

DISAGGREGATION OF UNITS AND EFFECTIVE SERVICE DELIVERY IN NIGERIA PUBLIC SERVICE

¹Anietie E. Ekanem, ²Patrick P. Ekanem and ³Judah D. Akwatang

Department of Political Science
,Akwa Ibom State College of Education,
Afaha Nsit – Nsit Ibom L.G.A
ayubongekang@gmail.com

Abstract

The study was conducted to examine whether disaggregation of units enhanced effective public service delivering. The objective of the study was to examine the extent disaggregation of units predicted effective public service delivery. The study used ex-post facts research design. Data were collected through both primary and secondary sources. The population of the study was 13479. The study used Taro Yamane's formula to get a sample size of 388 respondents. Two sets of questionnaire were constructed for the study as follows: Disaggregation of Units Questionnaire (DUQ) and Effective Public Service Delivery Questionnaire (EPSDQ). 200 copies of questionnaire on disaggregation of units were administered to selected members of the public through simple random sampling technique. Standard deviation, Regression analysis were used as analytical tools for the study. One research question and one hypothesis were formulated and which were tested and statistically analyzed. The null hypothesis which claims that disaggregation of units does not enhance effective public service delivery was rejected. The result means that disaggregation of units significantly enhances effective public service delivery in Akwa Ibom State civil service. It was recommended that ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAS) be broken down into smaller bureau to enhance effective public service delivery; functions and offices of government to be decentralized to debureaucratize government procedures and processes among others.

Keywords: *Disaggregation, public service, service delivery, subsidiarity, decentralization, departmentalization*

Introduction

The civil service organization is usually considered too large and humungous for any meaningful impact to be expected from it or for it to be used to achieve any desirable goal or objective. This is predicated on the belief that any organization that is too large does not only seem unwieldy but difficult to control with gainful success. The civil service bureaucracy is said to be the highest employer of labour in formal organizational setting. People are usually recruited in large numbers at the base of the organization, thinning out gradually towards the apex where ultimately there is one organizational leader.

Authority flows from the top to the bottom, while lower ranked officers are accountable to the next higher level official in a step-wise direction until the person at the top of the organizational structure receives reports and accounts for the performance of the entire organization. The above is typical of the civil service where Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAS) have large pool of staff at the base but ultimately have one organizational leader that is accountable not only to the legislature but the head of government. For instance, colleges of Education and other tertiary institutions, health institutions like teaching or specialist hospitals, General hospitals, cottage hospitals, polyclinics, security agencies such as the Army, Airforce, Navy, Police, Civil Defense Corps, Customs, Immigration, Correctional Centres (Prisons) among other agencies of government are usually considered too large or walloping and hence difficult to meaningful control.

Usually, the person at the helm of affairs of such organizations does not know all the staff working under him or her and would resort to getting reports from subordinates who work directly with those people. For example, in a university system, the vice chancellor may not know all the staff working in the University but would get information from what is going on in the system from Heads

of Departments and units. In the same vein, the inspector General of police may not know all the police officers working in the country but get information about their performances in a step-down-like fashion, from Deputy Inspectors General, through Assistant Inspectors General, Commissioners of police, Area Commander, Divisional Police Officer, etc. The same holds true for all large civil or public service organizations.

Statement of the Problem

The civil service is usually a large, complex, complicated and impersonal organization. Impersonal in the sense that the Head of the Civil Service may not know all the civil or public servants but merely control them by using his or her subordinates in the hierarchical organizational structure to instill discipline in a step-like manner. The hierarchy emphasizes that the line of authority should follow in order of rank from top to the lowest level within the organization. Orders, instructions, directives flow downward the hierarchy while obedience flows upward the hierarchy. With this arrangement, the civil service is expected to be efficient in the rendering of government services but sadly, this is not always the case. The reasons usually adduced for the poor performance of the civil service bureaucracy is that it is too large and humongous to allow for any meaningful control to enhance efficiency. That is why organizational experts have advocated the shrinking of the size of the civil service to small, corporatized units if efficiency and effectiveness is to be achieved in the service delivery. The belief is that the current large and unwieldy size of the civil service cannot allow effectiveness to be enhanced in public service delivery. The problem of the study therefore is to examine whether unbundling or disaggregating of large government Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAS) into smaller corporatized units will enhance effective public service delivery.

