The Abuja Management Review (AMR) Vol. 9 No. 2 2025
ISSN: 1596-6666

Legislative and Executive Relations in Nigeria.

AbdulRasheed Hamza Bamidele[1], Adedibu Abayomi Adegoroye[2] & Lawal Yusuf Birisan[3]

[1&3] Department of Politics and Governance, Kwara State University, Melete Nigeria.
[2] Department of Management and Accounting, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology Ogbomosho, Oyo State, Nigeria
https://doi.org/10.70118/AMR-0902-2025-14
email: hamza.abdulrasheed@kwasu.edu.ng, aaadegoroye@lautech.edu.ng & birisan.lawal@kwasu.edu.ng

Abstract
This chapter examines the complex connection that exists between the legislative and executive branches in Nigeria, highlighting the conflicts as well as the collaboration that is necessary for efficient democratic governance. It draws attention to important issues such as legislative oversight, the balance of power and the executive branch's impact on legislative agendas. The chapter extensively uses secondary sources including scholarly publications and government records. The chapter emphasises how collaborative governance promotes efficient policy execution, seamless budgetary procedures, and more robust democratic institutions. In Nigeria, where tensions between the executive and legislature are common, cooperation between these branches can enhance governance outcomes. Mechanisms such as consultative leadership, liaison committees and shared policy frameworks are highlighted as tools for aligning their priorities. Political party discipline and conflict resolution strategies are discussed as ways to reduce disputes and foster cohesion. The benefits of collaboration include more efficient lawmaking, enhanced accountability and political stability, all of which improve public service delivery and national development.
***Keywords**: Executive, Relations, Legislature*

1. Introduction

A fundamental understanding of Nigeria's democratic style of governance is the interplay between the legislative and executive branches. As a means of promoting checks and balances, the principle of separation of powers grants both branches the constitutional authority to carry out specified tasks (Akindele & Olaopa, 2004). The legislature, which consists of the National Assembly and State Houses of Assembly, is in charge of making laws, providing oversight and representing the people, whereas the executive branch, which is headed by the President at the federal level and the Governors at the state level, is in charge of implementing laws and managing government operations (Ibeanu & Nwosu, 2017). The stability of governance and the results of policies are greatly influenced by the relationship between these two branches.

Nigeria's political environment has historically been formed by the military administrations that governed the nation for the majority of its post-independence history, which lasted from 1966 to 1999. Legislative bodies were frequently disbanded under military rule, giving the executive branch more power (Olowu, 2002). But since 1999, when democracy was restored, the legislature has taken back control of the government and is now actively involved in monitoring the executive branch and making it responsible for its deeds (Ogundiya, 2010). Legislative-executive ties in Nigeria have frequently been tense, despite constitutional provisions meant to promote cooperation. Budgetary allotments, appointments, and policy initiatives are common sources of dispute. For example, under the administration of former President Muhammadu Buhari, financial disagreements caused delays in enacting national budgets (Olaitan, 2019). The executive branch's dominating position, which includes control over important institutions like the military, police, and civil service, frequently makes these tensions worse.

Party politics also have a significant impact on how the legislative and executive branches interact. Cooperation is less likely to be hampered by intra-party disputes when the governor or president's political party has a majority in the legislature (Oyeleye, 2015). On the other hand, there is a greater chance of conflict and power struggles as well as policy deadlocks when different parties control the two branches. Sustaining a working partnership between these two branches is essential to the efficacy of Nigeria's democratic governance. While executive authority is required for effective government, legislative scrutiny is crucial for accountability. Maintaining democratic stability and promoting the nation's socioeconomic development requires finding a compromise between these two responsibilities (Adetula, 2016).

2. The Balance of Power: Checks and Balances Between the Legislature and the Executive

In democratic governance, to avoid tyranny and promote accountability, the legislative and executive branches must have a balanced power structure. The checks and balances system makes sure that no one branch of government has too much power by enabling each branch to keep an eye on and restrict the authority of the other while maintaining effective governance. In Nigeria, how the legislature and executive branch interact is crucial in determining the political climate, how policies are made, and how the state is run as a whole (Akindele & Olaopa, 2004).

