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As a pathway of improving financial management and accountability in public institutions and services financing; the twentieth-century has brought heightened expectations for what systems of budgeting and finance may be expected to deliver for the public. Suggestion from systems to provide a first defense against theft and gross misappropriation, systems to help lawmakers’ direct public resources where they can give the best public return, to help managers efficiently utilize resources under their control, and to communicate plans and results to the public. Practical guide to budgetary and management control system for improved efficiency in public sector organizations were provided.

National budgets as part of management control device designed to promote the efficient use of resources and providing support for other critical functions. Nigerian budgetary reform is seen as set of actions and measures involving evaluation of current process to identify what reforms are needed, approval, and carrying out the budget project, finalizing, control and approval of the budgetary execution. The first step taken was budgetary procedures, the establishment of the federal project, consists of income and outlay estimation activity of the national public budget. The principles of budgetary procedure are as assemble of budgetary rules which orders the public finance resources of the allocation process for government-owned sectors and government owned corporations.

Keywords: A fitted-style approach: (tailored-spending of public funds); Babariga-style approach: (untailored-spending of public funds); Government-owned sectors and government-owned corporations; Nigerian MDAs: (ministries, departments, agencies and parastatals).

INTRODUCTION

Most governmental and not-for profit organization, regardless of size, categories, complexity or sector, relied heavily on budgets and budgetary systems to achieve strategic goals (Raghunandan, 2012). The success and importance of budgeting relates to the identification of organizational goals, allocation of responsibilities for achieving these goals, and consequently its execution (Shah 2007; Robinson 2007; Drake and Fabozzi, 2010).

It is one of the most successful and useful management accounting techniques that can reap handsome rewards if properly understood and adequately implemented. Undoubtedly in any nation budgets are part of national and management control tool designs to promote efficient use of resources and providing support for other critical functions. Its role in an economy cannot be overemphasize as formal is an instrument of government planning and control process and is not designs with aim of making profits. National budget/or public budget serves as an important tool for resource mobilization, allocation, fiscal and economic management. It is an economic tool for facilitating and realizing the vision of government in a given fiscal year, and if a national budget is to serves as an effective tool in public sector, proper linkages and management of all the stages of budgeting is necessary. Apparently public-sector’ budgets have same characteristics as private-sector budgets. Olomola (2006
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and 2009) national budget has to be well design, effectively and efficiently implements and adequately monitor; its performance must be effectively evaluate. As Horngren (1977) and Covalaski and Dismith and Jablonsky (1985) and Ahrens and Chapman (2006) and Yang (2010) have argue if administer wisely budgeting drives management planning, provides best framework for judging performance, and promotes effective communication and coordination among various segments of business organizations. The above view reflects process character of budgeting in private-public business organizations. As Nigeria’s budgetary systems as could be expect there is a sharp contrast between budgeting under a military regime former took place on an arbitrary basis and budgeting under civilian administration subject to scrutiny at various stages by the executive and legislative arms of government before it finally approve. According to Patterson and Okafor and Williams (2006) and Douglasson and Gbosi (2006) and Olomola (2000, 2006 & 2009) and Caleb (2011) and Faleti (2010 & 2012) irrespective of whether the government is military or civilian, Nigerian budgetary systems have always been abuse. “Complaints frequently relates to non-release, partial release or delay in release of approve funds for budgeted expenditure” has always been framework associates with Nigerian budgetary systems and MDAs performance on programmes implementation. The above attitudes have negative implications for institutional planning and management control process as well overall performance of National budgeting on developmental programmes and welfare of citizenry. It has documents in national history funds allocate for a particular quarter is made available only at the end of that quarter. As civilian administration usher in 1999 people had high expectations National budget would support laudable programmes that would lead to poverty reduction through employment creations and promotion of welfare of people. The administration of former president Chief Olusegun Obasanjo 1999–2007 made ceaseless efforts to strengthen budgetary systems of MDAs to fulfill policy objectives of government and by implication satisfy aspirations of the people. The reform of Nigerian budgetary systems is a significant aspect of public-service reform embarks upon introduction of civilian administration in 1999 prior to this time the country is under military rule during which Nigerian budgetary systems thrown into total disarray.

