Organizational Culture of Discipline and Efficiency Narrative in the Nigerian Public Sector: Revisiting Mcgregor Theory X and Y

Adesoye Isiaka Mustapha[*1] & Aimuan Eboigbe Eseosa[1]

[1]*Department of Public Administration*
University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria

Correspondence Email: isiakamustapha1961@gmail.com

Abstract
Efficiency in the delivery of public goods and services has remained a recurring decimal in the Nigerian public service discourse. Preponderance of ineptitude, laziness, lack of productivity and corruption in the service have among other problems been identified in the literature as the bane of organizational culture of discipline in the public service despite the myriad of the reforms in the sector. This paper therefore focuses on the issues by revisiting the McGregor theories X and Y as the basis for understanding the culture of discipline that should change the efficiency narrative. The work generates qualitative data from the literature explored. Desk analysis of the data was done. It concludes, among other things, that Western scholars' postulation of preference of theory Y as being capable of bringing about efficiency in organizations failed to consider the negatives that inhibit public sector efficiency which theory X has capabilities of addressing especially in transition economies and less advanced democracies like Nigeria. It equally recommended, among others, strict adherence to discipline and deterrence in order to curtail the excesses of deviants as espoused by theory X while initiatives and positive self-direction of the productive ones should be encouraged maximally in tandem with the dictates of theory Y.

Keywords: Organization, Culture, Discipline, Efficiency, Public Service
 JEL Classification: G14, M14, D46,

1. Introduction

Organizational culture is a widely used term but one that seems to give rise to a degree of ambiguity in terms of assessing its effectiveness on change variables in an organization. For the past decades, most academics and practitioners studying organizations suggest the concept of culture is the climate and practices that organizations develop around their handling of people (Schein, 2004). Watson (2006) emphasizes that an important trend in managerial thinking in recent decades has been one of encouraging managers to try to create strong organizational cultures. Schein (2004) suggests that culture and leadership are conceptually intertwined. This is supported by O'Farrell (2006) in his analysis of the Australian public service, where he concludes that 'statements of values, codes of conduct,

principles of public service management and so on set out in rules and regulation are simply rhetoric - or what we now call inspirational statements. Without leadership that is what they will ever be rhetoric. It is our job as administrators, managers and leaders to turn them into reality' (O'Farrell, 2006. p.8).

Organizations, in any context, are made up of groups of people and individuals who are interdependent, and work together to achieve organizational goals and objectives. Therefore, these people interact with one another on a daily basis to fulfill their job-roles and to contribute effectively to their organizations. However, individuals enter the workplace with their unique abilities, attitudes, values and perceptions, and this in itself can be a source of conflict in any organization (Knight & Ukpere, 2014). In the same vein, in a formal organization or establishment, as a result of conflicting interests, and acquisitive nature of some people, the behavioural attitudes of such people is deviant from the ethos, rules and regulation of the organization. Needless to say, a fair degree of predictable behavior is needed from individual(s) for the achievement of organizational goals and objectives. One of the means in ensuring decorum, progress and effectiveness in an organization is discipline. Where there are no proper disciplinary procedures for erring officers there will be a dislocation of effective organizational functionality.

Discipline in a broad sense is conceptualised as orderliness, the opposite of confusion. In a narrow sense, discipline refers to employee discipline, which is an important function of personnel management. The definition that captures all other definitions of discipline and which would be adopted for the purpose of this study is that of Heiman and Hilgert (1977). To them, discipline refers to "…a state of affairs – a condition in an enterprise in which there is orderliness, in which the members of the enterprise behave sensibly and conduct themselves according to standards of acceptable behaviour as related to the organization". Thus discipline from this perspective can be seen as a state of orderliness by which employees conduct themselves according to the laid down rules and regulation of an organization.

The effectiveness and performance of the public service depends on the existence of a systematic and well established disciplinary procedure. It involves sanctioning erring employees and rewarding conforming employees. Discipline is considered to be good when employees willingly conform to rules and regulation in an organization. It is bad when employees either follow the rules reluctantly or deliberately violate them. Poor discipline normally indicates the need for corrective action. Such action aimed at inhibiting undesirable behaviour in an employee is known as disciplinary action.

