

# CONFLICT MANAGEMENT MECHANISMS IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF NIGERIA AND SOUTH AFRICA

**Dennis Ogutum OLOLUBE**

Department of Political Science

Faculty of Social Science

Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Nigeria

[dennisololube@gmail.com](mailto:dennisololube@gmail.com)

---

## ABSTRACT

Public sector conflict remains a critical governance challenge across African states, often manifesting in prolonged strikes, policy breakdowns, and deteriorating service delivery. This study conducts a comparative analysis of conflict management mechanisms in Nigeria and South Africa, two of Africa's most influential economies with contrasting administrative traditions and institutional capacities. It explores how conflict arises within public sector institutions, how it is resolved or prolonged, and the effectiveness of legal and institutional frameworks governing dispute resolution. Anchored on Structural Conflict Theory and Human Needs Theory, the study adopts a qualitative-comparative methodology, drawing from empirical reviews, institutional reports, and scholarly literature between 2015 and 2024. Findings highlight that while South Africa operates a more autonomous and rule-based conflict management architecture, Nigeria's system is often hindered by political interference, weak enforcement, and discretionary legal provisions. The study argues for stronger legal autonomy, institutional clarity, and depoliticisation of labour dispute mechanisms. Implications point to the need for harmonising adjudication timelines, institutionalising mediation processes, and promoting proactive engagement between government and unions. Ultimately, the study provides evidence-based insights essential for advancing public service stability, policy accountability, and governance reform in sub-Saharan Africa.

**Keywords:** public sector conflict, Nigeria, South Africa, labour disputes, institutional mechanisms, governance reform, conflict resolution.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows:

Ololube, D. O. (2025). Conflict management mechanisms in the public sector: A comparative study of Nigeria and South Africa. *International Journal of Institutional Leadership, Policy and Management*, 7(3), 635-654.

## INTRODUCTION

Public sector conflict remains one of the most enduring governance challenges confronting many African states, manifesting in the form of labour unrest, institutional gridlock, bureaucratic disengagement, and operational dysfunction. These conflicts are not merely episodic disruptions but symptomatic of entrenched structural and administrative weaknesses particularly where institutions lack autonomy, enforcement capacity and procedural safeguards necessary for sustained dispute resolution. As Okon (2019) rightly argued, the absence of clearly delineated frameworks for managing conflicts in public institutions often exacerbates tensions, culminating in policy reversals and degraded service delivery. Mokoena (2020) in his review of public sector labour disputes in South Africa attributes recurrent unrest to weak accountability structures and political alliances that blur the line between regulatory authority and partisan influence. In the broader African context, unresolved conflicts in public administration have been directly linked to the deterioration of state legitimacy and escalating governance fragility (Afolabi & Ibe, 2021; UNDP, 2022).

While Nigeria and South Africa share post-colonial legacies, their public sector conflict management approaches diverge sharply in terms of institutionalisation, policy enforcement, and levels of participatory engagement. Nigeria's system is largely characterised by legal ambiguity, political interference, and weak compliance mechanisms, often leading to protracted strikes and cyclical disruptions (Ngige & Worlu, 2022). In contrast, South Africa has developed a relatively robust legal-institutional ecosystem anchored in its Labour Relations Act (Republic of South Africa (1995) and independent dispute resolution bodies such as the Commission for Conciliation, Mediation and Arbitration (CCMA), which has proven more responsive to grievances (Mogashoa, 2018; AU-PAPS, 2023). However, even within this structured model, conflict outcomes remain partially shaped by historical union alliances and policy inertia. As Adediran (2021) asserts, the effectiveness of conflict management mechanisms is not merely a function of legal design but also of institutional responsiveness, sociopolitical legitimacy, and inclusiveness in decision-making.

Importantly, conflict resolution in the public sector cannot rely solely on legal codes and formal protocols. Otopo (2018) emphasized that the success of such mechanisms depends largely on how insulated they are from political interference and whether they reflect the socio-administrative contexts in which they operate. Comparative governance studies further affirm that in states with fragile institutions, hybrid approaches blending statutory instruments with traditional or consensus-based practices have emerged as practical responses to institutional limitations (Ali, 2016; Olayiwola, 2022). Although such hybrid models are less relevant in the relatively centralised state structures of South Africa and Nigeria, the underlying principles of contextual adaptability, multi-stakeholder dialogue, and procedural equity remain indispensable to managing public service disputes.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Understanding conflict in the public sector requires a framework that captures both the structural realities of governance systems and the intrinsic motivations of the individuals operating within them. This study adopts a dual-theoretical foundation, drawing from Structural Conflict Theory and Human Needs Theory, to provide a multi-dimensional analysis of the roots, dynamics, and manifestations of conflict in public administrative systems. These theories were selected for their

relevance to the African public sector context, where institutional imbalances, procedural exclusion, and unaddressed psychological and professional needs continue to generate systemic unrest. Structural Conflict Theory helps explain how embedded inequalities and dysfunctional institutional arrangements provoke resistance and confrontation, while Human Needs Theory highlights the role of unmet fundamental human needs such as identity, recognition, and participation in fuelling worker dissatisfaction and collective action. Together, these theories offer a comprehensive lens for evaluating the institutional and human dimensions of conflict management mechanisms in Nigeria and South Africa.

### **Structural Conflict Theory**

Structural Conflict Theory, originally proposed by Johan Galtung in 1969, frames conflict not as a mere behavioural or interpersonal disagreement but as a consequence of deep-rooted institutional inequalities and systemic imbalances (Okon, 2019). Galtung introduced the concept of *structural violence* to describe how social structures and institutions can inflict harm by perpetuating inequality and exclusion without overt aggression. In African public sector contexts, this theory is especially relevant where governance systems sustain disparities through rigid bureaucratic hierarchies, marginalisation of certain worker groups, and opaque policy processes. As Okon (2019) pointed out in his investigation of bureaucratic inequality in Nigeria, conflict in the public sector often arises from wage gaps, politicised promotions, and the absence of inclusive decision-making frameworks, all of which reflect institutional asymmetry and imbalance rather than individual misconduct.

This theoretical integration finds particular relevance in Nigeria, where systemic neglect, poor enforcement of collective agreements, and non-participatory administrative practices contribute to recurrent industrial conflicts. The continued disregard for rulings by the National Industrial Court of Nigeria and the selective implementation of collective agreements with unions like ASUU and JOHESU exemplify structural flaws that generate distrust and resentment among public workers (Afolabi & Ibe, 2021). Structural Conflict Theory asserts that these recurrent disputes are not anomalies, but symptomatic of power disparities embedded in the institutional makeup of the Nigerian state. According to this view, public servants are often positioned at the receiving end of a vertically rigid and non-responsive administrative framework, which structurally denies them equitable participation in governance and dispute resolution.

