

**OBJECTIVITY, SOCIAL CHALLENGES/RESEARCH: THEIR
PERSPECTIVES FROM HUMAN GEOGRAPHY, LAW AND THE
SOCIAL SCIENCES**

**OBIECTIVITATEA, PROVOCĂRI ȘI CERCETARE
SOCIALĂ: PERSPECTIVE DIN GEOGRAFIA UMANĂ,
DREPT ȘI ȘTIINȚE SOCIALE**

Richard INGWE ¹

Abstract: Variation in practice procedures of professionals in different disciplines (e.g. social sciences and humanities) amazes those interested in objectivity. This is especially true concerning questions regarding human interest (conflict of interest, difference in the determination of interest, among other variants of interest) concerning the public realm and policy making/implementation. This has always been a matter of vigorous debate in the social sciences and other disciplines. Rather than engage in broad examination of their forms, we focus on clarifying the way various interests are perceived and treated with reference to objectivity in social science research and public policy. The objective of this paper is to assess the extent to which pluralism theory contributes towards understanding of differences between practices of social sciences and law. The specific objectives are: to explain the rather diametric opposition in the way social researchers are expected to exhibit objectivity in their approach to public policy/welfare and the way lawyers persist in applying bias towards persuading Judges to either acquit their clients or apply leniency to give their clients lighter sentences than could have been the case, should the full weight of possible penalty/punishment were to be applied. To provide reference material for stimulating multi-/cross-disciplinary discourse on the issues in the nexus of the title, we draw from multi-/interdisciplinary literature review to clarify the concept of objectivity from human geography, human society and the sovereign from political sciences and philosophies of Thomas Hobbes. The methods of aetiology and desk research were employed for implementing this study. The important empirical value of the study includes the analysis of the sub-field where social statistics (data) has been gathered against the backdrop of the perception of both the nature as well as the “how” the data is gathered to representing “facts”. Finally, we summarise the major ideas of the discourse, recommend future directions in exploring studies of this nature.

Key-words: *objectivity, research, social sciences, “public goods”, sharing, “public bads”*

Cuvinte-cheie: *obiectivitate, cercetare, științe sociale, “bunuri publice”, folosință comună, “rele publice”*

¹ Institute of Public Policy and Administration (IPPA), University of Calabar, Nigeria; Centre for Research and Action on Developing Locales, Regions and Environment (CRADLE), Calabar, Nigeria

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The problem that the study title attempts to address

How practitioners, professionals, philosophers in various institutions of the society perceive challenges, create or develop solutions to the same problems –as well as manage any contradictions that arise – remains unclear. As would be clarified below, the meanings of the term objectivity is frequently presented or taught variously in human geography compared to some other disciplinary fragments (e.g. the social sciences, law and the humanities). The latter makes a less articulated meaning of objectivity in some schools of human geography, like other disciplines, to appear to be rather rudimentary or less valuable. While an expatiation of the term has been long overdue, perhaps the multiplicity of issues and the eclectic nature of human geography has tended to hamper the undertaking of the more complex meaning of objectivity, a term whose value cuts across many sub-disciplines forming human geography and many of the social sciences and the humanities that human geographers interact with in seeking solutions to the challenges hampering the achievement of sustainable development generally, and that of citizens' rights, in particular. This study attempts to outline ways of examining the foregoing issues including how the challenges concern or relate to socio-economic development data gathering and social information production. The value of this study/article deserves statement at this outset thus: a trans-disciplinary articulation of the meaning of the term objectivity is urgently required, more than ever. The latter opinion is justified by the complexity of sustainable development challenges that individuals and groups as they contend with the complexities of daily living and the topics, (sub)disciplines, among other tasks.

Some vital premises

There is need for us to consider the following points in shaping this study for cogent reasons. First, some of the outcomes of the creation of the sovereign (State) includes the creation and steady evolution or development of institutions of society for facilitating public policy and administration in responding to the needs of citizens, whose individual powers has had to be given up to form the State in exchange for “public goods/services” (Hobbes, 1640-1654). Ever afterwards the approaches of professionals working in various social institutions take on different forms, norms, values, and mores, whose variations amaze and frequently confound observers, public analysts, and even those involved, either within the same institutions or from outside. Objectivity (describing many different things or meanings) has been coined as a term for assessing the correctness or otherwise of how “public goods/services” are provided or otherwise. Owing to the peculiarities of the meaning of objectivity in one subject that contributes towards public policy and administration (which is often different from the conception in others), its universal understanding has tended to be compromised or at least posed difficulties for inter-disciplinary communication and exchanges of ideas. Yet all social institutions work towards delivering on one goal: administration to the needs of the individuals (and groups) that have created the sovereign state in exchange for ever improving welfare.

Second, questions regarding the nature of geography that is desirable for servicing specific kinds of public policy needs have gained interest in human geography since the 1970s (Harvey, 1974). In the context of increasing offers of multi-disciplinary courses, there has been some confusion concerning what constitutes science generally and specifically objectivity in the sciences over time within human geography and the rest of the social sciences and the humanities. Practicing lawyers (or attorneys) specialize in or remains preoccupied with striving towards persuading Judges to either acquit (or at least grant them lighter sentences and “bearable” penalties their clients charged with various wrongs doing. Almost diametrically opposite to the habit of lawyers, practice by researchers in the social sciences is expected to be based on objectivity, impartiality, unbiased position, dispassionate positions, and dispositions that represent fairness to all stakeholders, all concerned, and all involved. The differences in the approach of practitioners involved in law and social science research, and by extension, public policy/administration, management (including implementation) or public (policy) administration constitutes matters that appear confusing to both students and practitioners (as well as certified graduates) of both professions. Although, explanations of these differences are part and parcel of the philosophical training, knowledge inculcation programming, management, during the process of producing graduates of all disciplines under discussion, these issues frequently get trapped in the maze of complex and complicated design of courses, and knowledge impartation programming/management as these differ by State/nation (country), tertiary educational institution, by course. These are some of the issues we draw attention to in this article.