In Nigeria, the President leads the executive branch at the federal level, while state governors oversee it. The executive branch is principally in charge of putting laws into effect, creating policies, allocating public funds, and supervising government departments and offices. Significant power is vested in

the Nigerian President, who may propose and carry out budgets, name important individuals including ministers, ambassadors, and agency heads, and manage the nation's security forces (Olowu, 2002). The necessity for effective management within the system is reflected in the concentration of authority within the executive. To prevent misuse and guarantee that the executive acts in the people's best interests, however, such substantial power requires robust checks.

The legislative branch, on the other hand, has the authority to enact laws, represent the electorate and provide oversight over the executive's actions. The Nigerian National Assembly, (consisting of the Senate and the House of Representatives) acts as a check on the executive branch. It is tasked with lawmaking, approving budgets, scrutinizing executive policies, and holding the executive accountable for its decisions (Ibeanu & Nwosu, 2017). The legislature is essential in making sure that the executive branch does not operate independently and that public policy is reflected in laws through these responsibilities. The legislature's authority of the purse is one of the most significant balances on the executive. Without the legislature's consent, the executive cannot implement a national budget or spend public funds. Furthermore, the legislature has significant control over fiscal policy and resource allocation because it must approve any borrowing plans that the government presents (Omotola, 2006). One of the most important ways the legislative makes sure the executive is still answerable to the people is through this budgetary control.

The purpose of Nigeria's checks and balances system is to guarantee that the legislative and executive branches stay within their constitutional bounds. For example, the National Assembly must discuss and adopt proposed legislation before it may become law, even if the executive has the right to introduce bills (Adetula, 2016). To ensure that government plans are thoroughly reviewed, the legislature also has the authority to reject or change executive recommendations. An additional essential check on the executive is provided by the Senate's authority to approve or disapprove appointments made by the executive branch. The Senate must provide its assent before ministers, diplomats, and other senior officials can be appointed. This guarantees that those chosen for important government jobs are vetted and fulfil the requirements (Suberu, 2010). The legislature can stop the executive branch from appointing people who could be detrimental to government oversight or who only serve the executive branch's interests by rejecting inappropriate nominations.

Similarly, in a similar vein, the executive can sway the legislative. Legislation passed by the legislature is subject to veto by the President or the Governor, although it can be overcome by a two-thirds majority in both houses of the National Assembly. The executive can veto laws that are deemed unworkable

or harmful to the functioning of the government (Oyeleye, 2015). Legislative override protection, on the other hand, guarantees that the executive is still answerable to the legislature and the people and that this authority is not abused.

In Nigeria, party politics also have a big impact on how the executive and legislative branches interact. Cooperation between the two arms of government is typically easier when the political party of the governor or president has a majority in the legislature. Since lawmakers from the same party are more likely to support the executive's agenda in such circumstances, the executive may find it simpler to enact laws and carry out policies (Olaitan, 2019). However, disagreements can occur even among members of the same party, particularly if lawmakers believe the government is going too far or neglecting their concerns. However, disagreement is more likely to arise when different parties control the legislature and the executive branch, which frequently results in political deadlock. In Nigeria's multi-party system, where power struggles and ideological differences regularly impair the smooth operation of government, such disputes are prevalent (Oyeleye, 2015). While both branches try to establish their dominance, these power battles might prevent legislation that is crucial from passing or postpone the execution of policies.

In Nigeria, there has frequently been conflict in the relationship between the legislature and the executive. Governance procedures have frequently been delayed by impasses resulting from disagreements over appointments, policy direction, and fiscal issues. For example, conflicting budgets between the National Assembly and the executive branch delayed yearly budget approval under President Muhammadu Buhari's presidency, which interfered with government program execution (Olaitan, 2019). These conflicts draw attention to how sensitive the legislative-executive relationship is and how crucial it is to preserve a balanced power dynamic in order to guarantee efficient governance. The Nigerian Constitution establishes a structure for oversight and cooperation, but party allegiance, political rivalry, and personal interests can occasionally undermine the checks and balances. Legislative oversight and accountability may suffer when the executive branch controls the majority of the legislative branch (Ogundiya, 2010). On the other hand, attempts by the legislative to subvert the executive branch may lead to a standstill in policy and ineffective governance.

Nigerian democracy is based on the distribution of power between the legislative and the executive branch. To ensure accountability, openness, and efficient policymaking while preventing the abuse of power, a system of checks and balances is necessary. The legislature is essential in monitoring the acts of the executive branch and making sure that the will of the people is reflected in government policies, even if the executive branch is in charge of running the state. But for this system to work, both branches must be prepared to uphold their constitutional obligations and work together for the good of the country.