Literature Review: An Overview

As Burkhead (1956) explains origination of public finance and budgetary systems are emergence of parliamentary control process over the crown in Britain; earlier king Charles II used to impose taxes for the financing of wars and for nothing else. The revolution of 1688 and the bill of rights in 1689 came with the provision that no man be compelled to make any gift, benevolence or tax or loan without common consent by act of parliament. In turn, the parliament reserved the right to authorize all expenditures made by the crown. The extension of parliamentary control over government finance came to emerge as the supervision of the king’s personal outlays. The civil list is established to separate the expenditures of the crown from the expenditures of the state. The annual specified grant control of the crown revenues and other modifications shall be made by successive parliaments. The term public budget is traditionally used to describe the leather bag of the Chancellor of the Exchequer containing the statement of the government’s plans and resources to parliament for the approval of the legislature. Drury (2000) terms the word Public budget as the money bag/or the public purse which serve several functions as a receptacle for the revenues and expenditures of the state. As Hilton (1997) cites in Abdullah (1998:1) and Adams (1998:104) view a public budget as the detailed quantitative plan of a government specifying how resources acquire and uses during a period of time. Silva (2012:355) the public budget is prepared for the primary purposes of planning, facilitating, allocating resources, communication, coordination, control of revenues and profits, operations, providing incentives and evaluating performances. A public budget provides rational and tangible information to facilitate and enable decision-making in public business organizations. Garisson et al. (2003) contend a public budget as a statical financial plan or blueprint and the term budgeting refers to the act of preparing a public budget/or the activities of predicting and qualifying future requirements for government finance. Yang (2010) budget is a detailed and quantitative plan. It shows information about the acquisition and use of financial and other resources over a specific time period; either a long-range period (two- to ten-year) or a short-term period (one-to two-year) or monthly, or daily-base. According to Mc Bain (1999) cites in Akintoye (2008:9) budgeting is not a substitute for effective decision making but the managers’ planning tool and budgeting is one of the most effective tools of communication and integration (Silva, 2012:355). GFOA (1998:4) the mission of budgeting process is to help decision makers make informed choices for the provision of services and capital assets and to promote stakeholder participation in the decision process. According to Amey (1979) and Bremer (1988) and Douglas (1994) and Yang (2010) budgeting in business organizations serves multiple purposes and functions but attention is given to two basic roles of budgetary systems, financial planning and control process, the so-called dual purpose. Formal budgeting process in management accounting is significantly classified into budget-planning and control process. As Drury (2000) and Joshi and Al-Mudhaki and Bremer (2003) as well as Garrison et al. (2003) report through budgeting in the process of financial decision-making and
internal operation of the private-public business organization, multiple functions regarding budgeting behaviour can be achieved. Budgeting with its multiple functions triggers a series of activities from the narrowest to the broadest, associates with financial planning, control, evaluating, coordinating and communicating within different departments of the organization when fully adopted. From the foregoing, public budget is viewed as a comprehensive document outlining what economic and non-economic activities a government intend to execute or undertake within a fiscal year with special focus on policies, strategies and corrective actions in the case that negative variances occur, and for accomplishments that are substantiated with public revenues and expenditures projections. These multiple functions of as established in previous research and its application to large private-public business organizations in both developed and developing countries budgeting process very invaluable.

Public Finance and Budgeting Systems: The Approaches

Cleveland (1915) in a brief note on systems theory applies to political science states the following: Inputs enter the governmental system produces outputs—in turn—relates to outcomes. The conversion of inputs to outputs is a measure of performance as the measurement of contributing inputs to impact outcomes is a measure of effectiveness.