Scope of this article

Observations of the different orientations of professionals such as social researchers and lawyers to their practice and indoctrination of incoming colleagues have been conducted rather casually. They have been seldom been exposed to academic analyses aiming towards understanding their origins and the underlying causes of their variation as well as the rationales for the way they have come to be what they are and have manifested to the public.

Objectives and organization

The objective of this article is to contribute towards understanding of the reasons underlying the differences in dispositions of the lawyer and researcher in social sciences. In the rest of this article, we present materials relevant for achieving the specific objectives of this study, as summarized briefly immediately and elaborated later. We begin by outlining, as well as, explaining the theory of pluralism. As already suggested, we fit the latter theoretical perspective to the various presentations of its meaning and applications. We follow on by examining the extent to which pluralism theory explains the differences as well as interrelationships among public welfare, public policy/administration, and objectivity in social science research. In achieving the foregoing, we undertake discussions involving tracing origins of major aspects of the matter. We trace public welfare, policy aimed at achieving public welfare in the

State/Sovereign, explain key concepts, contributions towards development theory, Thomas Hobbes' justification of the creation of the State, as the most orderly strategy of accumulation and use of power on behalf (for the profit) of the people who originally owned and exercised same. Then, we relate these concepts to the aspiration for equality and fairness in the administration (dispensation of "public goods") as well as sharing of "public bads" in the context of specific cases in the myriad kinds of public policy. Afterwards, we briefly comment on society, social institutions (including the judiciary, government, and how these have been understood from various social science perspectives or disciplines, and related issues.

Pluralism theoretical perspective

This theory has recently been conceived and applied from various disciplinary perspectives. This has ranged among its conception from a universal (i.e. encompassing many disciplines without focusing on one; on the one hand (Ingwe, Ikeji, Ojong, 2010); to perspectives that isolate and define its peculiarities and meanings to an increasing number of (sub)disciplines; on the other (Ingwe, Bessong, Uwanade, 2013). Here, we consider a hybrid of the foregoing perspectives. We justify this approach immediately, as follows. Considering that the theory is being applied for examining public welfare/policy/administration and related matters, the universal breed of the theory is appropriate for this study. We also consider that some specific disciplinary characteristics of the theory (such as those fabricated from political and sociological sciences) highlight certain interesting viewpoints that might offer greater clarifications than their "adisciplinary" (unbounded by subjects) counterparts. However, we present the theoretical form designed for this article as follows.

1.2. Pluralism theory with political science traits/roots

This view of pluralism theory has focused on causation, which involves diverse influences and/or factors that determine the occurrence of phenomena. Following, we present some connotations of theoretical perspectives of pluralism:

(a) As a behavioral perspective. References have been made to the following strands of pluralism theory: Some radical opinions expressed in politics and philosophy arguing that Marxist materialist monism (a belief that multiple factors) led to considerable opposition to this approach; Law-determined interpretation of the development of society is another belief under this viewpoint; Extensions of the theory connoting a doctrine pertaining to the diversity of cultural, ideological, radical, national, class, gender, among other societal characteristics.

(b) Pluralism has been employed to connote contradiction associated with class theory and to challenge state-centrism. These arise from pressure involving diverse factors characterizing the political environment (nationally, sub-nationally and internationally).

(c) To provide an alternative to the Marxist class perspective of pluralism, a balanced formulation of the theory involved incorporating its various perspectives, reviewed/presented here and elsewhere. This perspective has been applied for analyzing domestic politics and international political systems. This version provides a

doctrinal framework for waging opposition to Marxism, served as an alternative for understanding the multiplicity of factors that actually exist in society. The latter presents dynamism of varying degrees depending on the strength or capability of person(s) involved in analyses aimed towards resolving associated challenges.

Commendations of pluralism, its promotion operationalisation in public policy

Political scientists have suggested thoughts on this matter. One of such suggestions is that the division of society into social classes and the flourishing of modern electoral democracy, endorsed by revolutionaries before the “Cold War” serves as an illustration of the relevance of pluralism in advancing the interests of society working towards increasing human civilisation. Another refers to the “Cold War” era, as one during which pluralism was applied by opposing schools of thought to absolutise their own “truths” (Ingwe, 2005). Lincoln Allison, suggests that pluralism is part of philosophical theories and systems of thought that acknowledge influences (involving more than one ultimate principle contrasted to those exhibiting “monist” characteristics). One example of this can be cited in the United States of America (USA), where pluralism was employed for legitimising and/or rationalising the nation’s formation by various ethno-cultural groups including African Americans, Jewish Americans, Indian Americans, among others. The alternative would have been a resort to delusive optimism that such ethnic diversity would disappear (on its own) if allowed to exist separately. The latter would have involved evading or escaping from the associated challenges.

