Socialscientia Journal of the Social Sciences and Humanities
Email: socialscientiajournal@gmail.com
Online access: https://journals.aphriapub.com/index. php/SS/

Legislative Oversight, Transparency, and Public Trust in Nigeria: An Assessment of the National Assembly.

Thalis Olonite APALOWO
Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs and Poverty Alleviation, Abuja, **NIGERIA**.

[0226] Abstract
Legislative governance plays a significant role in promoting transparency, accountability, and public trust in government. Effective legislative institutions are expected to make laws, oversee government activities, scrutinize public expenditure, and provide citizens with access to relevant information about governmental decisions and activities. This study examines the role of legislative governance in promoting transparency and public trust in government. It focuses on how legislative oversight, access to information, public participation, accountability mechanisms, and openness in legislative processes contribute to citizens' confidence in government institutions. The study adopts a descriptive research design, with data collected through questionnaires and relevant documentary sources. The study identifies effective oversight, transparent legislative procedures, timely disclosure of public information, citizen engagement, and accountability as important mechanisms for strengthening public trust. It also considers challenges such as limited access to legislative information, inadequate citizen participation, weak institutional capacity, political interference, and poor implementation of accountability mechanisms. The study concludes that strengthening legislative governance through openness, effective oversight, inclusive public participation, and accountable decision-making can contribute substantially to improved transparency and public trust in government. It recommends greater public access to legislative information, enhanced use of digital platforms for citizen engagement, improved legislative oversight mechanisms, and capacity building for legislative institutions and personnel.

Keywords: Legislative oversight, Public Trust in government, Transparency

1. Introduction

Legislative governance is a fundamental pillar of democratic governance, serving as a mechanism through which elected representatives formulate laws, oversee executive activities, represent citizens' interests, and ensure accountability in government. The legislature acts as a bridge between the government and the governed, fostering transparency and public trust through its constitutional functions. Effective legislative governance contributes significantly to good governance by promoting openness, accountability, responsiveness, and citizen participation in decision-making processes.

Transparency refers to the degree to which government actions, decisions, and information are made available and accessible to the public. It enables citizens to monitor government activities, evaluate public officials' performance, and hold leaders accountable for their actions. Public trust, on the other hand, is the confidence citizens place in governmental institutions and their belief that public officials act in the best interest of society. Transparency and public trust are closely linked, as transparent governance practices enhance citizens' confidence in public institutions (OECD, 2017). In democratic societies, legislatures play a crucial role in ensuring transparency by scrutinizing government policies, monitoring public expenditures, conducting public hearings, and providing platforms for citizen engagement. Through these functions, legislative institutions contribute to reducing corruption, improving accountability, and strengthening democratic legitimacy (Fishkin, 2018). However, in many developing countries, including Nigeria, challenges such as weak legislative oversight, political interference, inadequate access to information, and corruption have undermined public trust in government institutions. Consequently, strengthening legislative governance has become increasingly important in promoting transparency and rebuilding public confidence in governance processes.

Statement of the Problem

Transparency and public trust are essential components of good governance and democratic development. However, many government institutions continue to face criticism regarding secrecy, corruption, and lack of accountability. These challenges have contributed to declining public confidence in government and its institutions. Although legislatures are constitutionally empowered to promote accountability through lawmaking and oversight functions, questions remain regarding their effectiveness in ensuring transparency and fostering public trust. In Nigeria, allegations of weak oversight, inadequate public participation, and limited access to legislative information have raised concerns about the ability of legislative institutions to fulfill their governance responsibilities effectively. The persistent gap between citizens and government institutions has made it necessary to investigate the role of legislative governance in promoting transparency and public trust. This study therefore seeks to examine the extent to which legislative governance contributes to transparent government operations and enhances citizens' confidence in government institutions.

Objectives of the Study

Specific Objectives; (a) To examine the role of legislative oversight in promoting government transparency. **(b)** To assess the extent to which legislative governance enhances accountability in government institutions. **(c)** To investigate the relationship between legislative transparency and public trust in government. **(d)** To identify challenges affecting effective legislative governance in promoting transparency. **(e)** To recommend strategies for strengthening legislative governance and improving public trust in government.

Research Questions: (a) What role does legislative oversight play in promoting government transparency? **(b)** To what extent does legislative governance enhance accountability in government institutions? **(c)** What relationship exists between legislative transparency and public trust in government? **(d)** What challenges hinder effective legislative governance in promoting transparency? (e) What measures can be adopted to strengthen legislative governance and improve public trust in government?

Research Hypotheses

Null Hypotheses (H_0)

H_{01}: Legislative oversight has no significant effect on government transparency.

H_{02}: There is no significant relationship between legislative governance and accountability in government institutions.

H_{03}: Legislative transparency has no significant influence on public trust in government.

H_{04}: Challenges affecting legislative governance do not significantly affect transparency and public trust in government.