Objective of the Study

The objective of this study is to examine whether disaggregation of units enhances effective public service delivery.

Research Question

To what extent has disaggregation of units enhanced effective public service delivery?

Research Hypothesis

Disaggregation of units does not tend to enhance effective public service delivery.

Literature Review

Disaggregation of units is an integral part of the New Public Management and demands that previously monolithic ministries be broken up into corporatized units around products with separate performance contracts with the aim of separating policy from operational units. According to Kalimulla, Adamand Nour (2012), it involves unbundling public sector into separate, district corporate units of activity, organized by products, with devolved budgets and these units dealing at arm's length with each other. It also involves making these units manageable; split provision and production, use contracts or franchises inside as well as outside the public sector. Given that public management embodies a strong criticism of the bureaucratic form of organization, it is not surprising that it advocates a disaggregation of bureaucratic units in order to form a more efficient and accountable public service. This is called disaggregation of public sector units. It is more efficient because smaller units of activity are better able to establish objectives and work toward achieving them more quickly and more directly than large complex organizations. It is more accountable, because the new public management replaces the 'faceless bureaucrat' that writes "I am directed ..." without really stating who is directing who, to a more visible, definite and responsible managers who are directly accountable to the public.

According to Ekang (2017) disaggregating of units harps on the need to shrink the humongous magnitude of the public bureaucracy to a size that can be readily managed for effectiveness and efficiency. It plays down on the undesirability of having an unwieldy bureaucracy that is not conducive to the achievement of organizational goals and objectives.

The belief is that large public bureaucracy manned by untrained, undedicated and ballooning number of lethargic workers, as seen in most African countries public bureaucracy does not enhance the achievement of a result-oriented public service delivery. Rather, a cute, pretty and well-structured bureaucracy that enjoys the blessing of a small size could be more efficient, effective and conducive to the achievement of organizations goals and objectives, especially in delivering public services.

In the view of Kalimulla, Adam and Nour (2012), the new approach to public management found the traditional bureaucracy too large and complex to be effective in public service delivery and promised a small but better government, emphasized on decentralization and empowerment, focused on customer satisfaction, promoted better mechanism of public accountability and institutional development.

Udo, Udom and Willie (2024) investigated effects of selected public administration policies on Nigerian economy. The study adopted descriptive and ex post facto design. The techniques adopted include the Augmented Dickey Fuller (ADF) test, and Autoregressive Distributed Lag (ARDL) model for the data analysis. The study used an ex post facto research design and collected data from the World Bank Development Indicators, Central Bank of Nigeria, Transparency International and National Bureau of Statistics of various years. The study found that selected public administration policies in this study proxied by effective governance index, corruption control index, quality budgetary and financial management index and public administration index, has not significantly impacted GDP growth rate to enhance economic growth and hence development in Nigeria. The study equally revealed that some of the policies have a non-significant impact on economic growth in Nigeria.

The study also found that corruption has significantly impeded economic growth in Nigeria though with a weak transmission effect through foreign direct investment, domestic investment, and government spending in Nigeria. Base on the above findings, the study recommended that sound micro and macroeconomic policies should be provided in Nigeria and these policies will direct both fiscal and monetary policies positively, as this is noted to have positive impact on government expenditures and hence on economic growth. The study also recommended that for corruption to be reduced, good, discipline and moral driven leaders who are honest with integrity should be appointed or elected to hold sensitive offices. It is also concerned with the ability of public administration to secure the economic, efficient and effective provision of public services, and concern for professional power within public services and consequent disempowerment of service users.

