

BUREAUCRATIC CORRUPTION AND PRACTICE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN NIGERIA

R. N. Nwankwo

Department of Public Administration

Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam Campus, Abuja, Nigeria

M. O. Ananti

Department of Public Administration

Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam Campus, Abuja, Nigeria

M. H. C. Madubueze 

Department of Public Administration

Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam Campus, Abuja, Nigeria

mcmadubueze@gmail.com

Abstract

The role of the public bureaucracy in fostering a perfect and efficient administrative system in a country cannot be under estimated. In Nigeria, performance of public bureaucracy has come under severe criticisms and questionings within the context of the gap that exists between its anticipated role and its actual output. The failure of public bureaucracy to deliver the expected output to the society informed the series of reforms that have come to form the policy thrust of successive Nigerian governments since the 1980's. Suffice it to say therefore, that the aftermath of such reforms has been on the need to have efficient and responsive public service that has the capacity to meet the challenges posed by the domestic and internal environments. The efforts of the Nigerian government have not yielded the much expected results due to the problem of corruption that has eaten deep into the fabrics of the Nigerian society. The paper therefore examined the causes of the upsurge of corruption in public administration in Nigeria. We argued that government should strengthen her political will to deal with the issue of bureaucratic corruption as it was seen that there was nothing wrong with the Nigerian system.

Keywords: Bureaucracy, Bureaucratic Corruption, Public Administration

INTRODUCTION

The role of the public bureaucracy in fostering a perfect and efficient administrative system in a country cannot be underestimated. This can be seen from the vital role it plays in the formulation and implementation of policies designed for the development of such country.

In Nigeria, the performance of the public bureaucracy has come under severe criticisms and questionings within the context of the gap that exists between its anticipated role and its actual output. The failure of the public bureaucracy to deliver the expected output to the society informed the series of reforms that have come to form the policy thrust of successive Nigerian governments since 1980's (Gbenga, 2006). Suffice it to say therefore, that the aftermath of such reforms has been on the need to have efficient and responsive public service that has the capacity to meet the challenges posed by the domestic and internal environments. The efforts of the Nigerian government have not yielded the much expected results due to the problem of corruption that has eaten deep into the fabrics of the Nigerian society-the public bureaucracy not spared.

Nigeria presents a typical case of a country whose development has been undermined and retarded by the menace of corrupt practices (Gbenga & Ariyo, 2006). Undoubtedly, corruption has permeated the Nigeria's society. In the words of Achebe (1988), "anyone who can say that corruption in Nigeria has not yet become alarming is either a fool, a crook or else does not live in this country". Achebe's observation underscores the level of corruption in the Nigerian society. The prevalence of these activities in the various aspects of our administrative activities have a tremendous adverse effect on the quality of life in Nigeria.

Urien (2002), noted that the allegation and charges of corruption now play a more central role in our bureaucratic system than at any other. He added that corruption has fallen the careers of world renowned public figures, and reputations of well-respected organization and business firms tarnished on account of it. More annoyingly is the fact that in a survey conducted by Gray & Kaufman (1998), they sampled 150 high level officials from 60 third world countries, the respondents rated corruption, especially as it concerns the public bureaucracy as the most severe obstacle confronting their development process.

Therefore, this paper examines bureaucratic corruption and its effects on the practice of public administration in Nigeria. In discussing these, this paper is divided into three sections. The first section focuses on conceptual definitions of concepts of Bureaucracy, Corruption, Bureaucratic Corruption and the Nigerian State. The second section centered on the Causes of Bureaucratic Corruption and its attendant effects on the Public Administration in Nigeria. The third section focused on recommendation and conclusion.

Conceptual Definitions

Bureaucracy

The concept of bureaucracy has been subjected to repeated criticisms among scholars and ordinary citizens alike. The concept has been used as a synonym for inefficiency, red-tapism, stupidity, secrecy, smugness, aggressiveness and self-interest (Stillman, 1980) in Akindele (2002).

Notwithstanding the above, Akindele (2002), observed that the concept is an ambiguous term which can be taken to mean different things. For example, it may be taken to mean different organizations used by modern government for the conduct of its various specialized functions, embodied in the administrative system and personified more specifically by the civil services. He added that it might also mean a mechanistic and formal approach in carrying out functions to the point of indifference towards the effects achieved.