In contrast, South Africa provides a more structured institutional model, but even here, the remnants of historical inequality continue to influence conflict dynamics. Institutions like the Commission for Conciliation, Mediation and Arbitration (CCMA) and various Public Service Bargaining Councils have been praised for reducing structural friction by offering fair and legally binding mechanisms for dispute resolution (Mogashoa, 2018). However, as Mokoena (2020) notes, uneven implementation at municipal and provincial levels still creates pockets of systemic exclusion, particularly in rural or underfunded sectors. Thus, Structural Conflict Theory remains an essential framework for diagnosing the hidden, institutionalised sources of public sector unrest even in relatively advanced systems. It argues that until governance structures are fully inclusive, equitably resourced, and procedurally transparent, conflict will persist as a structural inevitability.

## **Human Needs Theory**

Human Needs Theory, pioneered by John Burton in 1979, offers a human-centric framework for understanding conflict by positing that all individuals and groups possess non-negotiable needs such as identity, security, recognition, autonomy, and participation that must be satisfied to maintain peace and functional relationships. According to Burton, when these needs are denied or threatened, affected individuals or groups will resist, often through protest, confrontation, or withdrawal, regardless of available legal mechanisms. Applied to the African public sector, this theory explains why civil servants frequently resort to strikes or resistance when they perceive that their dignity, status, or professional identity is undermined by government policies. Amadi and Odigwe (2020), in their study on Nigerian academic unions, observed that the root of many industrial disputes lay not in salary demands per se, but in unmet emotional, psychological, and professional needs such as respect, security of tenure, and institutional recognition.

In Nigeria, Human Needs Theory sheds light on the repeated cycles of unrest involving academic and health sector unions. Workers often feel excluded from key decisions, particularly regarding resource allocation, personnel policies, and sectoral reforms. This exclusion translates into a denial of their need for recognition and meaningful participation conditions that Human Needs Theory identifies as central triggers of conflict. Union-led protests and prolonged industrial actions can thus be interpreted as expressions of deeper frustration with institutional cultures that fail to affirm worker identity or uphold their legitimate roles within governance frameworks. As Otobo (2018) argues, resolving such conflicts requires more than legal compliance; it demands genuine commitment to dignity and human-centred administration.

South Africa offers a more integrated model of recognising these intrinsic needs, as evidenced by its structured platforms for social dialogue and participatory labour policymaking. Through the CCMA and Public Service Coordinating Bargaining Council (PSCBC), public workers are provided mechanisms to voice concerns, negotiate workplace conditions, and challenge unfair practices, thus fulfilling their needs for recognition, fairness, and involvement. However, Mogashoa (2018) cautions that disparities remain particularly in provincial settings where grievance procedures are less consistent and bureaucratic responsiveness is weaker. Even with institutional platforms in place, the failure to meet deeper human needs such as identity and autonomy may reignite conflict in the form of micro-resistance, policy sabotage, or attrition. Human Needs Theory thus reinforces the position that meaningful public sector reform must centre on empathy, inclusion, and policies that restore not only compliance but dignity in administrative life.

## **METHODOLOGY**

This study adopted a qualitative comparative case study design, which critically examined the institutional frameworks, legal instruments, and stakeholder dynamics shaping conflict management in the public sectors of Nigeria and South Africa. The comparative method enabled the identification of convergences and divergences in policy implementation, institutional responsiveness, and dispute resolution outcomes within two distinct yet similarly post-colonial administrative systems. The study did not aim to generalise findings across the African continent but rather to offer a context-rich, theory-informed analysis that can illuminate broader reform implications for governance in similar environments.

Data for this study were derived primarily from documentary sources, including statutory instruments such as Nigeria's *Trade Disputes Act* (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2004) and South Africa's *Labour Relations Act* (Republic of South Africa (1995), policy briefs, labour court rulings, white papers, and institutional reports from relevant ministries, labour tribunals, and arbitration councils. Additionally, peer-reviewed journal articles, edited book chapters, and scholarly studies published between 2015 and 2025 were reviewed to provide empirical grounding and scholarly validation. Special attention was given to works by African scholars to ensure contextual relevance, as well as reports from international organisations such as the International Labour Organization (ILO), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and the African Union's Political Affairs, Peace and Security Department (AU-PAPS).

The analytical framework is anchored on Structural Conflict Theory and Human Needs Theory, both of which guide the interpretation of institutional dysfunction, procedural exclusion, and workers' unmet needs as underlying sources of public sector conflict. Through thematic analysis, key patterns were identified across the two country contexts focusing on legal structure, enforcement capacity, union-government relations, and participatory mechanisms. This non-experimental, interpretive approach allows for a deeper understanding of how systemic structures and institutional cultures shape conflict trajectories and resolution outcomes. The method emphasises contextual depth over breadth, enabling a nuanced critique of conflict resolution practices and the institutional logic that sustains or mitigates them.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Understanding public sector conflict within the African context requires a thorough interrogation of the structural, institutional, political, and socio-economic factors that underlie administrative friction. The literature on public administration in Africa reveals that conflict in the public sector is often a complex relationship of governance failures, institutional weaknesses, political manipulation, and unresolved grievances among stakeholders (Otobo, 2018; Ngige & Worlu, 2022). While conflict is a natural part of organisational life, the inability of public institutions to resolve such conflicts constructively has repeatedly led to strikes, service disruptions, legal battles, and in extreme cases, systemic collapse of public trust in governance. So to say, critically examining relevant scholarly and institutional literature, focusing first on the conceptual nature of public sector conflict, and then on the institutional mechanisms employed to manage and mitigate such disputes across African states.

### **Conceptualizing Conflict in the Public Sector**

Public sector conflict, within the African administrative and governance context, refers to persistent or periodic disagreements, disputes, or hostilities that occur within or between public institutions, or between the state and its employees, particularly within bureaucratic systems. These conflicts often arise from structural imbalances, policy failures, wage dissatisfaction, poor communication, or administrative exclusion (Mokoena, 2020). Conflict in this sense is not merely a disruption of harmony, but a reflection of deeper institutional and governance pathologies. According to Okon (2019), public sector conflict should be conceptualised as both a symptom and a cause of weak governance frameworks, particularly in states where the mechanisms of resolution are either politically controlled or administratively underdeveloped.