The balance of power between the legislative and executive branches would promote good governance and promote Nigeria's socioeconomic growth if it is appropriately upheld. However, party loyalty and political rivalry continue to put Nigeria's checks and balances to the test.

3. Legislative Oversight of the Executive: Mechanisms and Effectiveness

The procedure through which the legislature keeps an eye on and oversees the executive branch's operations to guarantee responsibility, openness, and legal compliance is known as legislative oversight. This role is crucial in democratic nations in order to uphold the separation of powers between the two arms of government, stop abuse of power, and safeguard the interests of the general populace. Legislative supervision of the executive branch is essential in Nigeria to guarantee that the branch upholds the constitution, carries out policies efficiently, and handles public funds sensibly (Akindele & Olaopa, 2004).

a) Mechanisms of Legislative Oversight

The Nigerian Constitution gives the National Assembly and the State Houses of Assembly a number of ways to monitor the executive branch's actions. These mechanisms include:

i. **Approval of the Budget**: The power of the purse is among the most potent instruments of legislative supervision. Without the legislature's consent, the executive cannot carry out the national budget. Committees in the National Assembly carefully review the budget before it is passed, looking at financing allocations, revenue estimates, and proposed expenditures (Suberu, 2010). The legislature makes sure that public monies are not misappropriated and are distributed in accordance with national interests by regulating budgetary approvals.

ii. **Committee Investigations and Hearings**: Committees are used by the National Assembly and State Assemblies to look into executive acts, policies, and initiatives. Ministers, heads of agencies, and other executive officials are called upon by committees to defend decisions, provide an explanation of policy or address misbehaviour accusations. Legislators could learn vital information about the executive branch's workings through investigative hearings, which could assist expose corruption, inefficiencies, and power abuse (Omotola, 2006).

iii. **Confirmation of Appointments**: According to Nigerian constitutional law, the Senate has the authority to ratify important executive appointments, such as those of ministers, ambassadors, and heads of

agencies. This system makes sure that the executive branch doesn't arbitrarily assign biased or underqualified people to important roles. The Senate can examine the credentials, experience, and moral character of appointees through confirmation hearings (Suberu, 2010).

iv. **Impeachment Powers**: The President, Vice President, and state governors may be impeached by the legislature to take them out of office. Impeachment is a strong check on executive wrongdoing while being a rarely used instrument. For "gross misconduct," which is generally characterised as power abuses, corruption, and constitutional infractions, the National Assembly has the authority to impeach the President (Olowu, 2002).

v. **Question Time and Motions**: Legislative members have the ability to ask questions about the actions and choices made by executive officials. The relevant executive officers are required to respond to those questions that are brought up during plenary sessions. Furthermore, lawmakers have the authority to express their disagreement with particular executive actions or policies by passing votes of censure or no confidence in them (Akindele & Olaopa, 2004).

b) Effectiveness of Legislative Oversight

Although legislative supervision is essential for encouraging accountability and sound government, its efficacy in Nigeria has been uneven. The difficulties and achievements of oversight roles across the nation are influenced by a number of things.

i. **Party Dominance and Political Alliances**: The National Assembly is often controlled by the President's party, which is one of the leading parties in Nigerian politics. Legislators are more likely to support the executive's policies in order to preserve party unity when the executive and legislative branches are controlled by the same party, which could lead to a weakening of oversight (Oyeleye, 2015). In these situations, the legislature might not scrutinize executive decisions closely enough, which would lessen the efficacy of checks and balances.

ii. **Corruption and Patronage**: The effectiveness of supervision can be seriously hampered by corruption in the legislative and executive branches. Patronage systems have the potential to undermine legislators, as they allow them to take political favours or financial incentives in return for reducing their oversight responsibilities (Ogundiya, 2010). As a result, an atmosphere of impunity is fostered, enabling the executive to avoid accountability and scrutiny.

iii. **Lack of Expertise and Resources**: The knowledge and resources that lawmakers and their staff have access to determine how successful legislative oversight is. Many Nigerian lawmakers lack the technical expertise required to evaluate intricate budgets, regulations, or administrative procedures (Ibeanu & Nwosu, 2017). Furthermore, limiting access to data, independent experts, and research resources can make it more difficult for the legislature to provide comprehensive oversight.

iv. **Public Pressure and Civil Society Engagement**: Public pressure and civil society participation can improve the efficacy of lawmakers. The media and civil society groups (CSOs) are crucial in drawing attention to executive misconduct and bolstering calls for legislative action. The National Assembly has been forced to take a more forceful stand against executive excesses on multiple occasions due to popular uproar (Olaitan, 2019). The legislature's capacity to serve as a check on executive power has been improved by the involvement of civil society.