A central feature of New Public Management (NPM) was the disaggregation of organizations into smaller units. It examines the ebbs and flows of organizational size in the United Kingdom public sector from the rise of the 'small is beautiful' idea in the 1980s and 1990s to the current big government. The phrase 'small is beautiful' was conceived at a time when industrial gigantism had been the dominant trend for decades, fuelled partly by the need for industry to satisfy the thirst of two World Wars (Hindle, 2008). After the book was published, a number of countries set up government bodies to look at ways in which the disadvantages faced by small organizations could be removed. Based on his experience, Schumacher wrote:

Organizations should imitate nature, which doesn't allow a single cell to become too large ... the fundamental task is to achieve smallness within large organizations ... the great achievement of Mr. Sloan of General Motors was to structure this gigantic firm in such a manner that it became in fact a federation of fairly reasonably sized firms (Schumacher, 1989:23).

He used the National Coal Board as an example of a big organization that set up a number of “quasi-firms” within it. These quasi-firms, according to him, had to have a large amount of freedom “to give the greatest possible chance to creativity and entrepreneurship”. Disaggregation of units obviously involves organizational restructuring and delineation of functions. Organizational restructuring is an essential ingredient of disaggregation of functions which finds expression in six elements, namely, work specialization, departmentalization, chain of command, span of control, centralization and decentralization (Robbins, Judge and Vohra, 2012).

Organizational restructuring is the process by which an organization changes its internal structure by revamping departments, ownership, operations and processes. The purpose of restructuring is to make the organization more profitable and integrated. Restructuring is usually a major change for an organization involving multiple departments and locations, computer systems and networks, legal ramifications and major changes in procedures and processes. This usually necessitates the application of the principle of subsidiarity.

Subsidiarity is a principle of social organization that holds that social and political issues should be dealt with at the most immediate or local level that is consistent with their resolution. Subsidiarity can also be seen as the principle that a central authority should have a subsidiary function, performing only those tasks which cannot be performed at a more local level. Frank (2007) asserts concerning the principle of subsidiarity that organizations should be structured hierarchically and functions assigned based on criterion of competence. The higher level must not absorb the functions of the lower one, on the assumption that being higher, it will automatically be wiser and fulfill such functions more efficiently than the lower level of the organization.

Subsidiarity is a principle whereby administrative responsibilities are assigned to the lowest level of government capable of carrying out these responsibilities competently. It is always the central policies that the subsidiary units implement. Organizational structure defines how job tasks are formally divided, grouped, and coordinated. According to Robbins *et al* (2012), six key elements are essential when designing organizational structure. These include: work specialization, departmentalization, chain of command, span of control, centralization and decentralization and formalization.

Work specialization or division of labour describes the degree to which activities in an organization are subdivided into separate jobs. The reason behind job specialization is to divide a job into a number of steps, each completed by a separate individual. In essence, individuals specialize in doing part of an activity rather than the entirety. The belief here is that the more people specialize, the more efficiently and effectively they can perform their work (Ekang, 2024).

Departmentalization according to Robbins *et al* (2012) involves the basis by which jobs in an organization are grouped together. There are different ways in which activities in an organization are grouped. It could be through functions performed, type of product or service the organization produces or renders, on the basis of geography or territory in which an organization's customers are scattered over a large geographical area and have similar needs based on their location. Another one is process departmentalization in which customers pass through several processes or departments before they receive the products or services. For example, a graduating student has to go through several departments or units to do clearance before he is finally given his certificate. A final category

of departmentalization uses the particular type of customer the organization seeks to reach. For example, private universities may seek to reach only the well-to-do people in the society (Upper Class and Middle Class) who can afford their fees as their customers.

