

BUREAUCRACY AND THE CRISIS OF DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA

AIDELOKHAI, DENNIS IDONIJE.

Department of Public Administration,

Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai, Niger State, Nigeria.

Abstract

Bureaucrats with their unique characteristics of inflexible adherence to rules in ordered hierarchical arrangements of authority pattern are designed to assist the government to propel development. In relatively "developed" polities, where social discipline and justice or equal allow for the efficient and effective delivery of public goods and services, bureaucracy, as a system of formal control, order and predictability of public performance may be development serving in the sense that it creatively assist in stabilizing an enduring level of development. However, in relatively less stable or developing societies as Nigeria, the crisis of development with a formal bureaucratic emphasis becomes disturbingly manifest with the concomitant effects of policy disconnect and summersault between policy enacted and its implementation. Thus, instead of bureaucrats fostering development, they tend to retard or slow down development in Nigeria. This study examined how bureaucrats can be properly positioned to involve the individuals in the collective decision making and their participation in the total developmental efforts. The study also examined how bureaucrats can be positioned to involve the individuals in qualitative movements from the acquisition of individual freedom from the clutches of feudal institutions, putting the individuals in command over the economy and the democratic process and towards the rigorous pursuit of collective welfare. Data for this study was sourced from content analysis. The study concludes that a new conception of bureaucracy is necessary and desirable. It is advocated that a bureaucracy with the capacity to creatively assist government in initiating and implementing collective decisions capable through conscious efforts of transforming the environment in some systematized and collectively desirable ways becomes imperative.

Key Words: Bureaucracy, Crisis, Development, Nigeria.

Introduction

The critical relationship between bureaucracy and development, particularly regarding development administrations in Nigeria can be contextualized in some challenging perspectives. What is bureaucracy, and what are its critical functional and dysfunctional aspects? How do these aspects reflect crisis in development? Bureaucracy, in the main, is about the inflexible adherence to rules in an ordered hierarchical arrangement of authority patterns, designed to assist the executive in achieving the objectives of government. In its inflexibility, impersonality and legal-rationality, bureaucracy assumes a system of stability of growth and developmental processes in which governmental structures and processes are predictably tilted in the direction of controlled efficiency of government performance. The implication of this is

that, in relatively “developed” polities, where social discipline and justice or equal allow for the efficient and effective delivery of public goods and services, bureaucracy, as a system of formal control, order and predictability of public performance, may be development serving in the sense that it creatively assists in stabilizing an enduring existing level of development. That further assumes a phased historical movement of the development process. However, in relatively less stable or developing societies, as Nigeria, the crisis of development with a formal bureaucratic emphasis becomes disturbingly manifest.

In terms of comprehensive development, dysfunctional bureaucracy represents a legal-rational formal structure of government operation which infuses into organizational members an inflexible and impersonal behavior, lacking in exercise of innovation and hence incapacitated in its capacity to transform the environment, which both supplies the resource and constraints, in desirable development direction. This is particularly, constraining when it is realized that 'development' is about collective decisions and the participation of the individuals in the total developmental efforts. When situated in a historical frame, development begins to manifest a qualitative movement from the acquisition of individual freedom from the clutches of feudal institution, putting the individual in command over the economy and the democratic process, to the rigorous pursuit of collective welfare.

The consequence of the evolution of development has been an unprecedented displacement of private participation in national development, manifested in the enlargement of the role of government in socio-economic and political development efforts. Here in lies the crux of the matter regarding the role Of bureaucracy in the crisis of development. For the inflexible bureaucracy, lacking sense of creativity and innovativeness, is anti-developmental, giving the increasing demands made upon government apparatus that are requiring collective participation of individuals. A new conception of bureaucracy has thus been adjudged desirable; a bureaucracy with the capacity to creatively assist government in initiating and implementing collective decisions capable, through conscious effort of transforming the environment in some systematized and collectively desirable way. Bureaucracy of the ideal classical type, in this sense, becomes a principal source of crisis for national development. This is particularly so in emergent nation state that are seriously and hastily desirous of development in a situation of incessant rising expectations from the populace.

The Character of Bureaucracy

What are the essentials of the ideal type bureaucracy that enable it to possess that capacity to be dysfunctional to development? To Weber, bureaucracy exhibits the following characteristics.

- a) There is the principle of fixed and official jurisdictional areas, which

are generally ordered by rules, that is, by laws or administrative regulations, in terms of the regular activities required by the authority to give the commands, and the methodological provision;

- b) The principle of office hierarchy and of level of graded authority means a firmly ordered system of super and subordination in which there is a supervision of the lower offices by the higher ones;
- c) The management of the modern office is based upon written documents ('the files') which are preserved in their original or draught form;
- d) Office management, at least all specialized office management--- and such management is distinctly modern--- usually presupposes thorough and expert training;
- e) When the office is fully developed, official activity demands of the fact that his obligatory time in the bureau may be firmly delimited; and
- f) The management of the office follows general rules, which are more or less exhaustive, and which can be learned. (Shafritz and Hyden, 1974:23-29).