4. The Role of the Executive in Shaping Legislative Agendas

The legislative and executive branches are separate but related in democratic systems. The executive is heavily involved in influencing the legislative agenda, even though the legislature is responsible for enacting laws and representing the people. In Nigeria, the legislative process is heavily influenced by the president at the federal and state levels, who frequently directs it in a way that advances their respective policy objectives. Budget proposals, legislative agendas, and the overall policy framework are just a few areas where this executive influence is evident (Akindele & Olaopa, 2004).

a) Mechanisms of Executive Influence on Legislative Agendas

i. **Budgetary Proposals**: The budget is one of the most direct tools the executive uses to influence the legislative agenda. The yearly budget in Nigeria, which details government revenue and spending for the upcoming fiscal year, is started by the executive branch. The National Assembly or State Houses of Assembly must approve the budget, which represents the executive's policy priorities. The executive can determine which aspects of public policy, like infrastructure, education, healthcare, and security, receive funds because it has the power to formulate the budget (Olowu, 2002). The executive branch successfully shapes the legislative agenda by allocating resources and encouraging legislators to give priority to debates on the topics covered by the budget.

ii. **Executive Bills and Legislative Proposals**: The introduction of executive bills is a key method by which the executive directs the legislative agenda. These are legislative proposals that come from the executive branch and are frequently written by departments or agencies

of the government that report to the governor or president. Executive bills address topics including social welfare, national security, and economic change and are intended to carry out the executive branch's policy goals (Suberu, 2010). These measures frequently take precedence in legislative deliberations, guiding the agenda toward the executive's priorities because of the executive's crucial role in policy creation.

iii. **Policy Framework and National Plans**: National development plans and larger policy frameworks are two other ways that the executive affects the legislative agenda. When a new president assumes office in Nigeria, their administration usually lays out a long-term national development plan or policy agenda. Legislative activity is guided by these plans, which represent the executive's vision for the nation's future. The objectives outlined in these plans are frequently the focus of laws that are passed by the legislature. For example, significant economic reforms like the privatization of state-owned businesses, modifications to tax legislation, or industrial strategies are usually started by the government and need approval from the legislature (Omotola, 2006). Lawmaking is ensured to be consistent with the executive's overarching objectives when it is coordinated with the executive branch's development plan.

iv. **Executive-Legislative Coordination**: The strong cooperation between the executive and legislative leadership enhances the administration's capacity to set legislative priorities. Prominent members of the legislature, especially those in leadership roles like the Senate President or Speaker of the House, frequently participate in discussions and negotiations with the executive branch. By ensuring that laws and policies that support its aims are brought up for discussion and voting, this connection enables the president to progress its legislative agenda (Olaitan, 2019). Party allegiance also frequently influences legislative agendas, particularly in situations where the majority in the legislature is held by the party of the governor or president. Further coordinating the legislative process with the executive's objectives is the likelihood that legislators from the same political party will support its agenda.

v. **Appointments and Patronage**: The executive's authority over appointments and patronage offers additional ways to shape the legislative agenda. In Nigeria, ministers, commissioners, and heads of government agencies may be appointed by the President or the Governor, pending confirmation from the legislature. By forming relationships with lawmakers through these nominations, the executive may guarantee that those who support its agenda hold important positions (Ogundiya, 2010). Additionally, the executive branch can maintain control over the legislative process by directing legislators to support or prioritize particular bills or policies through the allocation of patronage, which includes contracts, resources, and political favours.

b) Effectiveness and Challenges

The executive's influence on the legislative agenda is significant, but its effectiveness is not always guaranteed. Several factors can enhance or limit the executive's ability to shape legislative priorities.

i. **Party Dynamics**: The executive branch's power to set the agenda is frequently strengthened when its party controls a majority of the legislature. Legislation and initiatives with executive support can pass more easily if there is party loyalty and internal cooperation. Nonetheless, the executive may encounter opposition, slowing down or derailing its legislative initiatives, when the legislative majority is held by an opposing party or when there are internal conflicts within the ruling party (Oyeleye, 2015).

