

Development Administration: Interrogating Infrastructural Decay in Post 1999 , Nigeria Case Examples from Akwa Ibom State

Imoh Imoh-Ita, PhD

Department of Public Administration Faculty of Management Sciences Obio Akpa Campus Akwa Ibom State University

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2024.1108015>

Received: 08 August 2024; Accepted: 17 August 2024; Published: 30 August 2024

ABSTRACT

This study explores the problem of infrastructural decay in post 1999 Akwa Ibom. It follows the inclusive infrastructural development theory and builds on recent data from the National Bureau on Statistics (NBS) and the Africa Development Bank's (AfDB) Infrastructural Development Index (IDI) and case examples to examine key trends in rural basic infrastructural development with emphasis on water and electricity supply. In particular, it analyzes how and why efficient public administration is essential in infrastructural development and essentially shows how, on the contrary, inefficient public administration affects the relationship between development administration and infrastructural transformation. The study undertook a two decade scenario (1999 to 2019), which is aimed at a robust analysis. Findings among others, suggest that rural/urban dichotomy and in particular, urban bias obscure inclusive infrastructural development as there is decay in most basic rural infrastructures. This has serious implication for Agenda 2030. In the alternative, the study suggests that inclusive infrastructural development contributes significantly to human development, poverty reduction, and the attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Conclusion focuses on future research agenda and policy response

Keywords: Public Administration, Infrastructural Development, Governance, Sustainable Development, Nigeria

INTRODUCTION

Across the developed and developing countries globally, basic infrastructure is central to the task of economic development. This reflects the urgent need for basic infrastructural development, as well as the broader administrative implications of infrastructural related transformation including improvements in water infrastructure, education, roads, electricity, health care etc and the expansion of governmental efficiency, responsiveness and accountability to these basic infrastructures both in the urban and rural areas (Petter & Ekepe, 2015). Thus, the question regarding administrative efficiency in the context of development administration as an enabler of infrastructural development has not been adequately resolved in the developing countries.

In Africa, development administration has attracted recent scholarly interest. For example, Amadi and Ekekwe (2014) argued that development administration is that type of administration in which "development" is a central focus. In their analysis, development is a progressive economic, socio-political, technological and cultural change in which elements of transformation are evident (Amadi & Ekekwe, 2014). Thus, development administration has been historically central to enabling infrastructural development and the means of delivering such basic infrastructure (Amadi & Ekekwe, 2014; Nedozi, Obasanmi & Ighata 2014).

Correspondingly, a longstanding literature in the field of development administration suggests that infrastructural development, or at least the provision of basic amenities, may lead to increased socio-economic development (Aschauer, 1990; Firzli & Bazi, 2011; Tom, 2015; Balogun, 2020).

According to the World Bank Africa Infrastructure Country Diagnostic(AICD), infrastructure is necessary for national development and transformation (Foster &Pushak,2011).In its recent report the African Development Bank highlights that the development of infrastructure in Africa is critical for fostering economic growth and improving the living standards of Africans(AfDB,2018).

In Nigeria, there has been efforts at infrastructural development such as the National Policy on Public-Private Partnership (PPP),which provided the steps the government should take to ensure that private investment is used, where appropriate, to address the infrastructure deficit and improve public services in a sustainable way(Adeshina,Alaje &Idaeho 2021). The policy recognizes the various legal frameworks for PPP, including the Privatisation and Commercialization Act 1999, Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission (Establishment) Act 2005, Fiscal Responsibility Act 2007, Public Procurement Act 2007, Public Procurement Laws and Public-Private Partnership Laws of various States, and other relevant legislation. The scope and application of the Policy extend to various sectors of the economy, including housing and transportation (Adeshna et al.2021). The Institutional stakeholders include the Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission (ICRC), National Planning Commission (NPC), Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs), Federal Ministry of Finance, Debt Management Office, Accountant General of the Federation , Bureau of Public Procurement, and Bureau of Public Enterprises (Adeshna et al.2021).While infrastructure is central to economic growth and development (Cristina, 2017), inefficiency in public administration in the context of development administration appears a major constraining factor. For example, Amadi and Ekeke(2014)identified institutional corruption as a major constraining factor to development administration in Africa.

At the sub national level, there has been a few studies discussing infrastructural development among the states in Nigeria(Opawole, Jagboro, & Babatunde, 2011).This present study builds on these existing studies and in particular, follows Tom (2015)to identify some of the core problems of infrastructural problems in Akwa-Ibom State. The study discusses two basic infrastructural problems in Akwa Ibom namely; water and electricity and draws on case examples and related analyses from the African Development Bank's Infrastructural Development Index(IDI)to provide on –the- ground evidence of infrastructural decay.

Although Akwa- Ibom state government has made some achievements in the development of critical infrastructure since the creation of the State (Petters & Ekpe 2015), it appears that there are persistent challenges of sustainability and need for more attention to this sector, as infrastructure can help solve some of the basic development problems such as : social; health, environmental and economic development problems of any country. Arguments for infrastructural development suggest that a country's infrastructural development, is the key socio-economic driver that serves as conduits of economic development such as trade and investment (Ajulor & Korede,2020). However, the centrality of development administration and infrastructural development in the low- income countries such as Nigeria and particularly Akwa Ibom state-one of the infrastructural least developed states in Nigeria, is not reflected in existing practice or research since Nigeria's return to democracy in 1999 after many years of military rule. Little is known about infrastructural decay in post 1999, Akwa Ibom State or how prevailing development administration practice has stimulated infrastructural development.