Pluralism has also been applied in connotation with literal reference to descriptions of coexistence of more than one entity, belief system, points of view, among other things. The meaning of pluralism in contemporary times refers to of modern society’s constitution by diverse cultural, among other groups that form societies’ major political essence. In this connection, it has been argued that pluralism of groups facilitates horizontal distinction of society is viewed by some as more beneficial and important compared to contrasting hierarchical type deriving from historical dominance of society by the elite (ruling class). The elites are known for their habitual ignorance (i.e. indifference to the masses, their penchant for manipulating various constituents of society including communities, villages, trade unions, Churches, Religious groups and so forth (Scott and Marshall, 2005). Although, it facilitates understanding of some of the issues of interest to this study, the political perspective of pluralism offers only a partial explanation. Therefore, we turn towards elaborating the sociological perspective of pluralism theory.

Sociological (and related disciplinary) perspectives of pluralism

While it concentrates on the theoretical perspective of pluralism relating to one of many disciplines in social sciences, this version promises to contribute immensely – thereby showing its relevance to the clarification and understanding of variable approaches towards public welfare/policy, by social scientists and law. Its origin is traced to the 1970s, when some sociologists dissented against what they presented as a prolonged hegemony of positivist orthodoxy foisted by some intellectual elite in

sociology. This posed detrimental consequences on the subject and its philosophers and scholarship in the subject. It involved the championing of a rebellion against the over-reliance on only one approach to social research thereby hampering advancement of sociology. This was feared to be capable of enthroning a kind of intellectual or academic dictatorship within sociological research. The dissent targeted certain works identified as representing despised hegemonic positivist orthodoxy or enforcing methodological exclusiveness, produced as they were by eminent and influential sociologists. Works published by notable sociologists (credited with developing theories of functionalism), especially Talcott Parsons, and those contributed by Paul Lazarsfeld on ‘abstracted empiricism’, formed subjects targeted by the rebelling sociologists.

Prominent expressions of the dissent include “Against Method” (Feyerabend, 1988)’s highlight of concerns about Parson’s exposition of functionalism, as documented in “The Social System; Towards a General Theory of Action –a collaboration with Edward Shils (1951); Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives, 1966; and The System of Modern Societies 1971). Paul F. Lazarsfeld’s contributions that incurred the wrath of the critics include: *The People’s Choice: How the Voter makes up His Mind in the Presidential Campaign* - with Bernard Berelson and Hazel Gaudet, 1988); –being a revised edition of the original edition of 1944); *Personal Influence: The Part Played by People in the Flow of Mass Communication* - with Elihu Katz, 1955). Lazarsfeld’s works reflected his interests in promoting survey research and theories of the middle range. Therefore, the critics’ association of his works with “abstracted empiricism” was viewed as unjustified. In proposing to change the situation viewed as undesirable by the rebels, the latter promoted an approach they perceived allowed them greater diversity or flexibility, in terms of academic styles and methods of study.

What some scholars refer to as “epistemological anarchy” (describing application of various research methods and theories) in sociological research was advocated as a means of salvaging sociology from the emerging or prevailing tyrannical positivist orthodoxy perceived by the dissenters in the 1970s. The academic crusade project involved fabrication of phenomenological and structuralist sociologies as major academic research themes. Part of that mission was the splitting of Marxism into neo-Marxist factions and invention of philosophical relativism. There was also special descriptions and categorization of these (sub)disciplinary fragments by terms such as epistemological pluralism or epistemological anomie for denoting the multiplicity of theories of knowledge or paradigms that competed with what were perceived by the dissenters as positivist orthodoxy in sociological studies. The fabricated sociological pluralism was justified by arguing that since natural scientists alter their research methods when such was considered necessary, instead of remaining unnecessarily enslaved by existing but ineffective theoretical conceptualizations and methods; sociologists ought to emulate liberating academic adventures for their own good and advancement of the discipline.

The rest of sociology and social research community hit back at the “rebels”. The latter’s claim that sociology was threatened by hegemony in form of positivist

orthodoxy being foisted on the discipline from within was debunked. An opposition asserted that the desired methodological pluralism sought by the dissenting critics had been in existence prior to the rebellion of the 1970s. As a substantiation of the response and an advocacy of academic order, the critique of the academic rebellion referred to previous application of a multiplicity of philosophical and/or methodological alternatives in sociology. Scholars promoting order pointed out that a few of the alternative academic philosophies included: Marxism, idealism, symbolic interactionism, among others (Scott and Marshall, 2005).

Relevance of pluralism theory to explication of various roles of professionals

The difference in dispositions of a social researcher and a lawyer presents a case for employing pluralism. Pluralism, in this sense, in being spoken about with regards to the differences in the roles, functions, expectations, requirements for services by members of the society, and various institutions fabricated to administer to needs/wants of society's members as dictated by public policy. However, it deserves mention that the expectations of society's members from social research and lawyers differ.

II. DATA AND METHODS

The hypothetico-deductive scientific methodology was adopted for implementing this study. Within this framework, it is permissible to apply specific –but compatible– methods that allow particular objectives to be achieved. How the latter has been applied here through the use of the method of aetiology (similar to our previous studies) is explicated below.