Wage-related disputes have consistently featured as dominant triggers of public sector conflict in Nigeria, South Africa, and similar jurisdictions. Labour unions often protest delayed salary payments, non-implementation of negotiated agreements, and arbitrary dismissals, which they perceive as violations of fundamental rights and job security. In the Nigerian case, Amadi and Odigwe (2020) conducted a study on academic and health sector conflicts and found that unresolved salary arrears and lack of collective bargaining compliance were central to recurring strikes. Similarly, in South Africa, Mogashoa (2018) identified public worker protests as being strongly linked to perceived disparities in compensation and inconsistent enforcement of wage policies, especially at the provincial and municipal levels. These wage disputes are often aggravated by poor communication between government and workers' unions, coupled with a lack of transparency in fiscal management.



Figure 1: Comparative Matrix of Legal Frameworks  
Source: Author's Conceptualization 2025

Overall, the conceptual literature affirms that public sector conflict in Africa cannot be understood merely in terms of episodic disputes; it must be situated within the broader context of weak administrative governance, lack of legal responsiveness, and exclusionary political cultures. Otober (2018) rightly posited that without addressing the underlying institutional deficits and governance asymmetries, conflict in the public sector will remain cyclical and resistant to sustainable resolution.

### **Institutional Conflict Management Mechanisms in Africa**

Institutional conflict management mechanisms refer to the formalised systems, bodies, and procedures established by governments to manage and resolve conflicts that arise within the public sector. These mechanisms range from statutory tribunals and grievance redress systems to arbitration councils, collective bargaining boards, and mediation panels. Their primary objective is to provide predictable, impartial, and legally binding pathways for resolving disputes, thus ensuring administrative continuity and protecting the rights of both employees and institutions (Ngige & Worlu, 2022). However, the design, functionality, and effectiveness of these mechanisms vary widely across African states due to differences in political culture, legal development, and institutional maturity.

In Nigeria, the central institutional mechanism for public sector conflict resolution is the National Industrial Court of Nigeria (NICN), established under the Trade Disputes Act (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2004). The NICN is mandated to adjudicate labour and industrial disputes, including those involving public sector unions such as ASUU and JOHESU. However, several scholars including Amadi and Odigwe (2020) have criticised the court's limited accessibility, bureaucratic delay, and executive interference, which undermine its effectiveness. The Ministry of Labour and Employment is also empowered to mediate disputes through its Conciliation Department, but its resolutions are often non-binding and lack enforcement capacity, further eroding public confidence.

In contrast, South Africa's conflict resolution system is more institutionalised and autonomous. The Commission for Conciliation, Mediation and Arbitration (CCMA) serves as the primary mechanism for resolving public sector disputes and has been lauded for its transparency, procedural fairness, and accessibility (Mogashoa, 2018). The CCMA's quasi-judicial status allows it to handle disputes efficiently, and its rulings are generally respected by both government and public sector unions. In addition to the CCMA, South Africa also utilises Labour Courts, Bargaining Councils, and Public Service Coordinating Bargaining Councils (PSCBC) as multi-level avenues for conflict resolution, ensuring institutional redundancy and broad participation (Mokoena, 2020).

### **Collective Bargaining and Union Influence**

Trade unions play a pivotal role in public sector conflict resolution across Africa, often acting as the principal voice of civil servants and the most organised stakeholder in negotiations involving wages, working conditions, and administrative justice. Collective bargaining is the formal negotiation process between public sector unions and the state widely recognised in labour law and governance literature as an essential democratic process that ensures fairness and institutional accountability in employer-employee relations (Otobo, 2018). Across African nations, however, the degree of institutionalisation, legal recognition, and effectiveness of collective bargaining varies significantly, affecting the quality and sustainability of outcomes.

In Nigeria, collective bargaining in the public sector is regulated through frameworks such as the Trade Disputes Act and reinforced by the activities of influential unions like the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU), the Nigerian Labour Congress (NLC), and the Joint Health Sector Unions (JOHESU). While these unions have demonstrated a strong capacity to mobilise public attention and government response, the process of bargaining is often marred by executive interference, lack of compliance with signed agreements, and selective implementation of arbitration awards (Amadi & Odigwe, 2020). This has led to an erosion of trust in negotiation processes and frequent resort to industrial action. Afolabi and Ibe (2021) observed that while Nigerian unions possess political leverage, their influence is often compromised by fragmented strategies and an absence of binding dispute resolution enforcement mechanisms.

In contrast, South Africa presents a relatively successful model where collective bargaining has been institutionalised through legislatively supported platforms such as the Public Service Coordinating Bargaining Council (PSCBC) and sector-specific bargaining councils. These forums allow unions and government representatives to engage in structured negotiations with enforceable outcomes, often overseen by neutral arbitration panels or labour courts (Mogashoa, 2018). Unions like the South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU) and the

National Education, Health and Allied Workers' Union (NEHAWU) are embedded in national policy dialogues and have successfully influenced wage frameworks and working condition reforms. Mokoena (2020) concluded that while challenges of compliance remain, the integration of unions into legal frameworks has contributed to a more stable labour environment compared to other African countries.

### **Conflict Resolution Legal Frameworks**

Legal frameworks are the backbone of conflict resolution in public administration, offering statutory guidance, institutional jurisdiction, and procedural clarity. In Africa, the evolution of these laws has been shaped by colonial legacies, international labour conventions, and domestic political interests. Laws governing public sector conflict resolution not only define the rights and responsibilities of employers and employees but also determine the nature and enforceability of dispute outcomes. No wonder reports and scholarly literature of Otobo (2018) and AU-PAPS (2023) posits that while several African countries have formal legal frameworks in place, the effectiveness of these laws is often undermined by weak implementation, political interference, and gaps in institutional independence.

Nigeria's Trade Disputes Act (TDA) of 2004, though amended over time, remains the primary legal instrument for managing industrial and public sector conflicts. It provides for dispute resolution processes such as conciliation, mediation, arbitration, and referral to the National Industrial Court of Nigeria (NICN). However, scholars such as Amadi and Odigwe (2020) argue that the Act is reactive rather than preventive, often intervening only after disputes have escalated. Moreover, the law empowers the Minister of Labour with discretionary powers that can hinder neutrality. Afolabi and Ibe (2021) noted that the delays in implementing arbitration decisions and the selective respect for court rulings have weakened the TDA's deterrent effect and fostered a culture of protracted strikes and protests.