ii. **Public Pressure and Opposition**: The executive's power over the legislative agenda can also be influenced by public opinion and opposition parties. The legislative body may be forced to revert, amend, or reject laws supported by the executive branch when the public takes a strong stand against a certain policy initiative or when the opposition organizes against executive initiatives (Ibeanu & Nwosu, 2017).

iii. **Institutional Constraints**: Constitutional provisions and institutional checks also limit the executive's ability to shape the legislative agenda. For instance, the legislature has the authority to amend, postpone, or reject bills that the executive proposes, and committees and investigative hearings act as checks on the executive's power by guaranteeing that the priorities of the executive branch are scrutinized (Ogundiya, 2010).

5. Inter-Branch Conflicts: Causes and Consequences in Legislative-Executive Relations

The legislative and executive branches' interaction is essential to democratic governance in order to guarantee the efficient operation of the state. Conflicts between these two branches of government do, however, frequently occur despite the planned balance of power. Interbranch disputes between the legislative and executive branches are a common occurrence in Nigerian politics. Divergent policy agendas, political competition, party dynamics, and constitutional difficulties are some of the reasons for these conflicts. Such conflicts can have far-reaching effects on the effectiveness of government, the application of policies, and the general stability of the political system (Akindele & Olaopa, 2004).

a) Causes of Legislative-Executive Conflicts

i. **Constitutional Ambiguities**: The Nigerian Constitution establishes a division of powers, but it is not always obvious exactly where the legislative and executive branches' respective jurisdictions end. Conflicts regarding the extent of each branch's authority may arise from this uncertainty, especially when interpreting constitutional clauses pertaining to appointments, budgetary allotments, and oversight responsibilities. One area of disagreement has been the National Assembly's authority to change the executive's proposed budget (Suberu, 2010). Due to the uncertainties in the Constitution, disagreements arise when each branch tries to impose its interpretation of the law.

ii. **Divergent Policy Priorities**: Regarding national interests and policy directions, the executive and legislative branches may view things differently. The legislative may give other concerns a higher priority depending on the requirements of their constituency or the platform of their party, while the executive frequently works to carry out its policy agenda, which is usually formed by the vision of the President or the Governor (Ibeanu & Nwosu, 2017). Legislative opposition to executive plans may result from these conflicting priorities, especially when it comes to matters like public expenditure, taxes, and budgetary allocations. This was made clear by the many budgetary conflicts over resource allocation that occurred between the government and the National Assembly under President Olusegun Obasanjo's administration (Ogundiya, 2010).

iii. **Political Rivalry and Party Dynamics**: The multiparty system in Nigeria frequently makes tensions between the executive and legislative branches worse. Conflict is more likely when opposing political parties or factions control the legislative and executive branches. Factional conflicts can result in power plays even within the same party, as lawmakers may take on the executive branch to further their own political goals or impose their own authority. For instance, internal party conflicts within the ruling People's Democratic Party (PDP) exacerbated tensions between the executive and legislative branches under President Goodluck Jonathan's administration, leading to frequent altercations and delays in the execution of policies (Oyeleye, 2015).

iv. **Appointments and Patronage**: The legislative and the executive branch frequently clash over the appointment procedure. Ministers, ambassadors, and other high-ranking officials in Nigeria may be appointed by the executive branch, but the Senate must approve these appointments. When the Senate rejects the executive branch's nominations, conflicts frequently result, either because of credentials issues or as a part of a larger political battle (Suberu, 2010). Relations

between the two branches can also be strained by disagreements over the allocation of political favours and patronage since lawmakers may feel shut out of decision-making processes or refused access to public funds.

v. **Oversight and Accountability**: In a democratic government, legislative supervision of the executive is crucial, but when the executive sees this oversight as interference or an attempt to erode its power, it can also cause conflict. Tension frequently arises from investigations, public hearings, and motions of censure, particularly when they deal with touchy subjects like corruption or the misappropriation of public funds (Omotola, 2006). Legislative obstructionism and executive overreach charges may result from the executive branch's refusal or delay in responding to legislative questioning.