We applied the methods of aetiology and desk research for implementing this study. Aetiology is a method that resembles causation due to involvement of the creation of the nature of the principles of logical and empirical laws governing outcomes. In this study, we concentrate on explicating variation and interrelationships between the dispositions of social researchers and lawyers towards subjects (and objects) they encounter during their professional work universally. Aetiology employs systematic and scientific procedures to study the causation of outcomes of phenomena. Its origin has been traced to the medical sciences, where the method was initially applied to the understanding of challenges thereby producing robust results. Aetiology's procedure includes: the description of the study's object, as a preliminary step providing a basis for subsequent analyses of issues involved in the study; identification and isolation of fundamental constituents of the phenomena being investigated in the study as well as the nature and principles governing inter-relationships among aspects of the phenomena.

The basis for determining inter-relationships among the origin, history and evolution of the phenomena and subject matter of the study considers that their consequences are not discrete but developmental, dialectical instead of being perceived final. Aetiology was increasingly adopted for analyzing numerous challenges confronting society and of interest to social scientists within the latter's multiple sub-disciplines (sociology, criminology, where gangsterism, mafia, cultism, delinquency,

among others constituted subjects of inquiry. The latter was due to the robust results obtained from studies applying aetiology became well received and highly regarded by specialists outside the medical sciences, where it was originally applied frequently (Ingwe, 2005). Dialectical features of most phenomena or the way most issues present opposing aspects of the situations involved makes them to affect each other (Ingwe, 2005) thereby making them amenable to analysis that employ aetiology.

We preferred to use this method and considered it to be suitable for this study because of the impressive results that have been obtained from its previous adoption by previous studies undertaken by one of the authors of this article. Some of these studies include various challenges impeding the achievement of sustainable development in Nigeria and/or Africa. Some of the applications are: interrogating the role of diplomacy in Sino-Nigeria politico-economic relations (Okoro et al., 2011; analyzing land-grabbing in Africa by trans-national corporations and rich countries of the global North and emerging economies (Ingwe et al., 2009); and for explicating the role played by neoliberal globalization, financial and economic crises in impeding sustainable development in sub-Saharan Africa (Ingwe et al., 2009). Other recent applications of the method are: for highlighting Nigeria's federal legislators' neoliberalization campaign to de-autonomise the Central Bank of Nigeria through their equivocation on "transparency, credibility and accountability" of the institution (Ingwe, 2013); for proposing an agenda for researching the national socio-economic conditions and disease burden on Africa's population, by sub-regions (Ingwe, 2013a,b); for analyzing the challenges regarding the trafficking of women, girls for commercial sex work abroad, among other poor or socio-economically excluded Nigerians put through other forms of slavery abroad (Ingwe et al., 2012), among others.

We obtained data for this study through desk research and primary sources. The latter includes the authors' extensive experience of legal systems/practices in Anglo-Saxon nations and by extension, post-colonial countries (of Africa, Asia, and Latin America). Then we applied qualitative analytical techniques to process the data and information before analysis.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1. Objectivity and science: Relating the practices

We avoid arguments bothering on the contested natures of the concept of science (Gallie, 1964) and adopt some of the most essential parts of human geographer, David Livingstone's review of the conception of science by its proponents, here. The latter concern view of science as the application of first hand observation, procedures leading to (claims of) successful prediction, collection and analyses of data based on hypothetico-deductive (Harvey, 1969), and other times, including the inductive approach for producing information that fulfill requirements of verification and falsification (?). Like it might have happened in most, if not all of the social sciences, human geographers who frequently practice social research were later accused of negligence of the challenges in the nexus of social inequity while taking undue interest in (or emphasizing) quantification (that resulted from the quantitative revolution that swept the discipline in the 1950s and 1960s (Gregory et

al., 2009). The relevance (or value) of objectivity can be illustrated using the challenge of social inequity, mentioned above.

3.2. Objectivity: its multi-dimensional perspectives

Following, we draw from human geographer, John Picles' review of the literature of the term (Gregory et al., 2009) to present its three meanings in human geographic literature. Recall that the latter constitutes part of the wide spectrum of the social research (and practice) disciplines and professional areas. First is the use of objectivity with reference to disinterestedness or impartiality of the social researcher in studies s/he or they are undertaking. Second, is the view of objectivity with reference to the thinking that all knowledge (including scientific knowledge) as the product of social and historical constructions from projects characterized by specific spatial and temporal features. Third is the development of objectivity that rejects the objectivist conceptions of science. It is apposite to elaborate key aspects of the ideas associated with each of the above. The conception of objectivity as disinterestedness denotes situations whereby the persons involved (i.e. researchers does not have to have vested interest in issues at stake or taking advantage of being involved to settle old scores. It is also not concerned with ensuring that a particular ideological position is enforced, protected or otherwise.

What objectivity means in social research of the moulds of human geographies parallels (or contrasts) the principles and procedures of some of the humanities, where the way evidence is marshaled to the public and its representatives or conductors emphasizes codes that have been well-established, double-checking of sources, and representation of information in ways that are considered unbiased and accurate. Some key determinants of objectivity, in this meaning of the term, include: mastery of the evidence, observation of caution in the process information gathering, and the fulfillment of requirements set for exercising caution in maintaining "balance" in the representation of arguments. This difference applies to the discipline and professional practice of Law 1. Generally, objectivity means or presupposes direct (or unmediated) observation. This view is an element of the scientific method, whereby objects, being studied or worthy of being studied, are characterized by existence that are independent of human (including social researchers') perception of them. This view (a.k.a. the "god-trick" formed the basis for objectivist science or Cartesianism) concerned with beliefs that science "mirrors" nature, in its value-free and unmediated form (Haraway, 1985).

