



Published by the Nigerian Political Science Association, July 2019

Bureaucratic Corruption and Public Service Efficiency in Nigeria's Polity

Jolade Omede

Department of Political Science,
University of Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria.

&

Arinze Ngwube

General Studies Unit,
Federal University Oye, Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

Abstract

The issue of enhancing Nigerian Public service performance has been a subject of discourse over the years. The framework through which this can be achieved to a large extent is on the ability of government to formulate policies capable of promoting effective public service performance. This has been a major challenge to policy makers. Despite all reforms geared towards improving the performance of the Nigerian public sector, service delivery has remained poor. The theoretical framework adopted is the Max Weber's bureaucratic theory; the paper adopts a cross sectional method in reappraising the challenges facing public service at state level in Nigeria towards effective delivery. This paper discovers among others that favoritism, partisanship, corruption, tribalism, nepotism and other primordial considerations as factors inhibiting effective performance management in the Nigerian public service. The paper concludes that government needs to grow beyond primordial sentiments in the design and implementation of performance enhancement policies, if effective service delivery is to be achieved in the public service. The efforts of 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's source of data was secondary sources involving books, journals; articles on the subject matter under review.

Keywords: Effectiveness, Efficiency, Bureaucracy, Service Delivery

Introduction

The role of the public bureaucracy in fostering a perfect and efficient administrative system in a country cannot be neglected. This is drawn from the vital role it plays in the formulation and implementation of policies designed for the development of a nation. In Nigeria, the performance of the public bureaucracy has come under severe criticisms and questionings within the content 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 the 1980s (Lawal and Tobi, 2006). 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 environment. The efforts of the Nigerian government have not yielded much expected results due to the problem of corruption which has eaten deep into the fabric of the Nigerian society.

The public bureaucracy is not spared either. Undoubtedly, Corruption has permeated the Nigeria society. 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 led to the downfall of careers of world-renowned public figures and reputation of well-respected organization and business firms tarnished on account of it. It would be an understatement to say that corruption is Nigeria's bane. It is seen as the greatest cankerworm that has eaten deep into the marrows of Nigeria's public and private lives. The manifestations of bureaucratic corruption in Nigeria is seen and exhibited in her functionless public utilities such as the refineries, ill-equipped hospitals and schools' bad roads, Poor communication and electricity services, kwashiorkor railway and other transport systems. Coupled with these is the depreciating of Nigeria's currency, the porosity of her borders, trafficking in drugs, looting of the treasury and the coercive and arbitrary use of power, especially by Nigeria's leaders. It is a tragedy of unimaginable proportion.

Corruption is one element which distorts and defeats the noble objective of every policy, institution, organization or project in Nigeria. As at today it has affected several development projects and policies, thereby exacerbating poverty and socio-economic injustice in the country. For Nigeria to achieve economic growth and development, the presence of corruption must be vigorously tackled with a view to drastically reduce it, if not completely eliminate it. However, Mkandawire and Soludo (1999) contend that in the post-colonial phase, the state assumed a much broader range of activities and policy agenda and had a much wider reach than its colonial predecessor. This has made the bureaucracies more amenable to societal pressures and more open to clientelist relationships.

Following from the above, increasing wave of widespread corruption in the Nigerian bureaucracies should be of concern to all and sundry. This concern derives from the fact that bureaucracies are avenues through which developmental efforts are enhanced and sustained. Therefore, this paper examines Bureaucratic Corruption and public service efficiency in Nigeria. In discussion, this paper is divided into six sections; conceptual clarification, Theoretical Framework; Manifestation of Bureaucratic Corruption in Nigerian. Effect of Bureaucratic Corruption on Public Service, Tackling Bureaucratic Corruption in Nigeria and Conclusion.

Conceptual clarification

In order to understand this paper, it is imperative clarify some of the prominent concepts used throughout this paper. Therefore, the following section defines these critical terms. The following perspectives provide the foundation on which this paper is built.

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 redtapism (Akindele, 2002). Also, Gerths & Wrights (1970) conceptualized bureaucracy as: a hierarchical management within the organization based upon a line of authority and a division of work predicated upon this arrangement. To 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 seen as actions within the form and content of bureaucratic system.

