Management of Change and Innovation in the Nigerian Public Service

[1] Anietie E. Ekang, PhD

[1] Department of Public Administration, Heritage, Polytechnic, Eket, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria

Abstract: The civil service is always known to be conservative and status-quo oriented and incapable of transcending the cosmetic refurbishing of routinized policies and activities. Thus, any reform or innovation introduced in the civil service is always given a cool and half-hearted welcome and in most cases out right resistance. This has been blamed as one of the major causes of poor service delivery in Nigeria's public sector. This has made many governments in power, both military and civilian alike to attempt a reform of the public service by introducing new policies and innovation in order to place the service in a better pedestal to render effective service to the people. These reforms have been largely unsuccessful due mainly to inherent structural, administrative and attitudinal shortcomings in the service. This study believes that these shortcomings can be corrected if the public service is properly re-structured, administratively combed and attitudinally re-oriented to see the public service as service to the fatherland and not service to the colonial masters- a belief that was previously held by early generation of government workers in the country. Also there should be infusion of private sector mentality in the running of the public service. Training for aspiring public servants should be adequately laced with business sector courses so as to make them efficiency-conscious. Government may consider public – private – partnership in the rendering of most services as is obtainable in most parts of the developed world such as Britain, Australia, Canada, Germany, etc. We cannot afford to be left behind in this new and welcoming arrangement.

Introduction

Public service is a service rendered dispassionately to every member of the public. Those who render public services do not have anybody in mind as to who they are rendering the services to. They are expected to render the service to everyone and no one in mind. In other words, public services do not discriminate its beneficiaries. The services are rendered without recourse to one's social, political,

religious, ethnic and economic status in the society. Public service is also called government service. This type of service is for the benefits of all citizens.

However, with the increasing cases of privatization, commercialization and public-private-partnership (PPP) in the rendering of public services, most citizens, especially the less privileged have been denied the opportunities of enjoying public services because of affordability capability. In privatization, public services are handed over to the private sector or individuals to provide on behalf of the government to the people. Under this arrangement, the private sector is expected to charge higher prices in the provision of such services in order to recoup their equity in such investment. It's not everybody that will be able to afford paying for such services before they could enjoy them. In commercialization, government will still provide such services to the people but will be charging 'market prices' for such services. In other words, government will be charging prices that are determined by the forces of demand and supply as private sector investors in order to make profits.

Thus government becomes a businessman in the provision of services to the people instead of focusing on its core functions of providing welfare services to the generality of the people. Truth is that private sector is always pragmatic, efficient and effective in the rendering of services to the people though with a price tag than the public sector that is always dull, lethargic, insensitive and indolent in the rendering of services to the people at free rate. This has necessitated some people to call for the scrapping, reformation or the restructuring of the public service because of its perceived ineptitude, slothfulness, poor performance and inherent low productivity. The apostles of this school of thought are yet to provide us with an enlightened alternative to the public service that will be equitable in the rendering of services to all.

Philosophy of the Public Service

The philosophy of the public service is the belief people hold about what the public service is or not. Some see the public service as necessary and on a redemption mission to bridge the gap between the rich and the poor in the provision of welfare services to the people. Yet others see public service as evil and an oppressor only out to serve interest of those close to the government of the day while oppressing the rest of the people. The philosophy of the public service will really depend on how the individual sees the government and most importantly what he or she stands to benefit from the government and its services.

The philosophy of the public service congeals around the idea that such services are for the welfare of all. According to Obikeze (2011),

> *The philosophy behind public service arose from the Greek City States of Athens and Sparta. In these places the people saw their cities as common enterprise for the welfare of all. With time, however, greed made men to become acquisitive and individualistic. Thus, the need for a body that would concern itself with general good. Therefore, the philosophy behind public service originated from the struggles of people who believed that the people, especially, the weak in the society would benefit if government worked in the interest of the people. Gradually, reforms took place and rules, regulations and laws were made to ensure that those in public service actually operated in the interest of the people. The original philosophy was that people should work to promote their collective wellbeing rather than individual idiosyncrasies. This philosophy of service to people demanded commitment, patriotism, love, mutual respect and involvement in the affairs of the people. This in a nutshell was the philosophy of public service in Europe before they came to colonize us (Obikeze, 2001:71)*