The meaning objectivity as a result of socially and historically constructed knowledge and components of specific spatial and temporal factors deserves brief explanation, which follows immediately. Certain features characterize this view, as follows: First, knowledge development is traceable to a project (or projects) initiated and or managed by someone to whom interests associated with the knowledge and his/her personal interests are seen to be inevitably linked in inextricable ways. Second, it is perceived to be situated knowledge because its production, similar as it is to other forms of knowledge, represents social practice and is characterized by specific embeddedness forms, geographies, and

commitments. The third meaning of objectivity as a rejection of objectivists' conceptions of science resulted from the development or articulation of two major sets of ideas (i) hermeneutics, and (ii) Marxism and Feminism. The accomplishment of dialogical processes of understanding was considered to be essentially reliant on prejudicial pre-determined value-judgments that are known and acknowledged in hermeneutics. Ideas of Marxism and Feminism strengthened contributors to argue that ideology, denial of objectivity's histories, commitments and embeddedness in particular social institutions are central to claims of its existence. The works and arguments of three human geographers - Jurgens Habermas (1987a)[1968], Derek Gregory (1978a) and David Harvey (1974b) have been drawn to illustrate this development. For Habermas, knowledge and human interests have always been inextricably linked in ways indicating the necessity of such connection.

Representing the perspective of critical human geographies, Gregory argues that an ideology critiques required for understanding and exposing underlying actors, interests, and consequences of claims to objectivity. For Harvey (1974b), the consequence of human geographers' shift towards analyses of the role of human agency, institutions and the determination of the worlds that could be created and social interests led to abandonment of a transcendental or "god's eye view" of objectivity. The 1990s saw the documentation of the advent of critical human geographies that capture the opposition to "grand narratives", the advocacy for more flexible geographies in terms of tolerance of less stringent conditions earlier adopted for fulfilling the requirements of objectivist science. This period was associated with experimentation and production of human geographic literature that allowed openness, movement away from objectivist scientific knowledge and methods that centre on them towards increasing flexibility and tolerance of academic projects that bother less about falsification and fallibility (Gregory et al., 2009).

3.3. The State/Sovereign, public policy/administration, social researchers, lawyers and roles

To achieve the objectives of this paper, the Sovereign/State's invention together with their corresponding public policy/administration needs brief retelling as a way of clarifying various or divergent roles expected and played by social researchers and lawyers. It was to reverse human adversities characterizing the "State of Nature" (shortness, brutishness, nastiness, and solitude of life) that the State (Sovereign) was created due largely to the academic influences of erudite scholars of the 17th century. The prolific writings of the philosopher, Thomas Hobbes' lifetime, especially those he undertook between 1640 and the mid 1650s shaped the course of development of the sovereign as well as the human and civil rights of citizens, forming the state (Hobbes, 1640-54; Wikipedia, 2014). The State was to be an entity for accumulating and applying powers hitherto held by individuals and used in the fashion of "might is right" in the "State of Nature" in the State that better life was expected to be achieved in the society run by the law. For relinquishing part of their individually held powers to the Sovereign, individuals who contributed their powers were to be rewarded through

valuable “public goods” shared while also sharing “public bads”, all by means of the law, as one of many institutions fabricated and managed by the State.

Let us list specific examples, the State is expected to provide “public goods/services” such as security through armed forces, police, among other related apparatuses; provide opportunities for enabling individuals to achieve their full potentialities through education, health-care, prestige, self-esteem, and so forth Hobbes (1640). The works of Thomas Hobbes in the 17th century contributed immensely towards creating the new world of sovereignty that has been transformed into what presently obtains. This applies also to other aspects such as rights and social contract theory. In his words, Hobbes proposed that peace was attainable when “a multitude of men, united as one person by a common power” agreed to enter into covenant such that their individual power was transferred to the ‘body politic’ by relinquishing some of their rights to a sovereign. Examples of this are the right to wage war or take a person’s life (Hobbes, 1640-1654).

3.4. Institutions as means of dispensing “public goods” and sharing “public bads”

Having been invented, the State has had to create various institutions for purposes of administering to the needs/wants of society’s members. Legal institutions, like those responsible for managing “public goods/services” and distribution of development costs “public bads” such as nuclear wastes in the USA or petroleum oil-related environmental degradation in Nigeria’s Niger Delta, had to be established. Public administration, the equivalent of management in the private sector, aims to fulfill the State’s responsibilities to its citizens must be based on sound planning, implementation, monitoring, re-planning, evaluation. For all these processes (planning, implementation, monitoring, re-planning, evaluation) to be effective, evidence is crucial. The most appropriate evidence is information, from which knowledge and understanding for the refining of the same could be created or derived (Max-Neef, 2009).

3.5. Roles and expectations of a lawyer versus social researcher

Lawyers’ involvement in social matters, frequently life-threatening cases

An embattled individual, who has been arrested for murdering another person, hopes to get legal reprieve through lawyers’ services. The latter includes arguments and persuasion of the judge(s) presiding over the case (with authority to rule) that the crime of murder was circumstantial and has to be considered based on the understanding of such circumstances. Should the lawyers’ argument and appeals fail, s/he resorts to please for leniency, the use of greater words of persuasion such as those of the greatest writers in the mould of William Shakespeare. One succinct example is when one of Shakespeare characters wrote that: “(T)he quality of mercy is not strain; it dropeth”, and other kinds of such statements capable of eliciting sympathy. The embattled accused arraigned in court could be facing maximum punishment, a life threatening sentence for which only a lawyer or attorney is licensed by modern society to intervene and contribute solutions to challenges.