1.1 Statement of the Problem
The public service at independence has been described as one of the most enduring legacies bequeathed to Nigeria by her erstwhile colonial masters (Adamolekun, 2004 cited in Mustapha, 2017). The sustenance of the legacy as agencies of development administration was ensured and demonstrated in the various Regional civil services especially that of the South-West Nigeria. Credence was given to the assertion in the valedictory address by the then out-going Premier of the Region, Chief Obafemi Awolowo to the Western Nigeria House of Assembly in 1959 who inter alia attributed the success of the government to the virile civil service that according to him was "… exceedingly efficient, absolutely

incorruptible in its upper stratum, and utterly devoted and unstinting in the discharge of its many onerous duties…" (Mustapha, 2017: 56).

All these sterling characteristics and organizational culture of discipline and efficiency have long disappeared from the Nigerian public service. In contrast, they have been replaced with the culture of bribery and corruption; high rate of indiscipline; inefficiency; nepotism and favoritism; poor attitude to work; slothfulness, etc.

At the heart of all abnormalities bedeviling the public service is the issue of indiscipline and its development as a culture of the Nigerian public service. This paper therefore interrogates the adequacy of the institutional framework for culture of discipline and the relatedness of that to the application of McGregor theory X and Y to reverse the ugly trend in order to bring about a positive twist and a reversal in the current narratives of corruption, indiscipline and inefficiency that pervade the Nigerian public service.

1.2 Objectives of the Study
1. To examine the nature of the organizational culture of discipline in the Nigerian Public Service.
2. To assess the performance of the Nigerian public service in the context of the efficiency narrative.
3. To assess the provisions of the Douglas McGregor theory X and Y and its application to discipline in the Nigerian public service.

1.3 Research Questions
1. What is the nature of the organizational culture of discipline in the Nigerian pubic service?
2. What is the performance of the Nigerian public service in the context of the efficiency narrative?
3. What are the provisions of the Douglas McGregor theory X and Y, and to what extent can the theories be applied to establish and sustain the organizational culture of discipline in the Nigeria Public service?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Conceptual Clarifications
Some concepts used in the study are defined for clarification. These concepts include the following;
2.1.1 Organisational Culture: Organisational culture is a widely used term but one that seems to give rise to a degree of ambiguity. Watson (2006) emphasizes that the concept of culture is originally derived from a metaphor of the organization as 'something cultivated'. For the past number of decades, most academics and practitioners studying organisations suggest the concept of culture is the climate and practices that organisations develop around their handling of people, or to the promoted values and statement of beliefs of an organisation (Schein, 2004). Schein (2004) highlights that 'the only thing of real importance that leaders do is to create and manage culture; that the unique talent of leaders is their ability to understand and work with culture; and that it is an ultimate act of leadership to destroy culture when it is viewed as dysfunctional' (Schein, 2004).

Culture, therefore, gives organisations a sense of identity and determines, through the organization's legends, rituals, beliefs, meanings, values, norms and language, the way in which 'things are done around here'. An organizations' culture encapsulates what it has been good at and what has worked in the past. These practices can often be accepted without question by long-serving members of an organisation. One of the first things a new employee learns is some of the organization's legends. Legends can stay with an organisation and become part of the established way of doing things. Over time the organisation will develop 'norms' i.e. established (normal) expected behaviour patterns within the organisation. A norm is defined as an established behaviour pattern that is part of a culture.

2.1.2 Discipline: Discipline is understood differently by people. While some people view it as a punitive measure or chastisement, which generates fear, reproach when one is involved in a wrongful act, others look at it as orderliness and conformity to rules and regulations, etc. In order to clarify these differences in view or notion of people, an attempt will be made in this section to explain the concept of discipline with the help of definitions of some authorities and explanation by the writer on the subject.

Knight (2014), defines discipline as a pattern of behavior which can be traced back from a particular training. This behaviour is portrayed by a person in order to demonstrate his personal traits. An employee, for example, reflects a particular behaviour in a workplace situation and his behavior contributes towards attaining his or her goal at the organization. Dumisan, (2002) defines discipline as a system of rules and mechanism for ensuring that disciplinary codes are followed. This implies that every organization has its rules and regulation "dos and don'ts". Observance of these sets of rules in itself is discipline.