However, some large organizations may use all the forms of departmentalization discussed in this work. Chain of command is the unbroken line of authority that extends from the top of the organization to the lowest echelon and clarifies who reports to whom (Robbins *et al.*, 2012). Another element of organizational restructuring is span of control. Span of control is defined by Sokoh (1995) as “the number of subordinates one controls” Robbins *et al* (2012) see span of control as the number of subordinates a manager can effectively and efficiently direct. In his view, Naidu (2014) says span of control refers to the number of immediate subordinates any superior can effectively supervise. This principle derives from the belief that there is a limit to the number of subordinates that a supervisor can satisfactorily oversee. Because of the limitation to the range of human capacity and attention, span of control is connected to the psychological problem and ‘span of human attention’. It is also known as ‘span of management’ and attempts to identify the optimal number of subordinates who should be placed under any supervisor, given the nature of work.

In applying the concept of span of control in developing organizational structure, it should be noted what effectiveness of supervision depends on it. According to Naidu (2014):

...the number of subordinates (or units) involved affects the ability of a supervisor to exercise adequate supervision and control over his subordinates. The larger the number, the less effective is the supervision and control. If in a particular area of activity, the number of subordinates to be supervised is too great, the quality of supervision is weakened. Larger span of control makes the supervisor a bottleneck because he is over loaded supervision takes much time that other responsibilities of the supervisor suffer if the number is too narrow, then either the supervisor is not fully employed, or there are unnecessary tiers in the hierarchy. Narrow span results in too much direction which decreases initiative and moral of the subordinates. It is creases supervisory staff and paperwork and results in delay and higher cost (Naidu, 2014:83).

By keeping the span of control to five or six, Sokos (1995) asserts that a manager can maintain close control of the organization. But narrow span has three disadvantages: they are expensive because they add levels of management; they make vertical communication in the organization more complex and encourage tight supervision and encourage employee autonomy.

As a principle in public administration, it states that no administrator should directly supervise more than six subordinates at a time (Ejue, 2009).

By means of a mathematical formula in the early 1930s, Graicunas developed what he called “Graicunas Theorem” to explain span of control. He claimed that the following relationship applies:

Subordinates	Relationships
2	6
4	44
6	222

Graicunas developed the concept that the relationships of management multiplied in geometric progression. The statement above should not be regarded as a precise description of the theorem. It is a simplified version. Also, Graicunus suggested many types of relationships which might exist. Examples are:

- (i) Superior dealing directly with subordinates
- (ii) Superior dealing with other superiors
- (iii) Superior dealing with other different groups under his control
- (iv) Combinations of 1, 2, and 3.

The Graicunas theorem is important because it shows, in positive terms, the possible increase in complexities which result from increasing the span of control. Some scholars, have however, pointed out that Graicunas was not absolutely accurate in his analysis of the possible relationship.

Contemporary management writers recognize the importance of the span of control but qualify the theorem by the statement that: a manager should not directly supervise an excessive number of the subordinates whose works interlock, having regard to the nature of the type of organization and the complexity of the work involved (Ekang and Otukonyong, 2014).

There is now the suggestion that the span of control may be any number from, two to twenty. It should be noted however, that if the span is very narrow, example two or three, the organization tends to be “top heavy” with excessive administrative overhead costs. On the other hand, if there are many subordinates to each administrator, the employees may feel that they are too distant from the point of control and that they feel alienated, impersonal and unimportant part of the organization.

Centralization refers to the degree to which decision making is concentrated at a single point in the organization. In centralized organizations, top managers make all the decisions, and lower-level managers merely carry out their directives. Naidu (2014) avers that centralization is the process of transfer of administrative authority from a lower to a higher level of government.

It signifies the concentration of authority and decision making power at the top of the administrative pyramid – the top level may be chief executive or the headquarters. In a centralized system, the field agencies are merely executing and implementing agencies without any power to act on their own initiatives or ideas. In doing this, they have to obtain prior permission from the headquarters before making decisions on any matter.