Also, Gerths & Wrights (1979), conceptualized bureaucracy as: a hierarchical management within organization based upon a line of authority and a division of work predicated upon this arrangement.

To Gbenga & Lawal (2006), described the concept to denote the apparatus consisting of professionals, full time officials subject to hierarchical supervision and carrying out their functions in a well ordered way based on rules, regulations and orders coming from above. The bureaucrats are therefore seen as actions within the form and content of bureaucratic system. Anazodo (2004) noted that in the words of Webber, the father of bureaucracy, that bureaucracy is especially important because they allow large organization to perform the many routine activities necessary for their survival. Scholars have explained the concepts through its characteristics, function and criticisms with which we now turn to.

Characteristics of Bureaucracy

According to Weber (Stillman, 1980), the Characteristics of Bureaucracy are explainable as follows:

- There is the principle of fixed and official jurisdictional areas, which are generally ordered by rules, that is by laws of administrative regulations.
- The principle of office hierarchy and of levels of gradual authority mean a firmly ordered system of super and subordinations in which there is a supervision of the lower offices by the higher ones.
- The management of the modern office is based upon written documents (? the files?), which are preserved in their original or draft form.

- When the office is fully developed, official activity demands the full working capacity of the official, irrespective of the fact that his obligatory time in the bureau may be firmly delineated.
- The management of the office follows general rules, which are more or less stable, more or less exhaustive, and which can be learned.

Akindede (1982), opines that the central characteristics of bureaucracy has long been idealized by Weber and clearly deciphered them as; hierarchy of authority, -officialdom, - division of labour, - impartiality,-rules,-technical expertise and procedures. In the same way Anazodo, Okoye & Abba (2004) however, listed the Characteristics of Bureaucracy to include:

- Rules
- Division of labour
- Authority structure
- Lifelong career commitment.
- Rationality

They explained that these issues help the individual unit of the organizations to achieve their goals, hence that is done; the organization reaches their overall goals. Obi & Obikeze (2004), also highlighted these characteristics to include;-Hierarchy,-the frameworks of law,-technical specialization - search for rationality, and -value system.

Following the above therefore, it is worthwhile to argue that all of these characteristics were and have since been assumed to be indispensable to the efficiency, effectiveness, impersonality and responsiveness of any organization in the pursuit of its goals. In the contentions of Weber, bureaucracy is inevitable if the efficiency and effectiveness of organization are to be realized. This notion justifies why Sayre (1979), once argued that for any civil service to worth its name in terms bureaucratization that it has to;

- Eliminate patronage from its management of civil service matters.
- Guarantee equal treatment to all applicants for employment and among all public employees.
- Adopt the logic scientific-management in the performance of its duties.
- Foster the attainment of merit, efficiency, morality, impersonality, politics-administration dichotomy, protection of the employees from politically moderated retributions.

Functions of Bureaucracy

Scholars such as Anazodo, Okoye & Abba (2004), and Obi & Obikeze (2004), have come to agree notwithstanding areas of dissimilarities that the basic functions of the bureaucracy in any bureaucratic set-up could be itemized as follows;

- Implementing social change
- Recommending policy
- Framing legislation
- Influencing the legislative
- Consuming survival and growth
- Weighing competing interests
- Implementing legislation
- Balancing professional and ethical considerations

These to them, are what would surely keep the survival of any organization which wishes to thrive in its endeavors.

Criticisms of Bureaucracy

Kenneth Boulding in his book *“The Organization Revolution”* expressed concern over growing role of organization in modern societies. He claimed that such ethncal values as love, freedom, justice, laws etc. tended to run at across purposes with and thus loose over to such organizational features as power, impersonality etc.

William Whyte in his *“Organizational Man”* denounced in detail the debasing and dehumanizing effects of the organization. Obi (ibid) added that bureaucracy does not provide for rapid and unplanned changes. It thrives best under stable routine conditions. Conditions of turbulence, adjustment or modification to organizational tasks and procedures are difficult if not impossible to effect.