The question we may pose at this time is: Did the spirit of public service exist in Africa before the coming of the European colonizers? The answer to this question is in the affirmative. Africans lived a communal life and were their brothers' keepers. A child did not only belong to the parents but to the community as a whole. That explains why a successful son or daughter of any village belongs to the entire village, and is addressed as 'our sons' or 'our daughters' and are usually conferred with chieftaincy titles or special awards as 'our illustrious son or daughter'. In other instances, reception parties or ceremonies are organized for sons or daughters of any community who win elections, get political or administrative appointments or achieve any major breakthrough in the society. Such are occasions to celebrate the achiever as their own community son or daughter. The above scenario can also be buttressed in the manner we handle traditional marriages, death and birth in our communities. The public service in the pre-colonial era was people oriented and was committed to promoting the wellbeing of the people. This was mainly the situation of things before the coming of Europeans to balkanize, distort and bastardize our economy by infiltrating it with foreign culture. (Ekang, 2020). Their coming then put a knife on things that held us together, things fell apart and the centre can longer hold in the immutable words of the late literary icon, Professor Chinua Achebe.

Colonialism and Public Service Philosophy

The idea of the public service which the Europeans brought to us was not the same as practised in Europe. In fact, public service in Europe was used to better the lives of their people and enhance their living standards. Sadly, the public service that they brought to us was designed primarily to exploit the commonwealth of the people of Africa. From the Governor-General, the Resident officers, the Provincial officers, the District officers, the Magistrates, the Police, traditional rulers, the Army, the clerks, they used their positions to intimidate, oppress, exploit, harass, cow, threaten and blackmail the people and at the same time milked the economy of Africa dry. The tenets of the public service which is services to the people, commitment to the people, commitment to common interest, patriotism, empathy, responsiveness to public goods were jettisoned. Africans were objectified and treated as less human beings while the interests of the colonial masters were extolled. Our collective interest meant nothing to our colonial masters; what concerned them was to exploit and export our resources to develop Europe at the expense of Africans.

Adedokun (2004) assets that it was this miserable state of affairs that made our people to see public service as work for the 'Whiteman' – "olu oyibo". Our people then began to resist all entreaties to work for the colonial masters. Where they inevitably found themselves working for the "Whiteman", they absented themselves from work, reported late to office, left office early and even when present in the office would not do much, files were hidden and all manners of things were done to subvert the smooth running of the "Whiteman's" work. This ugly scenario now holds the connotation of public service as "Whiteman's" work that must be treated with levity and aloofness, in order to 'punish' the Whiteman. Even after the departure of the colonial masters, this mentality is yet to abate in our public service.

Again, there was a clash of public service ethics with the African culture, values and belief systems. For instance, our people did not see anything wrong in you giving kola nuts and drinks to somebody before making requests. This was not seen by Africans as bribery and corruption but to create a convivial atmosphere to present the request. The bureaucratic ethics and postulations frown at these cherished African values and beliefs systems, seeing it as a mockery and travesty of public service tradition.

According to Obikeze (2011), the Western culture believes that people must do their work objectively, meritoriously, impersonally and without fear or favor; that workers should not accept any largesse before doing their work. This runs contrary to our own culture of welcoming open handedness from a friend in the course of rendering services, and our people have found it difficult to drop this culture and value system. This has placed Africans in a situation in which they have their feet in two worlds, at home in

none and at a loss on how to resolve this bureaucratic conundrum. This has put our public servants in a fix. Attempts to reconcile this contradictory scenario have proven futile, sterile and fruitless at best.