In the view of Ajumogobia (2007), in a seminar presentation, he asserts that discipline in the work place does not mean strict and technical observance of rules and regulations for survival of the organizational system. Rather, it implies a situation where workers are expected to cooperate and behave in a normal and orderly way, as any reasonable person would expect an employee to do. This has become imperative since the goal of every organization or establishment is to enhance workers' satisfaction that would lead to higher productivity and profitability. This can only be realized where there are sets of rules and regulations that would govern the conduct of people at work. The absence of these rules and regulations will lead to anarchy, workers dissatisfaction which is antithetical to the basic principles that informed the establishment of such an organization in the first place. Workers who display unethical behaviour are capable of infesting others with good morals (Vonai, 2013).

3. Methodology

This paper is essentially exploratory and so it relies basically on secondary sources of data. Desk analyses of the issues generated from the secondary materials were done on the bases of which our conclusions were drawn and our recommendations made.

3.1 Theoretical Underpinning

Theory X and Theory Y was an idea devised by Douglas McGregor in his book "The Human Side of Enterprise" (1960). It encapsulated a fundamental distinction between management styles and has formed the basis for much subsequent writing on the subject.

In the first few decades of the 20th century Theory X was the style that predominated in business after the mechanistic system of scientific management had swept everything away. Theory X is an authoritarian style where the emphasis is on "productivity, on the concept of a fair day's work, on the evils of feather-bedding and restriction of output, on rewards for performance (Tim Hindle, 2003). Latterly, Theory X has been considered as a negative way of dealing with employees. In this theory, it is assumed that employees are, by nature, reluctant to fulfill the obligations of their job and instead will find ways to avoid work or otherwise reduce their work output in a bid to expend the least amount of effort possible. When there are more motivated management staff and owners urge the employees into making them work, the company will be successful and have productive employees as conceived by Theory X. In order to detect attempts by staff to avoid work it demands a strict control and monitoring of behavior. The authority must keep a careful eye out for sabotaging effects by self-interested employees and find the cause of disruptions, handing out penalties in the belief that a sincere wish to avoid responsibility is the root cause for majority of trouble.

Theory Y is a participative style of management which "assumes that people will exercise self-direction and self-control in achievement of organizational objectives to the degree that they are committed to those objectives". It is management's main task in such a system to maximize that commitment (Tim Hindle, 2003). In many ways, Theory Y is, the diverse to that of Theory X. Rather than taking the view that employees must be forced to do what management want and that they will not, under any circumstances, do anything beneficial for the company under their own direction, Theory Y states that employees actually become more productive when more trust and responsibility is delegated to them. According to Theory Y, employees do wish to work and be productive and the act of doing well at work is itself a strong motivator. Moreover, if the employee's will seek responsibility and ways to be productive, if they are allowed to do so. Regarding to Charles M. Carson, (2005), McGregor theory Y stands in a unique place in management history and advocated a heightened awareness of management's responsibility for the human side of employer-employee relations.

4. The Nigeria Public Service

The public service refers to all organizations that exist as part of government machinery for implementing policy decisions and delivering services that are of value to citizens. Ezeani (2006:190) refers to public service as the administrative machine within which the work of government is carried out. It is a mandatory institution under the Nigerian Constitution of 1999. Chapter VI of the Constitution, Executive, Part 1 (D) and Part II (C) provide for a public service at the federal and state levels of government. The Public Service in Nigeria is made up of the following: (1) The Public Service, which is often referred to as the core service and is composed of line ministries and extra-ministerial agencies; and (2) The Public Bureaucracy, which is composed of the enlarged public service, including the following: (a) Services of the State and National Assemblies; (b) The Judiciary; (c) The Armed Forces; (d)

The Police and other Security Agencies; (e) Paramilitary services (Immigration, Customs, Prisons, etc); (f) 'Parastatals' and agencies including social service, commercially oriented agencies, regulatory agencies, educational institutions, research institutes, etc. (Reichheld and Sasser 1990:107)

The contemporary public service system in Nigeria originated from British colonial administration. According to Nigerian public administration scholars (Okoli 1980; Adamolekun, 1986; Adeosun, 2012), British Colonialists under the leadership of Lord Lugard administratively unified the then Northern and Southern protectorates including the Lagos colony in 1914 as a part of the colonial service. The Europeans vested themselves with all the executive, judicial, and legislative powers and later incorporated traditional rulers into the power structure through a system of indirect rule. To solve the problems in the implementation of a centralized budgetary system, the three regional governance structures were created in 1946 along with a revenue commission. These regions, in turn, created their own public services following the adoption of a federal system in 1954 and the creation of a public service commission at the center. At independence in 1960, both the federal and regional services coalesced in advancing the establishment of a career public service within their jurisdictions (Anazodo, 2009).