However, we agree that there is no concept in the field of social sciences that doesn't have its weaknesses (bureaucracy inclusive) but we wish to borrow a leaf from the notion that says that *“though examination may not be the true test of knowledge, but remains the best if not the only way to test ones intelligence”*. By implication we mean that bureaucracy may not be the best way to ensure administrative efficiency and responsiveness but remains one of the best to make such aspiration of the government come true. The challenges that could impede the practice of bureaucratic principles in an administrative set-up are quite numerous which corruptions are at its fore-front and that brings us to the next concept.

Corruption, Bureaucratic Corruption and the Nigerian State

It is very simple to talk about corruption. It is a phenomenon that we experience in all facets of our livelihood but the big question is, what is corruption? Apparently, just like every other concept in the social sciences, it is very difficult to place hands on any universally acceptable definition of the concept. However, we shall explore some scholarly assertions on the concept.

Urien (2012) sees corruption as the intentional miss-performance or neglect of a recognized duty, or unwarranted exercise of power, with the motive of gaining some advantage more or less directly personal. Tanzi (1995) noted that corruption is the intentional non-compliance with the arm's-length principle aimed at deriving some advantage for one self or for related individuals from these behaviors.

The definitions above agree with the fact that corrupt practices have to do with the intentional awareness of the perpetrator. This explains the fact that the practice is not an involuntary action, the perpetrator according to the definition is very much aware of it. Also Gray & Kaufman (1998) defined acts of corruption to include bribery and extortion, which necessarily involves at least two parties and other malfeasances that a public official can carry out along including fraud and embezzlement. Lipset & Lenz (2000) sees it as an effort to secure wealth or power through illegal means or private gain at public expense.

The above scholars noted that corruption mostly takes place in a public establishment (i.e. government owned). To support this notion, a Nobel Prize laureate Gerry Becker stated that if "we abolish the state, we abolish corruption".

Khan (1996), sees it as act which deviates from the formal rules of conduct governing the actions of someone in a position of public authority because of private-regarding motive such as wealth, power or status. Otite (2000), while attempting to define corruption, states that "corruption is the perversion of integrity or state of affairs through bribery, favour or moral depravity".

A pensive examination of the Otite's assertion reveals that corruption transcends bribery but includes "treasury looting and also the deliberate bending of rules of the rules of the system to favour friends or hurt foes. It is clearly an evident of absence of accountability, law and order. Kalu & Yemi (1999) asserted that corruption refers to the conscious and well planned act by a person or group of persons to appropriate by unlawful means the wealth of another person. The view is not dissimilar with the overall views on the concept. But the pertinent issue therefore, is what bureaucratic corruption is?

Gbega (2006) linked the concept of bureaucratic corruption with the illegal activities of bureaucrats. He added that, traditionally, the concept is used to denote the practices of buying favour from bureaucrats who formulate and implement government economic and political policies. The concept however, transcends the buying of favour, it refers to the violation of public duty by bureaucrats or public officials. Bureaucratic corruption as we have conceived can simply be seen as a conscious practice by the bureaucrats that transcends to a deliberate deviation from an original norm of an organization for material or non-material, financial or non-financial selfish purposes.

Scholars are of the view that the pervasiveness of bureaucratic corruption would be explained within the nature and character of the government itself. They argued that bureaucratic corruption grows as its government grows and as such becomes dehumanized and consequently cultivated into the culture of governance if not properly checked.

Viewing the pattern of governance of the Nigerian State since the attainment of independence in 1960, one can rightly say that corruption has been the bane of Nigerian public administration. By way of illustration, the cry against corrupt practices in Nigeria became disturbing under the Gowon administration as a result of the alarming rate of different forms of scandals resulting from the importation and exportation of goods particularly in relation to port congestion. Assessing the Gowon administration, The Nigerian Tribune asserted inter alia:

Gowon's regime was unashamedly corrupt to the macro. Everyone knew it. They did not hide it from public gaze. His pledge to enact an anticorruption decree like other promises was never fulfilled. And when an attempt was made to expose these evils, he suppressed the attempts with the very weight of his high office. (Nigerian Tribune August 1 1975)

The level of corruption under the Gowon's regime came under public scrutiny when Muritala Mohammed became the Head of State and set up Assets Investigation panel to probe the Governors that served under Gowon.