The Line Item Budgeting is the simplest form of budgeting connects the inputs of the system to the system. These budgets arguably and typically appear in the form of accounting documents express minimal information regards purpose/or an explicit object within the system.

The Program Budgeting takes a normative approach to budgeting in decision-making regards allocating resources is determines by the funding of one program instead of another base on what that program offers. This approach quickly lends itself to the PPBS budgeting approach.

The Program Planning Budgeting System (PPBS Budgeting) is the link between the line-item and program budgets and the more complex performance budget. As opposes to the more simple programs budget in decision-making tool links the program under consideration to the ways and means of facilitating the programme. This intends to serve as a long-term planning tool for decision-makers aware of the future implications of their actions. These are typically and most useful in capital projects. The planning portion of the approach seeks to link goals to objects/ or expects outcomes from specific outputs then sorts into programs that convert inputs to outputs. The budgeting of PPBS helps determine how to fund the program. A leader in the promotion of PPBS is Robert McNamara’s uses in the US Government’s Department of Defense in the 1960s.

The Performance-Based Budgeting attempts to solve decision-making problems base on a program’s ability to convert inputs to outputs and/or use inputs to affect certain outcomes. Performance may be judge by a certain program’s ability to meet certain objectives contribute to a more abstract goal as calculate by that program’s ability to use resources/or inputs efficiently linking inputs to outputs and/or effectively linking inputs to outcomes. A decision-making/or allocation of scarce resources problem is solves by determining which project maximizes efficiency and effectiveness.

The Zero-Based Budgeting is a response to an incremental decision making process whereby the budget of a given fiscal year [FY] is largely decide upon by the existing budget of FY–1. In contrast to incremental, the allocation of scarce resources funding is determine from a zero-sum accounting method. In government, each function of a department’s section proposes a certain purpose relates to some goal the section could achieve if allocate x dollars.

The Program Assessment Rating Tool (P.A.R.T.) is an instrument develops by the United States to measure and assess the effectiveness of federal review programs, purpose, design, strategic planning, program management, and program results and accountability. The scores is rate from effective [ranging between 85 and 100 points], moderately effective [70–84 points], adequate [50–69 points], to ineffective [0–49 points].

The Priority-Based Budgeting is a response to poor economic conditions. As oppose to incremental budgeting where resources allocation is determine base on marginal shifts in costs, priority-based budgeting fixes the amount of governmental resources and then allocates resources across the various programs. The programs receive their allocation base on their priority; priorities may include safe and secure communities, health, education, and community development among others. Outcome assessment then determines the efficacy of the programs. This approach is pro-democratic critics the administration of this process is extremely difficult.

The Flexible Freeze Budgeting is a budgeting approach pioneer by President George H. W. Bush as a means of cutting government spending. In this approach certain programs would be affects by changes in population growth and inflation.

Public Finance and Budgeting Cycles: The Four Phases

As Smith and Lynch (2004) have report public budget
## Table 1: Key Budgetary Reform Strategies in Nigeria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Main aspects of budgetary reform</th>
<th>Key reform strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | Administrative Procedures        | -Establishment of the Budget Office of the Federation headed by a Director  
|     |                                  | -General who also doubled as Special Adviser to the President on Budget matters |
| 2   | Budget Preparation               | -Medium-Term Revenue Framework  
|     |                                  | -Medium-Term Expenditure Framework  
|     |                                  | -Fiscal Strategy Paper  
|     |                                  | -Medium-Term Sector Strategies  
|     |                                  | -Interactive Sessions  
|     |                                  | -Annual budgets with projects and programmes linked to medium-term plans |
| 3   | Management of Government Spending| -Oil-price-based fiscal rule,  
|     |                                  | -Debt/GDP limit,  
|     |                                  | -Aggregate expenditure limit,  
|     |                                  | -Limits by major expenditure heads, MDA limits (envelopes). |
| 4   | Budget Implementation            | -Use of Cash Management Committee to better manage the release of funds  
|     |                                  | -MDA now granted flexibility to manage the release of their capital budgets subject to set limits  
|     |                                  | -Timely and predictable release of capital budget  
|     |                                  | -Introduction of electronic payment process for payroll  
|     |                                  | -Publication of releases on BOF website |
| 5   | Monitoring and Evaluation         | -Timely monthly returns to OAGF by MDA  
|     |                                  | -Publication of budget performance report  
|     |                                  | -OPEN initiative led by OSSAP-MDGs  
|     |                                  | -Involvement of Civil Society in budget monitoring & evaluation |