On the other hand, decentralization involves the process of transfer of administrative power from a higher to a lower level of government. It also implies the establishment of relatively autonomous field and regional offices and delegation of decision-making powers and functions to the field officers. The assumption underlying decentralization is that conditions, problems, and the people are not the same everywhere. Therefore, in a decentralized administrative system, many decisions are taken in the field, that is in local offices, without reference to the headquarters. Field staffs are allowed greater initiative in taking decisions or actions that will enhance effective service delivery. Decentralization is in line with the principle of subsidiarity earlier discussed in this work. To be sure, subsidiarity is the principle whereby administrative responsibilities are assigned to the lowest level of governance capable of carrying out these responsibilities competently. Decentralization and subsidiarity share family semblance as both are interested in taking care of the local needs of the people through effective service delivery.

The principle of subsidiarity has been widely adopted in Europe and America. In political debates in the USA, it has been regarded, especially by the more conservative commentators, as representing an aspect of the original theory of American federalism which held that state government will be more responsive than national government to the public will and better informed about local circumstance (Vischer, 2001). In the past few decades, the principle has become incorporated into the political, economic and public administration understanding of decentralization. Kim (2008) fuses, and synthesizes this as federalism. In his view, “the subsidiarity principle and decentralization in federalism should produce the optimal allocation of resources and consequently maximize welfare”.

Disaggregation of units demands that previously humongous and monolithic MDAS be broken up into smaller corporatized units to render effective services to the people. Presently, over 70% of the

British civil service is organized in executive agencies and since the 1990s New Public Management (NPM) had become the prevalent bureaucratic process throughout the US, the UK and Canada (Ikwen, 2014).

Unbundling of large MDAs into smaller units of activity are better and easier to control and work towards achieving set goals and targets. The best way of disaggregating units to enhance efficiency and effective service delivery is through adopting the principle of subsidiarity. Subsidiarity involves creating subsidiary, offices in local areas to take care of local peculiarities and environmental sensibilities. Every local office then handles local problems peculiar to that area, employing local people who can speak the language of the environment, understand the culture, beliefs and values of the people as well as those familiar with the terrain that can enhance effective delivery service. This is better than concentrating power and authority in the headquarters thus stifling local initiative and innovation. (Ekang, 2024).

According to Ikwen (2014), America and United Kingdom have small bureau that are effective in managing the economy better than the large and unwieldy bureaucratic set ups that are prevalent in third world countries, incapable of effective service delivery. Nigeria should borrow a leaf from these developed economies.

Methodology

Research Design

This study adopted ex-post facto research design. The design was deemed most appropriate because the phenomenon under investigation had already occurred and the researcher could not exercise control over the variables. The independent variable was studied in retrospect in order to predict its influence on dependent variable. In this study, disaggregation of units was used to predict its influence on effective public service delivery in Akwa Ibom State civil service.

Population of the Study

The population of this study consisted of 13, 479 civil servants and selected members of the public.

Sample and Sampling Technique

388 civil servants were sampled for the study using Taro Yamane's formula with 5% error margin.

Method of Data collection

The data for the study were obtained both from civil servants and members of the public. The researcher did not consider it wise in using civil servants to rate their own performance in service delivery hence the decision to use selected members of the public to rate civil servants performance in public service delivery. The researcher used simple random sampling technique to pick 200 civil servants and 188 members of the public for the study. In simple random sampling, every respondent stands equal and independent chance of being selected for the study.

Instrumentation

Instruments for data collection were Disaggregation of units Questionnaire (DUQ) and Effective Public Service Delivery Questionnaire (EPSDQ). The instruments were validated by measurement and Evaluation experts. The reliability of the instruments was determined using the test of internal consistency on 20 staff and 18 randomly selected members of the public which were not part of the study. The data obtained were analyzed using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient.