The panel indicted ten (10) of the twelve (12) governors and subsequently had their assets confiscated. The total value of assets confiscated from the governor was over ₦10 million in 1976.

The anticorruption crusade of Muritala also spread to the entire public service. The purge of the public service led to the retirement/dismissal of over 10,000 public servants nationwide. One would have expected that going by the efforts and energy dissipated on the cause to address corruption under the Murtala administration and ignominious ways the indicted governors that served under Gowon were treated, the politicians of the second republic would distance themselves from corrupt practices but the reverse was the case.

The politicians of the second Republic engaged in different corrupt practices of different shades. The era was marked by gross abuse of power by virtually all public officers – career and political officeholders. The political office holders used their offices to siphon and misappropriate public fund. Lamenting the scourge of corruption in the second Republic Maduagwu (1995), asserts that: *Ministers, Governors, party officials, supporters of all the political parties, business associates, all rallied round to share the booty. Shagari's NPN ruling party, having more access to the national resources, excelled of course, in this rape of public wealth. But the other four parties were also involved in the scramble for the national cake. The parties made sure that in the states where they were in charge public funds were diverted to the*

parties and private accounts as subsequently revealed by panels of enquires after the overthrow of the politicians.

The level of corruption under the Shagari's administration got to an alarming rate that the administration could not just wait but created the Ministry of National Guidance to carry out ethical revolution.

The military government led by Major – General Muhammed Buhari which succeeded the Shagari's administration was determined to wipe out corruption from Nigeria through the War against Indiscipline crusade. Various Tribunals both at the Federal and state levels were set up to probe the political actors of the second Republic. The Paul Omu led Tribunal found most of the politicians guilty and sentenced them to jail of various terms.

The Babangida administration that terminated the Buhari's administration via the palace coup of on August 27, 1985 it did not show any commitment to the anti – corruption drive of its predecessor rather launched the Nigerian society to eight years of kleptocratic rule characterised by corrupt practices of different shades. Maduagwu (1995), citing *The News* December 20, 1993 listed the following as some of the highlights of Babangida corrupt practices:

- \$ 2 billion Gulf war wind fall in 1991
- 30% of oil revenue diverted to frivolous uses throughout the time.
- Huge extra-budgetary spending: 1989 = = N=15.3b, 1990= N23.4b, 1991= N35b, 1992=N44.2b, 1993 (by August) = N59billion.
- \$200 million siphoned from the Aluminum Smelter project.
- N= 400million wasted on Better life project
- Colossal Corruption at the NNPC, e.g. \$101 million for the purchase of strategic Storage facilitation.

The Okigbo panel set up by the Abacha led administration to look into the Babangida administration indicted General Babangida and the Governor of the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) of frivolous and clandestine spending.

The Abacha administration that took over from the interim National Government followed the pace set by the Babangida administration in looting the government treasury. A total sum of N63.25billion was said to have been recovered from the Abacha family. In fact up till now cases of money recovered from the Abacha's family and his cronies still occupy the headlines of many Nigerian newspapers.

The Abdusalam administration cannot be absolved from the mass looting of the public treasury. The Christopher Kolade panel set up to review contracts, licenses and appointment

made under the Abdusalam administration came out with shocking revelation. The panel found beyond imaginable proportions that, though Nigeria was already neck deep in corrupt practices, the Abdusalam administration made mockery of any sense of discipline and probity and at a scale that practically made saints of his predecessors.

The panel specifically in its final reports reviewed 4072 contracts 576 licenses, 807 appointments, and 768 awards and 111 approved, made within five months. The panel submitted that the 4072 contracts cost Nigeria N635.62billion as against the N88billion budgeted for in 1998 budget, this representing a deficit of N551 billion. The panel also revealed the depletion of the foreign reserve which as at the end of 1998 stood at \$7.6billion but shrank to a \$3.8billion by May 1999 (The News 30 April 2000).

