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Abstract
The public administration system in Nigeria which has been traditional and patterned towards the bazaar canteen model of Riggs has over the years led to gross inefficiency and inability to meet the needs of the citizenry. The failings of the traditional administrative system necessitated an investigation of the adoption of collaborative governance regime as a tool for achieving responsive governance. The study conducted in Ogun State, one of the 36 states in Nigeria, utilized qualitative data, and primary data were collected through interview of 97 respondents drawn from eight selected local governments in the state. The key informants included top government officials at state and local government levels, career civil servants, community leaders, traditional rulers, as well as members of the Ogun State Council of Elders. Data collected were content analyzed. The adoption of collaborative governance between the state government and the Ogun State Council of Elders led to resolution of several crises in the state; economic development programmes and projects; enhancement of qualitative education in the state; effective poverty reduction; and grassroots development. The study suggested that embracing collaborative governance regime in a prismatic society such as Nigeria ensures the attainment of responsive governance in the society, and equally short circuit the excesses of corrupt officials following the involvement of educated and enlightened citizens.

Introduction
Nigeria has failed to live up to the expectations of its founding fathers since independence, as it has been unable to achieve expected economic development in spite of enormous material and human resources at its disposal. The various institutions of the public sector including the bureaucracy, both during military regimes and civilian administrations since 1960 have been unable to deliver like similar institutions in the advanced democracies have done. Nigeria’s administration to great extent mirror’s the description of administration in developing countries put forward by Fatile, Majekodunmi, Oni & Adejuwon (2013:168), as it is characterized by
“unequal distribution of services; institutionalized corruption; inefficiency in rule application; nepotism in recruitment; motives of self-expectation; a pronounced gap between formal expectation and the actual behavior.”

The state of administration in Nigeria has over the years epitomized that of a prismatic society, as propounded by Riggs, where, “the relationship between the public official and their clientele would be in terms of buyer-seller relationship” (Riggs cited in Ujo, 2008: 116). Instead of public services being equitably distributed amongst the different sections of the society, it is distributed on the basis of relationship with public officials both elected, appointed and career bureaucrats.

The traditional institutions of administration are weak, while individuals who operate the institutions sometimes end up being stronger than the institutions, which has opened up opportunities of abuse of power and at times outright corruption. The administrative system has exhibited the attributes of the Bazaar canteen model of Riggs leading to high level of inefficiency and in ability to meet the needs of the citizens (Ujo, 2008).

This is at the background of the proposition of Fatile et al (2013: 171) that “the Nigerian state and bureaucracy capitalize on the ‘weakness and ‘softness’ of the structure and the fragility of the existing rules to manipulate the teeming ignorant population, and increase their economic base through the advantage of venality”. This has negated the ability of the country to achieve sustainable development.

The return to civil rule in 1999 was heralded with much pomp and pageantry as there was great expectations that civilian governments would midwife a new phase of good governance, characterized by accountability, transparency, adherence to rule of law and responsive governance. This accounts for the emergence of a cliche in political discourse, the dividend of democracy. Governments federal, state and local are believed to deliver the dividends of democracy when they execute their statutory responsibilities of repairing or rehabilitating roads, repairing of destroyed school buildings, provision of facilities in the various, health centres and hospitals, amongst others. Even when the residents of a particular area receive a project that does not meet their present need or does not score high in their scale of preference, such government is regarded as having been responsive and providing dividend of democracy.

Vigoda (2002) writes that while responsiveness is usually regarded as a passive, unidirectional reaction by public officials or government to the perceived needs of the and sometimes demands of the people, collaboration represents a more active, bidirectional act of participation, involvement, and uniting of forces by two active parties (the government on one side and the citizens on the other). This paves the way for the need for emphasis on collaboration which is a vital ingredient for achievement of responsive governance.