Method of Data Analysis

The data collected were analyzed using mean, standard deviation and Regression analysis. Mean and standard deviation were used to answer research questions while hypothesis was tested using regression. The significance level of .05 was the criterion for accepting or rejecting the null hypothesis. The two instruments were analyzed collectively but the responses were correlated to find the influence of the predictor variable on the criterion variable.

Results

Research Question

To what extent has disaggregation of units enhanced effective public service delivery?

Table 1.2: R^2 Analysis for the Prediction of Effective Public Service Delivery by Disaggregation of Units

Variables	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std Error of the Estimate
Disaggregation of units	.112	.013	.10	5.10680
			26.806	0.29

Effective Public

service Delivery 249 114
Field Study (2025)

The result in Table 1.2 shows the R for the strength of the relationship and R^2 for the determination of extent to which disaggregation of units predicts or enhances effective public service delivery.

The r-value of .112 indicates that a high extent to which the prediction occurs. The calculated R^2 of .013 which is the coefficient of determination indicates that 13% of effective public service delivery is predicted or enhanced by disaggregation of units, to an extent predicts effective public service delivery.

Testing of Hypothesis

Decision Rule for Regression Analysis (F-): when the calculated –F value is greater than the critical –F value at 0.05 level of significance, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis (Mcnabb, 2012). The hypothesis is tested using simple linear regression to predict how the predictor variable (disaggregation of units) could predict or enhance effective public service delivery in Akwalbom State civil service.

Null Hypothesis

Disaggregation of units does not tend to enhance effective service delivery.

Table 1.3: Analysis of Prediction of Disaggregation of Units on Effective Public Service Delivery

Variables	Source	Sum of Square df	Mean of Square	F-cal	F-crit	Decision @ .05 Alpha level
Disaggregation of units	regression	124.658	1	124.658		
Effective public service delivery	Residual	19779.788	375	26.0779		
	Total	9904.446	376		4.780	3.389

* = not significant @ .05 alpha level; df = 376; r-crit = 3.89

Source: Field Study (2025).

Table result in Table 1.3 shows that the calculated F-value of 4.780 is greater than the critical F-value of 3.89 at .05 level of significance with 1 and 376 degrees of freedom. With this result, therefore, the null hypothesis which claims that disaggregation of units does not enhance effective public service

delivery is rejected. The result means that disaggregation of units significantly predicts or enhances effective public service delivery.

Discussion of Findings

The testing of hypothesis showed that disaggregation of units significantly predicts or enhances effective public service delivery. This is because the calculated F-value of 4.780 is greater than the critical F-value of 3.89 at .05 level of significance with 1 and 376 degrees of freedom. This result is attributed to the fact that disaggregation of units brings services closer to the people in the grassroots.

Disaggregation of units is another way of decentralizing the distribution of public services. It involves decongesting and unbundling of large corporatized government Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAS) into smaller, cute, pragmatic, efficient and effective units that are responsive to the needs and expectations of the citizens. This seems to be in line with the postulation of Ernest Schumacher that small, pretty, well-structured organizations stand on better administrative pedestal of achieving efficiency than large, unwieldy and wobbling organizational structure that is insensitive to the needs of the citizens. Frank (2007) advocates the use of principle of subsidiarity to enhance administrative efficiency in achieving organizational goals and objectives. The principle of subsidiarity involves a situation whereby administrative responsibilities are assigned to the level of government closest to the people. In such situation, the subsidiaries are only carrying out policies that are made at the headquarters, (Ekang, 2024).

However, studies on disaggregation of units and effective service delivery produce conflicting results. In some studies, disaggregation of units enhances effective service delivery while in others, it does not. In a study by Ghuman and Singh (2017) on Decentralization and Delivery of Public Services in Asia, it concluded that impact of decentralization on public service delivery is contingent on factors such as the design of the decentralization policy, implementation bottlenecks and diluting the model of decentralization for accommodating the dissenting segments of stakeholders, including employees and participatory governance.