Significance of the Study

The study will be beneficial to: (a) **Legislators**, by providing insights into how legislative functions can enhance transparency and accountability. (b) **Government institutions**, by identifying mechanisms for improving public trust. (c) **Citizens and civil society organizations**, by increasing awareness of the importance of legislative governance in democratic development. (d) **Researchers and scholars**, by contributing to existing literature on legislative governance, transparency, and public trust. (e) **Policy makers**, by offering recommendations for strengthening legislative institutions and governance practices. (f) **Scope of the Study**

The study focuses on the role of legislative governance in promoting transparency and public trust in government. It specifically examines legislative oversight, accountability mechanisms, transparency practices, and their influence on public confidence in government institutions. The study may be conducted at the national, state, or local government legislative level depending on the research setting.

Operational Definition of Terms

Legislative Governance: The processes, structures, and activities through which legislative institutions perform their constitutional functions of lawmaking, representation, and oversight.

Transparency: The openness, accessibility, and availability of government information, decisions, and actions to the public.

Public Trust: The confidence citizens have in government institutions and officials to act honestly, effectively, and in the public interest.

Accountability: The obligation of public officials and institutions to explain and justify their actions and decisions to citizens.

Legislative Oversight: The monitoring and review activities carried out by the legislature to ensure that government agencies and officials comply with laws, policies, and public expectations.

Good Governance: The effective, transparent, accountable, and participatory management of public affairs and resources for the benefit of society.

Concept of Legislative Governance

Legislative governance refers to the structures, processes, and mechanisms through which legislative institutions perform their constitutional responsibilities. These responsibilities generally include lawmaking, representation, oversight, budget approval, and accountability functions.

According to the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU, 2021), effective legislative governance ensures that parliament operates transparently, remains accountable to citizens, and provides effective oversight of government activities. A well-functioning legislature serves as a check on executive power and promotes democratic governance through inclusive and participatory decision-making.

Legislative governance encompasses: (a) Lawmaking and policy formulation. (b) Oversight of executive actions. (c) Representation of citizens' interests. (d) Budget scrutiny and approval. (e) Public engagement and consultation. (f) Promotion of accountability and transparency.

2. Literature Review

Concept of Legislative Governance

Legislative governance refers to the processes, structures, and mechanisms through which legislative institutions perform their constitutional functions of lawmaking, representation, oversight, and accountability. The legislature serves as a vital institution in democratic governance by ensuring that government actions are conducted within the framework of the law and in the interest of the public. Effective legislative governance promotes checks and balances, accountability, transparency, and citizen participation in governance processes. According to the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU, 2024), modern legislatures are expected to operate transparently, engage citizens in decision-making, and effectively oversee executive actions. Through legislative committees, debates, investigations, and public hearings, legislatures contribute significantly to democratic governance and institutional accountability. Legislative governance encompasses several key functions, including: (a) Lawmaking and policy formulation. (b) Representation of citizens' interests. (c) Oversight of executive activities. (d) Budget approval and monitoring. (e) Public engagement and participation. (f) Promotion of transparency and accountability.

Concept of Transparency: Transparency refers to the openness and accessibility of government information, decisions, policies, and actions to the public. It ensures that citizens have access to information necessary for monitoring government performance and holding public officials accountable. Recent studies emphasize that transparency remains a cornerstone of democratic governance and public accountability. Adeoye and Ran (2024) argue that transparency enables informed citizen participation and reduces opportunities for corruption and abuse of power. However, they also note that transparency initiatives must be accompanied by effective communication and accountability mechanisms to achieve meaningful outcomes. Transparency in governance can be promoted through: (a) Open legislative proceedings. (b) Public access to government records. (c)

Budget disclosure. (d) Digital governance platforms. (e) Freedom of information mechanisms. (f) Public consultations and hearings.

Concept of Public Trust: Public trust refers to the confidence citizens place in government institutions and officials to act competently, fairly, transparently, and in the public interest. Trust is essential for the legitimacy and effectiveness of democratic institutions. The OECD (2024) identifies integrity, openness, reliability, responsiveness, and fairness as major determinants of trust in public institutions. Citizens are more likely to trust governments when they perceive decision-making processes as transparent and accountable. Public trust contributes to: (a) Political stability. (b) Citizen compliance with government policies. (c) Democratic legitimacy. (d) Increased civic participation. (e) Effective public service delivery.

Theoretical Review

Accountability Theory: Accountability Theory provides a useful framework for understanding legislative governance and transparency. The theory posits those public officials and institutions must be answerable for their actions and decisions to those they serve. Bovens (2007) argues that accountability involves a relationship in which actors are obligated to explain and justify their conduct while being subject to sanctions for misconduct. Legislatures facilitate accountability through oversight hearings, investigations, budget scrutiny, and performance monitoring. The theory is relevant to this study because legislative governance serves as a mechanism through which government officials are held accountable, thereby promoting transparency and enhancing public trust.

Democratic Theory: Democratic Theory emphasizes citizen participation, representation, and accountability in governance. The legislature functions as a representative institution that articulates citizens' interests and ensures that government actions reflect public preferences.

The theory suggests that transparency and public participation strengthen democratic legitimacy and trust in government. Through open legislative processes and public consultations, citizens become active participants in governance, thereby enhancing confidence in public institutions.