Source: Olomola (2009)

**Key Terms:**  
BOF = Budget Office of the Federation,  
OPEN = Overview of Public Expenditure in NEEDS,  
MDAs = Ministries, Departments, Parastatals and Agencies,  
OSSAP = Office of the Senior Special Assistant to the President,  
MDGs = Millennium Development Goals,  
OAGF = Office of the Accountant General of the Federation.

cycles occur in four phases. The first requires public policy planning and resource analysis: revenue estimation. The second phase is refers to as public policy formulation: the negotiation and planning of the budget formation. The third phase is public policy execution: budget adoption and consists of budget execution—the implementation and revision of budgets policy. The fourth phase encompasses the entire public budget process: the auditing and evaluating of the entire process and system.

**The Revenue Estimation:** Carried out in the executive branch by the finance director, the clerk’s office, the budget director, the manager, or a team.

**The Budget Call:** Issues to outline the presentation from recommendation of certain goals.

**The Budget Formulation:** Reflecting on the past, setting goals for the future and reconciling the difference.

**The Budget Hearings:** Can include departments, sections, the executive, and the public to discuss changes in the budget.

**The Budget Adoption:** Final approval by the legislative body. **Budget Execution:** Amending the budget as the fiscal year progresses.

**Public Finance and Budgetary Reforms: Nigeria**

Nigerian MDAs annual appropriation estimates are usually subjected to various approval procedures to become an economic tool. Such approval processes include ministerial approval phase, executive council approval phase and legislative approval phase, and collection of estimates from various government ministries/extra-ministerial departments. The ministry of budget and planning sets up a draft committee to review draft estimates and submit them for defense on the floor of the two houses; house of representative and the senate. This meeting is called budget session before passage into law. The approval phases comprise all centres administrative, legislative and programmers units.
Table 2: Areas of Improvement Consequent upon Budgetary Reform Strategies in Nigeria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>EFFECTS</th>
<th>KEY ELEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | Efficiency/Savings | (1) Staff verification and creation of detailed payroll data led to 64,500 reductions in inflated FGN staffing levels. This resulted in a saving of about N48 billion.  
(2) The right-sizing programme led to the disengagement of 25,000 core civil servants. This resulted in a saving of about N10 billion as at the end of 2006.  
(3) Detailed breakdown of overheads that was introduced into budget preparation provided savings of about N36.7 billion.  
(4) The 2007-2009 MTSS exercise led to the identification and reprogramming of poorly planned and conceived projects and programmes worth about N123 billion. |
| 2   | Value for Money    | **Better control of payroll and overheads involving:**  
(1) Nominal roll with detailed information on each Employee such as names, grade level/step, etc.).  
(2) Detailed breakdown of overhead cost components and unit costs.  
(3) Automation of budget data capture and computation templates.  
Integrated Payroll System:  
Installation of the first phase of the Integrated Payroll and Personnel Information System with biometrics application, to among other things establish a reliable and comprehensive data-base for the public service, eliminate record and payroll fraud such as the “ghost workers” syndrome and, double dipping, and facilitate easy storage, update and retrieval of personnel records for administrative and pension purposes. |
(2) Publication of federation account allocations to all tiers of government in the mass media (both print and electronic) on a regular basis. |
| 4   | Improved Participation | **The key areas of strength in the budget preparation stage resulting from the reform of the budget system are:**  
(1) The growing awareness about the need for consultation among the various stakeholders (MDAs, OPS, NGOs, CSOs, and Development Partners).  
(2) The establishment of a full-fledged Budget Office, headed by a Director General. |