Henton and Melville, (n.d) write that the need for collaborative governance has emerged in societies across the globe because of the inability of traditional government structures to effectively meet the needs of the citizens. The modern economies of today are too complex for the traditional institutions to meet the many challenges that they throw up. Traditional public institutions of administration do not have built in problem solving capacities to meet emerging community challenges and conflicts. Citizens are left frustrated as traditional administration systems of top-down approach, fails to articulate the actual needs of the citizens, whose inputs are not sought by government officials while various interest groups and civil society are left to make agitations, instead of making input in the policy formulation process.

Ansell & Gash (2008) write that collaborative governance is strictly neither adversarial nor managerial in the traditional sense. This is because collaborative governance does not operate the principle of winner takes all. Even in situations where the stakeholders on the different sides of
the divide have adversarial positions, the aim of the collaborative governance process is to transform such adversarial relationships into more cooperative ones. It is equally not managerial in the sense that whereas managerial approaches may take their decisions without the input of the stakeholders, and at times may consult the stakeholder, collaborative governance requires that stakeholders are an integral part of the decision making process.

Given the obvious failure of the traditional administration structures in Nigeria to deliver on the needs of the citizenry through responsive governance, this chapter seeks to interrogate the adoption of collaborative governance regime as remedy to the shortcomings of the bazaar-canteen model adopted in the traditional administration mechanisms of Nigeria, in efforts to achieve responsive governance. This chapter is sub-divided into seven sections; introduction, conceptual clarifications, theoretical framework, methodology, Ogun State government and Council of Elders in collaborative governance, conclusion and recommendations.

**Conceptual clarifications**

**Collaborative governance**

Collaborative governance like other concepts in the social sciences has been defined in different ways by scholars. Among the very popular definitions is that put forward by Ansell and Gash (2008), who write that collaborative governance is:

> A governing arrangement where one or more public agencies directly engage non-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage public programs or assets (Ansell & Gash, 2008: 544).

The authors in reviewing the propositions of other scholars on the concept, observed that “scholars have been focusing more on the species rather than the genius of collaborative governance” (Ansell and Gash 2008: 544). In response to the observation of Ansell and Gash (2008), Emerson, Nabatchi & Balogh (2011) provide a very broad definition of collaborative governance that provides for the utilization of collaborative governance as an analytical construct, not only in public administration, but in other related fields of study. To them, collaborative governance encompasses:

> The processes and structures of public policy decision making and management that engage people constructively across the boundaries of public agencies, levels of government, and or the public, private and civic spheres in order to carry out a public purpose that could not otherwise be accomplished (Emerson, Nabatchi & Balogh, 2011: 2).

The definition by Emerson, Nabatchi & Balogh, (2011) provides a broader perspective to collaborative governance, in the sense that it covers the newly emerging forms of cross-boundary governance, as against the public management centric conception of Ansell and Gash (2008) which focused entirely on the formal public sector.

The Emerson, Nabatchi & Balogh (2011) definition however covers the multipartner governance, which includes partnership among the state, private sector, civil society, the community, as well as joined – up government and hybrid arrangement such as public-private partnership, private-social partnerships and co-management regimes (Agrawal & Lemos, 2007 cited in Emerson, Nabatchi & Balogh, 2011:3). This implies an interdisciplinary applicability of collaborative governance in research by scholars across the management and social sciences. Several scholars including Sirianni (2009), Ansel & Gash (2008), Bingham & O’ Leary (2008) had earlier in their studies traced the multi-dimensional applicability of collaborative governance.
Emerson, Nabatchi & Balogh (2011) write that several scholars have provided different propositions regarding the theoretical roots of collaborative governance. While some link it to Bentley’s (1949) group theory, followed by linkages to Olsen’s (1965) logic of collective action. There is equally the tracing to the study of intergovernmental cooperation in the 1960’s, a proposition attributed to Agranoff & Mcguire (2003), Elazar (1984, 1962). Mcguire (2006) provides a further tracing of the roots as far as the birth of American federalism, which he regards as “the most enduring model of collaborative problem resolution.”