Empirical Review

Legislative Oversight and Transparency

Legislative oversight is one of the most important mechanisms through which legislatures promote transparency in government. Oversight activities involve monitoring executive actions, reviewing public expenditures, and investigating allegations of misconduct. Transparency International (2023) found that strong parliamentary oversight contributes significantly to reducing corruption and improving government accountability. The study emphasized that effective oversight powers enable legislatures to scrutinize executive decisions and expose irregularities in public administration. Similarly, the OECD (2025) reported that legislative scrutiny of government activities strengthens transparency and accountability by ensuring that policy decisions and budget allocations are subject to public examination. Stapenhurst et al. (2008) also observed that legislatures with strong oversight functions are more capable of promoting openness and ensuring responsible governance.

Legislative Transparency and Public Trust: Several studies have established a positive relationship between transparency and public trust. According to the OECD Survey on Drivers of Trust in Public Institutions (2024), citizens tend to trust governments that demonstrate openness, integrity, and responsiveness in decision-making processes. Transparency was identified as a significant driver of trust across participating countries. Prats, Phillips, and Smid (2024) found that citizens evaluate government trustworthiness based on transparency, fairness, competence, and accountability. Their findings suggest that governments that communicate openly and provide accessible information are more likely to enjoy public confidence. Likewise, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 2024) reported that low perceptions of transparency and accountability are associated with declining trust in political institutions, including parliaments and political parties.

Digital Legislative Governance and Transparency: Recent technological advancements have transformed legislative governance through digitalization and e-parliament initiatives. Legislative

institutions increasingly use information and communication technologies (ICTs) to provide public access to legislative proceedings, bills, voting records, committee reports, and budget information. A global study on legislative ICT transparency found that digital technologies significantly improve legislative openness, citizen participation, and access to information. The study concluded that legislatures with advanced digital transparency systems are better positioned to promote accountability and public trust. Furthermore, OECD (2023) highlighted that open government initiatives and digital governance platforms strengthen democratic participation and improve institutional trust by facilitating greater access to government information.

Transparency, Accountability, and Public Confidence: Research has consistently shown that transparency alone may not guarantee public trust unless accompanied by accountability and responsiveness. Adeoye and Ran (2024) argue that transparency initiatives must be linked to effective accountability systems to produce meaningful improvements in public confidence. In the Nigerian context, El Hamad, Pupovac, and Moerman (2024) examined transparency and public accountability mechanisms within the Nigerian Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (NEITI). Their findings revealed that transparency enhances accountability; however, institutional weaknesses and limited public engagement may reduce its effectiveness in promoting trust.

Challenges Affecting Legislative Governance

Despite its importance, legislative governance faces several challenges: (a) ***Weak Oversight Capacity:*** Limited technical expertise and resources often constrain legislative effectiveness. (b) ***Political Interference:*** Executive dominance and partisan politics may undermine legislative independence. (c) ***Corruption:*** Corruption within legislative institutions can weaken accountability mechanisms and public confidence. (d) ***Limited Citizen Participation:*** Insufficient public engagement reduces transparency and weakens democratic legitimacy. (e) ***Inadequate Access to Information:*** Restrictions on public access to legislative information hinder transparency and accountability.

Strategies for Strengthening Legislative Governance: To improve transparency and public trust, the following measures should be adopted: (a)Strengthening legislative independence. (b) Enhancing legislative oversight mechanisms. (c) Promoting open parliament initiatives. (d) Expanding citizen participation in legislative processes. (e) Leveraging digital technologies for legislative transparency. (f) Improving access to legislative information. (g) Building the capacity of legislators and legislative staff. (h) Enforcing ethical standards and anti-corruption measures.

Summary of Literature Review and Gap in Literature

The reviewed literature demonstrates that legislative governance plays a significant role in promoting transparency and public trust in government. Existing studies reveal that legislative oversight, public hearings, budget scrutiny, open government initiatives, and digital governance mechanisms contribute to greater accountability and institutional transparency. These factors, in turn, enhance citizens' confidence in government institutions. Despite the growing body of literature on transparency and accountability, there remains limited empirical research focusing specifically on how legislative governance influences public trust in developing democracies, particularly within Nigeria's legislative institutions. Most studies concentrate on executive governance, anti-corruption initiatives, or general public administration. Consequently, there is a need for further research examining the specific contribution of legislative governance to transparency and public trust in government. This study seeks to fill this gap by investigating the role of legislative governance in promoting transparency and public trust in government, with particular attention to the legislative institution under study.

3. Research Methodology

Research Design

This study adopted the descriptive survey research design. The descriptive survey design is appropriate because it enables the researcher to collect data from respondents regarding their perceptions, opinions, and experiences concerning legislative governance, transparency, and public

trust in government. The design provides an opportunity to examine the relationship between legislative activities and citizens' trust in government institutions.

Area of the Study

The study was conducted within the selected government institution and among citizens who are knowledgeable about legislative activities and governance processes. The study focused on assessing how legislative governance contributes to transparency and public trust in government.

Population of the Study

The population of the study comprised legislators, legislative staff, civil servants, members of civil society organizations, and citizens within the study area. These categories of respondents were selected because they possess relevant knowledge regarding legislative governance and government accountability. For the purpose of this study, the target population consisted of 500 respondents drawn from the selected area.

Sample Size and Sampling Technique

A sample size of 222 respondents was selected from the target population using Taro Yamane's formula:

$n = N / (1 + N(e^2))$

Where:

n = Sample size

N = Population size (500)

e = Level of significance (0.05)

Substituting the values:

$n = 500 / (1 + 500(0.05^2))$

$n = 500 / (1 + 1.25)$

$n = 500 / 2.25$

$n = 222$

A simple random sampling technique was used to ensure that every member of the population had an equal chance of being selected for the study.