In South Africa, the Labour Relations Act (LRA) of 1995 remains a benchmark legal document in African labour law. It clearly outlines the rights to unionisation, collective bargaining, and dispute resolution through independent mechanisms such as the Commission for Conciliation, Mediation and Arbitration (CCMA) and the Labour Courts. Mogashoa (2018) observed that the LRA's tripartite structure allows for transparency, legal predictability, and procedural fairness. The Public Service Act further supports conflict resolution by regulating employment conditions and public service ethics. Mokoena (2020) argued that South Africa's legal framework, though tested by strikes and sectoral tensions, remains among the most respected in sub-Saharan Africa due to its accessibility and judicial oversight.

In sum, while legal frameworks exist across the four countries, their ability to manage and resolve public sector conflicts effectively is shaped by broader governance conditions. The literature underscores that mere legal codification is insufficient; what matters is the degree of institutional autonomy, judicial independence, and political will backing these laws. AU-PAPS (2023) and Otobo (2018) affirmed legal frameworks to function as true instruments of peace and justice in public administration, they must be insulated from political manipulation and enforced with procedural integrity.

## **Role of Informal and Traditional Structures**

In many African societies, informal and traditional structures continue to play a vital role in conflict resolution, particularly where state institutions are weak, absent, or lack legitimacy. These systems, often rooted in clan-based, ethnic, or customary authority, serve as culturally embedded frameworks for resolving disputes within and beyond the public sector. The literature increasingly recognises the relevance of these mechanisms, especially in post-conflict and rural contexts, where they operate parallel to or in conjunction with formal administrative systems (Ali, 2016; Yusuf, 2019). Their significance lies not only in their accessibility and cultural legitimacy but also in their ability to mobilise community trust and social cohesion in environments where formal institutions are fragmented or perceived as corrupt.

In rural Nigeria, similar dynamics are observed, particularly in regions where traditional rulers such as emirs, obas, and chiefs continue to exercise influence over local administrative affairs. These leaders often resolve workplace grievances, disputes over recruitment, and conflicts arising from the perceived abuse of office in the local government system. Otobo (2018) explained that while Nigeria has formal grievance redress structures through public service commissions and courts, many rural public servants prefer traditional mediation due to delays, cost, and bureaucratic inefficiency associated with formal systems. Afolabi and Ibe (2021) further observed that in some states, traditional leaders are co-opted into official grievance panels, suggesting a hybridisation of conflict resolution frameworks that merges cultural legitimacy with legal formality.

Nevertheless, the interaction between formal and informal structures raises important concerns. Where clearly defined boundaries do not exist, overlaps in jurisdiction can lead to confusion, forum shopping, and inconsistencies in decision-making. Moreover, traditional systems, while accessible, often lack written records, due process, and appeal mechanisms, which can violate principles of fairness and transparency, especially for women and minority employees (Ngige & Worlu, 2022). There is also the risk of state authorities delegating conflict resolution responsibilities to traditional systems as a means of avoiding administrative accountability, especially in politically sensitive cases.

Yet, the literature also reveals innovative models of institutional synergy. In post-conflict Somaliland, for example, formal ministries have incorporated traditional leaders into district conflict resolution teams, ensuring that administrative norms are culturally grounded while maintaining legal oversight (AU-PAPS, 2023). In Nigeria, certain local governments have established consultative councils that include traditional rulers, civil servants, and community representatives, creating a pluralistic platform for dispute management. These models suggest that hybrid approaches where formal systems acknowledge and integrate traditional authority within defined parameters may offer pragmatic pathways for inclusive and responsive conflict resolution in the African public sector.

## **Political Will and Governance Culture**

Political will is arguably the most critical determinant of whether conflict resolution mechanisms in the public sector are effective, fair, and sustainable. It refers to the genuine commitment of political and administrative leaders to implement reforms, respect institutional independence, enforce legal decisions, and promote inclusive dialogue with stakeholders. In Africa, however, the literature reveals a recurring pattern of elite manipulation, policy inconsistency, and symbolic

compliance with conflict resolution protocols, especially in the public service domain (Olayiwola, 2022; Otobo, 2018). These factors severely constrain the functionality of legal and institutional mechanisms and perpetuate cycles of protest, negotiation breakdowns, and administrative standoffs.

In Nigeria, political interference has historically undermined public sector conflict resolution, with executive actors often reneging on signed collective agreements or selectively enforcing labour laws for political expediency. Amadi and Odigwe (2020) found that successive administrations have used delay tactics, divide-and-rule strategies, and media campaigns to delegitimise union demands rather than resolve them. Moreover, the discretionary powers granted to ministers and state governors over appointments, promotions, and disciplinary measures compromise the neutrality of conflict handling institutions. Afolabi and Ibe (2021) observed that the culture of non-compliance with arbitration outcomes reflects deeper issues of weak institutional checks and entrenched elite dominance in governance processes.

South Africa presents a contrasting yet nuanced scenario. While the country's legal frameworks are robust and its conflict resolution institutions are relatively autonomous, governance culture remains shaped by political considerations and union-party alliances. Mogashoa (2018) argued that the African National Congress (ANC)'s historical alliance with COSATU influences how public sector disputes are handled, often leading to politicised compromises rather than principled resolutions. Mokoena (2020) further noted that although the CCMA and Labour Courts are respected, their effectiveness is occasionally curtailed by funding constraints, case overload, and fluctuating political support. Nonetheless, South Africa's political system provides more institutional space for dialogue, judicial intervention, and multi-stakeholder participation compared to many of its continental peers.

The literature affirms that without genuine political will, even the most sophisticated legal and institutional frameworks for conflict management remain ineffective. Ngige and Worlu (2022) argued that political leaders in Africa often treat public sector conflict resolution as a tactical or symbolic gesture, rather than a democratic obligation rooted in justice and accountability. Consequently, sustainable conflict resolution requires a governance culture where institutions are respected, leaders are held accountable, and administrative justice is prioritised over political expediency. The African Union's governance agenda (AU-PAPS, 2023) underscored the need for value-based leadership (Ololube, 2025), institutional resilience (Ahiauzu & Ololube, 2016), and civic engagement as pillars of conflict-sensitive governance in the public sector (Ololube & Wome, 2025).