Finally, we must point out that both law (comprising soliciting for persons who have violated the law and adjudication i.e. determination or ruling by judges) and

social research are parts of the apparatuses of government. However, while the judiciary is responsible for balancing the other branches of government (the executive and legislature) in federal government systems run by many countries (e.g. USA, Germany, Canada, Switzerland, Nigeria, to name only but a few), the executive and legislature are responsible for public policy formulation management –including implementation and oversight of same. Social research is geared towards strengthening and facilitating public policy/administration by providing required information, knowledge and understanding of issues involved in public welfare improvement. Law comprises specializations in adjudication and solicitation aimed towards balancing opportunities available to persons bound by the law of the society to be prosecuted and be simultaneously defended or protected from unfair treatment as frequently life or death might be at issue when the Court sits over determination of matters. It is appropriate to resolve one matter in this article's title. Does lawyers' practice or approach constitute subjectivity or lack of objectivity? Put differently, are lawyers less objective compared to social researchers?

3.6. Law practice and objectivity

An assessment of the extent of observance of objectivity in law practice ought to depend on the choice of one of three perspectives reviewed earlier. The latter suggests that the variation in the conception of objectivity by either academic discipline, or groups of disciplines such as the social sciences and the humanities is warranted by their different conceptions of the term (objectivity). Therefore, we are instructed that the greater involvement of lawyers in matters they have to deal with is rationalized by their philosophers by the specific and peculiar nature(s) of the matters they process in the Courts. This is what determines what becomes considered as the most suitable forms or approaches for gathering evidence and presentation methods for the information generated and managed. It is also expected that judges mediate and moderate undue involvement in matters. It is apposite to return to social public policy.

3.7. Mediation of lawyers' involvement by other law enforcement and judicial representatives: alternate objectivity

What could lead to lawyers' bias due to their involvement in the cases they solicit and advocate for is mediated by the simultaneous participation of other functionaries of the legal system. The latter refers to the various functionaries of the judiciary (courts) including judges, magistrates, among other cadres of functionaries in the legal institutions/systems; the Police –engaged in facilitating prosecution for (and in the interest of the public (administration)). It is at this point of the spectrum of public administration, when public prosecution begins to appear to be over zealous about enforcing justice to protect members of the public from violators of the law (say a person accused of committing a heinous crime that public prosecutors would suggest s/he be put away from the public realm) that the lawyers involvement becomes a necessary effort to save such a person from 'injustice' by the same public. It suffices to note that lawyers neither act nor work alone; their actions –including those perceived as appearing to betray their social involvement with their clients, are subject to

mediation by other actors of the judiciary. This point represents a way of underlining the form of objectivity that differs from the variety employed by social researchers.

3.8. Objectivity, statistics, evidence, and public policy/administration

We shall begin this discussion of objectivity by foregrounding same with the consideration of science and the role played by science in promoting objectivity. This digression is justifiable by the fact or belief that while what is known as social research is considered to be concerned with society, for findings of studies (research) of the latter to be viewed as reliable, they must be based on science. At this juncture, we must explain what science is and is not before continuing.

Statistics, census and objectivity

The employment of census for producing statistics (derived from *statis* – a Greek term meaning State, and descriptions of its aspects. Proceeding from these, data, information, knowledge and understanding of manifold facets of the State or public structures, processes, institutions and attitudes are usually gathered, processed and managed for systematically conducting affairs of the State as it goes about carrying out its functions on behalf of its members or persons to whom it is indebted. Without accurate data/information on manifold aspects of the public sector, any administration is doomed to fail. In the same way, without employing objectivity (contrasted to subjectivity) for conducting social research, contributions by practitioners claiming to be serving solutions to public policy/administration would be applying a dis-service to society because their contributions would always be noxious to the latter.

Subjective “Planning without facts: ...”; in Nigeria

The failure of public policy and development administration in Nigeria as a consequence of subjectivity in social research is actually acknowledged and documented. This point was identified early in Nigeria’s post-independent development planning and mis-management.

One of the most notable documentations of this terrible habit was the book by that title published by an eminent economist, Wolfgang Stolper (1968). Apart from this commentary concerning the wide gamut of national development (mis)management of Nigeria’s economy shortly after independence attained on 1st October, 1960, the economist, Stolper on invitation to the “National Conference on Reconstruction and Development...” of the late 1960s, warned Nigeria’s economic managers on the existing failure of public policy to respond to educational planning/administration when he lamented why employment was not being provided for graduates of educational programmes at various levels yet plans (programmes and projects) for educating/graduating more Nigeria’s were progressing apace.

For over 50 years in post-independent Nigeria, most of social research has tended to tilt towards subjectivity contrasted to objectivity. Evidence for substantiating the foregoing historical challenge can easily be cited. Accumulation of subjective social research by official social researchers and their public sector managers (and planners) must be held accountable for the recent and current worsening of

unemployment situation in Nigeria. By late 2000s, most of Nigeria's Ministers, heads of Departments and Agencies, acknowledged that some 40 million youth were unemployed. One of Nigeria's Agencies heads, Chukwuma Charles Soludo, then transiting from Chairman of the National Planning Commission to Governor of the Central Bank of Nigeria, stated that most (over 70%) of the unemployed Nigerian youth were "unemployable" (Nigerian Tribune, 2007).