The various military administrators that served under Abdulsalam also did a lot of havoc to the states where they served. On assumption of office in May 1999, many state governors started lamenting the state of their treasury already looted by the military administrators. For instance James Ibori of Delta State claimed that he inherited a debt of N300million, Achike Udenwa of Imo State claimed he inherited a debt N10billion, Akume of Benue claimed he inherited N12million, Governor Osoba claimed that he inherited a debt of N687, 824, 729 salaries and allowance, N754, 187, 825.52 leave allowance, N26, 635.407, 71 pension, N7, 118.000.08 up paid gratuities N46, 826, 815.90. Governor Tinubu of Lagos State claimed that he inherited a total debt of N1billion from Governor Marwa. The list is inexustible.

The Obasanjo administration in 1999 which brought in the present democratic dispensation in spite of the anti-corruption crusade of the administration, cases of sharp corrupt practices involving key political officers were still proliferating. Cases of falsefication of age and academic records by Salisu Buhari and Ephraim Enwerem, contract scandal of Chuba Okadigbo, NEPA fund involving Bola Ige and Agugu, the privitisation fraud of NITEL and fraudulent scam from ministers to the National Assembly to increase budget figures as it were in the case of Fabian Osuji of the Education ministry to mention but a few, were all evidences of the presence of corruption in the dispensation. The effort of the administration to curb corrupt practices brought in the anti-graft agencies such as the EFCC in 2004 which was formed in 2003 and the ICPC in 2000 respectively.

The emergence of the Yar'dua's regime in 2007 goes with the popular saying in Igbo speaking parlance that says "...an Okro stem does not grow past its farmer..." and therefore, the regime could not do much to curb corruption. It kept on taken background instructions from her "godfather". This was purely manifested in the case of James Onanefe Ibori vs The Federal Government, where a trial judge in Nigeria freed him of corrupt practices only for a British judicial system to convict him of the same offence he was freed in Nigeria and he is currently

servicing his jail term. The James Ibori case, the Patricia Etteh case in 2007, the Dimeji Bankole saga in 2010 to mention but a few, were all corrupt offences of high magnitude yet nothing was heard or seen as its aftermath. Yusuf (2009), revealed the corrupt practices in the National Assembly and the President in the tabular representation below:

Table 1: Salaries and Allowances of Members of the National Assembly

Official	Annual Pay	Duty Tour	Estacode	Privilege	Other perks
Senate President	N2, 484,242	N37, 000 per day	\$1,300	8 vehicles with an ambulance	To be Provided
Deputy Senate President	N2,309,166	N32,000 per day	\$790	4 vehicles with pilot and protocol	To be Provided
Senator	N2,026,400	N32,000	\$600	Monetized	Monetized
Speaker, House of Reps	N2,477,100	N35,000	\$1000	7 Vehicles with Pilot and Protocol	To be Provided
Deputy Speaker	N2,287,034	N30,000	\$750	4 vehicles with Pilot and Protocol	To be Provided
Member, House of Reps	N1,985,212	N21,000	\$550	Monetized	Monetized

Source: Yusuf, 2009

Table 2: Salaries and allowances of the President and other key members of the Executive

Description	President	Vice President	Minister, Sec. to the Fed. Gov. etc.
Basic Salary	N3,515,705	N3,031,572	N2,026,400
Furniture	To be Provided	To be Provided	N6,000,000
Vehicle Loan	To be Provided	To be Provided	N8.100,000
Duty Tour	To be Provided	To be Provided	N35,000 per day
Estacode	To be Provided	To be Provided	\$1000 per day
Severance Gratuity	N10,500,000	300% of Basic Salary	N6,070,000
Hardship Allowance	N1.700,000	50% of basic salary	Not applicable
Accomodaton	To be Provided	To be Provided	N4,000,000
Entertainment	To be Provided	To be Provided	N911,880
Leave Allowance	N351, 470	N351, 470	N202,640
Newspapers	To be Provided	To be Provided	N303,960
Personal Assitant	To be Provided	To be Provided	N489,395
Domestic Staff	To be Provided	To be Provided	N1.400,000
Constituency	N8,700,000	N8,700,000	Not Applicable

Source: Yusuf, 2009

The tables above gave credits to the statement made by an eminent scholar Prof. Itse Sagay (SAN) that “the Nigerian National Assembly are the highest paid legislators in the world”.