In October 1963, Nigeria adopted a new constitution and proclaimed itself as a federal republic. Moreover, it altered the British sphere of influence in the country, and in the same year created a fourth region, the Midwest. Although, the public service that emerged after independence became more involved in formulating and executing public programmes and economic development policies, the unequal distribution of political power on the basis of ethnicity, and regional composition resulted in uneven socio-economic development. This is because both the elected and appointed government officials were more interested in bringing home the bacon to their respective regions. The politics of regional affiliation has deprived Nigeria of a national character and a sense of national interest as well as brought other issues such as zoning federal character and quota system into the lexicon of Nigerian public service (Mukoro, 2005).

The socio-economic problems of Nigeria in the 1960s may be seen as the consequences of weak federal and strong regional governments (Adamolekun and Ayo,1989); the regional public services provided better opportunities for development than the national government. These issues had compelled every regime since post-independence to experiment with different types of public service reforms or government organizational restructuring measures. In its 2010 report, the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa acknowledged that Nigerian public service system has experienced three political influences, the colonial, military and politician. Each of these provided distinct legacies (Omitola, 2012).

Political neutrality, anonymity and impartiality, for instance, are attributes transmitted from colonial rule. Some of these transmitted attributes were not retained under the military governments. For example, there was a clear absence of the colonial legacy because higher public servants, as confidential advisers to ministers dominated the public policy making process between 1967 and 1975, whereas the role of public servants became irrelevant

between 1975 and 1979 (Adamolekun, 1986, Adebayo 1994 and United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, 2010).

Moreover, between 1979 and 1983, the government experienced shifts from military to civilian rule and between 1984 and 1999, the Nigerian public service system operated under military regimes that culminated in the series of public service reforms which have affected the structure and operation of Nigeria public service system up to the recent times.

It is obvious that Nigeria has a large public service running into millions of personnel. Their major function is to implement government policies and programs. While it is true that some governments did (do?) not have any programs for the common good, the public service has not successfully implemented the policies and programs of those that did. Many public servants found it easier to align themselves with government of the day and participate in treasury looting that has reduced Nigeria to an embarrassment among the comity of serious nations. Okpala (2012:114) reported that Nigeria lost several hundred billions of Naira over the last few decades due to flagrant abuse of procedures, lack of transparency and merit in the award of contracts in the public service.

The public service in Nigeria exists to propel socio-economic development and to guard against control of the economy from foreign domination and exploitation but, the performance of the service has been replete with varying contradictions (Adeyemo and Salami, 2008). As noted by Chukwuemeka and Eme (2011), the public service in Nigeria for example, seems to be unable to cope with the prevailing ideological, political and economic changes as well as management innovations such that the institutional weakness of the public service is considered one of the fundamental causes of socio-political upheavals and economic crisis in Nigeria.

4.1 The Institutional Framework for Culture of Discipline in the Nigeria Public Service
The public service is the machinery that government uses to render services to the people and as such, public servants are expected to constantly improve themselves to give better service. The process of rendering of these services must conform to the prescribed code of conduct provided by the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. Thus the said constitution has established thresholds that would guide a public servant in the discharge of his or her duties. Part1 of the fifth schedule of the 1999 Constitution (As amended) has generally made provision in respect of code of conduct and work attitude for a public servant. Section 1 provides that 'a public officer shall not put himself in a position where his personal interest conflicts with his duties and responsibilities' (Junaidu and Aminu, 2015). This duty is an aspect of the common law duty to act in good faith. Sometimes in the course of his official duty, a public officer may experience a situation where his personal interest is in conflict with his duty. In such a situation, the public officer would be in breach of the code of conduct if he allows his personal interest to take precedence.

Public Service Rules (PSR) is another major institutional instrument which refers to a set of laws guiding the conduct of public servants for effective and efficient performance of their jobs. Included in the PSR are conditions of service for public servants (Okonkwo, 2009). The PSR in Nigeria have undergone many changes in nomenclature right from the colonial days to the present. It started as General Orders (G.Os) instituted by the colonial masters.