In this context, research on the relation between development administration and infrastructure has highlighted the relevant role of efficiency in public administration, which can guarantee basic infrastructural growth and development. However, according to National Bureau of Statistics(NBS)(2017), Akwa Ibom State has one of the least infrastructural development agenda. The data shows that 86% of the overall polity need infrastructural overhaul. The data further suggest that only 3% infrastructure are partially in existence and do not exist to meet the basic infrastructural needs of the people as such basic infrastructures are in disrepute. In a recent chronological analysis of infrastructural development in Akwa Ibom,Tom (2015)discusses the various problems of infrastructural decay in the state which among others includes poor health infrastructure, water, roads, electricity etc. Existing infrastructures in the state are either weak or of poor quality (Ating,2008;Tom,2015).

The quality of infrastructure is dependent on the following two elements: the desire for a state to pursue a developmental state and the need for a country to eradicate public corruption (Amadi & Ekekwe, 2014). This means that, to ensure infrastructural development, it is not only important that government define efficiency in public administration but also it is important that an efficient public sector administration provides and protects the basic infrastructural development needs, meeting these basic infrastructural needs and, consequently, providing the citizenry their basic social amenities against exploitation. There is a fundamental need for an inclusive infrastructural transformation, which is the central theoretical argument of the present study.

Against this background and giving the United Nations Agenda 2030 for sustainable and inclusive development, this study aims to interrogate infrastructural development in Akwa Ibom state in Post 1999, Nigeria. The study builds on case analysis from Uyo, Ikot Abasi, Abak, and Etinan to provide on-the-ground evidence that supports this argument. The paper examines and analyzes the impact of development administration on infrastructural growth and development it interrogates traces of infrastructural decay in these four localities in Akwa Ibom (Uyo, Ikot Abasi, Abak, and Etinan), to ascertain if they are characterized by similar or varying infrastructural rupture and decay and to understand various levels of infrastructural development prospects as well as challenges.

In particular, the paper analyzes how and why efficient public administration is essential in infrastructural development and essentially shows how, on the contrary, inefficient public administration affects the relationship between development administration and infrastructural transformation.

The contribution of this study is twofold. First, it shows how inefficiency in infrastructural service delivery system acts as a variable in explaining infrastructural decay. In this context, the paper adopts a case analysis of Uyo metropolis and three suburbs in Akwa Ibom State to examine the level of such infrastructural decay. Second, the paper adopts inclusive infrastructural development theory to explore linkages between development administration and efficiency in infrastructural service delivery system, which contributes to the value of the paper and the broader literature in the sub field. Although prior studies have examined aspects of inefficiency in infrastructural service delivery in Akwa Ibom (Petter & Ekpe, 2015; Tom, 2015; Okafor, 2020), the present study explores post 1999 trends and possible linkages with infrastructural transformation of Akwa Ibom state, which is a new and useful proxy that determines the importance of infrastructural service delivery system.

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted case example method to examine two basic infrastructures in Akwa Ibom State namely, water and electricity. The case method is a research technique that involves studying a real-life situation or problem. It observes a phenomena or group of cases to make an inference (Bromley, 1986; Feagin, Orum & Sjoberg, 1991). Case example is suitable as the cases surveyed seek to provide - on-the-ground evidence of infrastructural decay in post 1999 Akwa Ibom as well as its implications for development administration and sustainable development. The study undertook a two decade scenario (1999 to 2019), which is aimed at a robust analysis.

Study Area

Akwa-Ibom State is one of the states in the Niger Delta, Nigeria. Located in the southeastern coast of Nigeria, Akwa-Ibom state was created on September 23, 1987 from the former Cross River state of Nigeria. The State is wedged in between Rivers, Abia and Cross river States and the Republic of Cameroon to the Southwest, North, East and Southeast respectively while the Bight of Bonny bordered the State to the South. It lies between latitudes 4°32' and 5°32' North of the Equator, and longitudes 7°28' and 8°25' East of the Greenwich Meridian.

Generally, the region is characterized by rising waves of restiveness due to low levels of development in the face of increasing oil exploration and exploitation activities. The State is a major oil producing state and thus, contributes significantly to the total revenue base of the nation. According to the 2006 National Population

Census, Akwa-Ibom State had a total population of 3,920,208 out of which 87.89 percent constituted rural population while 12.11 percent formed the urban population (National Population Census (NPC), 2007), thereby accounting for 2.7 percent of the overall national population.

According to NPC (2007), Akwa-Ibom state has a total land area of 6,187 km², which represents 0.67% of the total land mass of Nigeria. The State has 31 Local Government Areas with Uyo, Eket, Ikot-Ekpene, Abak, Etinan, Ikot-Abasi and Oron as the most developed urban centres. The most striking characteristic of the population of Akwa-Ibom state is its crude density. When compared with other states in the south-south and southeast, the region is one of most densely settled state. In fact, apart from Imo and Anambra states, Akwa-Ibom state is the most densely populated state with densities as high as 634 persons per square kilometer in Nigeria (NPC, 2007)

Data Description and Procedure

Efficiency in infrastructural service delivery has been a major issue in the developing countries given the changing contexts of development administration in the 21st century and in view of Agenda 2030. To fill this research and knowledge gap. This study builds on recent data and makes a new contribution to the ongoing debate on efficiency in public service delivery system in the developing countries of the Global South. The study adopted qualitative case analysis methodology in which existing data in the sub field of infrastructural development were drawn from the National Bureau on Statistics (NBS) and the Africa Development Bank's (AfDB) Africa Infrastructural Development Index (AIDI). The Africa Infrastructure Development Index (AIDI) serves three key objectives, namely: (i) to monitor and evaluate the status and progress of infrastructure development

across the continent; (ii) to assist in resource allocation within the framework of AfDB replenishments; and (iii) to contribute to policy dialogue within the Bank and between the Bank, African countries and development partners (AfDB, 2018). The case examples were drawn from Uyo, Ikot Abasi, Abak and Itu to examine key trends in both urban and rural basic infrastructural development with emphasis on water and electricity supply. The data was analyzed using content analysis method.

