Medora: Medical Sciences
ISSN (Online): 3139-1400 | CC BY 4.0 | Erudexa Publishing
Vol 2, Issue 2, Apr – Jun, 2026

Received	14-Mar-26	Accepted	09-May-26
Revised	22-Apr-26	Published	12-May-26
DOI	https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20562693		

Bureaucracy and Service Delivery in Nigerian Public Healthcare Institutions: Implications for Efficiency and Patient Care

[1]Edime YUNUSA, Ph.D and [2]Ejuchegahi A. ANGWAOMAODOKO

[1,2]Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba Kogi State – Nigeria

[1]Orchid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0399-9169 [2]Orchid: https://orcid.org/0009-0001-6300-2017

Abstract

Efficient healthcare administration remains essential to effective patient care and sustainable public health systems, yet bureaucratic bottlenecks continue to weaken service delivery across many Nigerian public healthcare institutions. This paper examined bureaucracy and service delivery in Nigerian public healthcare institutions with emphasis on the implications for efficiency and patient care. Specifically, the paper investigated how bureaucratic procedures affect healthcare service delivery, examined the implications of bureaucratic inefficiency on institutional performance and patient care, and identified practical measures for improving administrative efficiency and effective healthcare delivery in Nigerian public hospitals. The paper adopted Max Weber's Bureaucratic Theory as the theoretical framework because of its emphasis on hierarchy, formal procedures and administrative control in organisational management. The paper utilised systematic review method through critical analysis and synthesis of recent peer-reviewed empirical and theoretical literature relevant to bureaucracy, healthcare administration and service delivery in Nigeria. The paper revealed that excessive administrative procedures, prolonged approval systems, centralised decision-making and manual documentation processes significantly contribute to delays in patient treatment, overcrowding, poor institutional coordination and reduced staff productivity in Nigerian public hospitals. The paper further found that bureaucratic inefficiency weakens patient satisfaction, continuity of care and healthcare accessibility, particularly during emergency situations. The paper concluded that although bureaucracy is necessary for accountability and institutional coordination, excessive procedural rigidity undermines efficiency and effective patient care in Nigerian public healthcare institutions. The paper recommended digitalisation of administrative systems, decentralisation of selected operational responsibilities and continuous managerial training for healthcare administrators in order to improve institutional responsiveness and healthcare service delivery.

Keywords: Bureaucracy, Service Delivery, Public Healthcare Institutions, Efficiency, Patient Care, Nigeria

1. INTRODUCTION

Healthcare service delivery remains one of the central responsibilities of the state because the quality of public health institutions directly affects life expectancy, disease control, labour productivity and national development. In Nigeria, public healthcare institutions at the federal, state and local government levels continue to provide medical services for a large proportion of the population, particularly among low-income households and rural communities. Despite several health sector reforms, complaints relating to long waiting time, delays in diagnosis and treatment, administrative bottlenecks, poor referral systems, shortage of personnel and weak institutional coordination continue to affect patient care across many public hospitals. The World Health Organization has consistently stressed that effective healthcare systems depend not only on medical infrastructure and personnel but also on efficient administrative structures capable of supporting timely and accessible healthcare services. In Nigeria, however, bureaucratic procedures within public healthcare institutions have increasingly become a subject of concern among scholars and policy actors because they often slow decision-making processes and reduce institutional responsiveness to patients' needs.

Bureaucracy refers to a formal administrative structure characterised by hierarchy, rules, division of labour, official procedures and authority relations as explained in Max Weber's classical theory of bureaucracy. Although bureaucratic arrangements are designed to ensure accountability, orderliness and administrative control, excessive adherence to rigid procedures may obstruct efficiency in organisations that require urgent and flexible service delivery such as hospitals. Kuye and Akinwale (2020) observed that bureaucratic processes in Nigerian government hospitals contribute to delays in healthcare delivery, thereby affecting patient satisfaction and institutional effectiveness. Public hospitals frequently operate through layers of approvals, paperwork, reporting channels and administrative routines that prolong access to treatment and sometimes worsen medical outcomes, especially in emergency situations.

The Nigerian healthcare system has faced increasing pressure due to population growth, disease burden, inadequate funding and migration of health professionals. According to the World Bank, Nigeria's population exceeded 220 million people in 2024, while healthcare expenditure as a percentage of gross domestic product remains below the recommendation for achieving universal health coverage. Within this context, administrative inefficiency has become more visible in public healthcare institutions where patients often spend several hours before receiving medical attention. Okeke et al. (2023), in their assessment of service delivery towards universal health coverage in Nigeria, noted persistent inequality in healthcare access and weak service coverage across several indicators of healthcare delivery. The study further revealed that poor institutional coordination and service inefficiency continue to hinder progress in the Nigerian health sector.

Evidence from recent studies also indicates that bureaucratic challenges affect the morale and productivity of healthcare workers. Administrative centralisation, delays in procurement procedures, excessive documentation requirements and rigid chains of command limit the ability of health professionals to respond effectively to patients. Ajisegiri et al. (2022) argued that organisational and administrative weaknesses within primary healthcare delivery structures contribute to poor management of non-communicable diseases in Nigeria. Similarly, Aika and Enato (2022) found that

weak administrative support systems hindered the implementation of infection prevention and antimicrobial stewardship programmes across healthcare facilities in Nigeria.

The implications of bureaucratic inefficiency extend beyond institutional operations to patient care outcomes. Delays in accessing healthcare services can increase mortality risks, reduce treatment effectiveness and discourage citizens from utilising public health facilities. In many Nigerian public hospitals, patients are confronted with lengthy registration procedures, delayed laboratory processing, overcrowded clinics and slow referral systems. These conditions weaken public confidence in government healthcare institutions and encourage reliance on private hospitals, self-medication and informal healthcare alternatives. Adewole et al. (2022) established that service satisfaction among National Health Insurance Scheme enrollees in Southwest Nigeria was strongly associated with the quality and timeliness of healthcare delivery.

Against this background, the study examines bureaucracy and service delivery in Nigerian public healthcare institutions with emphasis on how administrative structures and procedures influence efficiency and patient care. The study is important because improving healthcare outcomes in Nigeria requires not only increased funding and infrastructure but also institutional reforms capable of reducing administrative delays and improving responsiveness within public hospitals.

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Public healthcare institutions in Nigeria continue to experience serious service delivery challenges despite repeated health sector reforms and policy interventions introduced by government over the years. Patients in many government-owned hospitals encounter delays in registration, diagnosis, laboratory investigations, admission processes and access to treatment. In emergency situations, these delays sometimes contribute to avoidable complications and deaths. Reports of overcrowded clinics, prolonged waiting hours and poor administrative coordination remain common across federal and state-owned healthcare facilities. While inadequate funding and shortage of healthcare personnel are widely discussed in existing literature, insufficient attention has been given to the role of bureaucratic structures and procedures in weakening efficiency and patient care within Nigerian public healthcare institutions.