Anazodo et al (2004) noted that in the words of Weber, the father of bureaucracy, that bureaucracy is important because they allow large organization to perform the many routine activities necessary for their survival. 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.

Corruption

Conceptualizing corruption is not an easy task. The difficulty of defining corruption is first a function of its being a secret and clandestine activity and secondly because it has many manifestations, dimensions and forms. That is why Johnston argues that studying corruption is a tricky business. According to him:

Definitions are controversial, and solid evidence is often elusive. Descriptive accounts may be clouded by self serving equivocations. Equally subtle is the question of the significance of a corrupt act – not only its consequences, but also its meaning as perceived by citizens and officials alike (Ogundiya, 2009:282). Be that as it may Tanzi has argued that while it may not be easy to define corruption, the crisis associated with corruption is not difficult to recognize (Tanzi, 1998). Indeed, it is a daunting and challenging venture. (Olugbenga, 2007, Odofin and Omojuwa, 2007, Ajibewa, 2006, Faloore, 2010, Igbuzor, 2008). According to Andrig and Fjeldstad (2001:4) “corruption is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon with multiple causes and effects, as it takes on various forms and functions in different contexts”. In fact, one of the major crises in conceptualizing corruption is that while it is difficult for it to disappear it has a capacity to take on new forms (Andrig and Fjelstad, 2001; Girling 1997).

The word corruption is originally from the Latin verb *rumpere* which means to break (Abdul-Ismail, 2009). Following from the above, corruption means the breaking of a certain code of conduct for the personal benefit of the perpetrator. Sen defines it as the violation of established rules for personal gain and profit (in Aluko 2009:2). Osoba defines it as “an anti-social behaviour conferring improper benefits contrary to legal and moral norms, and which undermines the capacity of authorities

to improve the living conditions of the people” (in Aluko, 2009:3) The World Bank defines corruption as: The abuse of public office for private gains. Public office is abused for private gain when an official accepts, solicits, or extorts a bribe. It is also abused when private agents actively offer bribes to circumvent public policies and processes for competitive advantages or profit. Public office can also be abused for personal benefit even if no bribery occurs, through patronage and nepotism, the theft of state assets, or the diversion of state resources (Agbu, 2003:3).

In J.S. Nye’s classical definition, corruption is “behavior that deviates from the formal duties of a public role (elective or appointive) because of private (personal, close family, private clique) wealth or status gains” (Nye, 1967:416). What we can deduce from the definitions above is that corruption entails any behavior that deviates from accepted norm especially in the public space. It is any behavior that goes against established rules, regulations, and established procedure. In short, corruption is behaviour that breaks the law or aid and abets breaking the law. Such behaviour usually confers undue and/or unmerited advantages on the perpetrator. Such behavior also expresses the notion of a betrayal of trust especially in a democracy where public office is held in trust for the people.

Corruption has various forms and dimensions. Aluko has identified nine forms namely:

Political corruption (grand), Bureaucratic corruption (petty), Electoral corruption, Bribery, Fraud, Embezzlement, Favouritism, Nepotism (Aluko, 2009:5). Other categorizations which do not differ from that of Aluko exist (Yaru, 2010, Adenugba, 2009; Omotola, 2006, Orngu, 2006, Aghemelo and Oarhe, 2003). What is important, however, is that in whatever form it manifests, corruption perverts public interest and unlawfully elevates private gain and advantage. With the politicization of the civil service in Nigeria, has come bureaucratic corruption. Political corruption has laid down the ground for bureaucratic corruption. Bureaucratic corruption is the utilization of bureaucratic official’s positions for private gain. It is the corruption by officials in public offices who are not vocationally politicians but who are aided and abetted by corrupt politicians and a corrupt political system.

Bureaucratic corruption has been regarded as a particularly viral form of bureau pathology. Once it enters the blood of a public organization, it spreads quickly to all parts. If not diagnosed and treated. It will destroy public credibility and organizational effectiveness. Even if treated, there is no guarantee that it will be eliminated or that all infected areas will be reached. The possibilities of stamping it out altogether are remote as long as the machinery responsible for eliminating it is also corrupt (Caiden, 1981:10).