As a corollary, Weberian bureaucracy, giving the above characteristics, manifest in the following behavioural (internal and external) position of the official:

- a) Office holding is a "vocation". That is the office is defined in terms of a firmly prescribed course of training, and generally prescribed and special examinations are prerequisites for employment, and
- b) The personal position of the official is patterned in the following way: the official always strives and usually enjoys a distinct social esteem in comparison with the governed; the official is appointed by a superior authority, the position of the official (tenure) is held for life, at least in public bureaucracies; the official receives the regular pecuniary compensation of a normally fixed salary and the old age security provided by pension; and the official is set for a "career" within the hierarchical order of the public services. (Ibid)

From the above, bureaucracy, in a nutshell, is about a specific set of structural adjustments which characteristics influence majorly the behavior of individuals, as members (bureaucrats) or clients, who have to interact with bureaucracy in some predictable pattern. Expectedly, it is this mode of predictable anti-development behavior of bureaucrats, lacking sense of creative initiative in collection participation to transform society in some meaningful way, that stands critical to the nature and direction of the human development; especially as "virtually everywhere one looks in both developed and developing polities, economics, social and political problems are extensively influenced by bureaucratic organizations". (Ibid) In other words, the extent

to which bureaucratic behavior becomes instrumental to the participation or otherwise of the individual in the developmental process, will sensitize us to the place of "crisis" in human development efforts.

It is this thinking that has attracted some criticisms against the ideal type bureaucracy; this is regardless of its value: that the formal structure and processes, though mechanistic in orientation, assist the scholar or practitioner to have a fairly clear general idea of the formal aspects of the enterprises, of its various activities, techniques and their rational interrelations. Its chief setback, in terms of development however, is that impersonality, as contrasted with personal relationships, regulates activity(Ibid). It is this behavioural phenomenon of bureaucrats that has informed Marx's (Popper,1984) criticism that bureaucracy is an instrument of alienation and oppressive force felt by a majority of people. Relatedly, Blau (1952) attacks bureaucracy for disregarding the spontaneous, non-formal aspects of behavior without which things would grind to a halt: meaning that clues as to why operations will not proceed as officially specified have no place in the ideal type bureaucracy.

The Nature of Development

Nnoli (1981:36) offers a very basic definition of development, placing man at the centre of it contrary to the impersonal mechanistic relations of bureaucratic practice. In his words:

Development is a dialectical phenomenon in which the individual and society interact with their physical, biological, and interhuman environments transforming them for their own betterment and that of humanity at large and being transformed in the process... Development is first and foremost a phenomenon associated with changes in man's humanity and creative energies, not in things. It is the unending improvement in the capacity of the individual and societies for their own benefit and that of humanity at large. It is a process of actualizing man's inherent capacity to live a better and more rewarding life. It implies increasing skill and capacity to do things, greater freedom, self confidence, creativity, self-discipline, responsibility, and material well-being. (Nnoli,1981:36)

Perspectively, giving the centrality of man to societal development, bureaucracy is caught in the webs of crisis in the developmental process. Development, giving a bureaucratic framework, is indeed in crisis since there is evidently the failure of the dominant mode of analysis... to provide an adequate intellectual basis for the socio-economic and political emancipation of the "...people".(Ibid) This is particularly so when it is reasoned that development, in a way, represents "increased differentiation of roles to better cope with change; growing equality in the allocation of society's scarce resources, and particularly in the state's allocation of these; enhanced capacity (and performance) of social institutions, especially those associated with the state; and finally increased choice and enlarged opportunities in the decision-making

processes of society".(Coleman,1968:178).

Against the above scenario, scholars have made some efforts to relate bureaucracy to the challenges of development of the human society, particularly regarding development politics, in the light of the history of the origin of the ideal-type bureaucracy being an administrative phenomenon of the Western societies. As a result, one discernable conclusion made by scholars is that the classic bureaucratic type of administration of Max Weber may not adequately address the kinds of challenges governments in developing politics as in Nigeria, usually face; particularly giving the premise that bureaucratic organizations are better suited to problems than challenges of change in a situation of increasingly rising expectations from the populace.(Schaffer and Ilchman,1968:222).

Specifically, in the study of administration in developing politics, like Nigeria, two basic theoretically approaches become pertinent. One, an organizational theory, focuses on institutional development; the other, a social theory, stresses the underdeveloped nature of society as a determinant of administrative performance.(Hyden,etal,1970). The first approach stresses the need to institutionalize an administration that is adequately adapted to the problems of development; its advocates argue the need for fashioning new, more appropriate ways of conducting administration in situations of underdevelopment usually characterized by rising expectations, limited organizational capabilities, and severe shortages of resources required by public administration.(Schaffer 1969). The critical issue is whether the classical bureaucratic model is really very useful to developing states desirous of using the administrative arm of government as a primary instrument for initiating and guiding the processes of development; that is, it seeks ways and means of improving the performance of administrative structures and personnel so that government might properly become society's 'engine' of change.(Ilchman,1965).