## **International Interventions and Civil Society Involvement**

International organisations and civil society actors have become central players in shaping the architecture of conflict management in African public sectors, particularly in countries with transitional democracies and administrative instability. Institutions such as the International Labour Organization (ILO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and the African Union (AU) have provided both technical assistance and normative frameworks to enhance dispute resolution mechanisms. In South Africa, for instance, the ILO has supported efforts to harmonise national labour regulations with international standards, focusing on mediation training, legal codification, and compliance auditing. This external reinforcement has proven valuable, especially in promoting neutral and evidence-based approaches to labour relations in sectors historically plagued by politicisation and fragmentation (ILO, 2022). In

Nigeria, international engagement has come in the form of capacity-building for the National Industrial Court and institutional support for the Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment to better manage dispute referrals and mediation processes (UNDP, 2021). These interventions aim not just to solve immediate disputes but to promote institutional resilience and professionalisation of conflict handling in the long term.

Civil society organisations (CSOs) have equally played vital roles in bridging the gap between government agencies and the public workforce. Labour unions, non-governmental organisations, legal advocacy groups, and watchdog coalitions often act as accountability platforms that monitor government commitments, amplify the voices of marginalised workers, and expose procedural irregularities in conflict resolution processes. In Nigeria, for example, the Trade Union Congress (TUC), Nigerian Labour Congress (NLC), and various sectoral advocacy coalitions have pressured government actors into implementing court decisions and upholding collective bargaining agreements. Their watchdog function often brings public attention to institutional non-compliance, thus raising the political costs of state inaction (Ngige & Worlu, 2022). Similarly, in South Africa, COSATU and sector-based unions frequently work in collaboration with civil society groups to conduct policy dialogues, file litigation against unfair labour practices, and conduct public awareness campaigns that demand procedural transparency and prompt grievance redress. These activities not only fill the accountability vacuum in public sector administration but also legitimise the role of participatory governance in conflict mitigation (Mokoena, 2020).

However, the involvement of international and civil society actors is not without limitations. One of the most persistent challenges is the issue of legitimacy and ownership. Reforms initiated and implemented primarily by foreign institutions often suffer from a lack of local adaptation, making them appear externally imposed rather than organically developed. Amadi and Odigwe (2020) noted that reform efforts that do not engage domestic actors in design and implementation stages often struggle to gain traction, especially within bureaucracies conditioned to resist external pressure. Moreover, some donor-driven initiatives tend to emphasise compliance with international indicators over institutional alignment with national administrative cultures, thereby risking sustainability once donor funding ceases. In this context, civil society organisations that rely heavily on international aid may face existential crises when projects conclude, thereby weakening continuity in public sector engagement.

For interventions to be genuinely transformative, they must be context-sensitive and rooted in long-term partnerships. International organisations should aim not merely to introduce best practices but to build local capacity to adapt, contextualise, and scale those practices sustainably. Embedding interventions within local governance frameworks such as public service commissions, labour tribunals, and sectoral agencies helps to reduce institutional dependency on external actors. Furthermore, civil society organisations must be recognised not as ancillary implementers but as strategic partners capable of shaping reform design, monitoring implementation, and proposing alternative frameworks when state mechanisms falter. As AU-PAPS (2023) emphasized that promoting co-ownership and institutional embeddedness is essential to ensuring that reforms lead not only to dispute resolution but to structural transformation in public sector governance.

Ultimately, the effectiveness of international and civil society involvement in conflict management depends on their ability to recalibrate power asymmetries and institutional imbalances within public sector systems. While external actors bring credibility, expertise, and financial resources, the sustainability of their efforts is contingent upon the extent to which they

align with local administrative cultures and political dynamics. Conversely, civil society organisations offer grassroots legitimacy, continuity, and access to informal conflict zones that are often beyond the reach of formal state agencies. By cultivating mutual accountability and shared learning, these actors can help institutionalise a more inclusive, transparent, and adaptive model of public sector conflict management across African states.

## **Country-Specific Analyses of Public Sector Conflict Management**

An in-depth country-specific analysis is crucial to understanding how legal systems, institutional design, and political practices influence the management of public sector conflicts. While Nigeria and South Africa share post-colonial administrative legacies, they diverge significantly in the operationalisation of their conflict resolution systems. This section uses a comparative lens to evaluate the legal instruments, institutional effectiveness, and stakeholder engagement that characterise the public dispute landscape in each country. Emphasis is placed on how administrative structures either support or constrain fair and timely resolution of labour disputes in the public sector.

### **Institutional Gaps and Executive Interference in Nigeria, Public Sector**

In Nigeria, public sector conflict is marked by recurring strikes and breakdowns in labour relations, particularly in education and health. As Afolabi and Ibe (2021) conducted a study on institutional constraints in Nigeria's public labour adjudication, they revealed that delays in enforcement and executive interference routinely undermine the statutory conflict resolution system. Legal instruments such as the Trade Disputes Act (2004) and the operations of the National Industrial Court of Nigeria (NICN) are often side-lined by discretionary actions of the Ministry of Labour and Employment. These observations mirror the long-standing grievances of unions like ASUU and JOHESU, whose members often experience wage irregularities, unfulfilled collective agreements, and prolonged disputes with limited institutional recourse.

Ngige and Worlu (2022) conducted a governance-based analysis of political interference and concluded that executive overreach is a fundamental barrier to the neutral and effective resolution of labour conflicts. The Ministry of Labour is vested with significant powers to mediate or withhold referrals, which often leads to perceptions of bias and non-compliance. As Amadi and Odigwe (2020) carried out a study on ASUU's strike cycles, they noted that industrial actions are less a reaction to specific disputes than a result of institutional distrust and cumulative frustration with failed agreements. Many public sector unions now rely more on political bargaining and public protest than on the procedural mechanisms originally designed to handle such disputes.

Otobo (2018), writing in an edited volume on African public administration, argued that Nigeria's conflict management institutions suffer from a lack of autonomy and implementation discipline, conditions that create what he calls a "compliance vacuum." The absence of decentralised grievance mechanisms and early warning systems means that local administrative issues often escalate into national crises. Without prompt intervention or independent mediation, trust in institutional dispute systems continues to deteriorate. As a result, the legal frameworks appear operational in theory but falter under the weight of weak enforcement and executive discretion.

## **Analysis of South Africa Structured Institutions and Legal Predictability**

In contrast, South Africa presents a far more institutionalised and legally coherent framework for public sector conflict resolution. The Labour Relations Act (1995) remains the cornerstone of a rights-based approach to dispute management, establishing bodies like the Commission for Conciliation, Mediation and Arbitration (CCMA) and Public Service Bargaining Councils. Mogashoa (2018), in his evaluation of the CCMA's role, found that structured institutional platforms ensure timely intervention and resolution in over 70% of disputes, often before they escalate into strikes. These institutions are empowered to operate independently and have earned credibility among both government departments and labour unions.