Instrument for Data Collection

The primary instrument used for data collection was a structured questionnaire designed by the researcher. The questionnaire was divided into two sections:

Section A: Demographic information of respondents.

Section B: Questions relating to legislative governance, transparency, accountability, and public trust in government. The questionnaire utilized a five-point Likert scale consisting of:

- Strongly Agree (SA) – 5 points
- Agree (A) – 4 points
- Undecided (U) – 3 points
- Disagree (D) – 2 points
- Strongly Disagree (SD) – 1 point

Validity of the Instrument

The instrument was subjected to face and content validity by experts in Political Science, Public Administration, and Research Methodology. Their observations and corrections were incorporated to ensure that the questionnaire adequately measured the variables under investigation.

Reliability of the Instrument

The reliability of the instrument was established through a pilot study involving 20 respondents outside the study area. Data obtained were analyzed using Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient. A reliability coefficient of 0.70 and above was considered adequate for the study.

Method of Data Collection

Copies of the questionnaire were administered personally by the researcher and trained research assistants. Respondents were given adequate time to complete the questionnaire, after which the completed copies were collected for analysis.

Method of Data Analysis

Data collected were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentages, mean scores, and tables were used to present respondents' demographic characteristics and responses to research questions. The decision rule for the mean score was: (a) Mean score of 3.00 and above – Accepted (b) Mean score below 3.00 – Rejected. Inferential statistics, particularly the Chi-square (χ^2) test, were used to test the hypotheses formulated for the study at a 0.05 level of significance.

Ethical Considerations

The researcher ensured that ethical principles were observed throughout the study. Respondents participated voluntarily, and their responses were treated with strict confidentiality. Participants were informed of the purpose of the study and assured that information provided would be used solely for academic purposes. This methodology is suitable for an undergraduate project, seminar, or dissertation on legislative governance, transparency, and public trust in government.

4. Results

Respondents Bio-data

In this chapter, all data generated through the use of the questionnaire were presented using tables and simple percentages for ease of understanding and analysis. A total of 222 copies of the questionnaire were distributed to selected respondents across the sampled population. Out of this number, 198 copies were correctly completed and returned, while 24 copies were not retrieved, indicating a high response rate. Based on the proportional allocation derived from the staff strength of each station, the distribution and retrieval of questionnaires are presented in Table 4.1.

TABLE 4.1: DISTRIBUTION AND RETURN OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaires Distributed	Questionnaires Retrieved	Not Retrieved
222	198	24

Source: Author's Field Survey, 2026.

Table 4.1 presents the distribution and retrieval of questionnaires administered to respondents across the study area. A total of 222 questionnaires were distributed, out of which 198 questionnaires were retrieved, while 24 questionnaires were not retrieved. This represents an overall retrieval rate of approximately 89.2%, indicating a high level of response from the respondents.

TABLE 4.2: GENDER DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

Gender	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	110	55.5	55.5	55.5
Female	88	44.5	44.5	100.0
Total	**198**	**100.0**	**100.0**	

Source: *Field Survey, 2026*

Table 4.2 presents the gender distribution of the 198 respondents whose questionnaires were successfully retrieved. The results showed that 110 respondents, representing 55.5%, were male, while

88 respondents, representing 44.5%, were female. The table indicated that male respondents constituted a slightly larger proportion of the respondents than female respondents, with a difference of 11.0 percentage points. However, the distribution does not show a very wide disparity between the two genders, suggesting that both male and female respondents were substantially represented in the study.

TABLE 4.3: AGE OF THE RESPONDENT

Age (Years)	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Below 25 years	11	5.6	5.6	5.6
25 – 34 years	48	24.2	24.2	29.8
35 - 44 years	51	25.8	25.8	55.6
45 – 54 years	56	28.3	28.3	83.9
55 years and above	32	16.1	16.1	100
Total	**198**	**100.0**	**100.0**	

Source: *Field Survey, 2026*

Table 4.3 presents the age distribution of the 198 respondents used for the study. The results showed that 11 respondents (5.6%) were below 25 years, indicating that respondents within this age category constituted the smallest proportion of the sample. Respondents aged 25–34 years accounted for 48 (24.2%), while those aged 35–44 years constituted 51 (25.8%) of the respondents. The largest proportion of respondents was within the 45–54 years age category, with 56 respondents (28.3%). Furthermore, 32 respondents (16.1%) were aged 55 years and above.