On the other hand, the Macro perspective views bureaucratic corruption as a social problem. According to Nobbs (1984) the structural functionalists regard social problems as serious behavioral deviations hindering the function of society. Social problems are regarded as inhibiting the needs and goals of society and bureaucratic corruption could be so regarded. From this background, the widespread corruption in the Nigerian bureaucracies can be located within the existing social structure, norms

and the value system. If it is taken that a nation gets the kind of leaders it deserves, then by the same token a nation also gets the kind of bureaucracies it deserves. If the Nigerian society at large is corrupt, then it is logical and one would not be surprised that the Nigerian bureaucracies are corrupt too.

A corrupt bureaucrat regards his office as a business from which he is able to extract extra legal income. As a result, the civil servant's total compensation does not depend on an ethical evaluation of his usefulness for the common good but precisely upon the market situation and his talents for finding the point of maximal gain on the public demand curve (Klaveren 1990:26). According to Friedrich (1990:15) corruption entails the activities or behavior of individuals engaging in arbitrary use of the power given to them by the society to perform certain public duties but, as a result of the expectation of a personal reward or gain (be it monetary or otherwise) undertake actions that reduce the welfare of society or damage the public interest. Bureaucratic corruption provides civil servants with the opportunity to raise their compensation above what the law prescribes.

Lawal and Ariyo (2006) linked the concept of bureaucratic within the illegal activities of bureaucrats. He added that, traditionally, the concept is used to denote the practices of buying favor from bureaucrats who formulate and implement government economic and political policies. The concept however transcends the practices of buying favor from bureaucrats who formulate and implement government economic and political policies. The concept however, transcends the buying of favor, it refers to the violation of public duty by bureaucrats or public officials. It is 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.

Ayua, 2001; Dike; 2003; Lipsky, 2010 are of the view that the pervasiveness of bureaucrat corruption can be explained within the nature and character of the government itself. They argued that bureaucratic corruption grows as government grows and as such become dehumanized and consequently cultivated in the culture of governance if not properly checked. Former President Obasanjo (2004) lamented that the civil service as presently constituted "cannot drive development initiating reforms that neither he nor his successors have fully implemented. This statement calls into question the efficiency of Nigeria's public service in driving development process. It has also been observed that civil servants draw up rules to protect themselves and have outlived every administration over the years. They tutor every political officers on the dos and dones of office.

An efficient and neutral public bureaucracy is an ingredient in a democratic system because it leads to an efficient and effective public bureaucracy. The public bureaucracy has a significant role to play in the administration of government, it sees to the delivery of goods and services evenly distributed. A corrupt bureaucracy will lead to a decrease in the quality of goods and services provided by the government.

Theoretical Framework

The Paper adopts the bureaucratic theory which is propounded by Max Weber (1947). This is on the assumption that man is naturally lazy to work, yet he is materialistic in his approach. The assumption agrees with Douglas McGregor's theory of motivation (1960). As such man is portrayed as lacking self discipline highly deficient in the sense of responsibility and has the natural tendency to be controlled (Olufayo, 2000). Weber is of the view man needs uniformity and order for him to do things right. It was in agreement with the above assertion that Arowolo (2012) posits that bureaucratic ethics are designed to regulate the behavior of employees in a work place. Weber believes that man pursues economic gain selfishly and competes, mostly in an unfair manner (Olatunji, 2013).

Weber inferred that man who naturally dislikes work but wants economic reward must be regulated by a set of rules in his work place hence he designed the idea bureaucracy, suggesting that the use of coercive authority would enhance efficient performance in organizations. He opined that the increasing level of rationalization in the society necessitates legal rational domination. It is designed to accomplish large scale administrative tasks by coordinating the work of large numbers in a systematic manner as in the public service (Salawu, 2000).

Weber (1947) have been of the opinion that the effectiveness of an organization should be based on a system of legal rational rules that are impersonal. The above assertion implies that these rules are legally derived from the law of the land, and employees should obey the law and not individuals in the office. That is obeying the law regulating the office and not the office holder. This system of rules sets the standard operational procedure and norms that will be used to regulate the behavior of the employees in an organization.