Even after independence, our people find it difficult to realize that public service is actually service to the fatherland and no longer service to the Whiteman. It is no longer 'olu oyibo' but 'olu obodo'. Also, our public service thrives on ethnic and tribal lines, with a rich dose of ethnic sentiment as a result of the "divide and rule" tendencies entrenched and encouraged by the colonial masters. The bell of ethnic jingoism was sounded louder by European colonialists in different regions in recruitment into the colonial service and in the formation of political parties. These leaders saw themselves first as leaders of their regions, and not really as national leaders. (Ekang, 2020). Thus, these leaders fanned the embers of ethnic disunity in order to protect the interests of the respective regions. Thus, Nigeria was not seen as one country and no one really cared much about the corporate existence of Nigeria, but that of their regions or ethnic groups.

The Philosophy of the Public Service since Independence

The colonial public service was not originally designed with the interest of the African people at heart neither was it intended to promote the wellbeing of the people. Because colonialism was vindictive, dictatorial, repressive, exploitative and dehumanizing (Ekang, 2020), those who found themselves in the employ of the public service used their positions to sabotage the system. With the heralding of independence in 1960, the situation shifted from fighting the Whiteman to using the public service to curry sectional interest, personal aggrandizement and an avenue for primitive acquisition of wealth. Since independence, public service has been seen as the easiest means of enriching oneself, empowering cronies and renewing friends through dubious recruitment and doubtful contract awards while the collective interests of the people suffer serious setback. In both military regimes and civil administrations, public service is seen as a veritable instrument that enhances the looting and vandalization of our common till.

Almost all Nigerians who find themselves in the public service use such a platform to settle personal, sectional and parochial scores and interests while the public interest continues to die by instalments. Any curious observation of public institutions in Nigeria smacks of corruption, lethargy, ineptitude, care-free attitude to work, red tapism, lack of productivity, embezzlement of public funds, ineffectiveness, inefficiency, tribalism, religious bigotry, suspicion and near collapse of the service. This has eclipsed the fundamental philosophy of commitments and patriotism. Selflessness has been substituted with greed, avarice, untamed appetite for acquisition of wealth and insensitivity in renderings public service. This is a sad reminder of why people want to go into public service by all means. Elective positions have become a beautiful bride that must be gotten by all means, not really for reasons of rendering public service and contribution to the general wellbeing of the people but because of vested interests and desire for squander mania and plunder of our commonwealth. This currently is the pathetic and sorry image of our public service. Sadly, what we have as the present philosophy of the public service in Nigeria is out of touch with the original ideas, aspirations and needs of the forebears of our public service. Hence, the needs for a paradigm shift in the philosophy of the public service in order to enhance effective service delivery. Little wonder the status quo ante mentality of our people towards public service has made effective service delivery elusive in the country.

Needs for Change in philosophy, structure and orientation of the public service

The common perception among the people is that the current philosophy of the public service is obsolete, antiquated and outmoded and needs to be replaced with something contemporaneous. This calls for the reform of the present system. And we all know that every reform comes with change and innovation. Change means making something different. Innovation is a special kind of change which may involve

renewing inputs, renewing processes and therefore, renewing products. All innovations involve change but not all changes are innovation.

Innovations in work organizations range from small incremental improvements to radical technological breakthroughs, new structures, new administrative systems, leading to new and improved products and services (Etuk, 2006). The present civil service philosophy of the New Public Management (NPM) comes with a rich promise of salvaging the traditional public administration system through change and innovation. Change through radical technology involves the adoption of e-governance while structural and administrative changes involve altering the present organizational and administrative structure of the civil service.

Etuk (2006) opines that organizational structure refers to a number of things including:

1. The way and manner of grouping workers (Departmentalization);

2. Application of rules and regulations (formalization);

3. The degree of control exerted from the centre of the organization;

4. The number of people working under one head;

5. The number of levels between the man at the apex of the organization and those at the bottom, which either facilitate or hinder the flow of information between the top and the bottom of the organization.