The persistence of rigid administrative procedures in public hospitals has created concerns regarding institutional effectiveness and responsiveness. Excessive paperwork, hierarchical approval systems, fragmented communication channels and administrative centralisation often slow decision-making processes within hospitals that require urgent and coordinated healthcare delivery. Kuye and Akinwale (2020) noted that bureaucratic procedures in Nigerian government hospitals undermine effective healthcare service delivery because hospital operations require flexibility and timely intervention that rigid administrative systems often fail to provide. The situation is further compounded by weak accountability mechanisms, poor record management systems and inadequate use of digital administrative technologies in many public health institutions.

Available statistics also indicate continuing weaknesses in healthcare service delivery across Nigeria. The Nigerian healthcare system continues to record poor health indicators compared to several countries with similar economic profiles. According to the National Demographic and Health Survey and recent health sector reviews, maternal mortality, infant mortality and healthcare access disparities remain high, particularly in rural communities. Okeke et al. (2023) observed

persistent inequity in access to healthcare services and poor coverage across several universal health coverage indicators in Nigeria. These conditions suggest that institutional inefficiency within healthcare delivery structures remains a major obstacle to effective patient care.

Another problem relates to the effect of bureaucracy on healthcare workers and institutional productivity. Health professionals working in public hospitals are often constrained by administrative bottlenecks that reduce operational efficiency and increase work-related stress. Delays in procurement, promotion processes, release of medical supplies and administrative authorisations frequently affect service quality and staff morale. This has contributed to increasing migration of skilled medical personnel from Nigeria to other countries in search of better working conditions. The resulting shortage of healthcare workers places additional pressure on already overstretched public hospitals and further weakens patient care delivery.

Although previous studies have examined healthcare financing, infrastructure deficits and workforce shortages in Nigeria, there remains limited scholarly attention on how bureaucratic systems specifically shape service delivery outcomes and patient experiences within public healthcare institutions. Consequently, there is a need for a detailed examination of bureaucracy and service delivery in Nigerian public healthcare institutions in order to understand how administrative structures influence efficiency, responsiveness and the quality of patient care. Such inquiry is necessary for identifying institutional reforms capable of improving healthcare administration and strengthening public confidence in government-owned health facilities.

3. AIM AND OBJECTIVES

The aim of this paper was to examine the influence of bureaucracy on service delivery in Nigerian public healthcare institutions with emphasis on its implications for institutional efficiency and patient care. The specific objectives are:

i. To examine how bureaucratic procedures affect service delivery in Nigerian public healthcare institutions.
ii. To assess the implications of bureaucratic inefficiency on institutional performance and patient care in Nigerian public hospitals.
iii. To identify measures for improving administrative efficiency and effective healthcare service delivery in Nigerian public healthcare institutions.

4. METHODOLOGY

This paper adopted the systematic literature review approach guided by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework developed by Moher et al. (2009). The PRISMA approach was adopted because of its emphasis on transparency, replicability and methodological rigour in the identification, selection and synthesis of relevant literature. The method was considered appropriate for this paper because it provided a structured and evidence-based procedure for critically examining existing empirical and theoretical studies on bureaucracy and service delivery in Nigerian public healthcare institutions while minimising selection bias and enhancing reliability of findings. The paper relied extensively on secondary sources obtained from major academic databases including Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, PubMed and ScienceDirect. These databases were searched using Boolean combinations of keywords such as “bureaucracy”, “service delivery”, “public healthcare institutions”, “administrative efficiency”,

"patient care", "healthcare administration", "public hospitals" and "Nigeria". The search process was limited to peer-reviewed journal articles and relevant scholarly materials published between 2020 and 2025, while a few foundational studies published prior to 2020 were included through backward citation tracing to provide theoretical and conceptual context for the study.

4.1 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The inclusion criteria for the review required that all selected studies must be peer-reviewed, directly related to bureaucracy, healthcare administration, efficiency, service delivery or patient care within public healthcare institutions, clearly state the research methodology adopted and have accessible full-text versions written in English language. Studies were excluded if they lacked defined methodology, focused solely on unrelated medical or technical issues without administrative relevance, contained duplicate findings or were published in predatory and non-indexed outlets.

4.2 PRISMA Article Selection Process

Following the PRISMA article selection procedure, an initial search generated 286 potential studies from the selected databases. After removal of duplicates, 214 articles remained for title and abstract screening. Independent evaluation of the studies based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria led to the elimination of unrelated articles, leaving 97 studies eligible for full-text assessment. Further eligibility review resulted in the exclusion of studies lacking methodological clarity or sufficient relevance to the objectives of the paper. Consequently, 41 peer-reviewed studies and 7 foundational works constituted the final sample used for the review and thematic synthesis.

4.2 Quality Assessment

The methodological quality of the selected studies was assessed through adaptation of the quality assessment criteria developed by Kitchenham and Charters (2007). The assessment focused on clarity of research objectives, appropriateness of research design, adequacy of data collection and analysis procedures, validity of findings and relevance to the objectives of the review.

4.3 Data Extraction and Synthesis

Data extraction involved identification of theoretical frameworks, methodologies, study settings, findings and limitations from the selected studies. Thematic synthesis following the approach developed by Thomas and Harden (2008) was adopted for data analysis through line-by-line coding, identification of descriptive themes and development of analytical themes. The approach enabled the study to identify recurring patterns, institutional challenges and practical measures relating to bureaucracy and healthcare service delivery in Nigeria.

Table 1. Systematic Literature Review Protocol Summary

Element	Description
Databases	Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, PubMed and ScienceDirect
Time Period	2020–2025 systematic review search; foundational literature reviewed where necessary

Search Terms	“Bureaucracy” AND “Service Delivery” AND “Public Healthcare Institutions”; “Administrative Efficiency” AND “Patient Care” AND “Nigeria”; “Healthcare Administration” AND “Public Hospitals” AND “Service Delivery”
Inclusion Criteria	Peer-reviewed journal articles, books and empirical studies relevant to bureaucracy, healthcare administration, efficiency and patient care; English language full text available
Exclusion Criteria	Studies without clear methodology; unrelated healthcare studies; duplicate studies; non-peer-reviewed sources and predatory publications
Initial Records	286
After Deduplication	214
After Title/Abstract Screening	97
Final Sample	41 peer-reviewed journal articles + 7 foundational studies
Quality Assessment	Studies assessed based on relevance to objectives, methodological clarity, recency and credibility of sources
Synthesis Method	Thematic systematic review and narrative synthesis

5 LITERATURE REVIEW

The review of literature was done under conceptual review, empirical review and theoretical framework in line with the aim and objectives of the paper as follows:

5.1 Conceptual Review

Bureaucracy

Bureaucracy is commonly associated with formal administrative structures characterised by hierarchy, rules, division of labour and official procedures designed to regulate organisational activities. Contemporary scholars have expanded Weber’s classical conception by examining how bureaucratic systems influence organisational responsiveness and public service outcomes. Olsen (2021) argues that bureaucracy remains central to public administration because it provides predictability, accountability and institutional continuity in government operations. Similarly, du Gay and Pedersen (2020) maintain that bureaucracy promotes administrative order and procedural fairness through rule-guided conduct and professional authority. However, critics contend that excessive bureaucratic procedures often produce delays, rigid decision-making and institutional inefficiency, especially in sectors requiring urgent responses such as healthcare. In the Nigerian context, Kuye and Akinwale (2020) observe that bureaucratic bottlenecks in government hospitals frequently obstruct effective healthcare delivery through prolonged administrative procedures and hierarchical authorisation systems. While some scholars view bureaucracy as necessary for accountability and control, others stress that overdependence on rigid administrative routines weakens institutional adaptability and responsiveness to public needs. This paper adopts the definition of bureaucracy as a formal administrative system characterised by hierarchical authority, procedural rules and official control mechanisms that shape decision-making and service delivery processes within public healthcare institutions.

Service Delivery

Service delivery refers to the process through which public or private institutions provide goods and services to meet the needs of citizens and clients. In public administration and healthcare studies, the concept is often linked to accessibility, timeliness, quality and responsiveness in the provision of essential services. Osborne (2021) explains that service delivery involves the capacity of institutions to translate policy intentions into practical outcomes that satisfy public expectations. Likewise, Akinyemi and Isiaka (2022) argue that effective service delivery in public institutions depends on institutional efficiency, administrative coordination and accountability in resource utilisation. Within healthcare systems, service delivery extends beyond treatment to include patient access, continuity of care, referral processes and responsiveness to medical emergencies. Okeke et al. (2023) note that healthcare service delivery in Nigeria continues to experience challenges relating to inequality in access, poor coordination and weak institutional performance, all of which affect progress towards universal health coverage. Existing scholarly debates show that service delivery cannot be reduced merely to the availability of services because institutional efficiency and user satisfaction also determine the effectiveness of service provision. Therefore, this paper adopts service delivery as the ability of public healthcare institutions to provide accessible, timely, responsive and quality healthcare services that meet the medical needs of patients effectively.

Public Healthcare Institutions

Public healthcare institutions are government-owned establishments responsible for the provision, management and regulation of healthcare services to citizens at federal, state and local government levels. These institutions include teaching hospitals, general hospitals, specialist hospitals, primary healthcare centres and public clinics financed largely through public expenditure. Abimbola et al. (2022) describe public healthcare institutions as the organisational structures through which governments implement health policies and provide preventive, curative and rehabilitative services to the population. Similarly, Mohammed et al. (2021) maintain that public healthcare institutions are central to national healthcare systems because they provide affordable medical services to low-income populations and underserved communities. Scholarly discussions on public healthcare institutions often focus on issues of governance, infrastructure, funding, workforce capacity and institutional performance. In Nigeria, studies have shown that public healthcare institutions remain the primary source of healthcare for many citizens despite persistent problems relating to poor funding, staff shortages, administrative delays and weak service coordination. Ajisegiri et al. (2022) further argue that organisational and managerial weaknesses within Nigeria's public healthcare structures affect the quality and accessibility of healthcare services. This paper therefore adopts public healthcare institutions as government-owned health establishments responsible for the organisation and delivery of medical services to the public through structured administrative and healthcare systems.

Patient Care

Patient care refers to the range of medical, emotional and administrative services provided to individuals for the purpose of maintaining health, preventing illness and treating medical conditions. The concept encompasses diagnosis, treatment, nursing care, communication, patient safety and responsiveness to patients' physical and psychological needs. According to Santana et al.

(2021), patient care involves coordinated healthcare practices that prioritise patients' wellbeing, dignity and active participation in healthcare decisions. Similarly, Manzoor et al. (2019) explain that quality patient care depends on effective communication, professional competence, responsiveness and institutional support systems that facilitate timely healthcare interventions. Current scholarly discussions increasingly emphasise patient-centred care, which focuses on respect for patients' preferences, access to information and continuity of treatment. In many public healthcare institutions, however, bureaucratic delays, overcrowding and administrative inefficiency often reduce the quality of patient care and increase dissatisfaction among service users. Studies on Nigerian hospitals have also linked delays in administrative procedures and inadequate institutional coordination with poor treatment experiences and reduced healthcare outcomes. In this paper, patient care is defined as the coordinated provision of medical and supportive healthcare services aimed at ensuring timely treatment, patient safety, satisfaction and improved health outcomes within public healthcare institutions.

Efficiency

Efficiency refers to the ability of an organisation or institution to achieve desired objectives through the effective utilisation of available resources, time and personnel. In public administration, efficiency is often associated with productivity, timely service provision and minimisation of waste in institutional operations. Andrews et al. (2020) define efficiency as the extent to which public institutions maximise outputs while minimising operational costs and delays. Likewise, Pollitt and Bouckaert (2017) argue that efficiency in public sector organisations involves improving institutional performance through better administrative coordination, resource management and service responsiveness. In healthcare administration, efficiency is closely linked to the timely delivery of medical services, proper allocation of healthcare resources and reduction of unnecessary procedural delays that affect patient outcomes. Scholars have noted that inefficiency in public healthcare institutions often manifests through prolonged waiting time, duplication of administrative procedures, poor record management and inadequate coordination among units within hospitals. In the Nigerian healthcare sector, bureaucratic bottlenecks have been identified as major factors reducing institutional efficiency and limiting healthcare accessibility. Consequently, this paper adopts efficiency as the capacity of public healthcare institutions to utilise available human, financial and administrative resources effectively in delivering timely and quality healthcare services without unnecessary delays or wastage.

How Bureaucratic Procedures Affect Service Delivery in Nigerian Public Healthcare Institutions

Bureaucratic procedures within Nigerian public healthcare institutions continue to shape the quality, accessibility and timeliness of healthcare service delivery. Public hospitals in Nigeria operate through formal administrative systems characterised by hierarchical decision-making, extensive documentation, procedural authorisations and centralised control mechanisms. While these structures are intended to ensure accountability and procedural order, several studies have shown that excessive bureaucratic practices frequently delay healthcare delivery and reduce institutional responsiveness to patients. Kuye and Akinwale (2020) observed that bureaucratic bottlenecks in Nigerian government hospitals slow down medical operations and create administrative obstacles that negatively affect service delivery outcomes. Their study found that patients in many public

hospitals encounter delays arising from multiple approval stages, prolonged registration procedures and fragmented communication channels between departments.