In Nigeria public service most employees tend to pay their loyalty to their boss and not the job which in most cases are guided by primordial sentiment. Another Weber's postulation in his theory is that, the authority in an organization is derived from position of the office holder. Hence Weber opined that the authority which an employee exercise is restricted to the level of the office such employee occupied. Weber argues further that positions (recruitment, promotion, transfer and even retirement) in an organization should be based on merit-qualifiacation, competence and performance. Many social critics, scholars public stakeholders have identified the Nigeria public service as not giving a total attention to the above Weber postulation due to the influence of ecological factors (social network, personal contact and connection) on the public bureaucracy who you know and not what you know has become the other of the day in the Nigeria public service.

Manifestation of Bureaucratic Corruption in Nigeria

The effective functioning of the government bureaucracy is essential. It is an important determinant of poverty, inequality, and economic growth as stressed by the emergent literature on state capacity (Acemoglu 2005; Besley and Persson, 2010). Effective Public service delivery also matters from a microeconomic perspective: programs evaluations of small scale interventions often assume successful interventions can be effectively scaled up by government. However, despite the

importance of government effectiveness for citizen welfare economic analyses of incentives in the public sector have largely focused on the selection and motivation of politicians (Besley, 2004; Gagiarducci and Nannicini 2013; Martinez- Bravo 2014).

Public officials – politicians’ bureaucrats and legislators hold unique positions of power and responsibility, the abuse of which can cause significant and long-lasting damage to many aspects of socio-economic development such individuals may have privileged in roads to the legal infrastructure, offering them the opportunity to avoid prosecution for any malpractice. Dishonest behaviour at one level in public office is often contagious and supported by dishonest behaviour at the levels. For these reasons Bureaucratic corruption is viewed as being especially harmful especially pervasive and difficult to fight. However, some countries have largely overcome these problems. Nigeria appears to be trapped in a vicious circle of widespread poverty and whole mis governance.

One manifestation of this is when civil servant or bureaucrats exploit their powers of discretion delegated to them by the government to further their own interests including in illegal or unauthorized activities. Government have failed to honour the social contract entered with the people and in which ‘kleptocratic and plutocratic’ practices have been identified as major debilitating indicators to its development. Nigeria operates a fiscal federalism with a strong central government that controls and distributes the main resources to the federating units –the states and LGA. Nigeria has 36 states and 774 LGAs under this arrangement, both states and LGAs receive monthly appropriations from the federal. According to Human Right Watch Report this system had led to the decentralization of corruption- a situation in which corruption has become rampant and an organized crime (Human Rights Report, 2010).

It is vital to note that the public sector in Nigeria plays a key role in the implementation of public services which are vital to the economic growth of the country. It coordinates the federal ministries, advises political officials formulates and implements government’s policies gathers and supplies data for policymakers ensures continuity of services and public relations services. These roles are vital in running the country efficiently because the public sector can either make or ruin any administration. Bureaucratic Corruption can be manifested in a variety of ways. Bribery is the payment (in money or kind) that is taken or given in a transaction (Dike, 2003).In order to validate the truth ,the Nigeria’s National Bureau of Statistics recently reported that a total sum of 400 naira billion is spent on bribes each year since 2015(National Bureau of Statisitcs,2015).

In the public sector, bribery is prevalent in the execution of government services such as lower taxes, licenses and legal outcomes Bribes can influence the government’s choice interacting, in the allocation of government benefits, such as subsidies to private companies or individuals and access to pensions or unemployment insurance. Bribes vary in size, type and how much the public official will benefit from such a transaction (Moseley, 1999). The control of our resources by our bureaucrats has given them leverage to amass wealth for themselves at the

expense of society. Recent discoveries offer only a glance into a gargantuan machinery of graft, indolence and privilege our civil servants have built for themselves.

ICPC seized 62 houses from a female public official (Vanguard, 2017). In 2016 8 billion naira and 124 vehicles illegally acquired from government officials were recovered by ICPC (ICPC, 2016). One begins to marvel at the stupendous wealth amassed by some of Nigerian public sector employees and its impact on the polity. However more than 40 vehicles allegedly stolen by some retired directors of the Water Resources Ministry were recovered (Fumpere, 2016). Another bombshell, this time from the Minister of Information and Culture, Lai Mohammed, indicated that \$151 million and N8 billion were deposited in some banks by some faceless bureaucrats, but mercifully recovered, courtesy of whistle-blowers (Mohammed, 2017).