b) Consequences of Legislative-Executive Conflicts

i. **Policy Gridlock**: Policy deadlock, or differences between the legislative and the executive that impede the passing of significant legislation or postpone the implementation of government projects, is one of the most direct effects of interbranch conflicts. For instance, disputes over the budget between the executive and the Nigerian National Assembly have historically caused delays in national budget approval, which has hampered the implementation of public services and development projects (Olaitan, 2019). Essential policies and changes are stuck when both branches are unable to agree, which results in inefficiencies in governance.

ii. **Weakened Oversight and Accountability**: Excessive confrontations between the two branches can undermine the oversight's intended purpose of holding the executive branch responsible for its actions. Legislative investigations and probes into executive acts are sometimes brushed aside as politically motivated, which damages the legitimacy of monitoring institutions (Ogundiya, 2010). Furthermore, there is a chance that both branches may become more preoccupied with political manoeuvring than with maintaining accountability and efficient government when executive-legislative tensions take centre stage in the political agenda.

iii. **Erosion of Public Confidence**: Long-term disputes between the executive and legislative branches can weaken public trust in democratic institutions. People may begin to lose faith in their leaders' ability to cooperate for the sake of the country when they perceive the government as being incompetent as a result of continuous disagreements. Voters may believe that political elites are more focused on settling personal

grudges than solving the nation's urgent issues as a result of this erosion of confidence, which could cause the public to lose faith in democracy (Olowu, 2002).

iv. **Impacts on Governance and Service Delivery**: Conflicts between the executive and the legislature can also have direct negative impacts on governance and service delivery. For instance, delays in budget approval can stall government spending on infrastructure, health, education, and other critical sectors, leading to a decline in public services (Omotola, 2006). Furthermore, disputes between branches of government can impede the enactment of legislation that is required to solve pressing social and economic problems, aggravating problems like unemployment, poverty, and instability.

v. **Threats to Political Stability**: In severe circumstances, disputes between the legislative and executive branches may jeopardize the democratic system's stability. Tensions in Nigeria have previously reached unprecedented levels, leading to protests, mass defections from political parties, and efforts at impeachment (Oyeleye, 2015). Such crises have the potential to erode national cohesion, erode the legitimacy of the government, and foster a climate of political unpredictability.

6. Collaborative Governance: Enhancing Cooperation Between the Legislature and the Executive

The term "Collaborative Governance" describes a system where the legislative and executive branches cooperate amicably to accomplish common policy objectives and improve the efficacy of governance. Tensions between the legislature and the executive branch are widespread in Nigeria, as they are in many democratic systems, and they frequently result in inefficiency and deadlock. However, encouraging collaboration between these two branches is essential for boosting accountability, guaranteeing the easy passage of legislation, and achieving national progress. The legislature and the executive branch can coordinate their responsibilities while upholding the separation of powers via collaborative governance (Akindele & Olaopa, 2004).

a) The Importance of Collaborative Governance

Collaboration between the executive and legislative branches is essential for several reasons:

i. **Effective Policy Implementation**: The efficient execution of laws and policies can be ensured when the legislature and executive branch collaborate. The executive must effectively carry out the laws and

policies that the legislative enacts in order for them to be fully implemented. Working together ensures that legislative proposals align with the realities of implementing policies (Olowu, 2002). On the other hand, policy implementation delays are typical when there is a conflict between the two branches, frequently to the country's detriment.

ii. **Smooth Budgetary Processes**: The budgetary process is among the most significant domains in which legislative and executive cooperation is essential. The legislature is responsible for reviewing and approving the budget, even if it is proposed by the executive. According to Suberu (2010), a cooperative connection between the two branches could ensure that budget allocations satisfy national demands while maintaining fiscal discipline and avoiding needless delays. When fiscal concerns are collaboratively handled, resources are allocated more effectively and pressing national requirements are addressed more quickly.

iii. **Strengthening Democracy**: Collaborative governance fosters communication, mutual respect, and compromise between the legislative and executive branches, strengthening democratic institutions. Collaboration between the two branches results in a culture of shared accountability and decisions that take a wide variety of interests into account, which in turn makes governance more inclusive and people-centred (Omotola, 2006). Additionally, by increasing decision-making transparency, this cooperation boosts public confidence in democratic processes.

b) Mechanisms for Enhancing Cooperation

i. **Consultative Leadership**: Consultative leadership is one of the most important tools for improving collaboration between the legislative and executive branches. Legislative leaders and executive officials, such as the president and governors, might regularly confer to discuss legislative agendas, policy priorities, and possible obstacles (Oyeleye, 2015). Incorporating the legislature at an early stage of the decision-making process helps the executive branch foster consensus and prevent future disputes.