In terms of practical application and studies in several policy contexts, Emerson, Nabatchi & Balogh (2011) cite several scholars who have executed studies covering the application collaborative governance framework across different sectors, and different countries, when they write that collaborative governance:

- Has been used by law enforcement agencies (e.g., Nicholson-Crotty & O’Toole, 2004), the veteran’s Health Administration (e.g., Dudley & Raymer, 2001) and the Department of Homeland security (e.g Jenkins 2006; Taylor, 2006). It has been applied in child and family service delivery (e.g., Berry et al. 2008; Graddy and Chen 2006; Page 2003; Sowa 2008) and to government contracting (e.g., Bloomfield 2006; Brown, Potoski and Van Slyke 2007; Romzek and Johnston 2005).
- Collaborative governance approaches have been instrumental to local economic policy (e.g., Agranoff & Mcguire 1998), crisis management (e.g., Farazamand 2007; Kettl 2006), collaboration between environmental agencies and state and local public health departments (e.g, Daley 2009) and on environmental issues such as the protection of open-spaces (e.g., Smith 2009), natural resources management (e.g., Durant et al. 2004; Koontz and Thomas 2006), and forest management in both the United States (e.g., Manning 2005) and India (e.g., Ebrahim 2004; Kumar, Kant, and Amburgey, 2007) (Emerson, Nabatchi & Balogh, 2011: 4).

This high level of practical utility of collaborative governance across several sector underscores it relevance to the administration and management of societal affairs in the present century given the enormous shortcomings of the traditional system of administration that has failed to deliver, by meeting the needs of the citizenry.

**Responsive Governance**

A major requirement of good governance is that should be fast response by governmental institutions in the provision of services to the public and other stakeholders. It is expected that institutions and processes of government try to serve all stakeholders within a reasonable time frame (Mantu, 2006). Onah (2010, p. 107) writes that “leaders must be responsive and responsible to the people and must work for the public good and people’s welfare.”

In the developed western nations what existed in the mid and late 18th century was a situation in which government institutions treated citizens as subjects. Citizens on their part accepted the unlimited tyranny of the state and made only a minimal effort to sound their voices in such an un receptive environment. The kinds of services delivered to the people were limited and, in any case, absolutely dependent on the government’s will and decisions (Fredrickson, 1997 & Marshall, 1950 cited in Vigoda, 2002).

Vigoda (2002) writes that in many respects, this condition still predominates in the ‘popular democracies’ or dictatorial states of the second and third world. In both cases, centralized power in governance is accompanied by rigorous bureaucratic structures and is mostly a result of non-democratic culture. Such a culture imposes a form of monopoly over natural resources on government and public administration system. There is equally a government dominance of education and socialization systems. The traditional or orthodox public administration system
controlled and monitored many, if not all, aspects of citizen’s daily lives, creating a pattern of coerciveness in the citizen-ruler relationship.

Responsiveness generally denotes the speed and accuracy with which a service provider responds to a request for action or information. According to this definition, speed may refer to the waiting time between a citizen’s request for action and the reply of the public agency or the public servant. Accuracy means the extent to which the provider’s response meets the needs or wishes of the service user. Yet while speed is a relatively simple factor to measure, accuracy is more complicated. Beyond the recent trends of analyzing public arenas in terms that are appropriate for the marketplace, public-service accuracy must take into consideration social welfare, equity, equal opportunities, and fair distribution of public goods to all citizens (Vigoda, 2000 cited in Vigoda 2002: 529).

Responsiveness has been identified as having its own shortcomings. It is believed to be mostly passive, unidirectional reaction to the people’s needs and demands, and as such is not in tandem with the need for governance in which the citizenry and other stakeholders play active part. At time, public officials respond to perceived needs of the citizenry, which the citizenry do not buy into because they did not make any contribution to the development of the programs of projects. This is where the involvement of the citizenry by government and its agencies in a form collaborative effort in policy formulation process becomes pertinent. As such collaboration between the government officials and all stakeholders becomes very necessary in the search for good governance. “Collaboration, represents a more active, bi-directional act of participation, involvement, and unification of forces between two (or more) parties” (Vigoda, 2002: 527). It is when this collaboration between government and various stakeholders exists that responsive governance takes place.