The study undertook a two decade scenario (1999 to 2019), which is aimed at a robust analysis of key post 1999 trends. The study firstly conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis, of existing data on infrastructural development in Akwa-Ibom and provided a descriptive analysis that push the research frontier on improved development administration for efficiency in infrastructural service development and transformation. To examine infrastructural development, the paper builds on recent data on growth, and infrastructural development in Nigeria and examined key indicators of infrastructural service delivery system with focus on water and electricity supply from the selected localities of case analyses (Uyo, Ikot Abasi, Abak and Itu). The indicators are; regular power and portable water supply, periodic water and electricity infrastructural maintenance service delivery, equality in urban and rural infrastructural development. The dataset provided useful information on a large sample of infrastructural inefficiency. The collection of the dataset followed a rigorous survey methodology by two field research assistants. The sample was constructed in such a way to be representative of rural and urban infrastructural development indicators.

Theoretical Framework: The Inclusive Infrastructural Development Theory

The study of infrastructural development building on public administration has a substantial body of theoretical and empirical perspectives (Ahmed, 1996; Cristina, 2017; Firzli, 2021). In a study by Aschauer (1990), there is a positive and statistically significant correlation between investment in infrastructure and economic performance. Commission on Growth and Development (2008) elaborates the strategies for Sustained growth and inclusive development emphasizing the fundamental relevance of infrastructural development in this regard.

With specific reference to development theories of infrastructure and, the distinct character of infrastructural development relations across the developing countries, emphasis has been on the notion of building basic infrastructural amenities. Essentially a number of theoretical perspectives have sought to theorize the

connections between infrastructure and development (Commission on Growth and Development, 2008; Nedozi, et al. 2014). The primary focus here concentrates on inclusive infrastructural development account, arguably the most influential theoretical explanation of the distinct development implications of infrastructure and on its relation to other development approaches as appropriate is found in the theoretical debates of Aschauer (1990) on the infrastructure-development -properties. Aschauer (1990) argued that infrastructure is central to economic development and draws out the structural interconnections between basic infrastructure and transformation of the citizenry, particularly the developed and emerging economies of Asia, and the making and evolution of infrastructural development. He has provided further empirical and theoretical substance to the transformative strands of infrastructure by explicating “the basic theoretical assumptions of infrastructural development and meaning that promotes and shapes the specific context of infrastructural development and transformation,” while demonstrating the ways in which the local and global actors can draw upon strands of development administration theory to provide a “fusion of infrastructural and economic growth and development” (Foster & Pushak, 2011).

Following these theoretical postulations, it is worth exploring the socio-economic and political implications of infrastructural development to understand the prospects and omissions in prevailing theoretical accounts and its overlaps within the Akwa- Ibom state context. For example, Tom (2015) insists that if Akwa- Ibom state must develop, government must tackle the problem of infrastructural decay.

To overcome such decay in line with the theoretical assumptions of inclusive infrastructural development theoretical analysis is an emphasis on the liberal-democratic constitution of infrastructure where equality and transparency is deployed in the provision of basic infrastructural amenities such as roads, water, electricity, hospitals, communication etc. For Okafor (2020), it is the equitable and even spread of these basic infrastructures to the people that need them, that truly matters. The argument is that, where such infrastructures do not equitably address the needs of the critical mass, its central aim is defeated. The specifically inclusive character of infrastructure promotes and meets a number of basic needs of the core stakeholders involved in harnessing or using such infrastructure thereby facilitating and grounding “inclusive development” through a broader reach to a wide range of stakeholders. Such wider reach accounts for the basis for infrastructural development to meet historically unprecedented development results in terms of critical infrastructural development and the wider participation of individuals or groups as the target audience of such service delivery. A central relevance of such responsive and inclusive infrastructural system is efficiency. As Aschauer (1990) notes, infrastructural efficiency provides basic services that benefits the general public. He therefore puts forward an explicit “inclusive analogy” in exploring infrastructural development.

. Particularly significant is the politically “open” and economically “reciprocal” character of the inclusive infrastructural development assumption and the distinctly liberal form of “economic transformation” framed within the tenets of accountability, transparency and equality as well as local empowerment strands of infrastructure (Rives Heaney 1995).

Overall the plausibility of this theory is anchored on the premise that since inclusive infrastructural development is premised on equality it has been more consensual, cooperative, and integrative rather than exclusionary” —and, specifically, transformative.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of Development Administration

Development administration has become increasingly necessary in the study of organizational performance since the 1990s following the end of the cold war and triumph of liberalism. Thus development administration is one of the most important corporate governance mechanisms, particularly in contexts characterized by commitment to efficiency. Amartya Sen (2000) has defined development as a process of expanding the real freedom that people enjoy. The need to actualize such freedom in public administrative setting underline development administration. Amadi and Ekekwe (2014) argued that development administration is that type of administration in which —development is the central focus. To them, such development implies is a

progressive change in which elements of transformation in public sector management is evident (Amadi & Ekekwe,2014).