Source: Olomola (2009)

involve in development of periodic budgets. Upon approval by national assembly, budget is return to the president for executive signature and becomes an appropriation act to be distributed to MDAs inform of approved estimates. The Nigerian budget preparation primarily involves identifying and setting developmental goals. This entails setting budgetary thrusts and policies base on development plan. At the federal level, the responsibility of the president for preparation and submission of budget is well established (table 1 and 2). At state level, it is the statutory responsibility of the governor to prepare and submit budget. At local government level, the chairperson has complete control over budget preparation assisted by the finance committee and other departmental heads. The adoption of medium term expenditure framework [MTEF] in 2000 is to focus on Nigerian budget planning and control process strategies. This is to ensure that public sector managers give adequate provision for expenditure over a three-year rolling period based on departmental strategic and service delivery plans. As part of Nigerian budgetary reform measures introduced former president Olusegun Obasanjo, MTEF seeks to improve macro-economic balance through development of a consistent and realistic resource framework, employment creation, and improved allocation of resources to strategic priorities. The budgetary reforms embark upon open doors for large innovations in Nigerian MDAs for the first time in the history of Nigerian public-sectors. Public-sectors witness articulation of a medium-term revenue framework, a medium-term expenditure framework, and medium-term sector strategies in preparation of a national budget. Olomola (2006) puts it this way:

“The Country is still largely dependent on oil revenue and budget therefore continues to be exposed to volatility in the international oil market. The issue of diversification of the economy looms large in ensuring budget works effectively as an instrument of macroeconomic management. Despite the advantages of MTEF, its adoption should not be regarded as panacea for fiscal weaknesses and mismanagement in an economy, and for MTEF to succeed, sustained political commitment is required in turn, requires purposeful leadership”.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of public sector budgeting underpinning the study is derived from “Structuration” and
a “Dialect of Control Theories” (Giddens, 1979 and 1984; and Stones, 2005). As a way of accommodating both routine turbulence and reform measures in public finance and budgeting systems; the dialectic of control (Giddens, 1979 and 1984) should not only be able to analyse the effect of reform measures in public sector finance and budgeting systems, but should also be able to explain the almost routine turbulence of modern public sectors subject to the influence of the New Public Management (Seal and Ball, 2011:409). As Broadbent and Laughlin (1998:405) stated New Public Management is not a static set of requirements but a constantly changing round of realignments and adjustments (Seal and Ball, 2011). Some of these adjustments and realignments take place in a budgetary setting and may thus be recognized as part of a game of budgetary reform (Peters, 2001). It will be shown that these concepts provide a theoretical framework that subsumes approaches that view budgeting in terms of game (Hofstede, 1968; and Peters, 2001). The resulting theory can be used to analysis both short-term budgetary reforms as in which the rules stay the same; and more long-term dynamics, in which players respond to the outcomes of the short-term reforms with attempts to change the rules. Given that gaming models of public finance and budgeting systems may have a tendency to exaggerate both the knowledge-ability and selfishness of the participants. As Peters (2001:522) examines two possible theoretical approaches to budgetary reform in public sector organization. First, in the positivist rationality approach, “budgetary reforms are measured and described against models”. Second, in the symbolic interaction approach, “reforms are examined as rhetoric of change whose effects are captured at the level of actor perception”. Lewis and Hildreth (2013:24) posit that public finance and budgeting systems is different from personal or business budgeting systems as it is supposed to be. Public finance and budgeting systems is making choices about scarce resources for the fiscal period through the political process. It focuses on political purposes; calls for accountability, transparency, responsiveness, and stewardship centering on sustainability; and relies on public participation and scrutiny (Lewis and Hildreth, 2013:24). According to Key (1940) cited in Mikesell and Mullins (2011:3) Professor V.O. Key posed the simple question that encapsulates all budget decisions making: “On what basis shall it be decided to allocate X dollars to activity A instead of activity B?” As it turns out to be, answering this question has not been a problem for either theory or in practice. It has not stumped practitioners—they have made those decisions for years, even before Professor Key raised it and, indeed, even before there were formal public budgets. And it certainly has not been an unanswered question for prescriptive economic analysis: allocate resources between the private and public sector and between competing uses in the public sector so that moving $1 from one sector or use to another yields exactly the same return in the new use as it did in the old (Mikesell and Mullins, 2011:3). The basis is the welfare of the public, the allocation standard is easily understandable i.e. equate returns at the margins, and—whether the innovators understood it or not—recent innovations in budgeting have been square—on with working toward achievement of this result (Mikesell and Mullins, 2011:3). Apparently, answering the budgeting question has been no mystery for descriptive analysis: public choice maintains that politicians and bureaucrats are driven by individual self-interest and both will seek to allocate resources in a way that satisfies those individual interests, not some concept of the public interest (Mikesell and Mullins, 2011:3). The fact that the budgeting question has been regularly answered in practice and in both prescriptive and descriptive theory does not retard efforts to alter processes and procedures to produce results that are, at least to some calculations, better than those being achieved, meaning that they better fulfill the four roles of a budget process (Mikesell and Mullins, 2011:3).