In particular, decentralization has resulted in improvements in delivery of local services where devolution as a mode of decentralization is accompanied by sound financial base of local governments, full autonomy to local governments in human resource management matters, regular capacity building of local officials, performance based incentive structures and participatory governance (Ghuman and Singh, 2017). Though the motivating factors for disaggregation of units vary across countries, yet the underlying philosophy is improvement in public service delivery.

In all nine Asian countries comprising Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Pakistan, Phillipines, Thailand, Uzbekistan and Vietnam, studies carried out in these countries showed that disaggregation of units resulted in improvement in public services delivery. Disaggregated analysis of positive impact of decentralization on public services in terms of improvement in access, quality, efficiency and administrative innovation proved useful.

In Bagladesh, elite capture of services diverted the gains to the rich (Robinson, 2003). Also, in Bangladesh, there is poor access to government health facilities even with decentralization of services. This had made the people prefer traditional health practitioners. Besides, there is low provision of curative services by decentralized governments just as poor infrastructural facilities create disincentives among health workers to be stationed at such facilities.

In the Phillipines, cities suffered from problems such as lack of access to potable water and electricity, declining literacy rates even in the face of disaggregating of government MDAS. In Indonesia, performance of a few health services comprising births being attended by trained medical

workers, vaccination coverage and use of contraceptives has declined despite disaggregation of government MDAS (Asthana, 2008).

In India, high incidences of corruption in the form of bribes being paid by people for the provision of water services, kickbacks by contractors for getting contracts and also clearance for sub-standard works have been reported, thus undermining the quality of services delivered to the people. At the local level, auditing systems were neither technically competent nor immune to political influences. In Uzbekistan, decentralization or disaggregation of functions has not improved the collection of utility fees, local infrastructure and alleviation of poverty. A large number of functions are devolved to local units without corresponding resources at their disposal as poor funding of social assistance hampers the quality of services (Noori, 2006). In south Asia, the quality of public services has not shown improvement under decentralized mechanism and gaps quality exist across rich and poor regions (Robinson, 2003).

But this researcher believes that Nigeria should also experiment with disaggregation of large government MDAS and decentralize some functions to the government at the grassroots and observes how it turns out to be. The researcher believes it will enhance effective service delivery.

Summary and Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, it was concluded that disaggregation of units significantly predicts or enhances effective public service delivery. Thus, the null hypothesis that disaggregation of units does not tend to enhance effective service delivery is rejected. This rejection becomes imperative because humongous and unwieldy size of the bureaucracy cannot be readily managed for efficiency and effective service delivery. Rather, a cute, pretty and well-structured bureaucracy that enjoys the blessing of small size as well as applying the principle of subsidiarity could be more efficient, effective, pragmatic and conducive to the achievement of organizational goals and objectives, especially in public service delivery. Disaggregation of units offers a rich recipe that reduces the bureaucratic hurdles that customers pass through to get services. It emphasizes leaner bureaucracies after all small is not only beautiful but also smarter, effective and efficient.

Recommendations

Based on the summary and conclusion drawn, the researcher made the following recommendations:

- (i) The traditional Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAS) which are usually too large and unwieldy should be broken down into smaller, cute, effective and efficient bureaux manned by few but hardworking and well-trained staff that are ready to deliver effective services to the people. So far, the Nigerian civil service tends to be manned by pitifully slothful and un-courteous workforce that constitutes impediments to the achievement of effective service delivery. Leaves should be borrowed from the private sector, which are usually well designed and structured with leaner but competent workforce that can readily achieve effective service delivery.
- (ii) To enhance effective service delivery, there is the need to decentralize government offices and functions in line with the principle of subsidiarity and employ people of such areas who are familiar with the terrain of such environment to man such offices. This will de-bureaucratize government processes, procedures, rules and needless regulations and will free the civil service of undue administrative burden. This is economical and will reduce the cost of governance while making the government responsive to the needs of the people.