Mokoena (2020) conducted an assessment of democratic accountability in South Africa's public bargaining institutions and found that the CCMA and Labour Courts are perceived as impartial and efficient, particularly in sectors like education and health. He highlighted that the institutional strength lies in predictable procedures, legal timelines, and rights-awareness campaigns that empower civil servants to assert their claims through structured channels. Furthermore, the use of decentralised bargaining councils allows for sector-specific conflict resolution, ensuring that grievances are addressed in contextually relevant ways. This model offers a significant departure from Nigeria's centralised and reactive approach.

However, challenges remain. As AU-PAPS (2023) published in their review of labour peace mechanisms in transitional African states, political alliances such as the longstanding partnership between the African National Congress (ANC) and the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) may create subtle conflicts of interest in disciplinary and reform decisions. Moreover, inequality in the application of procedures across provinces results in service delivery delays and residual worker dissatisfaction, especially in rural municipalities. Despite these issues, South Africa's institutional landscape reflects a functional balance between legal oversight and participatory governance. Its experience affirms the argument that legitimacy, consistency, and decentralised dialogue are foundational to sustainable public sector conflict resolution.

## **STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVING PUBLIC SECTOR CONFLICT MANAGEMENT**

Effective public sector conflict management is not only a governance imperative but also a strategic necessity for administrative stability, institutional trust, and sustainable public service delivery. The cases of Nigeria and South Africa demonstrate that conflict in the public sector often stems not merely from disputes over wages or promotions but from deep-rooted weaknesses in legal design, institutional legitimacy, political will, and communication breakdowns. Afolabi and Ibe (2021) noted that a fragmented legal framework and weak institutional design often undermine conflict resolution efforts, while Mogashoa (2018) argued that South Africa's legal autonomy and procedural transparency contribute to the success of its mediation processes. To move from reactive, crisis-driven responses to proactive, institutionalised mechanisms, governments must adopt context-sensitive and evidence-based strategies. These strategies must be grounded in principles of good governance, administrative justice, and institutional resilience (Amadi & Odigwe, 2020; AU-PAPS, 2023).

## **Establishing a Clear Framework**

A well-defined and codified conflict resolution framework forms the foundation of effective public sector dispute management. Governments should institutionalise a structured, multi-tiered conflict resolution process, including internal grievance redress channels, administrative panels, and independent arbitration bodies. Mokoena (2020) highlighted the success of South Africa's CCMA and Public Service Bargaining Councils stems from their clarity of function, procedural transparency, and legal autonomy. Similarly, Mogashoa (2018) stressed that transparent processes and well-defined roles significantly contribute to the effective resolution of labour disputes in South Africa.

In contrast, Nigeria's public sector reveals the risk of fragmented enforcement, where statutory laws such as the Trade Disputes Act lack procedural follow-through, and ministerial roles are ambiguously expansive. This issue has been documented by Afolabi and Ibe (2021), who argued that the absence of clear legal roles and enforcement structures in Nigeria has contributed to the inefficiency of public sector conflict resolution. Additionally, Ngige and Worlu (2022) observed that overlapping mandates between ministries and union-led grievance bodies often lead to institutional confusion, preventing the resolution of disputes.

## **Promote Open Communication**

Public institutions should train managers and supervisors in active listening and empathy, encouraging a leadership culture that treats worker grievances not as insubordination but as legitimate administrative feedback. As Burton (1990) suggests, active listening and empathy are essential components of conflict management that enable resolution before issues escalate. Regular town hall meetings, digital suggestion boxes, and anonymous reporting systems can create spaces for honest feedback. Governments should also develop policies that encourage respectful communication, ensuring that grievances are expressed and addressed without fear of victimisation (Coser, 1956). Most importantly, communication should be continuous, not reactive. Erasmus (2020) suggested that building regular feedback mechanisms such as staff performance reviews and organisational health audits can identify brewing discontent before it escalates into strikes or administrative crises. In Nigeria, the lack of such feedback culture often forces workers to escalate issues to union level prematurely, bypassing institutional mechanisms that could resolve disputes internally (Amadi & Odigwe, 2020).

## **Nurture a Culture of Collaboration**

An institutional culture grounded in collaboration rather than confrontation can transform public sector conflict from a liability into an opportunity for co-creation. Governments must actively nurture collaborative problem-solving among departments, workers, and unions, moving away from zero-sum bargaining toward shared governance. As Mokoena (2020) highlighted, South Africa's sector-based bargaining councils enable problem-solving at the level closest to the dispute. This approach encourages a collaborative atmosphere, reducing conflict escalation. However, Nigeria's union-government interactions remain largely adversarial and reactive due to the absence of such collaborative structures (Amadi & Odigwe, 2020).

Capacity-building is essential. Public officials should receive training in mediation and conflict facilitation, enabling them to manage disputes before they spiral. Ministries of Labour,

Civil Service Commissions, and local councils should embed mediation desks or liaison officers capable of navigating disputes empathetically. Additionally, governments should adopt interest-based negotiation models, shifting discussions from rigid positions to the identification of shared interests and compromise zones. As Burton (1990) emphasized, such models can create mutually beneficial solutions by focusing on underlying needs rather than positions.

### **Utilise Mediation and Other Techniques**

Beyond legislative and institutional reform, practical conflict resolution techniques such as mediation, arbitration, and negotiation offer critical tools for immediate and effective intervention. Mediation has proven useful in South Africa, where the CCMA's neutral mediation capacity allows aggrieved parties to express grievances and seek resolution in a low-conflict environment. Mogashoa (2018) argues that such mediation structures have contributed significantly to resolving industrial disputes in South Africa's public sector. In Nigeria, where public distrust in legal systems remains high, community-based and departmental mediation platforms could provide faster and less confrontational alternatives (Ngige & Worlu, 2022).

Governments should establish professionalised mediation units, either within public service commissions or as semi-autonomous bodies. These units can resolve disputes through informal means, reduce caseloads in industrial courts, and promote restorative rather than punitive approaches to conflict (Otobo, 2018). Where mediation fails, arbitration mechanisms should be used, particularly in highly technical disputes involving contractual obligations or cross-ministerial responsibilities.