It was reported in 2013 of 50,000 fictitious ghost workers in 2013 with an increase to 60,000 in 2014 (Omisore, 2017). This calls for concern especially when this leads to serious wastage in the system. Undaunted by the anti-corruption credentials of the Buhari administration, civil servants, in connivance with politicians and crony-contractors, “padded” the federal budget in (2016). This was said to have embarrassed the President, who, unsuspecting, presented a fraud-infested 2016 budget draft to the National Assembly. N195 billion of pension funds once incredibly vanished under a task force that was, ironically, set up to stop the plunder. It is so obvious civil servants are also neck-deep in the looting spree. How can such a rotten system deliver development in the polity?

Furthermore, public sector fraud is also another type of bureaucratic corruption where individuals seek to take advantage of government grants and services for their personal gain. This type of fraud involves stealing public funds which affects all taxpayers; public officials who partake in such schemes exploit public funds and hinder the delivery of appropriate goods and services to citizens (Moseley, 1999). Also, bureaucratic embezzlement is when public officials steal resources from the public institution where they are employed. In Nigeria, the embezzlement of public funds is one of the most common ways in which individuals accumulate national wealth which can be attributed to the lack of strict regulatory systems in the country. Likewise, public sector extortion is a type of bureaucratic corruption which deals with the extraction of public funds and other resources by coercion, violence or the use of force, the police and customs officials usually use this means to collect money from civilians (Moseley, 1999).

Lastly policies are more often made for purposes of the selfish and egoistic interest of the political leaders and sometimes only to attract public acclaim and attention with less regard to their appropriateness in addressing given problems or the possibility of their practical implementation by the public bureaucracy (Ikechukwu and Chukwemeke, 2013). The scope of corruption has expanded significantly since 1999. It is common practice for government contracts to be inflated because public officials factor in kick backs which are usually paid upfront before the completion of the contracts.

Effect of Bureaucratic Corruption on Public Service

The National Planning Commission (2005) noted that Bureaucratic Corruption has been identified as a systematic practice which engenders low level of transparency and accountability which is the major source of development failures in Nigeria. The above mention goes to simply indicate that the effects of corruption on the practice of public service in Nigeria are enormous. Lipset and Lenz (2000) simply stated that a bureaucratic corrupt government would shift government expenditure to areas where they can collect bribes. It increases the cost of governance this underscores the reason why Nigeria spends huge sums of money in her public service yet no meaningful result is anchored. It has reduced public revenue and increases public expenditures. It distorts markets, reduces investments in critical infrastructure, creates monopolies that makes goods and services more expensive, and put off foreign investors. It distorts public choices in favor of the wealthy and powerful, and reduces the state's ability to provide a social safety net. It disembowels the poor beyond the generally received notion of failure of governance and pinches the pockets of the poor in favor of the rich.

There are instances where corruption within the public service manifested over the years: the haphazard or ineffective implementation of federal budgets between 1999-2002 could be gleaned from the people which the senate indicated over "an alleged non-implementation of all appropriation acts since the dawn of democracy in May 1999 (Eminue, 2005). The persistent challenges in the Nigerian health sector are human resources crisis which has the tendency to cripple the sector. Inadequate investment, weak administration and corruption remain the cause of poor health workers welfare and the widespread inefficiency in the healthcare workforce (Odusile, 2017). This has also been the case with Nigeria's public service.

This has resulted to an "eye-service" practice which consequently brings about sub-optimization and reduction on productivity. This has created a feeling of frustration on the few incorruptible ones in the system and low morale. This has given way to clannish and invidious system of governance where personal rule and clientelism reigns supreme. In such systems, there are no rules or institutions to restrain officials. The poor are usually hard hit. In its annual Report for 2012, the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) observed that: Corruption in the Public sector remains a sore spot in Nigeria's quest to instill transparency and accountability in the polity. The failure to deliver social services, the endemic problem of power supply and the collapse of infrastructure are all linked with corruption. Unfortunately, the will to combat corruption in all tiers of government is still very weak. In some cases, especially in the states and local government, the political will to fight corruption is non-existent, as the workings of the polity are intricately connected with corruption activities. It is not surprise therefore that most of the predicate offences to money laundering are connected with corruption within the officialdom (2012:10).