As Etuk (2006) asserts, introducing change/innovation into an organization involves changing the organizational structure from the mechanistic structure which aims at achieving organizational goals with less regard for human feelings, to the organic structure which has human touch in assigning people to work, in applying rules and regulations, in giving staff the opportunity to be involved in decision making, especially in decisions that concern their welfare and which allows workers to interact freely with one another. In short, the organic structure is the organizational structure which permits management to give human touch in the administration of the civil service.

Most organizations and their members usually resist change. If there is any organization that resists change the most, it is the civil service. As Ekang (2014) puts it, the civil service is slow to perceive change and even slower to adopt it. According to Okon (2013), resistance is necessary because it provides a degree of stability and predictability of behaviour in organizations, which otherwise would have been random and chaotic. Resistance to change can be overt, implicit, immediate or deferred (Robbins, et al, 2001). An example of an overt resistance is when employees respond to change by complaining or threatening a strike action. Implicit resistance is subtle and unvoiced, but behaviour at work is affected, like being disloyal to authority, loss of motivation to work, increased mistakes and regular absenteeism. A deferred resistance is seen when a change produces minimal reaction at the time it is implemented, but sometimes in the future, resistance by the affected employees surfaces and blows up out of proportion to the change. Civil servants in Nigeria appear to be more affected by implicit resistance than others.

Resistance to change by the individual is borne out of some basic human characteristics such as human perceptions, personalities and needs. In effect, individuals resist change based on any of the following reasons, as put forward by Shaw (1973), Robbins at al (2001) and Etuk (2006).

1. Resistance as force of habit. This resistance is borne out of the desire to maintain the status quo. Humans are creatures of habit. Since life is so complex, people do not usually consider different ways of doing things, they prefer to tread the familiar terrain. People like to engage in familiar programmes or routine behaviours for which they form habits. Any deviation from this is usually resisted. For instance, transferring a public servant from one state to another will mean losing contact with friends

and perhaps, being deprived of the conveniences which the other station offered. Moving such a staff may be strongly resisted.

2. Resistance for economic reasons. This type of change may bring about lower income to the staff concerned. For example, where a staff is moved from a post he or she used to get 'tips' from members of the public to a position he or she will not get such is likely to be resisted.

3. Resistance for security reasons. The concern here may be fear of losing one's job or life and will likely also be resisted.

4. Resistance for fear of the unknown. This resistance is based on stereotypes about the effects of change. Here, the individual is not sure how the change will affect him or her.

5. Resistance due to ego defensiveness. Staff in organizations who claim false pretences of being the power base may see change as being a demotion or loss of power when the change does not acknowledge him or her as such.

6. Resistance due to lack of information. When change takes people unawares they are likely to resist such change because they lack prior information about the change.

7. Resistance due to lack of support. People resist change when there is no backing and no reassurance for initiating the change.

8. Resistance due to the timing of the change. Where adequate time is not provided for people to make appropriate adjustments, resistance becomes inevitable.

9. Resistance due to jealousy. People may be resentful of change that will favour others but not themselves.

10. Resistance due to cynicism. Lack of belief that the change can solve the problem in the organization may prompt people to be cynical about the change. Some people may refuse to give the change a fair trial.

11. Resistance due to suspicion. People who belong to a different camp from that of the administrator may not be supportive of the change. They see nothing good about the initiative of the change and may put a hostile and resentful posture toward the change.

12. Resistance due to the desire to control. The desire to control the innovation by a small group or cabal, who have vested interest to gain or protect but cannot control, may put up resistance.

Management of Change and Innovation in the Public Service

The public service needs a change in both orientation and in philosophy. The philosophy behind New Public Management can be garnered to transform the public service to an enviable institution that is capable of midwifing effective service delivery. This requires a change in the way civil servants are trained. They should not be trained as conservative but as progressive individuals in rendering public services to the people. Public servants should be trained with a lot of courses borrowed from Business Administration so that the civil service could be run in a business-like manner.