Methodology

Drawing information from a wide array of national and international primary and secondary sources: through face-to-face interview, various government-issues, documents, and annual financial and statistical statements, academic publications, such as books, research papers, articles, published case studies and relevant websites. We are able to justify the principal changes that the radical budgetary reforms introduced. We are able to show that the Nigerian budgetary reforms have been geared to achieving aggregate fiscal discipline and enhancing technical efficiency and that formal mechanism for transparency and accountability have been central to these reforms. The information further reveal that our measures are correlated with expenditure outcomes i.e. reduction in fiscal discipline and unit costs of service delivery. Using our findings, we are able to critique recent initiatives being undertaken in Nigerian public sectors, and propose reform experiments that can improve incentives within government as well as between government and donors. Monitoring and evaluating these reform experiments constitutes a principal element of the proposed agenda for further studies.

Research Findings: The Implications of “Babariga-Style” Budgeting Approach

A mere mention of government-owned sectors and government-owned corporations exudes corruption. Corruption, financial mismanagement, money laundering, budgetary and financial indiscipline, lack of budget goals-
clarity, procedures and robust corrective measures are major problems faces government-owned sectors and government-owned corporations. The popular myth propagates by senior government officials, sectors are always short of funds. The heavy funding runs into billions of Naira may not be enough as a result of cankerworm of corruption in public sector organizations. As a matter of facts most sectors do not accord adequate regard to budgeting systems and project implementation. The consequences of these attitudes are mere lack of budget-discipline and corrective measures in the event that negative variance occurs. Nigerian government which should have serves as a check and balance is not completely free from this cankerworm as a result of inherited "babariga--style" budgeting approach in public sectors’ administration rather than "a fitted style" approach. Evidently there are numerous project scams in public sectors, these projects are inflates and worse still projects are not executes thereby defeating essence of Nigerian budgets-task and project implementation proper among many others.

Possible Suggestions

1. The decline of public confidence and trust imposed in leading political institutions and in public leaders is a long-term trend that affects Nigerians’ ability to reverse the negative believe and developments in public finance and budgeting systems and nurture the positive ones. Apparently, trust is a fundamental to the obligation of stewardship. According to Lewis and Hildreth "Trust means being able to rely on others to do what they genuinely believe is the right thing, even if you do not agree with them, and to do it in the right way. Trust invests our shared or public life and public policy with a sense of fair play, reliability, predictability, and stability.