The just concluded administration of Dr. Goodluck Jonathan, still had nothing to prove that corruption was reduced to its barest minimum just as it was said that “a dog does not eat a bone hanged on her own neck”. The administration cannot exempt itself from corruption. The Farouk Lawan vs Otedola sagas, the fuel subsidy scam, the police pension scam to be mention but a few, are all indications that the administration was not different from its previous regimes.

However, there appears to be unquantifiable views about the types or forms of corruption. From the available literature, researchers have made numerous commentaries on this. We shall, therefore, consider a brief look at identifying types and forms of corruption.

Types of Corruption

Some researchers have taken broader perception of corruption by dividing it into different types with which we shall consider below:

Bureaucratic Corruption

This occurs in the public administration or the implementation end of policies and programmes of government. It is the kind of corruption the citizen encounter daily at places like the hospitals, schools, local licensing office, police, the various ministries etc. (Victor, 2008).

Political Corruption

This takes place at the highest level of political authority; it is a “corruption of greed”. It affects the manner in which decision are made, manipulates and distorts political institutions and rules of procedures. The Encyclopedia Americana, (1999) describes it as an act that takes place when policy formulation and legislation is tailored to benefit politicians and legislators.

Other forms of corruption may include:

Bribery

The payment in money or kind that is taken or given in a corrupt relationship these includes kickbacks, pay-off, sweeteners, greasing palms etc.

Fraud

It involves some kind of trickery, swindle and deceit, counterfeiting, racketing and forgery.

Embezzlement

This is theft of public resources by public officials. It is when a State official steals from the public institution which she is meant to take care of.

Extortion

This is money and other resources extracted by the use of coercion, violence or threats to use force. The police and custom officers are the main culprits in Nigeria.

Favoritism

This is a mechanism of power abuse implying a highly biased distribution of State resources. However, this is seen as a natural human proclivity to favor friends, family and anybody close and trusted.

Nepotism

This is a special form of favoritism in which an office holder prefers his/her kinfolk and family members. It occurs when one is exempted from the application of certain laws or regulations or given undue preference in the allocation of scarce resources.

The Causes of Bureaucratic Corruption

The reasons people engage themselves in bureaucratic corruption are myriads. Researchers have attributed this causes/reason to so many things. We shall have a cursory consideration of the following ideas.

Tanzi (1998), identified regulations and authorization as a major cause of bureaucratic corruption; in many developing countries (Nigeria inclusive), the role of the state is often carried out through the use of numerous rules or regulations. Tanzi, explained that, in these countries', license, permits, and authorization of various kinds are required to engage in many activities. The existence of regulations and authorizations gives a kind of monopoly power to the officials who must authorize or inspect the activities. Tanzi, opined that, when the situation gets to this level, they can use their public power to extract bribes from those who need the authorization or permits. Agbo(2009), posit that there is the emergence of two broad social classes within the same state, with one directly involved in the production of primary goods, while the other groups is engaged in the provision of secondary services. To this end, the decision-making authority is rested in the second group and they also become the rules. The authority itself becomes exploitative to the extent that members of this ruling class turn the coercive apparatus of the state to individual and group advantages by allocating more of the social wealth to its members. To this end, Atatlas (1990), attributed the causes of bureaucratic corruption to "statism". He noted that the development model adopted by the developing countries (including Nigeria) is a serious cause of the level of corrupt practices we found ourselves today. Statism as a model has to do with government ownership as well as control of the major productive sectors

of the economy. The outcome of it however, amounts to the numerous abuses that are common to many contemporary developing countries.

Lipset & Lenz (2000), observed that those going through corrupt means (through the back door, so to say), to achieve their objectives have little or no access to opportunity structure. This resentment to the economic opportunity could be as a result of their race, ethnicity, lack of skills and other human resources. They noted that, culture that stresses economic successes as an important goal and strongly restricts access to opportunities will have higher levels of corruption. This incidentally explains why the high incidence of corruption in Nigeria. Many Nigerians are highly achievement oriented, but they have relatively low access to economic opportunities. For instance, many civil and public servants work for months without getting paid as at when due. This action only encourages nothing but corrupt practices which consequently retards the growth of the entire economy. However, there are myriads of reasons why people do what they do such as; Poor reward system, Influence of extended family syndrome, Pressure to meet family obligations and Greed.