Recently, researchers have increasingly explored development administration from various perspectives (Riggs 1964; Loveman,1976; Hope,1984; Okoli & Onah, 2002; Obi & Nwanegbo, 2006; Sharma, Sadana, & Kaur, 2012). For example, Amadi and Ekekwe(2014) have elaborated on the essence of development administration in promoting institutional overhaul against public corruption. In a related account, Ohemeng (2017) has examined the relevance of development administration in organizational efficiency pointing out the various processes of development administration. Several of these studies have shown that in many contexts, that development administration is integral to overall economic growth and development of a country. Such studies highlight the growing importance of administration and why the rules guiding administration in the public setting should be observed rather than subverted.

Administrative structures are not static in firms or organizations ; rather, they are generally innovative and dynamic and often aimed at achieving specific goals. Amadi and Ekekwe(2014) contend that the specific focus of development administration is development. Thus, they posit that development administration is that type of administration with the sole aim of ‘development. This includes economic development, social political, environmental, cultural and transformation or a shift from a condition of backwardness or static economy to economic growth and wellbeing. Administration in development settings is innovative and strives for efficiency in terms of monitoring, evaluation, accountability, planning, coordination, budgeting, control, and implementation.

To Obi, and Nwanegbo, (2006) development administration is essential for the implementation developmental administrative rules and related policies. Development administration is crucial to infrastructural development; as the setting up of any critical infrastructure must be aimed at development such developmental roles of infrastructure led Ncube, and Lufumpa, (2017).to argue that infrastructural development is essential in many ways for Africa’s development. In fact, when development administration is tailored to the core areas of priority, issues of ownership and management for results become evident. Such infrastructural projects are monitored and evaluated to understand the basic response to results and outcomes thereby benefiting the marginalized groups by transforming their infrastructural needs. However, public administration in infrastructural development contexts can also help stakeholders to pursue various developmental goals that diverge from the objectives of the infrastructure , thus extending to a wide range of economic values (AfDB,2018).Development administration has also been associated with reforms especially in the civil service.

In Nigeria, there have been several such reforms in the literature such as : the 1988 civil service reforms by Patrick Koshoni ; 1982 Gamaliel Onosode; 1975/76 Ani Commission, Williams Commission; (1975), 1973/74 Jerome Udoji Commission; 1970 Simon Adebo Commission; Adeyinka Morgan and Coker Commissions/Panels among others(Ibietan & Oni, 2013).The primary focus of these reforms among others, is to meet the core public sector needs and in particular, maintain a balance between public administration and efficiency.

The Concept of Infrastructure

The concept of infrastructure has been explored from various perspective to examine a number of interrelated issues. Canning and Pedroni, (2008) examined infrastructure, drawing on a long-run economic growth and causality for cointegrated panels. Their findings show that there is a positive relationship between infrastructure and economic growth.

According to Tom (2015), the concept of infrastructure was evolved during the second world war by military strategists to indicate wider regime elements of war logistics. Later economists introduced the term in development economics and used interchangeably (Tom,2015). According to Ahmed(1992) the term infrastructure has become a popular word extremely used loosely among scholars. However scholars agree that there is a distinction such as social infrastructure, economic infrastructure, soft infrastructure, land infrastructure, institutional infrastructure and physical infrastructure, have been in the literature to emphasize various aspects of the attributes that the term infrastructure is now subjected to(Tom,2015) .

In a broad context, infrastructure includes all public services from law, and other services, education and public health to transportation, communication, power, and water supply as well as agricultural over-head capital such as irrigation and drainage system (Tom,2015).From this definition, Tom(2015)further argued that both the executive and managerial responsibilities of government are incorporated into infrastructure. Tom (2015) emphasized that the concept of infrastructure is evolutionary and changes with the time. He stressed that such argument is reinforced in the position by Mailafia(2002)who argued that infrastructure refers to projects and services such as the construction and maintenance of roads, communication systems, ,railways ,airlines, seaports ,postal; services and telegraphs. Mailafia (2002) captured the social element of infrastructure, which includes provision of social services such as hospitals, setting up of organizations for the provision of various services such as water, electricity, provision of advice, equipment, inputs and loans to farmers for the improvement of agricultural productivity, housing service etc.

In a distinct exposition drawing on efficiency, Hornsby(1995)conceives infrastructure as the basic structure or facilities necessary for a country or organization to function efficiently. According to Adeyemo(1979), physical infrastrucutre encompasses the totality of basic pysical facilities upon which all other economic facilities in the system significantly depend. Smith etal(1997)elaborate that well functioning infratrcture facilitates sevices that meet a nation’s commercial and social needs that are critical to socio-economic development. In a related study, African Development Bank(2015) identified the importance of telecom Infrastructure Investment in meeting the communication infrastructural needs of Africans.Anyanwu and Erhijakpor, (2009) in their study examined the impact of road infrastructure on poverty reduction in Africa and provided deepened insights regarding road infrastructure/poverty reduction nexus. Égert., Kozluk, and Sutherland, (2009),in an empirical study, uncovered infrastructure and growth relationship. Thus, the literature on infrastructure and prospects for future development abound (Stern,1991; World Economic Forum,2012; Ncube and Lufumpa, 2017; AfDB,2018). For example, Ncube and Lufumpa, (2017) insist that infrastructure in Africa has potentials for future development while Stern, (1991) posits that infrastructure is a core determinant of economic growth of any country.