United Nations (2007) also agree on the idea of responsive governance. To the organization the responsive governance model emphasizes a government that is open and responsive to civil society and the private sector, one that is more accountable, and better regulated by external watchdogs and the law. The reference to law, in this context would be adherence to rule of law by both public officials and the governed. The expectation is that non-governmental actors would play a strong role through various civil society organizations (pursuing various citizen oriented programmes in different sectors of life) and community participation. Viewed from this perspective therefore, it follows that for a given government to be seen as responsive, it must adopt a governance model that focuses on articulating, aggregating, and incorporating in an active way the interests of the citizens in the policy making process, instead of seeing them as customers who would consume whatever policy or programme that the government offers.

**Theoretical framework**

We have adopted Collaborative governance regime as the theoretical construct for this study.

**Collaborative governance regime**

This is an interactive framework of collaborative governance propounded by Emerson, Nabatchi & Balogh (2011) as the output of their effort to synthesize the treatise of scholars from different fields, to see how they facilitate actual achievement of collaborative governance in given states. Their aim was to see how research from different applied fields such as public administration, conflict management, planning, environmental governance amongst others could be utilized “to illuminate the drivers, engagement processes, motivational attributes, and joint capacities that enable shared decision making, management, implementation, and other activities across organizations, jurisdictions, and sectors” (Emerson, Nabatchi & Balogh, 2011: 5).
The collaborative governance regime (CGR) and its collaborative dynamics and actions are believed to operate in a general system context which is depicted in figure 1 below. “The outermost box, depicted by solid lines, represents the surrounding system context or the host of political, legal, socioeconomic, environmental and other influences that affect and are affected by the CGR” (Emerson, Nabatchi & Balogh 2011: 5). Opportunities and constraints from the system context, influence the collaboration, but at the beginning and through the process. It is equally from the system context that drivers which include, leadership, consequential incentives, interdependence, and uncertainty emerge, and they help initiate and set the direction for a CGR.

**Figure 1**
The Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance


The proponents of the collaborative governance regime write that collaborative dynamics, consist of three interactive components: principled engagement, shared motivation, and capacity for joint action. The components of collaborative dynamics are believed to work together in an interactive and iterative way producing collaborative actions which are taken with the intention of implementing the shared purpose of the CGR. The actions of the CGR can lead to outcomes both within and external to the regime; thus, figure 1 above, outcomes are seen as impacts (the results on the ground) and adaptation (the transformation of a complex situation or issue) both within the system context and the CGR itself (Emerson, Nabatchi & Balogh, 2011).

Once a CGR has been initiated, collaborative dynamics and its three components are set in motion. The first component, principled engagement, encompasses the interaction of four basic process elements: discovery, definition, deliberation, and determination. They believe that principled engagement is generated and sustained by the four elements and that the quality and effectiveness of principled engagement depends entirely on the nature of the interaction among the four elements over time. The second component, shared motivation, also consists of four
elements: trust, mutual understanding, internal legitimacy, and shared commitment. The interconnection of the components of the collaborative dynamics is emphasized by the fact that principled engagement fosters the four elements of shared motivation, thus generating and sustaining shared motivation; while shared motivation in turn enhances and sustains principled engagement.

The third component of collaborative dynamics is the generation of capacity for joint action, which like the earlier two components also has four elements: procedural and institutional arrangements, leadership, knowledge, and resources. Emerson, Nabatchi & Balogh (2011) posit that principled engagement and shared motivation assist with the development of the four elements of the third component, thus generating and sustaining capacity for joint action.

The components of collaborative dynamics (principled engagement, shared motivation, and capacity for joint action) interact over time synergistically and propel collaborative action by the CGR. We posit that collaborative actions are more likely to be implemented if they are in line with an articulated shared theory of action and supported by the necessary capacity for joint action. We also propose that the resulting impacts from collaborative action are likely to be closer to those intended and targeted by the regime with fewer unintended negative consequences if they have been specified in a shared theory of action developed through collaborative dynamics (Emerson, Nabatchi & Balogh, 2011:20).