However public servants are non elected officials within a government that implements rules, laws, ideas and functions of their establishment. In essence they serve as the link between what governments decides to do and how it is being

implemented. In other words, they are the middlemen. Therefore, if public servants are regarded as being corrupt it will influence the public perception that the government is corrupt. The buck will be put on public office holders for not taken a decisive stand on corruption, hence will lead to a weak administration. Citizens hold elected officials accountable for the policies they make and if these policies are being implemented incorrectly, the politicians will bear the brunt. Corrupt public flourish in a society where there is a lack of proper governance, a failure in implementing of democratic values and prevalence of poor leadership.

Transparency International (TI), in its 2017 Corruption Perception Index (CPI) Ranked Nigeria in 148th position out of 180. The country, according to the CPI, scored 28 out of 100, a figure lower than the average in the Sub-Saharan region. CPI score relates to perceptions of the degree of corruption as experienced by business people and analysts and ranges between 100 (highly clean) and 0 (highly corrupt). Nigeria's latest placement indicates that the country has not made progress in its fight against graft, despite efforts by the Muhammad Buhari administration. In the 2016 rankings, Nigeria scored 28. In 2015, it scored 26. The year before that, it scored 25. In 2014, the country scored 27 and 25 in 2013. In 2012, the country's score was 27 out of 100. Nigeria has been consistently ranked very low by TI. For example in 2017 136 out of 176 with corruption perception index (CPI).

Tackling Bureaucratic Corruption in Nigeria

In the light of this discourse the following suggestions are discussed to tackle bureaucratic corruption in Nigeria. Nigeria needs a radical orientation in our value system. Value system is seen as the generally accepted ways of life of a people and it is sometimes conceived as the culture of a given people. When Nigeria is ready for the radical change it will make a different matter entirely. The change is desirable and at the same time imperative. It is vital that a radical change in the value system will definitely reduce incidence of bureaucratic corruption. The change has to start with leadership from the top. However, there must be an unequivocally stated policy of complete avoidance and discouragement of corrupt practices in the conduct of government affairs by running a government that will engender transparency, accountability and integrity.

Secondly the socio-economic conditions of our polity should be made more favourable for the masses in general. The cost of living is presently high while the standard of living has fallen drastically to unprecedented level and quality of life is nothing to write home about. The standard of living in the nation needs to be improved to allow for self-fulfilment, productivity improvements and to boost morale. This can be done by offering working and the governing classes' equitable wages which the government is deliberating on increasing minimum wages. This will go a long way to reduce the urgency to indulge in corrupt practices.

Thirdly Poor remuneration and other motivational incentives by government for public servants have been a bane for a long time. This is one of the popular arguments for the various corrupt practices in the Nigerian bureaucracies. The condition has worsened since the Buhari administration. According to Ake (1993) people

cannot continue to reproduce themselves at the level of poverty without doing something to help themselves in order to survive. The problem of poor remuneration was addressed by the Jonathan administration by increasing the minimum wage to 18,000 naira. Presently the persistent fall in the value of domestic currency accompanied by inflation which has affected worker's purchasing power and if care is not taken workers resort to corrupt practices. Nigeria should formulate a wage policy that is strictly attached to changes in the level of inflation and not tying wage increase to score cheap political points.

Fourthly there should be considerable reduction of regulations and other bureaucratic bottlenecks to reduce opportunities for the giving or demanding of bribes in the bureaucracies. There should be more openness and less secrecy; more streamlining of approved process and use of licensing procedures. It is suggested that all erring corrupt bureaucrats should be dealt with severely and made to face the law so as to serve as deterrence to others. In addition, all their ill-gotten wealth and properties be confiscated by the state.

Conclusion

Bureaucratic corruption remains widespread in Nigeria and that it portends evil for the nation is no longer a subject of discourse. However, the discourse has been about the manifestation of bureaucratic corruption and the resolution of it. This has been the focus of the paper. From all indicators, it is clear that corruption is a threat to the polity. With the existence of corruption being rampant there can be no trust for the polity. Bureaucratic corruption is endemic and most detrimental in our society which has transformed from one administration to another. If corruption persists in our society strong and effective governance will be difficult to establish. Social and economic development will also be hindered. In the light of the foregoing, the useful suggestions which had been made will be of use in Nigeria's Public sector service delivery. If the suggestions are adopted, the incidence of bureaucratic corruption will be at its lowest ebb.