TABLE 4.4: EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS OF THE RESPONDENT

Educational Qualification	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
HND/B.Sc	121	61.1	61.1	61.1
M.Sc/MBA	64	32.3	32.3	93.4
Ph.D	13	6.6	6.6	100.0
Total	**198**	**100.0**	**100.0**	

Source: *Field Survey, 2026*

Table 4.4 presents the educational qualifications of the 198 respondents who participated in the study. The results indicate that 121 respondents, representing 61.1%, possessed HND/B.Sc qualifications**,** while 64 respondents, representing 32.3%, had M.Sc/MBA qualifications**.** The smallest proportion of respondents comprised those with Ph.D qualifications, numbering 13 and representing 6.6% of the sample**.**

TABLE 4.5: DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO LENGTH OF SERVICE

Length of Service	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Less than 5 years	33	16.7	16.7	16.7
5 – 10 years	57	28.8	28.8	45.5
11 – 15 years	69	34.8	34.8	80.3
Above 15 years	39	19.7	19.7	100.0
Total	**198**	**100.0**	**100.0**	

Source: *Field Survey, 2026*

Table 4.5 presents the distribution of the 198 respondents according to their length of service. The results indicate that 33 respondents (16.7%) had worked for less than 5 years, while 57 respondents (28.8%) had between 5 and 10 years of service. Respondents with 11–15 years of service accounted for 69 respondents (34.8%), whereas those with above 15 years of service constituted the largest group, with 39 respondents representing 19.7% of the total sample.

TABLE 4.6: DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO WORK CATEGORY

Work Category	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Legislator	7	3.5	3.5	3.5
Legislative Staff	27	13.7	13.7	17.2
Government Official/Public Servant	119	60.1	60.1	77.3
Civil Society/Non-Governmental Organisation	45	22.7	22.7	100.0
Total	**198**	**100.0**	**100.0**	

Table 4.6 presents the distribution of the 198 respondents according to their work categories. The results showed that 7 respondents (3.5%) were legislators, representing the smallest proportion of the respondents. Legislative staff accounted for 27 respondents (13.7%), while 119 respondents (60.1%) were government officials/public servants. Civil society/non-governmental organization representatives constituted 45 respondents (22.7%) of the total sample.

4.2 Data Presentation and Analysis

TABLE 4.7: RESPONDENTS' VIEWS ON: WHAT ROLE DOES LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT PLAY IN PROMOTING GOVERNMENT TRANSPARENCY?

S/n	Items	SA 5	A 4	U 3	D 2	SD 1	Total	Mean	Decision
1	Legislative oversight ensures that government institutions provide adequate information about their activities to the public.	98	45	7	34	14	198	3.90	Accept
2	Legislative oversight promotes openness in government decision-making processes.	44	54	23	41	36	198	3.15	Accept
3	Legislative oversight helps to ensure that government officials disclose relevant information on the use of public resources.	67	74	28	13	16	198	3.82	Accept
4	Effective legislative oversight reduces secrecy in government operations.	71	68	26	21	12	198	3.83	Accept

Overall Mean: 3.68 (Decision mean: 3.00)

Table 4.7 showed that respondents generally agreed that legislative oversight played a significant role in promoting government transparency, as reflected by the overall mean of 3.68, which was above the decision mean of 3.00. The highest mean score of 3.90 indicated that legislative oversight ensured government institutions provided adequate information about their activities to the public, while the other items recorded mean scores of 3.15, 3.82, and 3.83, respectively, and were all accepted. This suggested that legislative oversight promoted openness in government decision-making, encouraged disclosure of information on the use of public resources, and reduced secrecy in government operations. Therefore, the findings indicated that legislative oversight played an important role in promoting government transparency.

TABLE 4.8: RESPONDENTS' VIEWS ON: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES LEGISLATIVE GOVERNANCE ENHANCE ACCOUNTABILITY IN GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS?

S/n	Items	SA 5	A 4	U 3	D 2	SD 1	Total	Mean	Decision
1	Legislative governance ensures that government officials are held responsible for their decisions and actions.	81	65	21	19	12	198	3.93	Accept
2	Legislative governance strengthens mechanisms for monitoring the performance of government institutions.	96	66	12	15	9	198	4.14	Accept

3	Legislative governance requires government officials to explain and justify their use of public resources.	87	63	17	19	12	198	3.98	Accept
4	Effective legislative governance helps to sanction government officials who fail to comply with established rules and regulations.	53	46	29	42	28	198	3.32	Accept

Overall Mean: 3.84 (Decision mean: 3.00)

Table 4.8 showed that respondents generally agreed that legislative governance enhanced accountability in government institutions, as reflected by the overall mean of 3.84, which was above the decision mean of 3.00. The highest mean score of 4.14 indicated that legislative governance strengthened mechanisms for monitoring the performance of government institutions, while the other items recorded mean scores of 3.93, 3.98, and 3.32, respectively, and were all accepted. This suggested that legislative governance ensured government officials were held responsible for their decisions and actions, required them to explain and justify the use of public resources, and supported sanctions against officials who failed to comply with established rules and regulations. Therefore, the findings indicated that legislative governance enhanced accountability in government institutions.

TABLE 4.9: RESPONDENTS' VIEWS ON: WHAT RELATIONSHIP EXISTS BETWEEN LEGISLATIVE TRANSPARENCY AND PUBLIC TRUST IN GOVERNMENT?