The proponents posit that the potential for adaptation exists both within the system context and the CGR itself, as shown in figure 1 above. They equally suggest that CGRs though faced with problems at the time of initial adoption, will be more sustainable over time when they are able to adapt to the nature and level of impacts that result from their joint actions. The relevance of the collaborative governance regime lies in its applicability in a wide range of disciplines and practice, such as political science, public administration, peace and conflict studies, Economics, policy studies, public health, educational administration, business administration, sociology, psychology, amongst others. Its practical application in a wide range of sectors across different countries of the globe has been highlighted by Emerson, Nabatchi & Balogh (2011).

Several scholars have criticized collaborative governance in terms of the fact that presence of power imbalances between stakeholders hinders its adoption and effectiveness (Gray 1989; Short and Winter, 1999; Susskind and Cruikshank, 1987; Tett, Crowther, and O’Hara 2003; Warner 2006). The critics posit that in situations where some stakeholders lack the capacity, organization, status, or resources to participate, or to participate on same level with other stakeholders, the collaborative governance process may be hijacked and manipulation by stronger actors.

Ansell & Gash (2008) write that the problem of power imbalances will be more complicated in a situation where important stakeholders are the ones that lack the organizational infrastructure to be represented in collaborative governance processes. Sometimes, the issues that require collaborative governance may be very technical and some of the stakeholders may not have the skill and expertise to engage in discussions with the more technically empowered stakeholders. Proponents of collaborative governance have posited that the identified challenges of the framework are not insurmountable. They propose that power imbalances where they arise would require the adoption of appropriate strategies that would empower weaker or underrepresented stakeholder groups (Mitchell 2005; Lasker and Weiss 2003; Schuckman 2001; Merkhofer,
Conway, and Anderson 1997). Empowering the weaker and underrepresented groups will provide a level playing ground for all parties, making them have a clear perspective of the accruable benefits of the processes. Once the weaker stakeholders have the resources, time, energy including the technical skills at their disposal, they would be more willing to participate, more so, when they have a clear perspective of the benefits that would be accruable to them from the collaborative governance processes.

**Methodology**

The study adopted descriptive survey design. The study area is Ogun State, one of Nigeria’s 36 states, located in the South-West geopolitical zone of the country. The state is populated by four major nationalities, Remo, Ijebu, Yewa and Egba. Administratively, it is sub-divided into twenty local governments, out of which eight, with two from each of the four nationalities were selected for the study. The selected local governments were, Ikenne and Sagamu (Remo); Ijebu Ode & Ijebu North (Ijebu); Ado-Odo Ota & Yewa south (Yewa); and Abeokuta South & Odeda (Egba). In executing the research the authors utilized both primary and secondary data. Primary data were gathered through in-depth interviews conducted with 97 personalities randomly selected using stratified random sampling from the eight local governments. The interviews were conducted over a six month period (October 2011 and March 2012). Secondary data was gathered through documentary review of government publications and research publications by scholars, newspaper articles as well as materials downloaded from the internet. Data obtained were content analyzed and presented thematically.

**Council of Elders in collaborative governance with Ogun State Government**

The Ogun State Council of Elders was a private initiative, the brain child of Pa Taiwo Alimi, who introduced the idea of a forum of distinguished elders of the state who have excelled in their various vocations to serve as advisory body to the state government on a non-partisan basis. The Ogun State Council of Elders was inaugurated on 9th October 2005 at Abeokuta, with one hundred and fifty four members following the acceptance of the initiative by the then governor of the state, Otunba Gbenga Daniel (Oyesiku, 2011).