ii. **Legislative-Executive Liaison Committees**: Better coordination and communication between the legislative and executive branches can be promoted by forming liaison committees or joint working groups. To make sure that both sides are in agreement on important topics, these committees can convene on a regular basis to examine impending laws, budget recommendations, and other legislative matters (Olaitan, 2019). These kinds of procedures promote continuous communication, which

lessens the possibility of miscommunications or confrontations during the legislative process.

iii. **Shared Policy Frameworks**: Through the creation of national development plans and unified policy frameworks, the legislative and executive branches can improve collaboration. In Nigeria, national development plans or policy agendas are usually outlined by the executive branch, but the legislature is crucial in bringing these plans to law. Both branches can cooperate to make sure that executive and legislative activities are in line with the larger national interest by deciding on shared objectives (Ibeanu & Nwosu, 2017).

iv. **Improving Party Discipline**: When one party controls both the legislative and executive departments, political party discipline can be a positive factor in fostering collaboration. A cohesive approach to governance can be achieved by strong party leadership ensuring that legislators back executive efforts. But it's crucial that party allegiance doesn't compromise the legislature's independence and that both houses can still hold one another accountable when needed (Ogundiya, 2010).

v. **Mediation and Conflict Resolution Mechanisms**: In order to resolve disputes between the legislative and executive branches before they become serious crises, proper mediation and conflict resolution procedures should be established. Senior politicians or impartial parties with the authority and background to mediate conflicts can serve as the leaders of these systems (Akindele & Olaopa, 2004). Early conflict resolution allows both branches to avoid drawn-out disputes that impede governance.

c) Benefits of Collaborative Governance

i. **Efficient Lawmaking**: An important advantage of collaborative governance is that legislation is passed more quickly. The legislative process runs more smoothly when the executive and legislature work together because there is more congruence between the legislatively provided legal framework and the executive's policy aims. As a result, there are fewer vetoes, legislative modifications, and delays in the enactment of important measures (Suberu, 2010).

ii. **Enhanced Accountability**: Working together does not equate to not having oversight. In actuality, good cooperation can improve accountability by guaranteeing that the legislature and executive branches fulfil their respective responsibilities for overseeing governmental choices and activities. For example, the legislature can use its oversight powers to hold the executive branch responsible for any

governance failures and collaborate with the executive to guarantee that policies are carried out as intended (Omotola, 2006).

iii. **National Development**: The progress of a country is directly aided by collaborative governance. The country as a whole gains when both branches collaborate to adopt and carry out laws that address social welfare, infrastructural development, and economic progress. Additionally, cooperation guarantees the timely delivery of public services and the effective use of government resources, both of which enhance citizens' quality of life (Olaitan, 2019).

iv. **Political Stability**: Political stability is another benefit of collaborative governance. Political crises, such as efforts at impeachment, delays in the budget, and power battles, frequently result from disagreements between the executive and legislative branches. Together, the two branches can prevent these disputes and make sure that the government runs well even in difficult political or economic times (Oyeleye, 2015).

References

Adetula, V. A. O. (2016). *Understanding Nigeria's Federalism and the Functioning of Governance*. Journal of African Political Economy & Development.

Akindele, S. T., & Olaopa, O. R. (2004). *A theoretical perspective of Nigeria's executive-legislative relations*. The Social Sciences.

Ibeanu, O., & Nwosu, A. (2017). *Nigeria's National Assembly and the Challenges of Effective Representation*. Journal of Legislative Studies.

Ogundiya, I. S. (2010). *Corruption: The Bane of Democratic Stability in Nigeria*. Current Research Journal of Social Sciences.

Olaitan, M. (2019). *Power Play in Nigeria: Understanding Executive-Legislative Relations*. African Affairs.

Olowu, D. (2002). *Governance and Policy in Nigeria*. Spectrum Books.

Omotola, J. S. (2006). *The Legislature and the Challenges of Democratic Governance in Nigeria*. Nigerian Journal of Legislative Affairs.

Oyeleye, A. (2015). *Nigeria's Political Parties and the Challenge of Governance*. Nigerian Journal of Policy Studies.

Suberu, R. T. (2010). *The Nigerian Federal System: Performance, Problems and Prospects*. Journal of Contemporary African Studies.