Reference

- Abdul-Ismael, A. (2009). Corruption and its threat to the Consolidation of Democracy in Nigeria: The Shariah Perspective. Mimeo Bayero University Kano.
- Acemoglu, D. (2005). Politics and Economics in Weak and Strong States. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 52, 1199-2226.
- Adenugba, A.A. (2009). Corruption in Nigeria- An Overview. *Journal of Social Policy and National Productivity*, 1, 56-69.
- Agbu, O. (2003). Corruption and Human Trafficking: The Nigerian Case. *West African Review*, 4(1).1-13.
- Aghemelo, A.T & Oarhe, O. (2003). Elections in Nigeria Since the end of Military Rule. *Africana*, 4(2):9-34.

- Ajibewa, A. (2006). Democracy and Corruption in Nigeria. In E. Ojo (Ed), Challenges of Sustainable Democracy in Nigeria. Ibadan: John Archers.
- Ake,C.(1993). Deeper into Original Sin: The Context of Ethical Crisis in Africa's Public Services in S. Rasheed & O. Dele (Eds) Ethics and Accountability in African Public Services.UNECA and AAPAM Publication.
- Akindele,S.T.(2002). The Concepts of Democracy and Governance: A Theoretical and Empirical Xray of their Linkage and Practical Application within the Nigerian Political Landscape. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3), 173-188.
- Aluko,Y.A.(2009). Corruption in Nigeria: Concepts and Dimension. In D.U. Enweremadu& E. Okafor (Eds) Anti-Corruption Reforms in Nigeria Since 1999: Issues, Challenges and the Way Forward. IFRA Special Research issue Vol 3,1-8.
- Anazdo,L.& okoye,J& Ugoo,E. (2004). Management and Organizational Behaviour: Theories and Application in Nigeria, Ontisha: Abbot Books.
- Andvig, J.C.& Fjeldstad, O,H.(2001).Corruption: A Review of Contemporary Research. Research Report: Chr. Michelson Institute Development Studies and Human Rights.
- Annual Report of Economic Financial Crime Commission (2012).
- Arowolo, D.(2012). Ethics Motivation and Performance in Nigeria's Public Service. *Public Policy and Administration Research*, 2(5), 37-43.
- Ayua,O.(2001). Political Evolution and Corruption in Nigeria Politics 1960-1979.Enugu:Many Dan Press.
- Besley, T, T. (2004).Paying Politicians: Theory and Evidence. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 2, 193-215.
- Besley, T.& Persson, T. (2010). State Capacity, Conflict and Development. *Journal of the Econometric Society*, 78(1), 1-34.
- Caiden, G.(1981). Public Maladministration and Bureaucratic Corruption. A Comparative Perspective .University of Pittsburgh.
- Dike, V.E (2003). Corruption in Nigeria: A new Paradigm for Effective Control. *Africa Economic Analysis*. Retrieved from <http://www.afrcaneconomicanalysis.org>
- Erunke, C.E.(2014). Effects of Corruption on Nigeria's Political and Democratic Objectives: The way forward. *Afro Asian Journal of Social Sciences*. V (3) Quarter III, 1-9.
- Falooore, O.O.(2010).The Family and Corrupt Management in Nigeria. *Journal of Social and Policy Issues*, 7(2) 84-89.
- Friedrich, C.(1990).Corruption Concepts in Historical Perspectives.4th Edition. London: Macmillian Publishers.
- Gagliarducci, S.S & Nannicini, T,T.(2013). Do better Paid Politicians Perform Better? Disentangling Incentives from Selection. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 11:369-398.
- Lawal,G.&Tobi,A.(2006). Bureaucratic Corruption, Good Governance and Development: The challenges and prospects of Institution Building in Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Sciences Research*, 2(10), 642-649.