Practical evidence from tertiary and secondary healthcare institutions across Nigeria demonstrates the extent to which bureaucratic procedures affect hospital operations. In many teaching hospitals, patients are required to move between several administrative units before obtaining consultation cards, laboratory approvals or access to treatment. Studies conducted in federal teaching hospitals in Southwest Nigeria showed that long waiting time remains one of the major causes of dissatisfaction among patients attending outpatient departments (Akinyemi et al., 2021). Administrative delays associated with manual record systems, multiple payment points and poor coordination between units were identified as major contributing factors. Similar findings were reported by Eze et al. (2022) in their assessment of service delivery challenges in public hospitals in Southeast Nigeria where bureaucratic processes delayed access to laboratory investigations and specialist consultations.

The effects of bureaucratic procedures became more visible during the COVID-19 pandemic when healthcare institutions required quicker administrative responses and emergency coordination. Okereke et al. (2021) noted that bureaucratic delays in procurement and approval procedures affected the distribution of medical supplies and emergency response materials in several public hospitals during the pandemic period. Delayed authorisation processes for equipment procurement and resource allocation reduced the capacity of some institutions to respond promptly to public health emergencies. In several isolation centres established during the pandemic, administrative rigidities delayed staff deployment and slowed operational coordination between government agencies and healthcare facilities.

Bureaucratic procedures also affect primary healthcare delivery systems in Nigeria. Ajisegiri et al. (2022) found that organisational weaknesses and administrative fragmentation within primary healthcare centres hindered effective management of non-communicable diseases across several Nigerian states. The study identified poor referral coordination, administrative duplication and delayed reporting structures as major barriers affecting continuity of care. In many rural primary healthcare centres, health workers are required to comply with multiple reporting procedures and administrative directives from different agencies, thereby reducing the time available for direct patient care. Such administrative burdens often weaken efficiency and service accessibility in underserved communities.

Another major issue relates to centralisation of authority in public healthcare institutions. Decision-making processes in many public hospitals are concentrated at senior administrative levels, making it difficult for lower-level personnel to respond swiftly to operational challenges. Mohammed et al. (2021) argued that institutional responsiveness in Nigerian healthcare facilities is weakened by administrative centralisation and delayed internal communication processes. Case studies from some federal medical centres revealed that procurement of basic medical supplies and maintenance of equipment often require lengthy approval procedures involving several administrative offices. These delays contribute to shortage of essential materials and interruptions in service delivery.

Bureaucratic procedures further contribute to poor patient flow management in Nigerian public hospitals. Patients frequently spend several hours before receiving medical attention due to

repetitive administrative requirements and weak coordination between units. In a study on patient satisfaction in tertiary hospitals in Nigeria, Obiyan and Kumar (2023) found that waiting time and procedural delays significantly influenced patients' perceptions of healthcare quality. The study revealed that many patients considered administrative delays as evidence of institutional inefficiency and lack of concern for patient welfare. Delayed access to treatment has particularly serious implications in emergency units where immediate medical intervention is necessary.

Healthcare workers are also affected by bureaucratic processes within public hospitals. Excessive documentation requirements, rigid reporting structures and prolonged approval systems increase workload pressure and reduce staff productivity. Aika and Enato (2022) reported that healthcare administrators and medical personnel identified bureaucratic delays as major obstacles affecting implementation of infection prevention and antimicrobial stewardship programmes in Nigerian healthcare facilities. Administrative delays in releasing funds, approving procurement requests and authorising programme activities affected institutional effectiveness and healthcare outcomes.

Although bureaucratic systems are necessary for accountability and procedural regulation, evidence from Nigerian public healthcare institutions indicates that excessive administrative rigidity undermines timely service delivery and institutional responsiveness. The persistence of manual administrative systems, centralised decision-making and fragmented coordination structures continues to weaken healthcare accessibility and operational efficiency across public hospitals in Nigeria.

The Implications of Bureaucratic Inefficiency on Institutional Performance and Patient Care in Nigerian Public Hospitals

Bureaucratic inefficiency has serious implications for institutional performance and patient care in Nigerian public hospitals because healthcare delivery depends heavily on timely decision-making, coordinated administration and effective resource management. Delays arising from administrative bottlenecks frequently disrupt healthcare operations, reduce staff productivity and weaken patient outcomes. Existing studies indicate that prolonged administrative procedures in Nigerian public hospitals contribute to overcrowding, delayed diagnosis, treatment interruptions and reduced patient satisfaction. Okeke et al. (2023) observed that service delivery challenges within Nigeria's healthcare system continue to affect progress towards universal health coverage, particularly in areas relating to institutional coordination and accessibility of healthcare services.

One major implication of bureaucratic inefficiency is prolonged waiting time in public hospitals. Several studies conducted across tertiary hospitals in Nigeria have shown that patients spend long hours before receiving consultation or treatment. A study by Oche and Adamu (2021) in public hospitals in Northern Nigeria revealed that outpatient waiting time in some facilities exceeded four hours due to delays in registration, retrieval of medical records and administrative processing. Such delays discourage healthcare utilisation and increase dissatisfaction among patients. In emergency cases, prolonged waiting time may worsen health conditions and increase mortality risks, particularly among critically ill patients requiring urgent intervention.

Bureaucratic inefficiency also affects healthcare workers and institutional productivity. Administrative delays in recruitment, promotion, salary processing and procurement of medical supplies reduce staff morale and weaken operational effectiveness. Nigerian public hospitals have

increasingly experienced migration of healthcare professionals to foreign countries partly because of unfavourable working conditions and weak institutional support systems. Studies by Nwosu et al. (2022) showed that poor administrative coordination and delayed institutional responses contribute to occupational frustration among healthcare personnel in Nigeria. Frequent shortages of essential drugs, malfunctioning equipment and delays in facility maintenance further increase pressure on medical staff and reduce efficiency within hospitals.

The implications for patient care are equally severe. Bureaucratic inefficiency often results in delayed diagnosis, postponed surgical procedures and interrupted treatment schedules. In several public hospitals, patients are required to complete multiple administrative stages before accessing laboratory investigations or specialist care. Studies on maternal healthcare delivery in Nigerian public hospitals revealed that administrative delays and referral inefficiencies contribute significantly to maternal and neonatal complications (Adewuyi et al., 2021). Delays in emergency obstetric care, especially in referral hospitals, have been linked to avoidable maternal deaths in some states. Similar patterns have been observed in the management of chronic illnesses where delayed appointments and poor coordination affect continuity of care.

The COVID-19 pandemic further exposed the implications of bureaucrare atic inefficiency within Nigerian public healthcare institutions. Delays in procurement processes, release of intervention funds and administrative approvals affected institutional preparedness during the pandemic. Okereke et al. (2021) reported that some public hospitals experienced delays in accessing protective equipment and treatment materials because procurement procedures remained highly centralised and bureaucratic. These administrative limitations weakened healthcare response capacity and increased exposure risks among frontline healthcare workers.