Management of change/innovations according to Etuk (2016) involves four activities: Identification of what needs to be changed, generation of possible solutions and choice of a satisfactory one, implementation of the preferred solution and evaluation of the results. Among these four stages, the implementation stage is the most complex, involving a wider range of activities, which Ekang (2012) groups into four as being: creating awareness, establishing structures to facilitate implementation, persuasion and commitment and finally, rolling out and fine-tuning the implementation.

Creating awareness involves giving honest information to those concerned on the need for change and the cause and nature of the change. It demands consulting widely about the mission in view, its implications for the people with regard to their careers, deployment and employment possibilities. Establishing structures involves forming a managerial team comprising staff from every department. The managerial team constitute the committee who should take certain decisions especially those touching on job assignments to members of the organization, available resources and decisions on different perspectives of the change/ innovation. Establishing structures also means setting up the infrastructure (Etuk, 2016). Persuasion and commitment involves systematically programming and synchronizing the work of different groups by spelling out objective work sequence and unit organizations, assigning individuals to different jobs, allocating resources and carefully recording them so that some decisions may be revisited if circumstance so demand.

Rolling out and fine-turning entails gradual implementation with regular group meetings to mobilize the people for information exchange, for monitoring the implementation and for feedback. Implementation is the translation of ideas into reality while feedback is to know the feeling, perception, success or failure of the programme with a view to making the necessary adjustments or modifications (Ekang, 2014).

It is one thing to introduce change and innovation into the public service to alter the previously held beliefs and philosophy of the public service as 'Whiteman' work to that of service to fatherland. Civil servants should be made to know that their duties are call to serve the fatherland and no longer a call to serve colonial masters or the Whiteman. They should handle public jobs as their private businesses and above all with utmost patriotism and commitment to the service of their fatherland. Implementing this change of public service philosophy from Whiteman's work to service to fatherland may appear a herculean tasks, but with sincerity of purpose, hard work, ethical and attitudinal re-orientation of civil servants, change of training templates for aspiring public servants, we would succeed. Let us forget about effective service delivery in the public service, if we do not get it right in terms of changing our perception and philosophy of the public service. So far, most people see public or civil service job as a lazy man's job, where you don't work enough but get paid regularly. Others see it as the only way they can have a tiny bite of the national cake through collection of salaries. Others see public service job as an opportunity to rest from hard work while engaging in their private businesses. Still others see it as a way of getting additional income from the public purse. This kind of mentality is not conducive for effective service delivery in the public service bureaucracy and needs an aggressive re-orientation (Aladegbola and Jaiyeola, 2016).

So far, several reforms carried out in the public service have not taken us far as a country. This is because the inherent philosophy in the public service is that, it is a Whiteman's work. This part of colonial carryover mentality that reporting to work late and leaving early, hiding files in offices, truancy, malingering, absenteeism, feigning sicknesses and presenting fake and doubtful medical reports, etc are all done to 'punish' the 'Whiteman' no longer hold true as the colonial masters had long left the public service to us. Public service is now our own service. Public servants are now rendering services to their people, their own kinsmen, their fellow countrymen and women.

It should be noted also that those who come into the public service through the instrumentality of a godfather or godmother or a patron owe their loyalty to such people since they believe that the godfathers will protect their interest while in the service. This category of people only owes their loyalty to their godfathers and not to the public service. If the public /civil service is to achieve effective service delivery, then there is the urgent need for a fundamental restructuring of the service to checkmate corruption, favouritism, mediocrity, religionism, ethnicism, red tapism, sexual harassment, statism, malingering, truancy, nepotism against which effective service delivery will not be feasible. Effective service delivery is the buzzword of every civil service reform. Such reforms are usually tall in promises but short in performances.

Citizens do not benefit from public services in the same proportion. This is usually because of the bias in the distribution of such services especially between urban and rural areas and also between areas political leaders come from and where they do not come from. This in turn means that groups or individuals may have less access to quality services like water and sanitation, education, health care and infrastructure than others. It is the effective delivery of public goods or services that re-inforces people's faith and trust in the government. When the government fails in effective service delivery to the citizens, they (the citizens) lack faith in such government, and in a democratic system, such government is usually voted out during the next election. Effective service delivery is thus the cornerstone of every successful government the world over (Rosenbloo and Krarchuck, 2002).