- Vanguard(2017) ICPC seizes 62 Houses from Female government Official Retrieved from vanguardngr.com/2017/02/icpc-seizes-62-houses-female-govt-official/<https://www.icirnigeria.org/icpc-recovers-n450-million-vehicles/>
- Human Rights Watch (2010). Corruption and Human Rights Abuses by the Nigerian Police. Human Rights Report .17th August 2010.
- Igbuzor,O.(2008) .Strategies for Winning the Anti Corruption War in Nigeria. Abuja: Action Aid.
- Ikechukwu, U.B& Chukwuemeke, E.O(2013) The Obstacle to Effective Policy Implementation by the Public Bureaucracy in Developing Nations: The Case of Nigeria. Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review Vol 2(7), 59-68.
- Klaveren, V, J (1990) The Concept of Corruption .3rd Edition. London: Macmillan Publishers
- Lipset, S. M. & Lenz, G.S(2000). Corruption Culture and Markets. In L.E. Harrison & S.P huntington (Eds) Culture Matters. New York: Basic Books.
- Martinez- Bravo,M.,M.(2014).The Role of Local Officials in New Democracies :Evidence Democracies: Evidence From Indonesia . American Economic Review 104: 1244-87.
- Mcgregor, D.(1960). The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: Mcgraw Hill.
- Mkandawire, T.& Soludo, C.C. (1999). Our Continent Our Future: African Perspectives on Structural Adjustment. Treaton New Jersey: World Press Inc.
- Moseley, N.(1999).Corruption: A Debilitating Effect. Retrieve from www.stanford.edu/class/e297cltrade-environment/whealing/corrupt
- National Bureau Of Statistics (2015) Report.
- Nobbs, J.(1984). Sociology in Context .London and Basingstoke: Macmillian Education.
- Nye, J.S.(1967).Corruption and Political Development: A Cost benefit Analysis. American Political Science Review 612:419.
- Obasanjo, O.(2004). Time to Deliver being the Opening Speech at a presidential and Ministerial Retreat on Service delivery Abuja: March 19-21.
- Odofin, A.P & Omojuwa, K.A.(2007).The Challenges of Democratization Process in Nigeria. Zaria: A.Y Sule Digital Printers.
- Ogundiya, S.I. (2009).Political Corruption in Nigeria: Theoretical Perspectives and Some Explanations. Anthropologist 11(4),281-292.
- Olatunji, O.E.(2013). A Critique of the Application of Max Weber's Idea Bureaucracy in Africa Public Service. The International Journal of Humanities and Social Studies Vol 1(4),10-19.
- Olufayo, O.(2000). Intellectual Standpoints on Bureaucracy. In A. Adesina, A & O.Olufayo (Eds) Bureaucracy and the Society. A Sociological Insight Ado-Ekiti: Kaycee Publishers.
- Olugbenga, O.(2007). Corruption and Corrupt Practices in Nigeria: An Agenda For Taming the Monster, Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa,14(3) 2012-2022.
- Omotola, J.S(2006). Through a dark Glass Darkly: Assessing the New War Against Corruption in Nigeria. African Insight 36(3 and 4),214-228.

- Orngu,C.S.(2006). Anti Corruption Campaign in Nigeria. A Paradox Makurdi: Aboki Publishers.
- Osoba, J.A. (1996). Corruption in Nigeria: Historical Perspectives. *Review of African Political Economy* 69(23) 371-386.
- Salawu,B. B. (2000). Bureaucracy and Public Policy Administration in Democratic Society: A Lesson for Nigeria. In A. Adesina& O. Olufayo (Eds) *Bureaucracy and the Society: Society: A Sociological Insight* .Ado Ekiti: Kaycee Publishers.
- Sayre,W.S.(1979). The Triumph of Techniques Over Purpose. In F.J Thompson (Ed) *Classics of Public Personnel Policy*.Oak Park Illinois: Moore Publishing Company Inc.
- Tanzi, V. (1998).Corruption, Public Investment and growth.IMF Working Paper, WP97/139.
- Urien ,J (2012) The impact of Corruption on the socio- Economic Development in Nigeria. .Crown Research in Education Volume 2(3).
- Weber,M.(1947). The theory of Economic and Social Organization. Translated by Henderson. A.M and Talcott. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Omisore,T.(2018). A Nation Saddled by Corruption and Stealing Retrieved from www.pmnewsnigeria.com/2018/03/16/a-nation-saddled-by-corruption-and-stealing/www.transparency.org/.../corruption_perceptions_index_2017_shows_high_co.
- Yaru,M.A.(2010) Economic Perspective of Corruption in Public Sector. A Theoretical Explanation and Lessons for Nigeria. *Ilorin Journal of*