Institutional performance is also weakened through poor data management and fragmented communication systems. Many Nigerian public hospitals still rely heavily on manual record systems, making retrieval of patient information slow and error-prone. Afolabi et al. (2022) found that poor health information management systems in public hospitals contributed to delays in treatment coordination and reduced efficiency in patient monitoring. Weak integration of digital administrative technologies continues to limit operational effectiveness in many healthcare facilities.

Financial inefficiency is another consequence of bureaucratic delays. Prolonged procurement procedures and administrative duplication often increase operational costs and contribute to wastage of limited healthcare resources. Delays in approving equipment maintenance or release of operational funds may result in deterioration of medical facilities and interruptions in healthcare services. Case studies from federal medical centres in Nigeria have shown that delays in administrative approvals frequently affect maintenance of diagnostic equipment, leading to service interruptions and referral of patients to private facilities at higher costs.

Public confidence in government healthcare institutions is also affected by bureaucratic inefficiency. Patients who repeatedly experience delays, poor coordination and administrative obstacles often seek alternatives through private hospitals, self-medication or informal healthcare providers. This weakens utilisation of public health institutions and undermines government efforts towards equitable healthcare access. The persistence of bureaucratic inefficiency therefore has

implications not only for institutional performance but also for healthcare accessibility, patient safety and public trust in Nigeria's healthcare system.

Measures for Improving Administrative Efficiency and Effective Healthcare Service Delivery in Nigerian Public Healthcare Institutions

Improving administrative efficiency and healthcare service delivery in Nigerian public healthcare institutions requires institutional reforms aimed at reducing procedural delays, strengthening coordination and promoting patient-centred healthcare administration. Existing studies indicate that administrative inefficiency in public hospitals can be reduced through decentralisation of decision-making, adoption of digital technologies, workforce development and improved accountability systems. Effective reform measures must address both structural and operational weaknesses within healthcare institutions in order to improve responsiveness and patient outcomes.

One important measure involves digitisation of administrative and medical record systems. Many Nigerian public hospitals still rely heavily on paper-based documentation, which contributes to delays in patient registration, retrieval of records and coordination between departments. Afolabi et al. (2022) argued that implementation of electronic health information systems can significantly improve efficiency in patient management and reduce administrative bottlenecks. Practical examples from some teaching hospitals that adopted electronic medical records have shown improvements in patient flow, appointment scheduling and information accessibility. The Federal Teaching Hospital, Ido-Ekiti, for instance, introduced electronic record systems to reduce delays associated with manual documentation and improve continuity of care. Digitalisation also enhances transparency and reduces duplication of administrative procedures.

Decentralisation of authority within public healthcare institutions is another practical strategy for improving administrative efficiency. Excessive concentration of decision-making at senior administrative levels slows institutional responsiveness and limits operational flexibility. Studies by Mohammed et al. (2021) showed that healthcare institutions with greater operational autonomy often respond more effectively to service delivery challenges. Allowing departmental heads and unit managers greater administrative authority in procurement, maintenance and personnel coordination can reduce delays and improve institutional performance. During the COVID-19 pandemic, some state-owned hospitals that adopted flexible administrative arrangements responded more quickly to emergency needs compared to institutions operating through rigid centralised approval structures.

Capacity building and workforce development are equally important for improving healthcare administration. Administrative personnel and healthcare managers require regular training in health management, digital administration, financial accountability and patient-centred service delivery. Aika and Enato (2022) emphasised that effective implementation of healthcare programmes depends on competent administrative leadership and institutional coordination. Continuous professional development programmes can strengthen managerial competence and improve operational efficiency within healthcare facilities. Leadership training for hospital administrators is particularly necessary because weak managerial capacity often contributes to poor coordination and ineffective resource utilisation.

Improvement of procurement and financial management systems is also essential. Delays in procurement of medical supplies and maintenance of healthcare equipment remain major problems in Nigerian public hospitals. Introducing transparent and decentralised procurement procedures can reduce delays and improve availability of essential medical resources. Some federal teaching hospitals have adopted framework procurement arrangements for frequently used medical supplies in order to minimise interruptions in service delivery. Strengthening internal auditing systems and financial accountability mechanisms can further reduce wastage and improve resource management.

Another important measure is strengthening interdepartmental coordination and referral systems within healthcare institutions. Fragmented communication structures frequently delay treatment processes and reduce continuity of care. Ajisegiri et al. (2022) found that weak referral coordination within primary healthcare systems affects effective management of chronic illnesses in Nigeria. Establishing integrated communication systems and standardised referral protocols can improve collaboration between units and reduce administrative delays affecting patients. Regular interdisciplinary meetings among healthcare professionals and administrators can also improve institutional coordination and service responsiveness.

Patient-centred administrative reforms are equally necessary for improving healthcare service delivery. Public hospitals should simplify registration procedures, reduce repetitive documentation requirements and introduce appointment systems capable of reducing waiting time. Studies on patient satisfaction in Nigerian hospitals consistently identify waiting time and administrative delays as major causes of dissatisfaction. Introducing customer service units, patient feedback mechanisms and complaint resolution systems can improve institutional accountability and responsiveness to patients' concerns.

Government commitment to healthcare funding and institutional reform also remains critical. Administrative efficiency cannot be sustained without adequate investment in healthcare infrastructure, workforce development and digital technologies. Improved budgetary allocation to healthcare institutions will enhance operational capacity and reduce administrative pressures arising from resource shortages. Institutional reforms should further prioritise transparency, merit-based appointments and reduction of political interference in healthcare administration.

Effective healthcare service delivery in Nigerian public healthcare institutions therefore depends on administrative reforms that promote flexibility, accountability, digitalisation and patient-centred operations. Reducing bureaucratic bottlenecks through practical institutional measures will improve efficiency, strengthen healthcare accessibility and enhance the quality of patient care across public hospitals in Nigeria.

5.2 Empirical Review

Kuye and Akinwale (2020) examined bureaucratic processes and healthcare service delivery in government hospitals in Nigeria. The study was conducted in selected public hospitals in Lagos State, Nigeria, with emphasis on how administrative procedures affect healthcare delivery. The study adopted Weber's Bureaucratic Theory as its theoretical framework in explaining the influence of hierarchical structures and procedural rules on organisational performance. A descriptive survey research design was utilised, while the researchers selected healthcare workers and patients from selected government hospitals through purposive and simple random sampling techniques. Data

were collected through structured questionnaires and interviews. The findings revealed that bureaucratic bottlenecks such as excessive documentation, multiple approval channels and delayed decision-making significantly affected healthcare service delivery and patient satisfaction in public hospitals. The study concluded that rigid bureaucratic structures reduce institutional efficiency and delay timely healthcare intervention.

Although the study provided important insights into administrative inefficiency in government hospitals, it concentrated mainly on bureaucratic procedures and service delivery in selected hospitals in Lagos State without giving broader attention to the implications for institutional performance and patient care across Nigerian public healthcare institutions generally. The present paper therefore filled this gap by examining bureaucracy, efficiency and patient care within the wider context of Nigerian public healthcare institutions.