### **Monitor and Evaluate**

No strategy can succeed without systematic monitoring and iterative reform. Governments must develop robust monitoring and evaluation (M&E) frameworks for conflict resolution systems. These frameworks should include follow-up mechanisms to ensure that mediated agreements are implemented, evaluated for effectiveness, and refined over time. Mokoena (2020) emphasized that regular audits of CCMA case resolutions have contributed to institutional improvement and greater public trust in South Africa. M&E systems should also identify systemic bottlenecks, such as delays in case processing, non-compliance with rulings, or gaps in legal coverage. These findings must feed directly into policy revision cycles, ensuring that conflict management remains a dynamic, learning-based process rather than a static bureaucratic function.

Pursuing these five interconnected strategies establishing clear frameworks, promoting open communication, encouraging collaboration, utilising practical resolution techniques, and entrenching monitoring systems, African governments can transform the public sector into a space of fairness, dialogue, and institutional trust. These recommendations are not prescriptive blueprints, but adaptable tools that must be tailored to each country's political climate, cultural context, and institutional maturity. Ultimately, investing in structured and responsive conflict resolution is not merely a labour relations issue it is a foundation for administrative legitimacy and governance stability.

Empirical studies conducted between 2010 and 2024 offer a varied picture of how public sector conflict resolution frameworks perform across African countries. These studies reveal significant contrasts in effectiveness, reflecting differences in institutional capacity, legal structures, political commitment, and societal norms. In South Africa, multiple empirical

evaluations underscore the relative success of formal conflict resolution mechanisms such as the Commission for Conciliation, Mediation and Arbitration (CCMA) and the Public Service Coordinating Bargaining Council (PSCBC). Mokoena (2020) found that over 70% of disputes submitted to the CCMA between 2015 and 2019 were resolved through mediation or arbitration within stipulated timelines, indicating strong institutional performance and public trust (see Table 1).

Table 1: Timeline of Major Public Sector Conflict Events (2010-2024)

Year	Nigeria	South Africa
2010	Nationwide ASUU strike	Health sector wage strike
2012	Fuel subsidy protests	Teachers' wage disputes
2013	JOHESU strike	Mining-linked service disruption
2015	ASUU/NASU strike	Rise in CCMA grievances
2017	Judiciary & legislative walkouts	PSCBC negotiation deadlock
2018	Minimum wage protests	Municipal worker protests
2020	Health worker COVID-19 strike	Health sector strike on PPE
2021	Doctors' strike on residency pay	NEHAWU legal action
2022	8-month ASUU strike	PSCBC-led wage resolution
2023	Mass protest vs subsidy removal	PSCBC wage compromise
2024	JOHESU, NLC protests over delays	Provincial protests resolved via PSCBC

Source: Author's Conceptualization 2025

In Nigeria, however, the picture is more mixed. Afolabi and Ibe (2021) analyzed over 150 public sector industrial disputes recorded between 2016 and 2020 and observed that less than 40% were resolved through statutory mechanisms such as the National Industrial Court or ministerial mediation. The study attributed the inefficiency to prolonged delays, lack of legal clarity, and political interference in dispute resolution processes. Amadi and Odigwe (2020) similarly found that the Nigerian government's failure to honor collective bargaining agreements often led to cyclical strikes, particularly in the education and health sectors. These studies highlight institutional fatigue, worker disillusionment, and the erosion of trust in existing mechanisms.

## Discussion and Comparative Evaluation

This paper has critically examined public sector conflict management mechanisms in Nigeria and South Africa, revealing that institutional coherence, legal clarity, political commitment, and cultural responsiveness are decisive factors in shaping dispute resolution outcomes. The comparative framework affirms the central argument that contextually grounded and procedurally autonomous institutions not just the presence of formal legal codes are essential for sustaining administrative peace, labour fairness, and governance legitimacy in the public sector. While both countries operate within post-colonial legal traditions, the degree to which their institutional arrangements are insulated from executive interference or politicisation accounts for much of the variation in conflict outcomes. In effect, institutional form must be accompanied by implementation fidelity and stakeholder trust to ensure that public sector conflicts are resolved equitably and efficiently.

South Africa emerges as a regional leader in institutionalised conflict resolution due to its multi-tiered, rule-based, and participatory approach. The synergy between the Labour Relations Act (1995), the Commission for Conciliation, Mediation and Arbitration (CCMA), Labour

Courts, and Public Service Bargaining Councils creates a robust and functional system capable of absorbing and resolving public service disputes with limited disruption. Mogashoa (2018) and Mokoena (2020) underscore the CCMA's procedural efficiency and wide credibility among unions and government actors, highlighting that the majority of disputes are resolved without escalation to strikes. Importantly, South Africa's system is not without limitations especially where political patronage and party-union alliances blur boundaries but the structural autonomy and legal predictability of its conflict resolution institutions offer a working model for democratic governance and social dialogue. This model demonstrates that when institutional mandates are clearly defined and consistently applied, administrative conflict can be managed through structured channels rather than political brinkmanship.

In contrast, Nigeria's conflict resolution framework presents a paradox: while the country possesses relatively comprehensive legal provisions including the Trade Disputes Act (2004) and a specialised court, the National Industrial Court of Nigeria (NICN) its implementation environment is undermined by procedural delays, selective enforcement, and executive interference. Afolabi and Ibe (2021) noted that the persistent industrial actions led by bodies like ASUU and JOHESU often recur because government agencies fail to honour mediation outcomes or court decisions, creating a cyclical pattern of unrest and negotiation breakdowns. The over-centralisation of authority in the Ministry of Labour and Employment further compromises neutrality and often politicises what should be technocratic interventions. Amadi and Odigwe (2020) observed the efficacy of conflict resolution in Nigeria is not determined by the strength of its legal instruments, but by the extent to which those instruments are protected from arbitrary interference and aligned with a culture of institutional accountability.

This comparative analysis (see Table 2) highlights that effectiveness in public sector conflict resolution does not solely depend on legal sophistication but on the operational independence and credibility of institutions tasked with adjudicating disputes. South Africa's strength lies in its embeddedness of legal processes within a broader framework of democratic oversight and institutional trust. Nigeria, on the other hand, exemplifies how institutional fragmentation, political volatility, and discretionary governance can neutralise even the most carefully drafted legal frameworks. The implication for policy reform is clear: African states must look beyond legislative enactment and invest in mechanisms that insulate dispute resolution institutions from political capture, promote procedural transparency, and ensure enforceability of outcomes. Only by aligning institutional design with political realities and administrative capacity can public sector conflict be managed in a way that promotes long-term stability and strengthens state legitimacy.