The Ogun State Council of Elders has eight operational committees, each headed by an eminent personality. The committees are: Peace Building and Conflict Resolution Committee - Bola Ajibola (SAN); Community Initiatives and Poverty Alleviation Committee - Akin Mabogunje (CON); Statute and Legal Matters Committee - G. O. K. Ajayi (SAN); State, Economy and Development Committee - Adebayo Adedzeji (CFR); Social Welfare Committee - Ebun Oyagbola; Security Committee - Olujimi Jolaoso (OFR); Health Committee - T. O. Ogunlesi; and Education Committee - Sonny F. Kuku (CFR).

The acceptance of the proposed role of the Ogun state council of elders by the then state governor Gbenga Daniel led to the state government through its relevant agencies, creating the enabling environment for the Ogun State Council of Elders to operate in collaborative governance with it. Responses by majority of those interviewed indicate that the Ogun state council of elders made worthwhile contributions to the policy formulation process of the state government. The different committees of the council made inputs into the policy making process covering the areas of focus of each committee.

**The Peace Building and Conflict Resolution Committee**

The Peace Building and Conflict Resolution Committee mediated in the processes of resolving various conflicts in the state. Among the conflicts in which effective resolution was achieved through the active involvement of the Council of elders as peace agents were the Ijebu – Ife crisis. This was a major crisis which could have degenerated to the nature of the Odi case, if not...
for the prompt intervention of the state government, and active involvement of the council in the peace building processes. Other crises in which the committee helped in the achievement of enduring peace were the Iperu – Ogere land crisis, and the Ado-Odo Ota Obaship tussle (Oyesiku, 2011).

Majority of the respondents stated that the high level of success of the Ogun state council of elders intervention in the various crises in the state was as a result of the fact, that members were personalities that had distinguished themselves in different spheres of life. They were also people who had no direct pecuniary interests derivable from the settlement of the various crises. As a result the different warring factions in the crises were willing to participate because they saw the mediators (the peace building and conflict resolution committee) people who could be trusted in ensuring that there was impartial resolution of the crises. This finding corroborate earlier reports of Farazamand (2007) and Kettl (2006) which indicated that collaborative governance is a good tool for resolution of conflicts.

Attempts at resolving the crisis within Ogun State Chapter of Peoples Democratic Party by the Peace Building and Conflict resolution committee of the Forum between 2008 and 2009 was not successful. The crisis was protracted and affected the governance of the state, as several interview responses revealed that prominent members of the party in the state were divided on issues that border on self-interest and positioning for 2011 general elections.

Several party big-wigs such as: Olusegun Obasanjo, the former President (then Chairman, BOT of PDP); Dimeji Bankole, the then Speaker of the Federal House of Representative and his father, Alani Bankole; Senator Iyabo Obasanjo-Bello; and Jubril Martins-Kuye, were in one faction with some members of the state House of Assembly, while the then state governor, Gbenga Daniel and other official of the state government was on the other faction (Oyesiku, 2011).

Eighty of the ninety seven respondents that were interviewed stated that the non resolution of the state political crisis was not for lack of attempt, by the Council of Elders, but because of the self-centeredness of some of the personalities involved. These politicians either desired to occupy various positions or had ‘anointed’ candidates for some positions in 2011 both at the Federal and State levels. As a result of the vested interests of the politicians on both divide they were not prepared to make concessions, leading to the failure of the reconciliatory efforts of the of the Ogun State Council of Elders as well as other stakeholders within and outside the state. The inability of the Council of Elders to resolve the crisis is in tandem with the proposition of Ansell & Gash (2008) that it is not in all cases that adoption of CGR facilitates resolution of crisis. in cases where extraneous factors may hinder resolution, the goal of CGR is to build on consensus, even if complete resolution is not achieved.

Education committee

The Ogun state council of elders realizing the enormous challenge posed to the state government in terms of effective funding and management of the many schools in the state, viz-a-viz the high level of success being recorded by the private and faith-based owners of schools in the state and across the country, recommended the return of former mission schools to their former owners by the state government. This followed wide ranging consultation between the Education committee, the Missions that owned the schools previously and the ministry of Education. The Ogun state government in 2007 accepted the recommendations and returned all Mission schools to their former owners. The return of the schools has made it possible for the state government to improve the funding its own schools while the missions have equally improved the funding of
their schools since they have the requisite resources to manage those schools. This policy has led to improvement in the quality of education in Ogun state.