Public service goods and services are usually for consumption of everybody unlike private goods and services which are usually only for those who can pay to obtain or enjoy such goods and services. It is usually alleged that since private goods and services are provided for at a profit, the provider normally becomes creative, innovative and uses cutting-edge technology to deliver such goods and services with a view to maximizing profits. Where profits serve as bait, the private sector usually goes for a bite. However, public goods and services are usually not provided at a profit and this always serves as a disservice to creativity, innovation and technology driven service delivery.

Ostrom and Ostrom (1991), present the following as the major differences between public and private goods:

Table 1: Differences between public and private goods

	Public Goods	**Private Goods**
i	Relatively difficult to measure quantity and quality	Relatively easy to measure quantity of quality
ii	Consumed jointly and simultaneously by many people	Can be consumed by a single person
iii	Difficult to exclude someone who does not pay	Easy to exclude someone who does not pay
iv	Generally, no individual choice to consume or not	Generally, individual choice to consume or not
v	Generally, little or no individual choice of kind and quality of goods	Generally, individual choice of kind and quality of goods.
vi	Payment for goods not closely related to demand or consumption	Payment for goods closely related to demand and consumption
vii	Allocation decisions made primarily by political process	Allocation decisions made primarily by market mechanism.

Source: Ostrom and Ostrom (1991)

It should be noted however, that allocation decision regarding public goods usually take on the political colouration of the government in power while allocation decisions made in the private sector are determined by market mechanism. According to Olowu (2005), the ability of a government to legitimately tax and govern people is premised on its capability to deliver a range of services required by its population which no other player will provide. Put differently, governments owe their existence and legitimacy to the fact that there are services in which the possibility of market failure is great. Thus, Osborne and Gaebler (1992), have categorized activities that are best suited for government or civil service, those best suited for the private sector and those best suited for Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) or what they called third or voluntary and community organizations.

Table 1.2 Task Best Suited to Each Sector of the Economy

	Public	Private	Third
Best suited to public sector			
Policy management	E	1	D
Regulation	E	1	D
Enforcement of equity	E	1	E
Prevention of discrimination	E	D	D
Prevention of exploitation	E	1	E
Promotion of social cohesion	E	1	E
Best suited to private sector			
Economic tasks	1	E	D
Investment tasks	1	E	D
Profit generation	1	E	1
Promotion of self-sufficiency	1	E	D
Best suited to third sector			
Social tasks	D	1	E
Tasks that require volunteer labour	D	1	E
Tasks that generate little profit	D	1	E
Promotion of individual responsibility	1	1	E
Promotion of community	D	D	E
Promotion of commitment to welfare of others	D	1	E

Legend: E- Effective; Ineffective; D = Depends on context

Source: D. Osborne and T. Gaebler (1992)

One of the reasons usually advocated for poor service in the public sector is that government dabbles into areas that are strong domain of the private sector and thus wobbles in performance. It is thus believed that if government sticks to her area of strength in service delivery and allows the other areas to the private sector, it would perform better (Ringold, Alaka, koziol and Santhosh, 2012).

Thus, government especially in Africa, usually attempts, though unsuccessfully, to run businesses which are in the realm of the private sector. As a way out of this economic cul-de-sac, these governments usually establish public enterprises to bestride the public and the private sectors of the economy.

Basically, there are four broad types of public service delivery arrangements. These are: direct delivery, privatization of service delivery, Alternative service Delivery (ASD), and decentralization of service (Lessman and Markwardt, 2010).

In direct service delivery, the central government brings out legislation, enforces it, hires staff, puts money, produces and distributes services, either directly operating from the headquarters or through de-concentrated line agencies. It assumes full responsibility and is accountable not only for provision but also for delivering services (Cheung, 1997).