Thus, conflict in the public sector is not merely a disruption, it is a governance barometer. How a state manages the grievances of its public workers speaks volumes about the depth of its institutional maturity, the authenticity of its democratic credentials, and the resilience of its social contract. Thus, the reform of conflict management systems should not be viewed in isolation but situated at the core of public administration reform and governance transformation. African states can turn conflict from a chronic liability into a catalyst for participatory reform, institutional trust, and developmental stability by anchoring these mechanisms in legal clarity, communicative openness, institutional fairness, and cultural legitimacy.

Table 2: Comparative Matrix of Legal Frameworks

Legal Parameter	Nigeria	South Africa
Primary Law	Trade Disputes Act (2004)	Labour Relations Act (1995)
Dispute Resolution Bodies	NICN, Ministry of Labour	CCMA, Labour Courts
Collective Bargaining Support	Weak enforcement, executive override	Strong institutional support via PSCBC
Enforceability of Awards	Frequently delayed or ignored	High compliance and timely enforcement
Ministerial Powers	High discretionary powers	Limited; defined in law
Traditional Systems	Coexist with formal systems	Minimal involvement
Legal Predictability	Low, with common delays	High, codified timelines
Political Interference	High	Moderate

Source: Author's Conceptualization 2025

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this paper has argued that the quality and legitimacy of conflict management in the public sector across African states are inextricably tied to the strength, adaptability, and contextual relevance of institutional mechanisms. The comparative analysis of Nigeria, and South Africa has illuminated the diverse legal, cultural, and administrative landscapes within which public sector conflict is negotiated, and the varying degrees of institutional resilience that underpin dispute resolution. South Africa's structured legal frameworks and institutional independence exemplify a working model, whereas Nigeria's frequent disruptions reveal the perils of politicised and weakly enforced systems. The overarching position holds that sustainable public sector stability must be driven by legally codified, culturally grounded, and democratically shielded mechanisms that prioritise dialogue, justice, and institutional accountability.

## Recommendations

The following recommendations are derived from the study's findings and are directed at relevant stakeholders to enhance public sector conflict management systems across African contexts:

- Governments of these African countries should revise and harmonize outdated conflict management laws to ensure clearer grievance procedures, enforceability, and legal autonomy in resolving public sector disputes.
- Public service commissions and ministries of labour should establish independent, well-resourced mediation and arbitration bodies with clearly defined roles to reduce bureaucratic overlap and enhance procedural efficiency.
- National civil service training institutions should integrate structured modules on conflict mediation, negotiation, and administrative justice to equip public officials with the skills needed to manage workplace disputes constructively
- The African Union (AU) and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) should facilitate continental platforms for best practice exchange and peer learning on public sector conflict resolution among member states.

## REFERENCES

- Adediran, A. (2021). *Customary institutions and conflict resolution in African governance: A contextual review*. *African Journal of Administrative Studies*, 18(2), 33-47.
- Afolabi, S., & Ibe, J. (2021). Labour adjudication and procedural delays in Nigeria: A review of institutional constraints in public sector conflict resolution. *Nigerian Journal of Public Administration*, 29(2), 112-127.
- Ahiauza, L. U., & Ololube, N. P. (2016). The mediating effect of organizational culture, size and structure on the relationship between innovations and resilience in selected Nigerian universities. In N. P. Ololube (Ed.), *Handbook of research on organizational justice and culture in higher education institutions* (pp. 324-364). Information Science Reference DOI:10.4018/978-1-4666-9850-5.ch013.
- Ali, M. A. (2016). Customary institutions and post-conflict state building in Somalia: The enduring relevance of the guurti. *African Conflict and Peace building Review*, 6(1), 34-58.
- Amadi, T., & Odigwe, C. (2020). Recurrent industrial actions in Nigeria's education sector: ASUU strikes and implications for governance. *Journal of African Studies and Development*, 12(3), 56-67.
- AU-PAPS. (2023). *Institutional capacity for conflict prevention and resolution in Africa: Progress and prospects*. African Union Peace and Security Department. <https://au.int/en/paps>
- Burton, J. (1990). *Conflict: Resolution and prevention*. St. Martin's Press.
- Erasmus, T. M. (2020). *Communication breakdown and institutional inertia in African public administration*. Ubuntu Governance Institute.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria. (2004). *Trade Disputes Act*. Federal Government Printer.
- International Labour Organization. (2022). *Building labour mediation capacity in Djibouti: A pilot assessment*. <https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---africa/documents>
- Mogashoa, T. (2018). An evaluation of the Commission for Conciliation, Mediation and Arbitration (CCMA) as a tool for labour conflict resolution in South Africa. *South African Journal of Labour Relations*, 42(1), 78-95. <https://doi.org/10.25159/2415-0479/1916>
- Mokoena, S. (2020). Democratic accountability in public sector bargaining: An assessment of CCMA and PSCBC in post-apartheid South Africa. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 46(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v46i1.1836>
- Ngige, K., & Worlu, C. (2022). Political interference and public sector industrial conflict in Nigeria: A governance-based analysis. *Nigerian Journal of Governance and Development*, 11(4), 151-168.
- Okon, E. (2019). *Structural failures and conflict escalation in Nigeria's public administration*. *Journal of Administrative Development*, 14(1), 29-44.
- Olayiwola, M. (2022). *Governance and public sector conflict in sub-Saharan Africa: A systems theory perspective*. *African Public Sector Review*, 19(2), 74-90.
- Ololube, N. P. (2024). *Institutional leadership: Laying the foundation for success*. Pearl Publications.
- Ololube, N. P., & Wome, M. O. E. (2025). *Principles of green human resource management: Theory and practice*. Pearl Publishers.
- Omar, H. Y., & Ahmed, D. S. (2021). Authoritarian governance and the repression of trade unionism in Djibouti's public service sector. *Horn of Africa Review*, 4(1), 44-61.

- Otobo, D. (2018). Labour law and conflict management in Africa: Between legality and political discretion. In U. Onyeneke & S. Adekunle (Eds.), *Conflict resolution in public administration: African perspectives* (pp. 92-114). Emerald Press.
- Republic of South Africa. (1995). *Labour Relations Act No. 66 of 1995*. Government Gazette.
- UNDP. (2020). *Strengthening conflict resolution in Somalia: Integrating traditional structures in civil service grievance redress*. UNDP Somalia Governance Programme Report. <https://www.undp.org/somalia>
- UNDP. (2022). *State fragility and governance risks in Africa: Trends and interventions*. United Nations Development Programme. <https://www.undp.org>
- Yusuf, H. A. (2019). Clan elders and conflict mediation in post-conflict Somalia: Building institutional legitimacy or entrenching informalism? *African Journal on Conflict Resolution*, 19(2), 23-41.