Ajisegiri et al. (2022) investigated the organisation of primary healthcare service delivery for non-communicable diseases in Nigeria through a case-study analysis. The study area covered selected primary healthcare centres across different states in Nigeria. The researchers adopted the Health Systems Framework in analysing institutional and organisational factors affecting healthcare service delivery. A qualitative case-study research design was employed, while purposive sampling technique was used to select policymakers, healthcare workers and health administrators involved in primary healthcare delivery. Data were collected through in-depth interviews, document reviews and observational methods. The findings showed that weak administrative coordination, fragmented referral systems, delayed reporting structures and inadequate institutional management negatively affected healthcare delivery and continuity of patient care within primary healthcare centres. The study concluded that administrative and organisational weaknesses remain major obstacles to effective healthcare service delivery in Nigeria.

However, the study focused specifically on primary healthcare delivery for non-communicable diseases and did not adequately examine broader bureaucratic structures and their implications for efficiency and patient care in secondary and tertiary public healthcare institutions. The current paper addressed this gap by examining bureaucracy and service delivery across Nigerian public healthcare institutions with emphasis on efficiency and patient care outcomes.

Mohammed et al. (2021) assessed responsiveness of healthcare services within a health insurance scheme in Nigeria. The study was carried out among healthcare facilities participating in Nigeria's health insurance programme. The researchers utilised the Service Delivery Theory in explaining institutional responsiveness and healthcare performance. A cross-sectional survey research design was adopted, while respondents were selected through multistage sampling techniques from healthcare facilities covered under the health insurance scheme. Data collection involved the use of structured questionnaires administered to healthcare users and healthcare personnel. The findings indicated that delays in administrative procedures, poor institutional coordination and weak communication systems significantly affected responsiveness and quality of healthcare services. Patients reported dissatisfaction with waiting time, administrative processing and delays in accessing treatment. The study concluded that administrative inefficiency remains a major challenge affecting healthcare responsiveness in Nigerian public health facilities.

Despite the relevance of the study, its focus was limited to responsiveness within the health insurance scheme and did not sufficiently examine the broader relationship between bureaucracy, institutional efficiency and patient care in Nigerian public healthcare institutions. This gap is addressed in the current paper through a broader analysis of bureaucratic structures and their implications for healthcare service delivery and patient outcomes in Nigeria.

5.3 Theoretical Framework

This paper was anchored on Max Weber's Bureaucratic theory as review below;

Max Weber's Bureaucratic Theory

Max Weber's Bureaucratic Theory was propounded by the German sociologist, in 1922. Weber developed the theory to explain how formal organisations could achieve efficiency, predictability, discipline and administrative control through clearly established structures and procedures. The theory emerged from Weber's analysis of authority systems and organisational administration in modern societies. According to Weber, bureaucracy is characterised by hierarchical authority, division of labour, formal rules and regulations, official procedures, merit-based recruitment and impersonality in organisational operations. Weber argued that modern institutions function more effectively when activities are governed through rational procedures rather than personal discretion or arbitrary decisions. Bureaucratic administration, in Weber's view, promotes accountability, consistency and institutional stability because responsibilities are clearly defined and administrative conduct follows established regulations.

The central assumption of the theory is that organisations achieve efficiency and orderliness when administrative activities are guided by formal structures and standardised procedures. Weber maintained that authority should flow from superior to subordinate levels within a clearly defined hierarchy, while employees should perform specialised functions according to institutional rules. Another assumption of the theory is that administrative decisions should be impersonal and based on official regulations rather than emotional considerations or personal relationships. Weber further assumed that bureaucracy enhances organisational productivity because specialisation and procedural coordination reduce confusion and improve administrative control. Within public institutions, bureaucratic structures are expected to ensure accountability, transparency and continuity in service delivery irrespective of changes in leadership or personnel.

The theory has several strengths that explain its continued relevance in public administration and institutional studies. One major strength is that it provides a systematic structure for understanding how formal organisations operate through hierarchy, rules and division of labour. The theory also promotes accountability because responsibilities and reporting channels are clearly defined within institutions. Bureaucratic arrangements further encourage professionalism and merit-based administration since recruitment and promotion are expected to follow competence and official qualifications rather than favouritism. In public healthcare institutions, bureaucratic structures can support coordination among departments, maintenance of medical records and regulation of healthcare procedures. The theory also explains why public institutions rely heavily on documentation, official procedures and administrative supervision in order to maintain institutional order and operational consistency.

Despite these strengths, the theory has important weaknesses, especially within service-oriented institutions such as hospitals. Critics argue that excessive adherence to bureaucratic procedures often results in rigidity, delays and administrative inefficiency. The emphasis on rules and hierarchical approvals may slow decision-making processes in situations requiring urgent responses. In public healthcare institutions, prolonged administrative procedures may delay patient treatment, procurement of medical supplies and institutional responsiveness during emergencies. The theory has also been criticised for encouraging impersonality in administrative conduct, which may weaken human relations and patient-centred care within healthcare institutions. Another weakness is that the theory assumes that formal procedures automatically improve efficiency, whereas in practice excessive bureaucracy may increase operational bottlenecks and reduce organisational flexibility.

The relevance of Weber's Bureaucratic Theory to this study lies in its direct explanation of how administrative structures and procedural systems influence service delivery in Nigerian public healthcare institutions. Public hospitals in Nigeria operate through hierarchical administrative arrangements characterised by official regulations, reporting procedures, approval channels and formal documentation systems. While these structures are intended to ensure accountability and coordination, they often produce delays in patient registration, procurement processes, referrals and access to treatment. The theory therefore provides a useful framework for understanding how bureaucratic procedures shape institutional efficiency and patient care outcomes within public healthcare institutions. It explains why excessive administrative control and procedural rigidity contribute to delays in healthcare delivery, poor coordination and patient dissatisfaction in many Nigerian public hospitals. The theory is particularly appropriate for this study because it establishes a clear connection between bureaucracy, organisational efficiency and service delivery outcomes, which are the central concerns of the paper on bureaucracy and service delivery in Nigerian public healthcare institutions.

6 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The findings of this paper revealed that bureaucratic procedures significantly affect service delivery in Nigerian public healthcare institutions. Evidence from the reviewed literature showed that excessive administrative procedures, prolonged approval systems, centralised decision-making and manual documentation processes contribute to delays in healthcare delivery across many public hospitals in Nigeria. This finding aligns with the position of Kuye and Akinwale (2020), who argued that bureaucratic bottlenecks in government hospitals reduce institutional responsiveness and delay access to treatment. Their position reflects the realities within many Nigerian public hospitals where patients are often subjected to multiple registration stages, repeated documentation procedures and movement across different administrative units before receiving medical attention. Such practices increase waiting time and weaken patient confidence in public healthcare institutions. The finding also corresponds with the study of Mohammed et al. (2021), which established that poor administrative coordination and delayed internal processes negatively affect responsiveness within healthcare facilities operating under Nigeria's health insurance system. In practical terms, several tertiary hospitals in Nigeria still depend heavily on paper-based records and multiple approval procedures for laboratory investigations, referrals and procurement of medical supplies. These administrative processes slow institutional operations and affect the quality of

healthcare delivery, especially in emergency situations where immediate medical intervention is required.