In privatization of service delivery, government hands over the delivery of public services to private companies. In such a case, government assumes no responsibility, except that of monitoring company's compliance with terms and conditions put in place by the government. If such companies are to be effective in service delivery, then government must set clear, attainable and measurable terms or objectives for such companies. In public service delivery through Alternative Service Delivery (ASD),

government partners with private sector organizations or companies through what is known as Public Private Partnership (PPP) in delivering public services to the people. This may come in the form of 'Build, Own, Operate and Transfer (BOOT) or Build, Operate and Transfer (BOT) or Build, Own, Operate (BOO), or Build, Own, Operate Share and Transfer (BOOST), or Build, Own, Lease, Transfer (BOLT) or Design, Build, Finance, Operate (DBFO) and Operate, Maintain, Transfer (OMT). In Australia, Canada, Germany and India, the BOT has been used in building new highways, airports and other infrastructural facilities with maximum success while in Britain; urban roads are being maintained through what are essentially DBFO contracts (Njoku, 2013). The partnership arrangement could be Operational and Maintenance (O and M) contract. This option according to Njoku (2013) calls for a private operator to manage and maintain in the service but does not include investment obligations. Put differently, the operator assumes the risk of operating and maintaining the services and the government retains the investment risk. Accordingly, the contracts are usually awarded for a given period of time normally 2-5 years. This is the management option adopted on the completion of the Murtala Mohammed Airport Terminal 2 in 2007 which management was contracted to Accenture – a management consulting firm (Njoku, 2013).

Challenge in the management of change and innovation in the Nigerian Public Service

The basic challenge of the public service is how to deliver efficient and effective service to the citizenry. The traditional public administration system with its attending problem of red-tapism and bureaucratic bottleneck is not conducive for effective public service delivery. Neither can the private sector provide services that can be afforded by all citizens. This is because the private sector charges some amount on its goods and services to recover the cost of investment. Without recovering the cost of investment, and making profits, the private sector cannot remain in business. This scenario obviously excludes some segments of the population from enjoying such goods or services because they cannot afford the cost. This now defeats the purpose of existence of the state which is to cater for the interests of all citizens, rich or poor, mentally sound or not; physically challenged or not. This usually prompts the government to embark on social safety net to accommodate the interest of the less privileged members of the society. Social safety nets are social welfare services geared towards the elimination, reduction or prevention of poverty. It includes welfare, unemployment benefits, universal health care, right to healthcare, free education, right to housing, legal aid, victims' rights, mutual funds, superfund for pensioners and veterans, workers compensation, severance package, consumer protection, social credit, homeless shelters, and some cases, also include subsidized services such as public transport, education, healthcare, etc.

The provision of public services usually consumes a large chunk of government budgetary allocation but this does not always correspond with the quality and quantity of services delivered to people. In third world countries, this is usually blamed on corruption that mischannels money meant for the provision of such services into people's private bank accounts. According to Tom (2015), corruption fritters away funds needed for effective policy implementation. Again, Tom (2015) asserts that nepotism and favouritism in staff employment and service to the clients as well as victimization of vocal staff and inter-institutional conflict could impede effective public service delivery.

Public services are normally arranged in a way that makes the public to play a passive role as the receiver of quality service. This runs contrary to innovation ideology witnessed in the private sector in areas of service delivery. It is to be noted that while the private sector may be more efficient and respond better to the needs of their customers, the problem is that of social justice, in that these facilities are only available to those who can afford to pay for them, which puts them out of the reach of the poor.

It is usually argued that one of the reasons public sector organizations are poor in service delivery is because their staff are poorly paid with unattractive incentives. This is not always true. Muralidharan (2007), writing from his Indian background, avers thus:

> *A common misconception is that government employees are not paid well enough, while the reality is that the typical government teacher is paid three to ten times more than a typical teacher in a private school. However, while salaries are high, the pay does not in any way depend on any measure of performance, which means that there is no incentive for good performance. One solution to this problem would be to link a portion of salary to objective measures of performance (Muralidharan, 2007:13).*

The notion of poor pay has been trumpeted as the cause of poor service delivery in public organizations. If this is the case, then why are staff in private schools more productive, committed and effective in service delivery than public schools? Perhaps, the answer lies more in the mean. In fact, this assertion applies mutatis mutandis to different other institutions such as hospitals, hotel and most other private sector organizations, etc.

