches in accordance with the principles of transparency and accountability.

References

Abu Hassan, H. (2013). Transparency, trust and confidence in the public sector. *British Journal of Arts and Sciences*. Vol.13, No.1, pp.131-140.

Bovens, M. (2006). Analysing and assessing public accountability. A conceptual framework. European Governance paper No. C-06-01

Busch, T., Heichlinger, A., Johnsen, E., Klausen, K.K., Murdock, A. &Vanebo, J.O (eds) (2013). *Public Management in the twenty-first century, trends ideas and practices*.Osho, Norway; Universitets-forlaget.

Denhardt, R.B. &Denhardt, J.V. (2006). The new public service; serving rather than steering.*Public Administration Review*. Vol.6, No.6, pp.549-559

Economic and Financial Crimes (Establishment) Act, Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004)

Egwu, J.I. (2005). *Nigeria yesterday and today for tomorrow; essays in governance and society*. Jos; Aha Publishing House Ltd.

Ademi, M., &Behmanesh, M.R. (2012). New public management approach and accountability. *International Journal of Management Economic and Social Sciences*.Vol.1(2), pp.42-49.

Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999) Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999, Lagos, Federal Government Press.

Fiscal Responsibility Act, Federal Republic of Nigeria, (2007).

Frederickson, H.G., Smith, K.B., Larimer, C.W., &Licari, M.J. (2012), *Thepublic administration theory primer* (Second edition) Colorado, USA; Westview Press.

Freedom of Information Act, Federal Republic of Nigeria (2011).

Global Integrity (2004) 2004 Global Integrity report. Accessed on 15/12/2008 from www.globalintegrityreport.org

Global Integrity (2006) 2006 Global Integrity Country assessment and global integrity index. Accessed on 15/12/2008 from www.globalintegrityreport.org

Hood, A. & Jenkins, B. (2006). From public administration to public management; reassessing a revolution? In E.C., Otenyo& N.S. Lind (eds). *Comparative Public Administration; The Essential Readings, Research in Public Policy Analysis and Management,* Elsevier Ltd, Vol.15, 543-572, doi:10.1016/50732-1317(06) 15023-x

Lining, G. (2001). Origin and theoretical bases of new public management. *International Public Management Journal,* Vol.4, pp.1-25

Pe, M.S. (nd) Newpublic management; origins, dimensions and critical implications. *Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems*.

Ar, N. (2006) Good government; an unstylish idea that warrants a worldwide welcome. In E.C. Otenyo& N.S. Lond (eds). *Comparative Public Administration; The Essential Reading, Research in Public Policy Analysis and Management.* Elsevier Ltd. Vol.15,905-915. Doi:10.1016/50732-1317(06)15042-3

Hope, K. R. (2001) Thenew public management; context and practice in Africa. *International Public Management Journal*. Vol.4, pp.119-134.

Ibietan, J. (2013). New public management and public service effectiveness in Nigeria; a pragmatic discuss. *Public Policy and Administration Research*, Vol.3, No.7, pp.53-61.

Independent Corrupt Practice and Other Related Offences Commission (ICPC) (2000). *The ICPC Act 2000*. Ibadan; University Press.

Islam, F. (2015) Newpublic management; a dominating paradigm in public sectors. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*. Vol.9(4), pp.141-151.

Jones, L.R. &Kettl, D.F. (2006). Assessing public management strategy in an international context. In E.C. Otenyo& N.S. Lond (eds). *Comparative Public Administration: The Essential Readings Research in Public Policy Analysis and Management.* Vol.15, 883-904, Elsevier Ltd; do; 10.1016/50732-1317(06) 15041-1

Laurence, E. & Lynn Jr. E. (2006). The new public management as an international phenomenon; a skeptical view. In E.C. Otenyo, & N.S. Lind (eds). *Comparative Public Administration; The Essential Readings. Research in Public Policy Analysis and Management.* Elsevier Ltd. Vol.15, 573-591; doi; 10.1016/50732-131(06)15024-1

Mo Ibrahim Foundation (2016). A decade of African governance. www.moibrahimfoundation.org

National Planning Commission (2004). Nigeria; National economic empowerment and development strategy, Abuja; National Planning Commission.

Nigeria Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative Act, Federal Republic of Nigeria (2007).

Olaopa, I. (2008). *Theory and practice of public administration and civil service reforms in Nigeria.* Ibadan; Spectrum Books Limited.

Olowu, D. (2002). Accountability and transparency. In L. Ademodekun (ed). *Public Administration in Africa; Main Issues and Selected Country Studies* (139-150), Ibadan; Spectrum Books Limited.

Osborne, D. (1993). Reinventing government.*Public Productivity and Management Review*. Vol. 16, No.4, pp.349-356.

Promberger, K. &Rauskala, I. (2003). New public management-an introduction from UK perspective. Working Paper 6/2003, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria.

Public Procurement Act, Federal Republic of Nigeria (2007).

Sovie, D.J. (2006) What is wrong with new public management? In E.C. Otenyo, & N.S. Lind (eds) Comparative Public Administration; The Essential Readings, Research in Public Policy Analyses and Management. Vol.15, 593-602 doi; 1016/50752-1317(06) 5025-3

UNESCAP (2010). What is good governance? Accessed from www.unescap.org/pdf on 29/08/2016