Before independence, the G.Os served as guide for all government employees in Government Departments and Agencies. Immediately after independence, the name changed again to Civil Service Rules, and later to the present title of Public Service Rules (Mustapha, 2008). The present title is adopted to make the rules have general application to all manner of government employees in Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs). The public service is generic and broader in nature than civil service which is restricted to personnel of core government Ministries only. Thus, all civil servants are public servants but not all public servants are civil servants.

According to Okonkwo (2014), practically, the PSR refers to a code of regulations which provides for basic rules, regulations and procedures that are germane for carrying out the business of government geared towards efficient service delivery. Consequently, it is expected that every public servant should strictly comply with the provisions of the rules. The overall aim of the PSR is to ensure good conduct, loyalty, honesty, courtesy, hard work and ethical principles. The PSR covers a wide range of issues which include discipline.

The PSR (2007) as reviewed captures the importance of discipline. Discipline according to the PSR generally refers to good conduct and behaviour. Anything contrary to this becomes indiscipline. Act of indiscipline in the public service has been broadly classified into two – misconduct and serious misconduct. Rule 030301 of the PSR defines misconduct as any act of wrong doing or an improper behaviour which is inimical to the image of the Service and which can be investigated and proved. It can also lead to termination and compulsory retirement. Gross or Serious Misconduct, on the other hand, is a specific act of very serious wrongdoing and improper behaviour which is inimical to the image of the Service and which can be investigated and if proved, may lead to dismissal. There are many examples of misconduct and serious misconduct given in the PSR. A few worth mentioning include scandalous conducts such as; immoral behavior, drunkenness, refusal to proceed on reposting or to accept posting, habitual lateness to work, deliberate delay in treating official document, unauthorized removal of public records, membership of cults, sleeping on duty, improper dressing, hawking merchandise within office premises, malingering, insubordination in order to avoid work, discourteous behaviour to the public. Furthermore, conducts classified as serious misconducts include; falsification of records, conviction on a criminal charge, false claims against government officials, engaging in partisan political activities, unauthorized disclosure of official information, bribery, corruption, divided loyalty, sabotage, willful damage to public property and sexual harassment.

Following from the above, the public service rules provided for disciplinary procedures to be taken. It states under rule 030302 that if a senior officer notices any of the misconduct, they should issue the staff involved with a query in writing, and request the staff to submit a response within a specific time, and as regards serious misconducts Rule 030407 made provisions that the ultimate penalty for serious misconduct is dismissal, and an officer who is dismissed forfeits all claims of retiring benefits, leave or transport grant, which is subject to the provision of the Pension Reform Act 2004. Reinforcing the institutional framework for culture of discipline provided by the Constitution and the PSR are the Financial Regulations, Fiscal Responsibility Act, etc. The foregoing explicates the institutional framework for ensuring discipline in the public service which can be said to be in tandem

with the dictates of the Mc Gregory theory X on discipline and disciplinary procedures. If the deviants are provided for institutionally to ensure they are disciplined, the whole arrangement becomes more holistic by the time the theory Y is applied as a necessary counterpoise in cultivating a well balanced organizational culture of discipline in the public service.

4.2 The Efficiency Narrative and the Nigeria Public Service Performance
The debate on the role of the state has shifted in recent years towards empirical assessments of the efficiency and usefulness of public sector activities. A growing academic literature has been investigating the stabilization, allocation and distribution effects of public expenditure. It has also been assessing the role of rules and institutions and the scope for privatizing public sector activities (Gwartney et al., 2002; Mueller, 1997; Persson & Tabellini,2001; Rodrik, 2000; Shleifer & Vishny, 1998; Strauch & Von Hagen, 2000; Tanzi & Schuknecht, 1997, 2000). Most studies conclude that public spending could be much smaller and more efficient than it is today especially in the developing and transition economies. However, for this to happen, governments should adopt better institutions and should transfer many non-core activities to the private sector (Diana et al, 2010). This assertion is associated mainly with neo-liberal reformists' position about public sector organizations.

The Nigerian public service has undergone a number of reforms in the past decades in conformity with the neo-liberal reformists' dictates with the aim of enhancing, improving and sustaining its efficiency and effectiveness. The mission of these reforms was to build a public service that is performance and result-oriented, customer- driven, investor friendly, professionally and technologically sensitive, accountable, fostering partnerships with all stakeholders and committed to a continuous improvement in government business and enhancement of overall national productivity. The vision is (was) to have "a Nigerian public service that works efficiently and effectively for the people" (Oronsaye, 2009). However, in recent times, the public service has failed in its numerous duties impeding on her efficient delivery of basic services to the Nigerian populace. The reasons for this are not far-fetched as there appears to have been a detachment of the government bureaucracy from the fundamental organizational culture of discipline necessary for running of an efficient public service.