- (iii) Government should abolish the present civil service commission and allow each MDA to recruit, promote, discipline, reward and retire its own staff as is obtainable in most developed countries of the world. Each MDA should have its own governing Board that handles its own personnel functions. This will obviously free the commission of dispensable encumbrances and unnecessary entanglements in line with the principle of disaggregation of units.

References

- Asthana, N. (2008). Decentralization and corruption: evidence from drinking water sector. *Public Administration and Development*, 28(3): 56 – 71.
- Ejue, F. (2009). *Essential theories of public administration*. Baye Publishers, Calabar, Nigeria, 23p.
- Eakang, A. E. (2014). *Theories of administration and management*. Radiant Publishers, Eket, Nigeria.
- Eakang, A. E. (2017). Book review on small is beautiful: economics as if people mattered. Department of Political Science/Public Administration, University of Uyo, Nigeria.
- Eakang, A. E. and Otukonyong, S. (2014). *Elements of public administration. a contemporary approach*. Radiant Publishers, Eket, Nigeria.
- Eakang, A. E. (2004). Competition and effective service delivery in Nigeria public service. *Journal of Finance, Government & Strategic Studies*, 7(1), 33-42.
- Eakang, A. E. (2023). Management of change and innovation in the Nigerian public service. *Central Asian Journal of Innovations on Torism, Management and Finance*, 6(1), 121-120.
- Frank, E. (2007). *Public administration: theories and practices. a text for African Universities*. Ethiope Publishers, Benin City, Nigeria.
- Ghuman, B. and Singh, R. (2017). Decentralization and delivery of public services in Asia. *Journal of Policy and Society*, 32(1): 7 – 21.
- Hindle, T. (2008). *Guide to management ideas and gurus*. Profile Publishers, Great Britain.
- Ikwen, M. (2014). The civil servant and public administration: an imperative for good governance. University of Calabar Press, Calabar, Nigeria.
- Kalimulla, N., Adam, K. and Nour, M. (2012). New public management: emergence and principles. *BUP Journal*, 1(1): 1 – 20.
- Kim, A. (2008). Decentralization and the provision of public service: framework and implementation. *Policy research working paper 4503, world bank capacity building, partnership and outreach team*. Washinton DC: World Bank.
- McNabb, D. (2012). *Research methods in public administration and nonprofit management: quantitative and qualitative approaches*. PHI Publishers, New Delhi, India.
- Naidu, S. (2014). *New age public administration: concepts and theories*. new age international publishers, New Delhi.

- Noori, N. (2006). Expanding Asian authority, cutting back local services: decentralization and its contradictions in Uzbekistan. *Central Asian Survey*, 25(4): 69 – 81.
- Robbins, S., Judge, T. and Vohra (2012). *Organizational behaviour*. Prentice Hall, New Delhi, India, 298p.
- Robinson, M. (2003). *Participation, local governance and decentralized service delivery*. elivery.workshop on new approaches to decentralized service delivery, Santiago, Chile.
- Schumacher, E. (1989). *Small is beautiful. economics as if people mattered*. Harper and Row Publishers, London, UK.
- Singh, N. (2008). Decentralization and public service delivery of health care services in india. *Health Affairs*, 27(4): 71 – 89.
- Sokoh, C. (1995). Theories and principles of administration. In A. O. Ikelegbe (Editor) *politics and government: comparative perspective*, Uripublishers, Benin City, Nigeria, 116p.
- Udo, S.S ;Udom, S. D. and C.E. Willie (2024). Public administration policies and effects on Nigerian economy. *AKSU Annals of sustainable development*, 2 (1), ISSN: (P) 3027-0499; ISSN: (E) 3043-4955
- Vischer, R. (2001). Subsidiarity as a principle of governance: beyond devolution. *Indiana Law Review*, 35(8): 103 – 142.