Effects of Bureaucratic Corruption on the Practice of Public Administration in Nigeria

Bureaucratic corruption has been identified as a systematic practice that engenders low level of transparency and accountability as the major source of development failures in Nigeria (National Planning Commission, 2005).

The above notion goes to simply indicate that the effects of corruption on the practice of public administration in Nigeria are enormous. Lipset & Lenz (2008), simply stated that a bureaucratic corrupt government would always shift government expenditure to areas where they can collect bribes. And this is exactly the case with Nigerian State.

When corruption permeates into bureaucracy, public administration crumbles in so many ways. Firstly, performance becomes an “eye-service” practice which would consequently bring about sub-optimization and reduces productivity. Secondly, it creates a feeling of frustration on the few incorruptible ones in the system, and low morale. Thirdly, it increases the cost of running of the government. This underscores the reason why Nigeria spends huge sums of money in her public service yet no meaningful result is anchored.

Bureaucratic corruption deepens poverty and makes it difficult for a smooth running of the system. This is because it undermines the original characteristics of transparency, accountability, impersonality etc. for which an administrator stands for. We would therefore subscribe that bureaucratic corruption would affect the practices of public administration in ways as listed by Gbenga (2006) as we explained, as follows:

Monopoly of Public Office

This has to do with the situation where some public officers see political offices as an everlasting position. This explains the reason we still have over aged public servants and political appointees in our governance nowadays.

Inefficient/Un-Transparent Contract Awards Standard

This is seen in the poor quality of public infrastructures been provided by our government. In fact, one can easily attribute any any structure put up by the government in the society as it is today as “*substandard*”. The simple reason is due to the upsurge of corruption. Contracts in Nigeria are either over funded to suit selfish gains or under-funded to punish any contractor who is antithetical to bribery or log rolling.

Inadequate Enforcement of Existing Laws

Because corruption has been allowed to be a usual thing our system, hence the government have lacks the political will to deal with the issue of corruption. People are now meant to face the law if only one do not have a political giant that will stand in for the person.

Nepotism and Tribalism

This involves situations where family affiliations and friendship are seen as the bases for a fare share of treatment in public places.

Reckless Expenditure

This simply involves the abysmal spending of government budgets by the political appointees.

Poor Remuneration

This happens when so much that is meant to be used for the remunerations of the civil servants has been used for other trivial things. The public officer resorts to under payment of his employees.

CONCLUSION

Without doubt, there is a nexus between the bureaucratic corruption and poor performance of the bureaucrat’s vis-à-vis the practice of public administration in Nigeria. Measures to improve administrative performance may prove-ineffective should corruption be permitted to run rampant. We therefore, urge the government to pay a serious attention to the ideas of scholars that have been proffered over time on how best bureaucratic corruption can be jettisoned. This

is because we have been able to discover that just like Achebe (1988) noted that there is nothing absolutely wrong with the “Nigerian system”. What we lack is the political will to say “NO” to the upsurge of corruption and fight it with all entire arsenals within our disposal. A well articulated laws and bills have been made. We can only but suggest for a sincere political will to follow it up.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Robert & Mc Namara, former presidents of the World Bank and Ford Motors corporation, have argued that for any campaign against corruption [be it bureaucratic or otherwise] to be successful in sub-Saharan Africa, certain characteristics should be common in the plans against corruption. They suggested that it;

- Requires direct, clear and forceful support of the highest political authority: The president.
- Introduce transparency and accountability in government functions, particularly in all financial transaction.
- Encourage a free press and electronic media to forcefully report to the public on corrupt practices in the society, via freedom of information act recently passed by the Nigerias National Assembly.
- The organize civil society to address the problems of corruption by the process of transparency
- Introduce into government watch-dog agencies- anti-corruption bureaus, inspectors general and auditors general who will identify corrupt practices and bring them to public attention.
- Minimize and simplify government regulations particularly those involving the insurance of licenses permits and preferential positions, thereby restricting opportunities for rent seeking by corrupt means.
- Introduce similar anti-bribery clauses into contracts relating to privatizations of government enterprises and the development of natural resources.
- Ensure that enforcement is predictable and forceful (Boeninger, 1998).