4.3 The Douglas McGregor Theory X and Y and Discipline in the Nigerian Public Service: A Theoretical Application
More than forty years ago, Miner (2003) surveyed subject matter experts (past presidents of the Academy of Management and editors and journal review board members of two prominent publications, AMJ and AMR), to ascertain their familiarity with and their rated importance of 73 organizational behavior theories. Miner (2003) found that McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y was tied for second place as the most well-known theory in organizational behavior out of the universe of 73 theories.

In a nutshell, according to McGregor: "Man is a wanting animal and as soon as one of his needs is satisfied, another appears in its place. McGregor urged companies to adopt Theory Y. Only it, he believed, could motivate human beings to the highest levels of achievement while maintaining organisation culture of discipline. Theory X merely satisfied their lower-

223

level physical needs and could not hope to be as productive. McGregor's postulation explains the situation in advanced countries. It fails to a huge extent to account for organisational behaviour in developing countries transition economies. As observed in Nigeria, managements, especially in the public sector, tend to be at a crossroad on what leadership technique to adopt in sustaining the organisation culture of discipline in their institutions. Organizations with a Theory X approach have several levels of managers and supervisors to oversee and direct workers. Authority is rarely delegated in the strict sense of it, and control remains firmly centralized. Managers are more authoritarian and actively intervene to get things done. Although Theory X management has largely fallen out of fashion in recent times, big organizations may find that adopting it is unavoidable due to the sheer number of people, also the primordial culture of discipline dominate in many citizens of Nigeria and the tight deadlines that they have to meet (McGregor 1967, Miner 2003, Oronsaye, 2009).

The theory X provides a clear lay out of rules and punishments which follow disobedience of these rules. An effective application of theory X would ensure that employees follow these rules and regulations in any organization. In Nigeria taking into account the environment factors and the attitude of workers in the country, Chukwuemeka and Eme (2011), describe the Public servants in Nigeria as lazy, unaccountable, indiscipline and lackadaisical. Following suit, Okwudili (2015) explained that the average public servant lacks commitment to work and would only perform effectively if closely supervised. Drawing from the above scholars' postulation, it can be deduced that the theory X approach when applied would ensure efficiency in the public service.

5. Conclusions and Recommendation
5.1 Conclusions
The Nigeria public service has a sound documented institutional framework consistent with the McGregor Theory X nuances for organizational discipline. But there appears to be a divergence between documentation and practical application of the document over time that eventually translate to a culture of the organization. Were there to be a match between the preponderance of framework of discipline such as the PSR, Financial Regulations, Public Procurement Act, Fiscal Responsibility Act and various other extant circulars relating to establishment and development of culture of discipline, our public service would not have been disreputed for the rot it suffers today.

Contrary to the relevant and extant institutional framework for maintenance of discipline, deterrence is hardly noticed and consequently corruption and other forms of act prejudicial to maintaining the culture of discipline have become systemic.

Western scholars who posit a preference of the adoption of Theory Y to Theory X in the maintenance of organizational culture of discipline do so without consideration to societies in transition that are still battling with primordial factors that hinder their institutional effectiveness. Inhibitive factors such as ethnicity, religious bigotry, nepotism, sectionalism, quota system without regard to merit, political patronage, 'god-fatherism', etc, still pervade and hinder the establishment of culture of discipline in the Nigeria public service and so, Theory X is what is more relevant to the building of a virile public service.

Further to that, it can be deduced that Theory Y becomes more relevant when all the encumbrances that are supposed to be taken care of by Theory X have virtually disappeared and near complete sanity has been achieved. The protection and sustenance of sanity reigns when the individual in an organization is already conscious of the consequences of his or her aberrant behaviours and the full weight of the law comes down on deviants. No organization that hopes to achieve its core mandate will completely do away with Theory X. Even when it has adopted Theory Y as its operational philosophy, the total jettisoning of Theory X would be abnormal as it will amount to concluding that the public service is populated by perfect human beings. To have a service where well-behaved workers are given opportunity of self direction and control, the instruments to keep the deviants in check should also be kept alive and functional.