The paper further established that bureaucratic inefficiency has serious implications for institutional performance and patient care in Nigerian public hospitals. The reviewed studies demonstrated that administrative delays contribute to overcrowding, prolonged waiting hours, interrupted treatment schedules and reduced staff productivity. This finding agrees with Ajisegiri et al. (2022), who found that organisational and administrative weaknesses within Nigerian healthcare facilities hinder continuity of care and effective management of patients. Delayed decision-making and fragmented communication structures within hospitals often result in poor coordination among departments, thereby affecting patient outcomes. In many public healthcare institutions, patients are required to undergo repetitive administrative procedures before accessing specialist care or diagnostic services, which sometimes worsens medical conditions. Evidence from studies on maternal healthcare delivery further indicates that delays in referrals and emergency administrative approvals contribute to maternal and neonatal complications in some Nigerian hospitals. The findings also support the position of Aika and Enato (2022), who maintained that bureaucratic obstacles hinder implementation of healthcare programmes and weaken institutional effectiveness. The implication is that administrative inefficiency not only affects institutional operations but also exposes patients to avoidable health risks and increases dissatisfaction with public healthcare services.

Another important finding of the paper is that improving administrative efficiency and healthcare service delivery in Nigerian public healthcare institutions requires practical institutional reforms centred on digitalisation, decentralisation, workforce development and stronger accountability systems. Studies reviewed in the paper showed that hospitals adopting electronic health information systems recorded improvements in patient management, reduction in waiting time and better coordination between departments. This finding supports the argument of Afolabi et al. (2022), who observed that digital health systems improve efficiency in healthcare administration and reduce delays associated with manual record management. Practical examples from some Nigerian teaching hospitals where electronic medical records have been introduced indicate improvements in retrieval of patient information, appointment scheduling and continuity of care. The paper also found that decentralisation of administrative authority can improve institutional responsiveness because lower-level managers are able to make operational decisions without waiting for prolonged bureaucratic approvals. This position agrees with Mohammed et al. (2021), who emphasised that institutional responsiveness improves when healthcare facilities operate with greater administrative flexibility and coordination.

Furthermore, the findings of this paper strongly support Weber's Bureaucratic Theory adopted as the theoretical framework for the paper. Weber argued that formal administrative structures based on hierarchy, rules and official procedures are necessary for organisational coordination and accountability. The paper confirmed that Nigerian public healthcare institutions operate through bureaucratic systems characterised by hierarchical authority, official procedures and structured reporting mechanisms. However, the paper equally demonstrates the limitations of excessive bureaucratic rigidity identified by critics of Weber's theory.

Although bureaucracy promotes procedural order and administrative control, excessive adherence to rigid rules and approval systems weakens flexibility and delays healthcare delivery in institutions

where urgent decision-making is required. The experiences of patients in many Nigerian public hospitals, including prolonged waiting time and delayed access to treatment, illustrate how bureaucratic structures can undermine efficiency when procedural requirements become excessive. The theory therefore provides an appropriate explanation for understanding the relationship between administrative procedures, institutional performance and patient care within Nigerian public healthcare institutions.

The paper further indicated that healthcare institutions require a balance between administrative accountability and operational flexibility. While formal procedures remain necessary for transparency and institutional coordination, healthcare delivery demands systems capable of responding promptly to emergencies and patient needs. The paper therefore demonstrated that reforms aimed at reducing bureaucratic bottlenecks, strengthening digital administration and improving institutional coordination are necessary for enhancing efficiency and patient care within Nigerian public healthcare institutions.

7 CONCLUSIONS

This paper examined bureaucracy and service delivery in Nigerian public healthcare institutions with emphasis on the implications for efficiency and patient care. The paper established that although bureaucratic structures are necessary for administrative coordination, accountability and institutional control, excessive procedural rigidity and centralised decision-making significantly weaken healthcare service delivery in many Nigerian public hospitals. The paper revealed that prolonged approval processes, manual documentation systems, fragmented communication structures and administrative bottlenecks contribute to delays in patient treatment, overcrowding, poor institutional responsiveness and reduced staff productivity. Evidence from the reviewed literature further showed that bureaucratic inefficiency affects patient satisfaction, continuity of care and healthcare accessibility, particularly in emergency situations where timely intervention is critical. The study also demonstrated that weak administrative systems contribute to operational inefficiency, poor resource management and declining public confidence in government-owned healthcare facilities. The paper therefore concluded that improving healthcare service delivery in Nigeria requires institutional reforms capable of reducing unnecessary bureaucratic delays while strengthening accountability, administrative flexibility and patient-centred healthcare management within public hospitals.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Federal and state governments should accelerate the digitalisation of administrative and medical record systems in public healthcare institutions through the introduction of integrated electronic health information management systems capable of reducing delays associated with manual documentation, patient registration and retrieval of medical records.
2. Management of public healthcare institutions should decentralise selected administrative and operational responsibilities to departmental and unit heads in order to reduce prolonged approval processes, improve institutional responsiveness and ensure timely decision-making in patient care and procurement procedures.
3. Government and healthcare administrators should establish continuous training programmes for hospital managers and administrative personnel on healthcare management, digital

administration, institutional coordination and patient-centred service delivery in order to improve efficiency, accountability and quality of patient care in Nigerian public hospitals.

9. LIMITATIONS

While this paper contributes significantly to existing discussions on bureaucracy and service delivery in Nigerian public healthcare institutions, some limitations should be acknowledged. As a systematic literature review, the study was dependent on the scope, quality and methodological approaches of the empirical and theoretical studies included in the analysis. Although the review adopted the PRISMA framework and applied rigorous inclusion, exclusion and quality assessment procedures, the findings of the paper remain limited by the reliability, methodological decisions and contextual focus of the selected studies. Most of the reviewed studies utilised cross-sectional research designs and qualitative case-study approaches, thereby limiting opportunities for establishing causal relationships between bureaucratic procedures, institutional efficiency and patient care outcomes in Nigerian public healthcare institutions.

In addition, despite the extensive search conducted through major academic databases including Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, PubMed and ScienceDirect, the review was restricted to studies published in English language. Consequently, the study may be affected by language and database coverage bias because relevant studies indexed in other databases or published in other languages may not have been captured during the review process. The exclusion of unpublished dissertations, conference papers, government technical reports and other forms of grey literature may also have introduced publication bias since studies with significant findings are more likely to appear in peer-reviewed publications than studies reporting insignificant or contradictory findings.