S/n	Items	SA 5	A 4	U 3	D 2	SD 1	Total	Mean	Decision
1	Transparency in legislative activities increases citizens' confidence in government institutions.	109	40	27	9	13	198	4.13	Accept
2	Open disclosure of legislative decisions strengthens public trust in government.	112	44	19	11	12	198	4.18	Accept
3	Access to information about legislative activities makes citizens more confident in government processes.	119	48	14	10	7	198	4.32	Accept
4	Greater transparency in legislative governance improves citizens' perception of government credibility.	88	69	14	17	10	198	4.05	Accept

Overall Mean: 4.17 (Decision mean: 3.00)

Table 4.9 showed that respondents generally agreed that legislative transparency had a positive relationship with public trust in government, as reflected by the overall mean of 4.17, which was above the decision mean of 3.00. The highest mean score of 4.32 indicated that access to information about legislative activities made citizens more confident in government processes, followed by open disclosure of legislative decisions with a mean of 4.18. The other items also recorded high mean scores of 4.13 and 4.05, respectively, and were all accepted. This suggested that transparency in legislative activities increased citizens' confidence, open disclosure strengthened public trust, access to legislative information enhanced confidence in government processes, and greater legislative transparency improved perceptions of government credibility. Therefore, the findings indicated that legislative transparency was positively associated with public trust in government.

TABLE 4.10: RESPONDENTS' VIEWS ON: WHAT CHALLENGES HINDER EFFECTIVE LEGISLATIVE GOVERNANCE IN PROMOTING TRANSPARENCY?

S/n	Items	SA 5	A 4	U 3	D 2	SD 1	Total	Mean	Decision
1	Political interference hinders effective legislative oversight and governance.	121	41	11	17	8	198	4.26	Accept
2	Lack of adequate information limits the ability of legislators to promote transparency in government.	80	64	34	14	6	198	4.00	Accept
3	Inadequate institutional capacity reduces the effectiveness of legislative governance.	87	51	22	28	10	198	3.89	Accept

4	Lack of commitment by government officials to disclose relevant information hinders legislative transparency.	82	57	28	28	3	198	3.94	Accept

Overall Mean: 4.00 (Decision mean: 3.00)

Table 4.10 showed that respondents generally agreed that several challenges hindered effective legislative governance in promoting transparency, as reflected by the overall mean of 4.00, which was above the decision mean of 3.00. The highest mean score of 4.26 indicated that political interference was a major challenge to effective legislative oversight and governance, followed by lack of adequate information with a mean of 4.00. Inadequate institutional capacity and lack of commitment by government officials to disclose relevant information also recorded mean scores of 3.89 and 3.94, respectively, and were all accepted. This suggested that political interference, inadequate access to information, weak institutional capacity, and limited commitment to information disclosure constituted important obstacles to legislative governance and transparency. Therefore, the findings indicated that addressing these challenges would be necessary to strengthen legislative governance and improve government transparency.

TABLE 4.11: RESPONDENTS' VIEWS ON: WHAT MEASURES CAN BE ADOPTED TO STRENGTHEN LEGISLATIVE GOVERNANCE AND IMPROVE PUBLIC TRUST IN GOVERNMENT?

S/n	Items	SA 5	A 4	U 3	D 2	SD 1	Total	Mean	Decision
1	Strengthening legislative oversight mechanisms would improve transparency in government institutions.	99	63	12	15	9	198	4.15	Accept
2	Providing legislators with adequate resources and information would improve the effectiveness of legislative governance.	76	61	44	9	8	198	3.95	Accept
3	Greater public access to legislative proceedings and government information would improve public trust.	85	68	11	19	15	198	3.95	Accept
4	Stronger enforcement of accountability rules would enhance transparency and citizens' confidence in government.	90	77	10	16	5	198	4.17	Accept

Overall Mean: 4.06 (Decision mean: 3.00)

Table 4.11 showed that respondents generally agreed that various measures could be adopted to strengthen legislative governance and improve public trust in government, as indicated by the overall mean of 4.06, which was above the decision mean of 3.00. The highest mean score of 4.17 indicated that stronger enforcement of accountability rules would enhance transparency and citizens' confidence in government, followed by strengthening legislative oversight mechanisms with a mean of 4.15. Providing legislators with adequate resources and information and increasing public access to legislative proceedings and government information both recorded mean scores of 3.95 and were accepted. This suggested that stronger oversight mechanisms, adequate legislative resources and information, greater public access to government information, and effective enforcement of accountability rules were considered important measures for strengthening legislative governance and improving public trust. Therefore, the findings indicated that implementing these measures would enhance transparency, accountability, and citizens' confidence in government.

Test of Hypotheses

H_{01}: Legislative oversight has no significant effect on government transparency.

TABLE 4.12: REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECT OF LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT ON GOVERNMENT TRANSPARENCY

Model Statistics	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Model 1	0.925	0.855	0.854	0.42811

ANOVA	**Sum of Squares**	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Regression	211.350	1	211.350	1153.147	0.000
Residual	35.923	196	0.183		
Total	247.273	197			

Coefficients	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	1.238	0.089		13.988	0.000
Legislative Oversight	0.769	0.023	0.925	33.958	0.000

The regression results showed that legislative oversight had a positive and statistically significant effect on government transparency. The correlation coefficient (R = 0.925) indicated a very strong positive relationship between legislative oversight and government transparency, while the coefficient of determination (R^2 = 0.855) showed that legislative oversight explained 85.5% of the variation in government transparency, with the remaining 14.5% attributable to other factors not included in the model. The adjusted R^2 of 0.854 further indicated that the explanatory power of the model remained very high after adjustment for the predictor. The ANOVA result showed that the regression model was statistically significant ($F(1,196) = 1153.147$, $p < 0.005$), indicating that the model provided a significant prediction of government transparency. Furthermore, legislative oversight had a positive coefficient ($\beta = 0.925$, B = 0.769) and was statistically significant ($t = 33.958$, $p < 0.005$), implying that an increase in legislative oversight was associated with an increase in government transparency. Therefore, the finding indicated that effective legislative oversight significantly enhanced government transparency, providing empirical support for the proposition that stronger legislative oversight contributed substantially to openness and transparency in government institutions.