In Nigeria, a number of studies in the literature seek to identify the core issues affecting infrastructure development, which among others relate to procurement process and funding (Oyegoke, 2005; Oforeh, 2006).For instance, Akanji etal (1999)highlight that funding is part of infrastructure. They contend that infrastructure could be defined to include funding and facilities for education, roads, water supply and treatment systems energy, postal and telecommunication system, urban mass transit system, judiciary and hospital etc. They posit that the literature on infrastructure could fall within two broad categories namely; economically sensible large capital natural monopolies, and tangible stock owned by the public sector. While Opawole, Jagboro, and Babatunde, (2011) identified budgetary allocations as a factor in infrastructural development. Wahab (2000) on infrastructure development showed that before 1999, Nigeria was losing an average of \$265 million annually through various kinds of manipulation of the procurement procedure in award and execution of public contracts. Opawole, . Jagboro Babatunde and Opawole (2013) make a case for critical infrastructure drawing particular attention to road infrastructure in Osun South Western Nigeria.

The literature on infrastructural development in Akwa Ibom State points to a few issues including prospects as well as challenges of infrastructural development (Peter and Eke,2015).The increasing disparity between infrastructure and development in Akwa Ibom has made the interrogation of infrastructural decay in contexts linked to administrative efficiency an important research agenda.

The reviewed literature shows the negative impact of infrastructural decay However, if consideration is given to development administration as the paper highlights, there is likelihood of efficiency in infrastructural service delivery systems, this is a major gap the present study seeks to fill.

Case Examples

At the turn of 1999, democratic rule emerged in Nigeria after several decades of military regime. One key development element , painted in glowing colors namely basic infrastructural development jostle for scholarly investigation .The case examples examined a two decade scenario (1999 to 2019), which is aimed at a robust

analysis of key post 1999 infrastructural development trends in Akwa Ibom State. Our analytic frame is benchmarked with African Development Banks's Infrastructural Development Index(AIDI). The annual AIDI updates present selected indicators that comprise the Index's major components, namely: (i) electricity; (ii) transport; (iii) ICT; and (iv) water and sanitation(AfDB,2018). Drawing on evidence based case analysis of our four selected localities for the study, we examined three key indicators of variables namely, regular power and portable water supply, periodic water and electricity infrastructural maintenance service delivery, equality in urban and rural infrastructural development

Case 1: Regular power and portable water supply

Regular electricity power and portable water supply in Akwa Ibom is marked by a critical juncture in the states's infrastructural development, although some of the effects of irregular electricity power and portable water supply have been evident for several years, the challenges experienced in Uyo Ikot Abasi, Abak and Itu mark a juncture in general infrastructural decay.

While Uyo is the capital of Akwa Ibom State with several basic infrastructures such as the Sports Stadium, the Airport, Federal Medical centre etc, there has been evidence of epileptic electricity power supply across the metropolitan city. Thus, people are often disillusioned with poor and irregular electricity power supply.

It is also evident that the city has one of the worst urban portable water shortages. Indeed due to non-functional portable water inhabitants of the city resorted to self -help through sinking of bore hole. Yet in most areas within the tow, there is absence of electricity supply to pump the bore- holes. In particular, the urban poor who cannot afford the high cost of sinking bore holes are left with the challenge of contaminated water, which has adverse health effects. In his study on water supply in Akwa Ibom Tom (2015)identified the pressing challenges of irregular electricity and water supply two basic infrastructures needed for human survival

In Ikot Abasi, there is evidence of long and protracted electricity power outage as most inhabitants' clamor for regular electricity supply have been futile. It is evident that due to lack of power supply several thriving businesses that rely on power supply increasingly closed such as entrepreneurs dealing with frozen foods, sale of cold drinks and bottled water. Irregular electricity supply as AfDB(2018)identified has rendered several households poor. So both for general and particular reasons, regular electricity supply has been a serious challenge. In most households in Ikot Abasi, people trek very long distance in search of water especially poor households who do not have access to direct water sources Not only has most households been subjected to vulnerability of near absence of water infrastructure, but they also often suffer with the ability to cope without regular provision of water.

In Abak, a suburb in Akwa- Ibom water and electricity have been a major problem. Most communities within the locality rarely experience the provision of these basic amenities. There is hardly any household that relies of electricity supply because it comes once in a very long while. Several homes lack basic water provision and substantially rely on alternative water sources, which undermines the inclusive infrastructural development. Related electricity power outage is common among residents of Itu, another major town in Akwa Ibom. Despite community efforts, irregular power supply increasingly undermines economic activities in Itu a well- known economically active local in Akwa Ibom. Such repeated power outage has been very common occurrence giving rise to dissatisfaction with the government's insensitivity to basic infrastructural provision. It is also evident that the various towns in Itu share an unconventional absence of portable drinking water. The state water Board Cooperation has been inefficient to meet the overall basic water needs of the people as water shortage remains a growing concern in Itu.

Case 2: Periodic water and electricity infrastructural maintenance service delivery

Because of the near absence of electricity and portable water supply across Uyo, Ikot Abasi, Abak and Itu, periodic water and electricity infrastructural maintenance service delivery remains a major infrastructural development problem. It evident that several portable water facilities have been abandoned due to lack of maintenance culture. The abandonment of these facilities gave rise to vandalization by criminals. This scenario

has been evident in several urban and rural communities in Akwa Ibom. The maintenance of the few existing electricity and water infrastructure have been a challenge.

The federal and state governments failed to ensure that various suburbs and localities are infrastructurally-viable. It was hoped that these localities might create a framework in which various economic enterprises might thrive and promote overall economic growth and development generated, on the contrary poor infrastructural maintenance and repairs have not only undermined basic infrastructural development rather imposed burden on the local entrepreneurs who struggle to cope with livelihood sustainability and access to basic infrastructure.