5.2 Recommendations
In view of the foregoing conclusions, the following are recommended.
i.   First, orientation should be given to new entrants into the public service on the mandate of the service and the instruments put in place to achieve the goals including that of maintaining the culture of discipline. They should be exposed to the various institutional documents notably the PSR, the Public Procurement Act, the Financial Regulations, Fiscal Responsibility Act and extant circulars relating to their conduct in the service. This would afford them adequate information about the service especially where they have had negative orientation that public service job is no man's business and it is an avenue to acquire wealth as quickly as possible. Copies of the documents should also be made available to all staff.
ii.   Secondly, there should be complete maintenance of discipline. This is multi-dimensional. The core of it is adherence to the provisions of our institutional documents such as the PSR, Financial Regulations, Public Procurement Act, Fiscal Responsibility Act etc especially in the aspect of punishment and deterrence. This is without prejudice to encouraging the good hands to exercise their initiatives and positive self-direction that could lead to building a virile public service. This ultimately is a combination of the postulates of both Theories X and Y.
iii.   Thirdly, is exemplary leadership. Since culture is essentially transmitted from old to the younger generations, the role of the leadership in the public service cannot be over-emphasized. Where those who constitute the administrative elite are bastion of corruption, transmitting the desirable culture of organizational discipline to their subordinates, who look up to them for guidance, becomes an impossible task.
iv.   Lastly, it is also highly recommended that trade unions in the public service should be carried along in the task of establishing and sustaining the culture of discipline. This is so because the power exerted by workers' unions in limiting the management discretion when it comes to the issue of punishment and deterrence is so enormous. One of the primary duties of a responsible Union is to protect its members especially against punishments that, in consideration of the Union, are unjustifiable. But when the Unions are part and parcel of disciplinary process and they are made to participate actively in protecting the service through instilling discipline, they will not provide a hiding place for an indolent and irresponsible officer.

References

Adamolekun, L. (1986). *Politics and Administration in Nigeria*, Ibadan, Spectrum Books Ltd.

Adamolekun, L, and Ayo, S. B. (1989). The Evolution of the Nigerian Federal Administration system, Publius: *The Journal of Federalism*, 19(1):157-176.

Adamolekun, L. (2004). Politics and Administration in Nigeria. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.

Adebayo A (2000). *Principles and Practice of Public Administration in Nigeria*, Ibadan, Spectrum Books Ltd.

Adeosun, A. B. (2012). Nigeria @50: The role of good governance and effective public administration toward achieving economic growth and stability in fledging democracy. *International Journal of Politics and Good Governance*, 3 (3.3):1-17.

Adeyemo, D. O. & Salami, A. (2008). A review of privatization and public enterprises reform in Nigeria, *Contemporary Management Research*, 4(4), 401-418.

Ajumogobia, O. (2007). *The challenges of leadership in Nigeria*. An address at the Stern & Kay Seminar on leadership in Nigeria June 2007.

Anazodo R. O, Okoye J. C, & Chukwuemeka E. O (2012). Civil Service Reforms in Nigeria: The Journey So Far in Service Delivery. *An American Journal of Social and Management Sciences*, 3(1):17-29.

Charles, M. C. (2005). A historical view of Douglas McGregor's Theory Y, *Management Decision,* Vol. 43 (3), 450-460

Chukwuemeka, E. & Eme, O.I. (2011). Refocusing the federal public service: The role of the Head of Service*, Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review* (OMAN Chapter) 1(5), 17-31.

Diana M. M., Alin O. & Marian, P. C. (2010). Efficiency, effectiveness and performance of the public sector. *Romanian Journal of Economic Forecasting*. 1-2: 63.

Dumisan, E. M. (2002). Impact of discipline on learner performance. A thesis submitted in fulfillment of partial requirements for the degree of masters of education in the department of foundation for education (Unpublished).

Ezeani, E. O. (2006). *Fundamentals of public administration* (revised Edition) Enugu: Snap Press Ltd.

FRN (1999). The constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, Abuja, Government Printers.

FRN (2004). Pension Reform Act. Abuja: Government Press.

FRN (2007). Public Service Rules. Abuja: Government Press.

Gwartney, J.; Lawson, R.; Park, W.; Wagh, S.; Edwards, C. & de Rugy, V. (2002). Economic Freedom of the World: 2002 Annual Report. Vancouver, the Fraser Institute.