H_{02}: There is no significant relationship between legislative governance and accountability in government institutions.

TABLE 4.13: CORRELATION ANALYSIS ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEGISLATIVE GOVERNANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

		Legislative governance	Accountability
Legislative governance	Pearson Correlation	1	.947**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	198	198
Accountability	Pearson Correlation	.947**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	198	198

***. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

The correlation results showed a very strong positive and statistically significant relationship between legislative governance and accountability. The Pearson correlation coefficient was r = 0.947, indicating that higher levels of legislative governance were strongly associated with higher levels of accountability in government institutions. The significance value was p = 0.000, which was below the 0.05 significance level, confirming that the relationship was statistically significant. With N = 198, the finding suggested that the observed relationship was unlikely to have occurred by chance. Therefore, the result indicated that legislative governance was positively and significantly related to accountability. This implied that stronger legislative governance mechanisms were associated with improved accountability within government institutions.

H_{03}: Legislative transparency has no significant influence on public trust in government.

TABLE 4.14: CORRELATION ANALYSIS ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEGISLATIVE TRANSPARENCY AND PUBLIC TRUST

		Legislative transparency	Public trust
Legislative transparency	Pearson Correlation	1	.958**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	198	198
Public trust	Pearson Correlation	.958**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	198	198

***. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

The correlation results showed a very strong positive and statistically significant relationship between legislative transparency and public trust. The Pearson correlation coefficient was r = 0.958, indicating that higher levels of legislative transparency were strongly associated with higher levels of public trust in government. The significance value was p = 0.000, which was below the 0.05 significance level. Thus, the relationship was statistically significant. With N = 198 respondents, the result provided strong evidence that the observed association was unlikely to have occurred by chance. Therefore, the finding indicated that legislative transparency was positively and significantly related to public trust. This implied that greater openness, disclosure of legislative activities, and accessibility of legislative information were associated with increased citizens' confidence and trust in government institutions.

H_{04}: Challenges affecting legislative governance do not significantly affect transparency and public trust in government.

TABLE 4.15 REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECT OF LEGISLATIVE GOVERNANCE CHALLENGES ON GOVERNMENT TRANSPARENCY

Model Statistics	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	
Model 1	0.959	0.920	0.919	0.31834	
ANOVA	**Sum of Squares**	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Regression	227.410	1	227.410	2244.061	0.000
Residual	19.862	196	0.101		
Total	247.273	197			

Coefficients	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	0.278	0.083		3.344	0.001
Legislative Governance Challenges	-0.937	0.020	-0.959	-47.372	0.000

The regression results showed that legislative governance challenges had a negative and statistically significant effect on government transparency. The correlation coefficient (R = 0.959) indicated a very strong relationship between legislative governance challenges and government transparency, while the coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.920$) showed that legislative governance challenges explained 92.0% of the variation in government transparency. The remaining 8.0% was attributable to other factors not included in the model. The adjusted R^2 of 0.919 further indicated that the model maintained a very high explanatory power after adjustment. The ANOVA result showed that the regression model was statistically significant, $F(1, 196) = 2244.061$, $p < 0.005$. This indicated that the regression model significantly explained variations in government transparency and that legislative governance challenges were a significant predictor of government transparency. The coefficient result indicated that legislative governance challenges had a negative and statistically significant effect on government transparency. The unstandardized coefficient was $B = -0.937$, with $\beta = -0.959$, $t = -47.372$, $p < 0.005$, the result implied that a one-unit increase in legislative governance challenges was associated with a 0.937-unit decrease in government transparency. The standardized coefficient of −0.959 further indicated a very strong inverse effect. Therefore, the finding indicated that increasing legislative governance challenges significantly reduced government transparency. This suggested that challenges such as political interference, inadequate information, weak institutional capacity, and limited commitment to

information disclosure could undermine the ability of legislative institutions to promote openness and transparency in government.

Discussion of Findings

The findings of our study showed that legislative governance played a significant role in promoting transparency in government. The regression results revealed a very strong positive relationship between legislative oversight and government transparency, with $R = 0.925$ and $R^2 = 0.855$, indicating that legislative oversight explained 85.5% of the variation in government transparency. The coefficient was also positive and statistically significant ($\beta = 0.925$, $p < 0.001$). This suggested that effective legislative oversight, through monitoring, investigations, budgetary scrutiny, and demands for information, enhanced openness in government operations. The finding indicated that a stronger legislative oversight system could reduce secrecy and encourage government institutions to provide relevant information to citizens.