Essentially, Ikot -Abasi for example has been a nerve centre of economic activities however much of these activities are stalled as several electricity and water infrastructures that have been in disrepute are rarely repaired or maintained. The government rarely takes seriously the need to balance local infrastructure with development planning and economic growth which has been a major development administration gap in the state, that could be resolved within the State economic development and infrastructural development planning blueprint. The local communities have been earnest in their continued commitment to resolving the problem of abandoned basic infrastructures and the development constraints they pose. Thus the government at all levels have been rarely tasked or mandated as a set of development paraphernalia that, could hold them accountable to poor infrastructural development, were existing dilapidated and non- maintained infrastructures could be serviced or replicated across the State or the country as a whole. Thus 'maintenance and service delivery have been core to sustainable infrastructural development. Several studies on infrastructural development in Akwa Ibom corroborate the present analyses. For example, Peter and Eke(2015) have provided a detailed analyses of infrastructural decay in the State, covering issues of roads and other basic infrastructure. While Tom(2015), emphasizes the need for water and sanitation.

Case 3: Equality in urban and rural infrastructural development

A long standing debate has been the growing concern regarding unequal access and provision of basic infrastructure among urban and rural Akwa Ibom. Such inequitable distribution of basic infrastructure is evident in the structure and patterns of infrastructural development in the state. Importantly, Uyo, the capital city has the highest concentration of infrastructure in the State. This has not only resulted in rural/urban migration but increasing infrastructural underdevelopment of Ikot Abasi, Abak and Itu, which ought to have experienced some level of equitable spread and distribution of infrastructural growth and development.

Thus, even and equitable spread of basic infrastructure is essential for inclusive infrastructural development of the areas of study. In practice, however, Ikot Abasi and other small and adjoining localities have not had a fair spread of basic infrastructural amenities. A major consequence of this unequal infrastructural development is, however, a growing underdevelopment of the suburbs and a major shift in the conception and execution of economic activities solely in Uyo metropolis against equitable development that cuts across Ikot -Abasi, Abak and Itu.

As the present analyses show, this critical juncture and its unequal development implications have never been explicitly acknowledged or remedied by the government. Thus, 'new replicability' of infrastructures across the suburbs should be the norm. On the one hand, this does not mean that 'the metropolis' who largely benefit and experience a far more concentration of infrastructure should be de-legitimized or stalled. Rather as the metropolis experience infrastructural transformation, the adjoining towns of Ikot Abasi, Abak and Itu as well as similar localities should be equally transformed and made infrastructurally viable.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The relevance of our case analyses and the points the paper has been making for explaining both development administration and infrastructural development is to promote a culture of efficiency in public service delivery system through development administration where the state could be responsive to the infrastructural needs of the people. The construction and political characteristics of post-1999 infrastructural development and service delivery as the present analyses show is contradictory— as dividends of democracy have not been

inclusive. This finding is corroborated by several studies, which argue that infrastructural development in Akwa Ibom has been largely skewed to favor the urban centres giving rise to urban bias. Tom (2015) shows that lack of basic infrastructure has given rise to poverty both in the rural and urban areas of the state—and remained, to a significant degree, in place across the various localities as poor water supply results in several water borne diseases including recent cholera outbreak. Thus, regular power and portable water supply are key problems of infrastructural decay in Akwa.

Similarly, in the localities of our case analyses, the social-political conditions for constructing the bases of liberal democracy and its benefits were problematized because of the continuing political legacies of public corruption (Amadi & Ekekwe, 2014), which nascent democracy has not eradicated rather public corruption persists. Thus, across Uyo, Ikot Abasi, Abak and Itu, as the case examples show, periodic water and electricity infrastructural maintenance service delivery remains a major problem. The crises and conflicts of abandoned infrastructure is evident across the state, which define poor maintenance culture, and which adversely undermines infrastructural development and efforts at inclusive and sustainable infrastructural development. Thus, the challenge that confronts infrastructural development in the state is the need to evolve an inclusive and sustainable infrastructural development strategy or mechanism that can promote periodic water and electricity infrastructural maintenance service delivery. As some of the key development needs across the localities of the state show; periodic water and electricity infrastructural maintenance service delivery have been the primary development dilemma faced by the citizenry since nascent democracy: the recurring problem of maintaining or reconstructing dilapidated infrastructure in line with modern development trends remains a key problem and a contradictory dynamics of liberal democratic order wherein majority of the common people hardly benefit from basic infrastructural service delivery.

This unequal benefit is further buttressed in our third case analysis in which inequality in urban and rural infrastructural development is evident among the various localities of our case analysis. Uyo the capital city has the highest concentration of infrastructure unlike Ikot Abasi, Abak and Itu. The concentration of infrastructure in the urban centres does not promote inclusive and equitable infrastructural development. This has serious implication for Agenda 2030. For example, AfDB (2018) in its findings suggests that inclusive infrastructural development contributes significantly to human development, poverty reduction, and the attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In a similar finding, AfDB (2018) showed that inequality has been a major problem in equitable infrastructural development in Africa. Such inequitable distribution of basic infrastructural amenities shows urban bias and has precisely been the situation in Akwa Ibom State, where the rural areas are not only marginalized but perhaps conceived as less important as post 1999 infrastructural development trends tend to suggest.