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We conclude that variation in the roles, responsibilities and expectations of society from the social researcher and the lawyer can be explained by pluralism theory. Specifically, social research must be objective in order for public policy/administration to be conducted cost-effectively in terms of fulfilling the responsibility of the State for providing members of society with "public goods/services" as well as sharing "public bads" or costs of development as dictated by the compact between the Sovereign and individuals, who forfeit part of their rights by contributing same to enrich the State to service its members

Notes:

1. In law, building of evidence or facts through cross-examination of witnesses, placing persons connected to a matter brought before a Court of competent jurisdiction is practiced in some law or legal traditions e.g. United Kingdom. However, how such evidences are accepted is guided by codes, principles that are determined and applied through exercise of authority by presiding judges or juries.

2. A list of Hobbes' works -including explanatory notes on same as captured by contributed by persons through the free encyclopaedia, Wikipedia (2014) is included in the references.

Acknowledgment

The authors gratefully acknowledges financial support for the research project on multidisciplinary social research from the Centre for Research and Action on Developing Locales, Regions and the Environment (CRADLE) –an non-granting sustainable development think-tank - from which this article was prepared. Thanks are due for Dr. J. Ellah, a fellow and faculty member in research methodology at the Emerald Energy Institute, University of Port Harcourt, for inspiring this research. The authors take responsibility for others challenges and claims.

REFERENCES

ABOYADE O. (1971), *The Development Process* in Ayida, A.A. and Onitiri, H. M. A. (Eds.), *Reconstruction and Development in Nigeria* (Proceedings of a National Conference), Ibadan, Oxford University Press, p. 34-37

ALLISON L. (2005), *Pluralism* in Iain McLean and Alistair McMillan (eds.), Oxford

- BIDWAI P. (2009), *The convergence of fundamentalism and new political Closures-What Next in the struggle for pluralism?*, What next II: the case for pluralism, Development dialogue, No. 2, August
- BULPIT J. (2003), *Thatcherism*, in: Iain McLean and Alistair McMillan (eds.), Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics, University Press, Oxford, 534-536
- CALLAWAY A. (1966), *Education and the Rise of Youth Unemployment*, in P.C. Lloyd, A.L. Mabogunje, and B. Awe (eds.), The City of Ibadan, University Press, Cambridge
- DAHL R. (1963), *Who Governs?*, New Haven, Yale University Press
- FEYERABEND P.K. (1988), *Against Method*, London, Verso
- FURNIVAL J.S. (1948), *Colonial Policy and Practice*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- GALLIE W.B. (1964), *Essentially contested concepts*, in W.B Gallie, Philosophy and the historical understanding. London, L Chatto and Windus
- GREGORY D., JOHNSON R., PRATT G., WATTS M., WHATMORE S. (2009), *The Dictionary of Human Geography*, Chicester, Wiley-Blackwell
- GREGORY D. (1978), *Ideology, science and human geography*, Hutchinson, London
- HABERMAS J. (1987), *Knowledge and human interests*, Polity Press, Cambridge, UK
- HARAWAY D. (1985), *A manifesto for cyborgs: science, technology, and social feminism in the 1980s*, Socialist Review, 80, 65-107
- HARVEY D. (1979), *Social Justice and the City*, Arnold, London
- HARVEY D. (1974), *What kind of geography for what kind of public policy?* Transactions of the British Institute of Geographers, 63, 18-24
- HOBBS T. (1640), *Elements of Law, Natural and Politic* (circulated only in handwritten copies, first printed edition, without Hobbes's permission in 1650).
- HOBBS T. (1641), *Objectiones ad Cartesii Meditationes de Prima Philosophia* (Third series of Objections).
- HOBBS T. (1642), *De Cive* (Latin first limited edition).
- HOBBS T. (1643), *De Motu, Loco et Tempore* (first edition 1973 with the title: Thomas White's De Mundo Examined)
- HOBBS T. (1644), *Part of the Praefatio to Mersenni Ballistica* (in F. Marini Mersenni minimi Cogitata physico-mathematica. In quibus tam naturae quàm artis effectus admirandi certissimis demonstrationibus explicantur)
- HOBBS T. (1644), *Opticae, liber septimus*, (written in 1640) in *Universae geometriae mixtaeque mathematicae synopsis*, edited by Marin Mersenne (reprinted by Molesworth in OL V pp. 215–248 by the title *Tractatus Opticus*)
- HOBBS T. (1646), *A Minute or First Draught of the Optiques* (Harley MS 3360; Molesworth published only the dedication to Cavendish and the conclusion in EW VII), p. 467–471)
- HOBBS T. (1646), *Of Liberty and Necessity* (published without the permission of Hobbes in 1654)
- HOBBS T. (1647), *Elementorum Philosophiae Sectio Tertia De Cive* (second expanded edition with a new Preface to the Reader)
- HOBBS T. (1650), *Answer to Sir William Davenant's Preface before Gondibert*
- HOBBS T. (1650), *Human Nature or The fundamental Elements of Policie* (first thirteen chapters of *The Elements of Law, Natural and Politic*, published without Hobbes's authorization)

HOBBS T. (1650), *Pirated Edition of The Elements of Law, Natural and Politic*, repackaged to include two (of the following) parts:

HOBBS T. (1650a), *Human Nature, or the Fundamental Elements of Politic* (chapters 14–19 of Part One of the Elements of 1640)