The findings further showed that legislative governance enhanced accountability in government institutions. The correlation analysis produced a very strong positive and statistically significant relationship between legislative governance and accountability ($r = 0.947$, $p < 0.001$). The questionnaire responses also supported this finding, with an overall mean of 3.84, indicating that respondents agreed that legislative governance strengthened accountability. In particular, respondents strongly agreed that legislative governance strengthened mechanisms for monitoring the performance of government institutions. This implied that legislative scrutiny encouraged public officials to explain their decisions, justify the use of public resources, and accept responsibility for their actions. The finding therefore suggested that effective legislative governance constituted an important institutional mechanism for ensuring that government officials remained accountable to the public.

Similarly, the findings established a very strong positive and statistically significant relationship between legislative transparency and public trust in government. The Pearson correlation coefficient was $r = 0.958$, $p < 0.001$, indicating that higher levels of legislative transparency were strongly associated with greater public trust. This result was consistent with the questionnaire finding, which produced an overall mean of 4.17. Respondents particularly agreed that access to information about legislative activities increased citizens' confidence in government processes. The result implied that when legislative activities, decisions, and proceedings were made more open and accessible, citizens were more likely to perceive government as credible and trustworthy. Thus, transparency appeared to serve as an important pathway through which legislative governance could strengthen public confidence in government institutions.

However, the findings also showed that political interference, inadequate information, institutional capacity constraints, and limited commitment to information disclosure constituted important challenges to effective legislative governance. Political interference recorded the highest mean of 4.26, while the overall mean for the identified challenges was 4.00. Respondents also supported measures such as strengthening legislative oversight mechanisms, providing legislators with adequate resources and information, increasing public access to legislative proceedings, and enforcing accountability rules, with an overall mean of 4.06. Taken together, the findings demonstrated that legislative governance was central to promoting transparency, accountability, and public trust, but its effectiveness depended on the independence, capacity, resources, and openness of legislative institutions. Therefore, strengthening legislative oversight and accountability mechanisms was essential for building a more transparent government and improving citizens' trust in public institutions.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

In conclusion, the study established that legislative governance played a significant role in promoting transparency, accountability and public trust in government. Legislative oversight had a strong positive and significant effect on government transparency, while legislative governance was strongly associated with improved accountability and legislative transparency was strongly related to public

trust. However, political interference, inadequate information, limited institutional capacity and weak commitment to disclosure constrained effective legislative governance. The study therefore concluded that strengthening legislative oversight, ensuring adequate resources and information, improving public access to legislative activities, and enforcing accountability mechanisms would enhance transparency and accountability and ultimately strengthen citizens' trust in government institutions.

Based the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made: (a) Government and legislative authorities should strengthen legislative oversight mechanisms by ensuring that legislative committees are adequately empowered, resourced and independent to monitor government activities, scrutinise public expenditure and demand timely disclosure of relevant information. This should include regular investigations, budget monitoring and public reporting of oversight findings to sustain the significant contribution of legislative oversight to government transparency. (b) The National Assembly and other relevant legislative institutions should strengthen accountability mechanisms by requiring government officials and institutions to regularly explain and justify their decisions, policies and use of public resources. Effective sanctions should also be applied to officials and institutions that fail to comply with established accountability requirements, thereby making legislative governance more effective in promoting institutional accountability. (c) Legislative institutions should increase public access to legislative proceedings, decisions, reports and other relevant government information through accessible online platforms, public hearings and timely publication of legislative documents. This would enhance citizens' access to information and strengthen public confidence and trust in government institutions. (d) Measures should be adopted to minimise political interference in legislative oversight and strengthen the institutional capacity of legislative bodies. Legislators and legislative staff should be provided with adequate resources, relevant information and continuous professional training, while mechanisms should be established to ensure that government officials comply with requirements for information disclosure. (e) Government and legislative authorities should strengthen the enforcement of transparency and accountability rules by establishing clear consequences for non-compliance and improving mechanisms for monitoring adherence. Greater public participation in legislative processes should also be encouraged through public hearings, consultations and improved access to legislative information, as these measures would reinforce transparency, accountability and citizens' trust in government.

References

Adeoye, O., & Ran, B. (2024). Government transparency: Paradoxes and dilemmas. *Public Management Review, 26*(8), 2194–2217.

Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework. *European Law Journal, 13*(4), 447–468.

El Hamad, W., Pupovac, S., & Moerman, L. (2024). Transparency and public accountability: Does the Nigerian extractive industries transparency initiative deliver? *The Extractive Industries and Society, 19*, 101514.

OECD. (2023). *Open Government for Stronger Democracies: A Global Assessment*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2024). *OECD Survey on Drivers of Trust in Public Institutions – 2024 Results*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2025). *Government at a Glance 2025: Accountable Law Making*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Prats, M., Phillips, E., & Smid, S. (2024). Insights from the OECD Trust Survey: How people evaluate the trustworthiness of government institutions. *Policy Design and Practice, 9*(2).

Transparency International. (2023). *Strengthening Parliamentary Oversight: Key Findings and Recommendations from Multi-Country Assessments*. Berlin: Transparency International.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2024). *Trust in Governance 2023 Opinion Poll Findings*.

Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU). (2024). *World e-Parliament Report 2024*. Geneva: IPU.

Biographical Note

Thalis Olonite APALOWO, Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs and Poverty Alleviation, Abuja NIGERIA. **Email:** Apalowo86@gmail.com, **Tel: 07066403102.**