A few recent studies have made related findings. For example, Pater and Eke (2015) in their study, identified rural infrastructural decay as a major problem resulting in rural poverty. A precarious condition of lack of basic portable water, electricity supply, good roads and community health service delivery. The absence or short supply of these infrastructure as Anyanwu, et al. (2009) highlight are both a challenge and possible marginalization of the rural areas, which calls for urgent attention and reconsideration.

In Abak, Itu and Ikot- Abasi, the present case examples show that, the principal infrastructural need of the people namely, electricity supply is not available and where it exists, it is short in supply. This has been a form of marginalization as most local people are deprived of core basic infrastructure for a healthy living. The dialectic of poverty and infrastructural decay simultaneously entail the displacement and non fulfilment of the promises of democratic rule—suggesting lack of development administration, inefficiency in public service sector, strains of the conjuncture of infrastructural decay resulting in the over-all problem of underdevelopment. In this context, the notion of inclusive infrastructural development is essential to—the process of even and equitable and sustainable development as it directs our attention to the exclusionary nature of prevailing public sector administration, which is challenging and in several ways contradictory to inclusive development.

Thus, while the post 1999 period is discernibly a paradigmatic era of democratic ascendancy, it has not delivered the much expected infrastructural development as this paper tends to suggest intermittently.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The World Bank recommends that raising Nigeria's infrastructure to the level of the African leader, Mauritius, would boost annual per capita growth rates by 4 percentage points, according to simulations. About half of this potential impact is associated with improvements in the power sector, which would contribute as much as 2 percentage points to the per capita growth rate (Foster & Pushak, 2011). Based on the findings, the following recommendations were made;

(i) Efficiency in human and natural infrastructural Resources: The country has abundant natural resources, including one of the largest natural gas and crude oil reserves in Africa, over 300,000 square kilometres of arable land, and significant deposits of largely untapped minerals. The strong demographic growth with an improving age mix with a median age of 18.1 years, increased technological innovation, and fast urbanization have all contributed to shaping Nigeria's future. Similarly, Foster & Pushak, (2011) pointed out that despite these, resource infrastructure has not positively impacted Nigeria's development. There is need for efficiency in human and natural infrastructural resources to promote and sustain infrastructural development.

(ii) Corruption: There is urgent need to tackle corruption head on. Nigeria has a long history of corruption, coupled with the systematic abuses of power, which have contributed to its inability to explore and exploit its natural and human resources. Nigeria is ranked the 146 least corrupt nation out of 180 countries, according to the 2019 Corruption Perceptions Index reported by Transparency International. The government has made efforts to fight corruption, but not much has been achieved in this regard.

(iii) Developmental Administration and development continuity in Governance: Consolidation of past development efforts by successive governments: Governments have abandoned several abandoned projects at various levels over the years. Conflicting ideologies and antagonism sometimes compound this issue by rival political parties who may take over the helms of affairs at the various levels.

(iii) Efficient use of resources: Efficient utilization, effective management, and maintenance of facilities: Some roads, railways, and structures constructed over time have been abandoned and poorly maintained. The lack of a proper maintenance culture has negatively impacted Nigeria's infrastructural development. This has ultimately hampered economic growth and development and negatively affected potential revenue generation for the government. Improvement of the means of transport, health, storage, electricity, water will facilitate the faster and easier economic growth and development, particularly the production and circulation of goods from rural areas, ease the congestion on the roads, generate more income for the government, and reduce production costs. These processes will stimulate infrastructural growth and development.

(iv) Access to Credit Facilities: Credit facilities for infrastructural projects is essential for infrastructural development and should be made easily accessible with minimum interest rates. This will serve as a boost to investment in infrastructural projects. It is imperative to point out that access to credit facilities is a critical requirement for infrastructural development. Government should therefore provide such facilities which should be transparently managed and put into effective and efficient use.

(v) Improving the ICT facilities: According to AfDB (2018) ICT is one of the most important and thriving infrastructure. AfDB (2018) posits that ICT has emerged as the main driver of AIDI improvements. AfDB (2018) recommends that the ICT sector has driven the most improvements in the AIDI ratings over the past decade, compared to all other sectors. It maintained that it is no coincidence that the top ten countries in the latest AIDI were those with the highest growth in their ICT sectors.

(vi) To overcome shortage of water and electricity supply and to achieve efficiency in the water infrastructure sector, there is need for water financing. This entails adequate financial provision by the government. Such fiscal responsibility could be actualized through improved budgetary allocation to rural water and electrification projects.

(vii) Leadership re-orientation: The need for true patriotic leadership in Nigeria is crucial for ensuring sustainable infrastructure development. The civil society groups and other stakeholders must commit to

providing good leadership and governance and ensure that public infrastructures are adequately provided and well protected, managed, and maintained. Also, government facilities should be efficiently managed and put into effective and adequate use. This will help resuscitate abandoned projects and overcome the problems of non impactful projects, which must be checked for inclusive and developmental infrastructure development.