Heiman, T. & Hilgert. R. (1979). *Supervision concepts & practices of management*, (Ohio: South Western Publishing Company.

Junaidu, B. M & Aminu M. M (2015). Public service in Nigeria- an overview of functions and code of conduct. *Global Journal of Politics and Law Research*. Vol. 3(1),61-69.

Knight, X. & Ukpere, W. I (2014). ''The effectiveness and consistency of disciplinary actions and procedures within a South African organisation''. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* (MCSER). 5(4) 589 – 596.

McGregor, D. M. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

McGregor, D. M. (1967). *The professional manager*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Miner, J. B. (2003). The rated importance, Scientific Validity, and Practical Usefulness of Organizational Behavior Theories: A Quantitative Review. *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 2: 250-268.

Mukoro, A. (2005). The impact of the environment on Nigeria's public administration. *Journal of Human Ecology,* 17(2):117-122.

Mueller, D. (1997). *Perspectives on Public Choice*: A Handbook, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mustapha, A. I. (2007). Labour unity and job security in the process of reform of the federal civil service of Nigeria (1999 – 2007). *UNIUYO Journal of Public Governance and Administration, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, University of Uyo, Uyo.*

Mustapha, I.M (2008). *Manual on Public Service Rules, Office Procedures, Office Routine and Reforms,* Oyo: Busco Publishing Academy.

O'Farrell, G. (2006). Cultures and values in the Queensland public service, Speech presented at the Queens land Regional Heads Forum Annual Business Conference, Conrad Hotel, Broad beach, retrieved on 25 May 2006 from http://www.qrhf.gov.au/04_conferences/ George ofarrell. presentation. pdf.

Okoli, F. C. (1980). The dilemma of premature bureaucratisation in the new states of Africa: The case of Nigeria*, African Studies Review*, 23(2), 1-16.

Okonkwo, J.K.J (2009). *General public administration: A rudimentary and Nigeria perspectives*. Onitsha: Chambers Books Ltd.

Okonkwo, J.K.J (2014). Public *services rules* and code of conduct for public servants. A paper presented to the newly employed staff of Akanu Ibiam Federal Polytechnic, Unwana, (2009 – Date), On the occasion of the induction programme organised by the Polytechnic.

Okpala, K. E. (2012). Fiscal accountability dilemma in Nigeria public sector: A warning model for economic retrogression, *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting* 3(6), 113-131.

Okwudili, B.E (2015). Effects of Non-Monetary Rewards on Productivity of Employees among Selected Government Parastatals in Abia State, Nigeria: *Journal of Business and management*, 17(2): 06 – 11.

Omitola, B. O. (2012). Nigerian public service reforms and the forth republic experience: Challenges and Prospects. *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences*, Vol. 5(1), 142-154

Oronsaye, S. O (2009). Restructuring of the office of the public service of the federation. Workshop on annual performance and evaluation report.

Persson, T. & Tabellini, G. (2001). "Political Institutions and Policy Outcomes: What are the Stylized Facts?" Mimeo.

Reichheld, F.F. & Sasser, W.E. (1990), "Zero defections: Quality comes to services", Harvard Business Review, Sept.–Oct., 105-111.

Rodrik, D. (2000). "Institutions for high-quality growth: What they are and how to Acquire them," NBER Working Paper 7540.

Schein, E.H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership*, Third edition. Jossey-Bass. San Francisco.

Shleifer, A. & Vishny, R. (1998). *The grabbing hand: government pathologies and their cures*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Strauch, R. & Hagen, J. (2000). *Institutions, Politics and Fiscal Policy*, Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Tanzi, V. & Schuknecht, L. (1997). Reconsidering the fiscal role of government: The International Perspective, *American Economic Review*, 87 (2), 164-168.

Tanzi. V. & Schuknecht, L. (2000). *Public spending in the 20th century*: A Global Perspective, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tim, H. (2003). *Guide to management ideas and gurus*. The Economist (Profile Books; 322 pages; £20).

Transparency International (2016). Corruption Perceptions Index. Accessed online at http://www.transparency.org on November 21, 2017].

UNECA, (2010). Innovation and Best Practices in Public Sector Reforms. The case of Civil Service in Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria and South Africa, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Vonai, C. (2013). Management of discipline for good performance: A theoretical perspective. *Online Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 2(**7**), 214 – 219.

Watson, T.J. (2006). *Organizing and managing work*. UK: Pearson Education Limited.