2. As earlier captured by Lewis and Hildreth (2013:294) in the 2002 UN Convention: “The seriousness of the problems and threats posed by corruption to the stability and securing of societies, undermining the institutions and values of democracy, ethical values and justice and jeopardizing sustainable development and the rule of law”.

3. There is more to trust than the expectation that public leaders will obey the rule of law and avoid lining their own pockets as public service is a public trust. The nineteenth-century politician Thomas Jefferson of the United State of America and British politician Benjamin Disraeli stated this: “All power is a trust---we are accountable for its exercise.” According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development: “Public service is a public trust. Citizens expect public servants to serve the public interest with fairness and to manage public resources properly on a daily basis. Fair and reliable public services inspire public trust (OECD, 2000).”

Practical Guide to Budgetary and Financial Management Control System

Budgetary and financial management control systems of the functional operations of any governmental and profit-seeking organization(s) largely depend on certain essential elements (Lewis Daniel Houck, Jr., 1979:3):

1. Information system that records the progress of an activity or group of activities for a specific time period which must include a description of activity steps or phases and a quantitative or qualitative measure for tracking the progress or achievement level of the activity.
2. A specified structural organization element to which the activity is assigned.
3. A formal reporting document for generating feedback of achievement levels to the supervisor or manager of the organization unit.
4. A planned or predetermined activity measure against which actual achievement measures can be compared.
5. A decision-making capability that exists within the organization element or unit to take action that will bring the achievement level in line with the planned level.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That diversification of public funds should be based on a scientific reckoning of actual needs of different sectors.
2. That governing body should adopt sound accounting techniques, procedures, and robust corrective measures should be in place in the event that negative variance occurs.
3. There should be budgetary and financial discipline, while public officials should spend funds lawfully for the purposes provided by law otherwise face impeachment or dismissal and also made to bear the full brunt of the law.
4. Finally, that free and fair democratization and economic independence be established in all ramifications.

CONCLUSION

As a matter of facts, a technical stumbling block in public sector organizations and it is politics. To Build processes and procedures that are in some sense better will not necessarily lead to budget outcomes that are better, in the sense of providing a superior allocation of resources probably because the processes bridge the technical and
the political. Aaron Wildavsky (1979:5) stated that the budget lies at the heart of politics: “The victories and defeats, the compromises and bargains, the realms of agreement and the spheres of conflict in regard to the role of government in our society all appear in the budget”. As Mikesell and Mullins (2011:3) have argued “without both political will and motivation, innovations in budgeting and financial management will be futile, both in terms of getting the innovations adopted and in terms of getting the desired result from them”. The political dimension in any nation probably elevates the value of process rather than outcomes. As Wildavsky (1979) has points out, one measure of a good budget is simply its enactment; that it emerged from the compromises of the political system in place as it may appear as quite a low standard. The budgetary statements of nearly the past quarter half century suggest the vital nature of process to both political and technical outcomes. Importantly, one of the difficulties in budgeting process is the easy movement between political and technical that there is no single measure of public welfare that applies across all public services. Second, is the fact that elected officials generally care more about the political party and people they represent, i.e. the ones who directly or indirectly vote them in, than they do for the general public welfare. The desire for such a yard stick has in some ways, been the challenges of budgeting for nearly a century. These are the inherent complications of getting a budget process that generates improvements in the common welfare of the people. Without a measure, we do not know what we have or how we are changing (Mikesell and Mullins, 2011:3). Finally, the ultimate measure of budgeting processes and procedures is whether they improved the allocation of resources, both between government-owned sector and government-owned corporation uses and among alternate public options. However, the information and standards for evaluating the economic quality of budgeting outcomes are scarce and this makes public sector resource allocation inherently complicated and a process perpetually open to improvements and reforms; the improvements sometimes only appear to be reforms in the eyes of those proposing them (Mikesell and Mullins, 2011).
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