REFERENCES

1. Adekalu Balogun, "Infrastructure development in Nigeria: Better Late than Never" available on <https://www.pwc.com/ng/en/assets/pdf/infrastructure-development-in-nigeria.pdf>, accessed on 21st July 2024
2. Adeshina T, Alaje C and Idaeho R (2021) *Infrastructural Development in Nigeria: Challenges for Private Sector Participation and the Way Forward*. Jackson, Eti & Edu
3. Africa Development Bank. (2018). *The Africa Infrastructure Development Index (AIDI)* www.afdb.org
4. Ajulor O and Korede H (2020) Revenue Generation and Infrastructural Development in Ogun State *Journal of Sales, Service and Marketing Research* 1, (1): 20-30
5. Amadi, L & Ekekwe, E.(2014). Corruption and Development Administration in Africa Institutional Approach. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations* 8(6):163-174.
6. Anyanwu, J. C. and Erhijakpor, A. E.O. (2009). "The Impact of Road Infrastructure on Poverty Reduction in Africa." In T. W. Beasley (ed.), *Poverty in Africa*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.
7. Bromley, D. B. (1986). *The case-study method in psychology and related disciplines*. Chichester: Wiley. ISBN 0471-90853-3. OCLC 12235475.
8. Canning, D. and Pedroni, P. (2008). Infrastructure, Long-Run Economic Growth and Causality Tests for Cointegrated Panels, *Manchester School*, 76 (5): 504 -527
9. Égert, B., Kozluk, T. and Sutherland, D. (2009). "Infrastructure and Growth: Empirical Evidence," Working Paper 685. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
10. Feagin, J.; Orum, A.; Sjoberg, G (1991). *A Case for the case study*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
11. Hope KR(1984)*The dynamics of development and development administration*. Greenwood Press, Westport
12. Ibietan, J (2014) Conceptual Issues in Development Administration *International Journal of Innovative Education Research* 2 (2):19-31
13. Ibietan, J. and Oni, S. (2013) The Weberian Bureaucratic Principles and Nigerian Public Bureaucracy: An Evaluation, *The Quarterly Journal of Administration*, XXXIII (2): 31-51.
14. National Population Commission (2007). *2006 National Population Census Result: Legal notice on the details of the breakdown of the national and state provisional totals*. Lagos: Federal Government Printer.
15. Riggs F W .(1964) *Administration in developing countries: the theory of prismatic society*. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston
16. Schaffer BB (1969). The deadlock in development administration. In: Leys C (ed) *Politics and change in developing countries*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
17. Sen A.(2000) *Development as Freedom*, Oxford :Oxford University Press
18. Smith, R et al (1997).*Getting Connected: Private Participation in infrastructure in the middle East and North Africa* Washington DC World Bank Social Science Quarterly 57(4):875-82
19. Stern, N. (1991). The Determinants of Growth, *Economic Journal*, 101 (404): 122–133
20. Opawole A, Jagboro G, Babatunde S, & Opawole, M .(2013). Critical factors in road infrastructure development in Osun state, south western Nigeria *International Journal of Development and Sustainability* 2 (1): 240-253
21. Opawole A., Jagboro, G.O. and Babatunde, S.O. (2011), An Evaluation of the Trend of Budgetary Allocations for Infrastructural Development in Osun State, South-Western, Nigeria, in Laryea, S., Leiringer, R. and Hughes, W. (Eds). *Proceeding of West Africa Built Environment Research (WABER) Conference, 19-21 July 2011, Accra, Ghana*, pp. 105-117.
22. Oforeh, E.C. (2006), *The Nigerian Institute Of Quantity Surveyors As An Agent Of Economic Development*, Paper Presented at 22nd Biennial Conference and General meeting of the Nigerian

- Institute of Quantity Surveyors, 22nd-25th Nov.,2006 at Channel View Hotel/Conference Centre, Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria.
23. Oyegoke, A.S. (2005), Infrastructure Project Finance and Execution Development Strategies, Journal of The Nigerian Institute of Quantity Surveyors, 52 (3): 11-19.
 24. Sharma, M. P; Sadana, B. L. and Kaur, H. (2012). Public Administration in Theory and Practice. Allahabad: Kitab Mahal.
 25. Okoli, F. C. and Onah, F. O. (2002). Public Administration in Nigeria: Nature, Principles and Application. Enugu: John Jacob's Classic Publishers Ltd. Public Administration in Nigeria: Nature, Principles and Application. Enugu: John Jacob's Classic Publishers Ltd.
 26. Obi, E. A. and Nwanegbo, C. J. (2006). Development Administration: Theory and Applications. Onitsha: BookPoint Ltd.
 27. Loveman B.(1976) The comparative administration group, development administration and antidevelopment. Public Adm Rev 36(6):616–621.
 28. Foster V and Pushak V (2011) Nigeria's Infrastructure: A Continental Perspective Africa Infrastructure Country Dagnostics (AICD)Country Report.The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank
 29. Petter S and Ekpe A (eds.) (2015) Infrastructure Renaissance in Akwa Ibom: The Challenge of Sustainability. Ikot Akpaden, Akwa Ibom State University Press.
 30. Ncube, M. and Lufumpa, C.L. (2017). Infrastructure in Africa: Lessons for Future Development. University of Bristol Policy Press.
 31. Nedozi,F, Obasanmi J and . Ighata J.(2014) In frastructural Development and Economic Growth in Nigeria: Using Simultaneous Equation, Journal of Economics, 5, (3): 325-332,
 32. Tom, E.(2015) Infrastructural Development in Akwa Ibom State Issues, Challenges and Prospects In Petter S and Ekpe A (eds.) Infrastructure Renaissance in Akwa Ibom: The Challenge of Sustainability. Ikot Akpaden, Akwa Ibom State University Press.
 33. Commission on Growth and Development (2008). The Growth Report: Strategies for Sustained Growth and Inclusive Development. Washington, DC: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, World Bank.
 34. Wahab, K.A. (2000),Implementation of Public Procurement Reforms in Nigeria, Presentation at Workshop on World Bank Procurement Procedures, Organized by the Nigeria Economic SummitGroup at the Golden Gate Restaurant, Ikoyi , Lagos, 28th September.
 35. World Economic Forum (2012). The Global Competitiveness Report 2012–2013, New York: WEF.