HOBBS T. (1650b), *De Corpore Politico* (Part Two of the Elements of 1640)

HOBBS T. (1651), *Philosophical Rudiments concerning Government and Society* (English translation of De Cive)

HOBBS T. (1651), *Leviathan, or the Matter, Forme, and Power of a Commonwealth, Ecclesiasticall and Civil*

HOBBS T. (1654), *Of Libertie and Necessitie, a Treatise*

HOBBS T. (1968), [1651], *Leviathan*, Edit. CB Macpherson, London, Penguin

IGWE O. (2005), *Politics and Globe Dictionary*, Aba, Eagle Publishers

INGWE R. (2013a), *Urbanisation, urban environmental quality, national socio-economic conditions and diseases burden in Africa: an agenda for analysing sub-regional characteristics*, Journal for Geography, University of Maribor, 8-2, 19-34

INGWE R. (2013b), *Elitist legislators' equivocation on "transparency, credibility and accountability" of Nigeria's Central Bank, neoliberal-capitalist contradiction and sustainable development*, Annals of the University of Craiova. Geography Series, 131-157

INGWE R., MBOTO W., UGWU U. (2012), *Trans-national crime, human rights violation and human trafficking in Nigeria's oil-rich Niger Delta*, Romanian Journal of Society and Politics, No. 3, December, 65-94

INGWE R. (2012b), *Federal government transformation of Hausa-Fulani Almajiri education and Islamic sectarian (Boko Haram)'s terrorism in northern Nigeria: neoliberalistic hegemonisation of Nigeria's multi-cultural nationalities* (Unpublished paper, CRADLE, Calabar)

INGWE R., INYANG B., ERING S., ADALIKWU R. (2009), *Sustainable energy implementation in urban Nigeria*, Management Research and Practice, Vol. 1, No. 1, December, 39-57

INGWE R. (2009), *Characterising national development at the dawn of Post-Neoliberalism: An analysis of the legacies of the Washington Consensus in Nigeria* (Unpublished paper, CRADLE, Calabar)

INGWE R., OKORO J., UKWAYI JK. (2010), *The new scramble for Africa: How buying of large parcels of land in sub-Saharan Africa threatens sustainable development in the region*, Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa, JSDA, Nr. A.

INGWE R., BESSONG PK., UWANADE C. (2013), *Risks and disasters in Nigeria's petrocapiatistic oil and gas industry: a pluralistic theoretical-conceptual framework*, Riscuri și Catastrofe, Vol. 2

INGWE R., IKEJI CC., OJONG FE. (2010), *Neoliberal globalization, financial and economic crises and sustainable development in Africa*, ICFAI University Journal of Governance and Public Policy, Vol. 5, Issue 4, Hyderabad, 31-62.

INGWE R. (2013a), *Tourism and sustainable development in the context of Nigeria's neoliberal-capitalist notoriety: issues in Cross River State's budding tourism sector development* (Unpublished paper on file at CRADLE)

INGWE R. (2013b), *Road infrastructure development in Nigeria: comparing scenarios in Nigeria's six geopolitical zones with reference to the South-South zone* (Research article under processing by International J of Infrastructure Studies)

INGWE R. (2013c), *Nigeria's preferred tourism destination (Cross River State), 2000s-2010s: neoliberalising violence or good governance in sub-national regional development planning/management?* (Unpublished paper on file at CRADLE)

- LAZARSELD P.F., BERELSON B., GAUDET H. (1988), *The People's Choice: How the Voter makes up His Mind in the Presidential Campaign*, New York, Columbia (Originally published as: Lazarsfeld, Paul F and Katz, Elihu. 1944 [1955]. *Personal Influence: The Part Played by People in the Flow of Mass Communication*, Glencoe, Ill, Free Press)
- PARSONS T. (1951), *The Social System*, New York, The Free Press
- MAX-NEEF M.A. (2009), *From knowledge to understanding-Navigations and Returns*, in Niclas Hallstroem (eds.) what next vol. II: The case for pluralism, development dialogue, Nr. 52, 15-22
- OKORO J., INGWE R., OJONG M.O. (2011), *Diplomacy in China-Nigeria politico-economic relations*, Romanian Journal of Society and Politics, December
- PARSONS T., SHILLS E. (1951), *Towards a General Theory of Action*, Cambridge, Mass., Havard University Press
- PARSONS, T. (1966), *Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall
- PARSONS T. (1971), *The System of Modern Societies*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall
- PICLES J. (2009), *Objectivity*, in Gregory et al. (2009), *The Dictionary of Human Geography*, Chicester, Wiley-Blackwell, 507
- SCOTT J., MARSHALL G. (2005), *Oxford Dictionary of Sociology*, Oxford, University Press, 405
- SMITH M.G., KUPER L. (eds.), (1969), *Pluralism in Africa*, Berkeley, University of California Press
- STOLPER W.F. (1971), *The Development Process*, A.A. Ayida and H.M.A. Onitiri (eds.), *Reconstruction and Development in Nigeria (Proceedings of a National Conference)*, Ibadan, Oxford University Press, 72-80
- NIGERIAN TRIBUNE (2007), *40 million Nigerian youths unemployed – FG – Plans Summit on youth unemployment – 80% Nigerian graduates unemployable – Education Minister*, in: Nigerian Tribune (Abuja/Lagos), 25 February 2009 (correspondent reports by S.E. Fagbemi and C. Idoko), 20