WAY FORWARD

Further empirical research with an advanced research tools be conducted in this area of study. The essence would be to give a further insight of the ills of bureaucratic corruption and finally put to rest the unending debate of how much money the Nigerian legislative actually take home.

REFERENCES

- Achebe.C (1988), *The Trouble with Nigeria*, Enugu, Fourth Dimension Publishers.
- Atatlas, S.H. (1990), *The Sociology of Corruption*, Singapour, Times Books
- Agbo. A. (2009), *A Catalogues of Failures*, Nigerias Independent Weekly Magazine, No 2, June 3rd.
- Akindele, S.T et al (2000), *The Subject-Matter of Political Science*, Ibadan, Dekaal Publishers
- Anazodo et al (2004), *Management and Organizational Behaviour : Theories and Applications in Nigeria*, Onitsha, Abbot Books Ltd.
- Boeninger.E. (1998), "Governance and Development : Issues and Constraints" in *Proceedings of the World Bank Annual Conference on Development Economics*, The World Bank.
- Curson, J.J & Harris (1963), *Public Administration in a Modern Society*, McGrwa-Hill
- Dimmock, E. V (1969), *Public Administration : Concepts and Cases*, Boaston, Miffing Company.
- Dike, V.E (1999), *Leadership, Democracy and the Nigerian Economy : Lessons from the Past and Directions for the Future*, Sacramento, The lightening Press.
- Ekpo.A. (2010)," *An Economy Still Trapped at the Crossroads* " in Nigerias Idependent Weekly, (Tell Magazine) No 40, 11th October.
- Gray & Kaufman (1998), "Corruptuion and Development" in IMF/World Bank, Finance and Development.
- Gbenga, L. & Ariyo, T. (2006), "Bureaucratic Corruption, Good Governance and Development : The Challenges and Prospects of Institution Building in Nigeria" in "Journal of Applied Sciences Research", Department of Political Science, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, INSI-net Publication.
- Kalu, U.A & Yemi (1991), *Perspective on Corruption and other Economic Crimes in Nigeria*, Lagos, Federal Ministry of Justice
- Khan, M.H (1996), *A Typology of Corrupt Transactions in Developing Countries*, IDS Bulletin.
- Keeper, D.G (2012), *Systemic Corruption in Nigeria : A Threat To Sustainable Development*, Department of Public Administration, Rivers State College of Arts & Sciences, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
- Lipset & Lenz (2000), "Corruption, Culture and Markets", in *Culture Matters*, L.E. Harrison & S.P. Huntington (EDs), New York, Basic Books.
- Maduagwu, M.O. (1995), "Nigeria in Search of Political Culture : the Political Class, Corruption and Democratization"; A paper presented at a conference on *Corruption and Democratization in Nigeria (1983-93)*, Held at the University of Ibadan, September, 1995.
- Nnoli, O. (1986), *Introduction to Politics*, Ibadan, Longman Group Ltd
- Otite, O. (2000), "Corruption against the Norms of African Life" in O. Femi (Eds) "Effective and Efficient Implementation of Nigerias Recent Anit-Corruption Legislation" Ibadan, Africana feb press.
- Obi & Obikeze (2004), *Public Administration in Nigeria : A Developmetal Approach*, Onitsha, Abbot Books.
- Stillman, R.J (Eds).(1976), *Public Administration ; Concepts and Cases*, Boston, Houghton Miffing Company.
- Tanzi, V. (1995), "Corruption : Causes, Consequences and Agenda for Further Research", IMF/World Bank, Finance and Development.
- Urien, J. (2012), "The Impact of Corruption on the Socio-Economic Development of Nigeria", in *Crown Research in Education*, Volume 2, Issue 3, Department of Political Science, Delta State University, Abraka.
- Waldo, D. (1980), *The Study of Public Administration*, Boston, Houghton Miffing Company.
- Willson, W. (1976), *The Study of Public Administration Written in 1887* reprinted in Stillman (1976), New York : McGraw-Hill.

Yusuf, A. (2009), "We Run a Corruptocracy" in Nigeria's Independent Weekly, (Tell Magazine) 5th February 2009.