Community Initiatives and Poverty Alleviation Committee

The Ogun state council of elders following extensive deliberations by its community initiatives and poverty alleviation committee and wide ranging consultations with stakeholders across the state recommended the creation of the ministry of community development and cooperatives by the state government. The issues the committee focused on during their consultations were, the developmental needs of the state’s rural areas, especially in the area of poverty reduction; activities of various cooperative societies across the state as agents of economic empowerment; as well as the roles of various community development associations that engage in different forms of self help projects.

The notable contributions of the ministry to the developmental efforts of the state government include: The disbursement of N24.3 million as Grant-in-Aid to community Development Associations in the state, to support their self-help projects from 2004 – 2008. This is normally done once a year. Leadership training workshops for 3, 500 leaders of CDAs; as well as disbursement of subvention of N1 million yearly to Ogun state cooperative federation. Others are include; Infrastructural development at the Social Development Institute (Shasha) Iperu – One female hostel renovated, a borehole sunk and perimeter fencing for the institute to enhance security, coaster bus donated to the institute. The ministry between 2003 and 2009, registered a total of 3, 058 cooperative societies and unions, as well as 1, 397 FADAMA cooperatives in the state. The FADAMA departments at the various Local government secretariats coordinate the activities of these cooperatives in the efforts at achieving food sufficiency in the state (Jacobs, 2010).

State, Economy and Development Committee

The state, economy and development committee of the Ogun state council of elders made major contribution towards industrialization of the state during the time under review. The committee through its member, Olusegun Oshunkeye, (Chairman, Nestle Nigeria Limited), who influenced the location of Nestle’s largest in Africa, in Ogun state, Nigeria. The original plan of Nestle was to locate the factory for Ghana, given what the parent company viewed as advantages of citing the company in Ghana as against some perceived adverse conditions in Nigeria. However, the state, economy and development committee of the Council of Elders’ collaborated with of the then state governor (Gbenga Daniel) and the relevant government agencies to ensure the location of the factory in Nigeria. The factory is expected to employ five thousand people from Ogun state when operating in full capacity (Oyesiku, 2011:186 – 187). This success of collaborative governance in economic planning and re-positioning of the state, corroborates the earlier propositions of Emerson, Nabatchi Balogh (2011), as well as Agranoff & Mcguire (1998) on the relevance of CGR in local economic planning.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The implementation of collaborative governance regime between Ogun State Council of Elders and the Ogun State government was able to facilitate formulation of people oriented policies specifically tailored to meet the needs of the citizens who were the originators of such policies through their leaders. Evidence from different sectors covering conflict resolution, community development and poverty reduction, education, state and economic development provide sufficient proof that the collaborative governance regime indeed has the capacity to provide the needed solution to the society’s complex problems.
Collaborative governance regime which offers a bottom-up approach in policy formulation, encourages citizens’ buy-in on public projects and programmes, this eliminates wastages and undue sabotage of public programme and projects. It ensures that government does not embark on white elephant projects that have no terminal date that end up being a drain on the resources of government. It has therefore emerged as a more viable option capable to tackling the teething problems of the Nigerian society, especially in the area of ensuring accountability, transparency, responsive governance, inclusiveness and equity in allocation of resources which have been major problems of governance in Nigeria.

We therefore recommend that various governments, federal, state and local encourage adoption of collaborative governance regime by their agencies and institutions with relevant stakeholder groups to tackle societies teething problems.

Governments should encourage formation of non-partisan interest groups targeting various needs of the society at all levels, federal, state and local.

Non-elitist groups such as farmers, cooperatives, NACCIMA, amongst others should be encouraged to develop capacities to engage in collaborative governance with relevant government agencies in terms of proposing policy options, on their specific sectors.

Government may adopt collaborative governance regime in efforts at combating security challenges and the many crises that erupt across the different sections of the country from time to time.
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