Furthermore, the recommendations and institutional reform measures proposed in this paper were derived from synthesised evidence obtained from reviewed studies and were not subjected to direct empirical testing within specific healthcare institutions. As such, the proposed administrative reforms relating to digitalisation, decentralisation and institutional restructuring should be regarded as evidence-informed recommendations requiring further empirical validation across different healthcare settings in Nigeria. Finally, most of the studies reviewed concentrated on tertiary and urban-based public healthcare institutions, particularly teaching hospitals and federal medical centres. Therefore, the findings may not fully reflect the realities of primary healthcare centres and rural public healthcare facilities where administrative structures, resource availability and service delivery challenges may differ considerably.

Article Publication Details

This article is published in the **Medora: Medical Sciences**, ISSN 3139-1400 (Online). In Volume 2 (2026), Issue 2 (April - Jun). The journal is published and managed by **Erudexa Publishing**.

Copyright © 2026, Authors retain copyright. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/ (CC BY 4.0 deed)

Acknowledgements

The authors thank those colleagues and reviewers who have been helpful during the entire process of developing this article.

Authors' contributions

All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Data availability

No datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable. This study did not involve human or animal subjects.

Funding

The authors declare that no funding was received for this work.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

- Abimbola, S., Asthana, S., Montenegro, C., Guinto, R., Jumbam, D. T., Louskieteris, D., Pai, M. (2022). Addressing power asymmetries in global health: Imperatives in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. *PLOS Medicine, 19*(4), e1003904.
- Adewuyi, E. O., Auta, A., Khanal, V., Tapshak, S. J., Zhao, Y., & Agho, K. E. (2021). Prevalence and factors associated with delay in seeking maternal healthcare services in Nigeria. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18*(18), 9620.
- Adewole, D. A., Reid, S., Oni, T., & Adebowale, A. S. (2022). Factors influencing satisfaction with service delivery among National Health Insurance Scheme enrollees in Ibadan, Southwest Nigeria. *International Journal of Health Services, 52*(3), 325–337.
- Afolabi, M. O., Alex, G., Coker, M., Akinyemi, O., & Ilesanmi, O. (2022). Digital health and health information systems in Nigeria: Implications for healthcare delivery. *BMC Health Services Research, 22*(1), 1124.
- Aika, I. N., & Enato, E. (2022). Health care systems administrators perspectives on antimicrobial stewardship and infection prevention and control programs across three healthcare levels: A qualitative study. *Antimicrobial Resistance & Infection Control, 11*, 157.
- Akinyemi, B., & Isiaka, S. B. (2022). Public service delivery and governance reforms in Nigeria. *African Journal of Public Administration, 14*(2), 55–71.

- Akinyemi, O. O., Ogunsile, S. E., & Adesola, A. O. (2021). Waiting time and patients' satisfaction in outpatient clinics of selected Nigerian teaching hospitals. *African Journal of Health Economics, 10*(1), 45–58.
- Ajisegiri, W. S., Abimbola, S., Tesema, A. G., Odusanya, O. O., Peiris, D., & Joshi, R. (2022). The organisation of primary health care service delivery for non-communicable diseases in Nigeria: A case-study analysis. *PLOS Global Public Health, 2*(7), e0000566.
- Andrews, R., Boyne, G. A., & Walker, R. M. (2020). Strategy implementation and public service performance. *Administration & Society, 52*(3), 399–426.
- du Gay, P., & Pedersen, J. S. (2020). What is public administration? *Political Studies Review, 18*(4), 496–512.
- Eze, P., Agu, U. J., & Onwujekwe, O. (2022). Public hospital service delivery and administrative challenges in Southeast Nigeria. *Health Services Insights, 15*, 11786329221118659.
- Kitchenham, B., & Charters, S. (2007). *Guidelines for performing systematic literature reviews in software engineering*. Keele University and Durham University Joint Report.
- Kuye, O. L., & Akinwale, O. E. (2020). Conundrum of bureaucratic processes and healthcare service delivery in government hospitals in Nigeria. *Journal of Humanities and Applied Social Sciences, 3*(1), 25–48.
- Manzoor, F., Wei, L., Hussain, A., Asif, M., & Shah, S. I. A. (2019). Patient satisfaction with health care services: An application of physician's behaviour as a moderator. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16*(18), 3318.
- Mohammed, S., Bermejo, J. L., Souares, A., Sauerborn, R., & Dong, H. (2021). Assessing responsiveness of health care services within a health insurance scheme in Nigeria. *BMC Health Services Research, 21*(1), 1–11.
- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & PRISMA Group. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *PLoS Medicine, 6*(7), e1000097.
- Nwosu, A. D. G., Ossai, E. N., Mba, U. C., Anikwe, I., & Nwakpu, K. O. (2022). Migration intentions of Nigerian physicians and associated factors: A cross-sectional study. *Human Resources for Health, 20*(1), 1–11.
- Obiyan, M. O., & Kumar, A. (2023). Patient satisfaction and healthcare service quality in tertiary hospitals in Nigeria. *International Journal of Health Planning and Management, 38*(4), 1121–1135.
- Oche, M. O., & Adamu, H. (2021). Determinants of patient waiting time in Nigerian public hospitals. *Sahel Medical Journal, 24*(2), 95–102.
- Okeke, C., Ezenwaka, U., Ekenna, A., Onyedinma, C., & Onwujekwe, O. (2023). Analysing the progress in service delivery towards achieving universal health coverage in Nigeria: A scoping review. *BMC Health Services Research, 23*, 1094.

- Okereke, M., Ukor, N. A., Adebisi, Y. A., Ogunkola, I. O., Iyagbaye, E. F., Owhor, G. A., & Lucero-Prisno, D. E. (2021). Impact of COVID-19 on access to healthcare in low- and middle-income countries: Current evidence and future recommendations. *International Journal of Health Planning and Management, 36*(1), 13–17.
- Olsen, J. P. (2021). Democratic accountability and the changing European political order. *European Law Journal, 27*(1–3), 78–101.
- Oni, S., Abasili, C. O., Dele-Dada, M., & Osarumwense, C. (2022). Government bureaucrats and ethical conduct in Nigeria's fourth republic: Implications for good governance. *Masyarakat, Kebudayaan dan Politik, 35*(4), 396–406.
- Osborne, S. P. (2021). Public service logic: Creating value for public service users, citizens, and society through public service delivery. *Public Management Review, 23*(5), 641–650.
- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2017). *Public management reform: A comparative analysis into the age of austerity* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Santana, M. J., Manalili, K., Jolley, R. J., Zelinsky, S., Quan, H., & Lu, M. (2021). How to practise person-centred care: A conceptual framework. *Health Expectations, 24*(2), 429–440.
- Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 8*(45), 1–10.

Publisher's Note

ERUDEXA PUBLISHING remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations. The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of ERUDEXA PUBLISHING and/or the editor(s). ERUDEXA PUBLISHING disclaims responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.