Summary and Conclusion

Infusing change into organizations, especially the civil service is not always a welcomed development, especially in third world countries where such change would alter previous arrangement of things. This is one of the major reasons, change or innovation is difficult to effect in third world countries civil or public service. Several governments in power in Nigeria have carried out litany of reforms in the public service with a view to correcting and perhaps extirpate the perceived ills in the service but with little or no success. That is the reason this work was carried out to examine the management of change and innovation in the Nigerian public service. The work argued that attitudinal re-orientation of civil servants will serve to correct the anomaly. Besides, the template for training perspective civil servants should be generously interspersed with training in business courses so as to make civil servants smart and business oriented. Civil servants should be made to know that change and innovation are indispensible in any organization, and the earlier they embrace them the better for them and the organization.

References

1. Adedokun, O. (2004, unpublished) Public Personnel Management , Mimeograph, Department of Political Science, University of Calabar, Nigeria.

2. Aladegbola, I. and Jaiyeola, F. (2016).Critique of Public Administrative Reform System; Post Independence in Nigeria. *African's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review*, 4(1): 147-171

3. Cheung, A. (1997). Understanding Public Sector Reforms: Global Trends and Diverse Agenda.*International Review of Administrative Science*, 63(5) 435-457

4. Ekang, A. (2014). *Theories of Administration and Management*. Radiant Publishers, Eket, Nigeria, 107 P.

5. Etuk, G. (2006). *Educational Financing for Colleges and Universities*. Abaam Publishers, Uyo, Nigeria, 309p.

6. Lessman, C. and Markewardt, G. (2010). One size fits all? Decentralization, corruption and the Monitoring of Bureaucrats. *World Development Journal*, 38(4) 631-646.

7. Muralidharan, K. (2007). Public Service Delivery in India: Challenges and Opportunities. *Centre for the Advanced Study of India and the Trustee of the University of Pennsylvania, USA.*

8. Obikeze, O.S.A (2011). Prospects of the Public Service, pp 69-79. In: L.C. Nwachukwu, O. Onwubiko and E. A. Obi Editord), *Readings on the Nigerian Public Service*. Bookprint Publishers, Onitsha, Nigeria, 71p.

9. Okon, K. (2013, unpublished): Social Welfare Administration Lecture Notes Department of Public Administration, Heritage Polytechnic, Eket.

10. Njoku, R. (2013). *Comparative Public Administration (A Transnational Study of Administrative Systems in their Ecological Settings)*. Nwachukwu Publishers, Aba, Nigeria, 126p.

11. Osborne, D. and Gaebler, T, (1992). Reinventing Government. How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector. Prentice-Hill Publishers, New Delhi, India, 292p.

12. Ostrom, V. and Ostrom, E. (1991).Public Goods and Public Choices. The meaning of American Federalism: Constituting a self-Governing Society. Institute of Contemporary Studies, San Francisco, USA, 313p.

13. Ringold, D. Alaka, H. Koziol, M. and Santhosh, S. (2012).*Citizens and Service Delivery: Assessing the use of Social Accountability Approaches in Human Development*. Washington DC: World Bank, 304p.

14. Robbins, S., Judge T. and Vohra, N. (2012).*Organizational Behaviour*.Prentice Hall, New Delhi, India, 298p.

15. Rosenbloom, D. and Kravchuck, R. (2002).*Public Administration: Understanding Management, Politics and Law in the Public Sector (5thed)*. MCC raw Hill, Boston, 321p.

16. Tom, E. (2015). Public Policy Implementation in Nigeria: Evidence and Reality. In: C. O. Bassey and U. I. Agbor (Editors), *Public Policy and Politics in Nigeria: A Critical Discourse*. Concepts Publishers, Lagos, Nigeria, 176p.