The second model, usually linked with the works of Riggs, approaches administrative analysis from the perspective of the 'ecology' and attempts to explain administrative behavior in the light of the general social and cultural characteristics of a society. (Riggs,1964:78-120). For Riggs,(1977:75-79) just as earlier insinuated by Nnoli (Ibid) in his definition of development, the essence of bureaucracy should involve an increasing ability to make collective decisions. As such, we expect development oriented bureaucracy to reflect an increasing ability of the people to participate in making and implementing collective decisions that change their environment in socially desirable ways. In this way, Riggs sees the essential problem of bureaucracy as involving the relation between a bureaucracy and its total setting.

Two levels of such interrelations cover separate analysis: the environment, and the context. The environment of bureaucracy is all that are in its setting but not part of the social system: the physical covering the land, air, water and growing things with materials or entities located in time and space; the human environment manifested in

personal abilities, interests, preferences, knowledge and skills; and the cultural environment found in the minds of the people and takes such forms as values, languages, laws and attitude towards change. The relations between a bureaucracy and its environment are ecological for they set constraints on behavior and provide resources; and from the point of development it is to increase the extent to which we can consciously shape or reshape our own environments/in desirable ways. The context, on the other hand covers relations between the bureaucracy and the socio-political behaviour, or structures of action prevalent in the world of society where bureaucracy is located.

It then boils down to the fact that the significance of the distinction between the environment and the context of bureaucracy and for development, arises from the different principles that appear to govern relationships between a bureaucracy and its environment, as contrasted with its relation to its context. According to Riggs,(Ibid), development does not only involve a growing ability of any social system to make collective decision which entails changes in its environment, but essentially the re-adjustment of relationships between any social system and its context in order to create a better balances to convert asymmetrical relations into symmetrical ones.

Bureaucracy, its Evolution and Crisis of Development

The need to relate bureaucracy to development is due to the changing nature of development over-time; particularly with the increasing inability of bureaucracy to meaningfully grapple with the momentum of development in modernizing polities. And the rise of development from individualism to collectivism in human history helps to account for the seemingly administrative incapacity of bureaucracy to adequately respond to incessant rising developmental challenges of human societies.

In the nineteen century, development meant the mechanization of industries and the rise of mechanical culture. The resultant capitalism and democracy of the period were responsible for the rise of individualism.(United Nations Department of Economics and Social Affairs,1975). Individualism liberated the people from the feudal institutions, enabled them to build a new mechanical civilization in which the freedom of the individual put him in command both of the political and economic systems; that is, a voter in political democracy and a consumer in the economic system.

During this era, when development became the centre of politics, it was first handled mainly from the point of economics. Development meant only economic development defined in terms of increase in material income or gross national product per capital. The outcome of the economy of a nation was determined by the input of capital broadened to include labour and land. Giving a system of free competition, the ultimate economic decisions were in the hands of the individuals as consumers resulting in maximum output and the greatest satisfaction; and the distribution of the national product to owners of capital, land and labour. Although individual decisions were

decisive in the direction of economic growth, yet these decisions, undoubtedly, were negatively skewed giving the “invisible hand” as a decisive determinant of effective demand of consumers, and the distribution of productive forces. As a corollary, the management technology of the era emphasized technical rational nature, applying the mechanical and impersonal principle of the machine to management and administration. This gave birth to the growth of formal organizations as factories, corporations and bureaucracies.

In the twentieth century, individualism began to give way for collectivism(Ibid) as an orientation in the developmental path. It should be remarked that individualism was discredited for paying too little attention to the relationship among technology, institutional changes and the environmental factors of the individual countries. Thus, the rise of collectivism was a function of a new technological revolution based on the principles of accuracy, standardization, consistency, speed and coordination; that is, it was based on computers and other precise instruments of organization. The new technology comprised of the technical and management technologies. The former being a better organization and an efficient management. Division of labour was basic to this technological revolution leading to greater mass production from the resultant expansion of the scale of production.

The new phase of development based on the philosophy of development under collectivism differed remarkably from individualism not only in both scope and substance, but also in the pace of change. In the twentieth century, more technological changes had occurred; similarly, social and economic changes had been rapid and turbulent. Giving such changes, the economy could no longer be self-regulating or self-adjusting as no “invisible hand” could be strong enough to guide the workings of the complex economic system meaningfully. A new management technology became inevitable. Thus, economic growth of individualism in terms of an increase in material income per capital was no longer deemed adequate as the only development objective. Collective interests began to inform development objectives. Hence, equitable distribution of wealth and income, full utilization of manpower, better utilization of natural resources, land protection of the human environment have since become major development objectives. In addition, social development, that is the improvement in the well being of the people has also joined the list, and the participation of individuals in the development effort has become a part of social development. Development, giving collectivism, is viewed as a totality embracing a process of economic and social change from traditional to a modern state.

Although one major challenge of the rise from individualism to collectivism for development has been how to liberate the minds of both politicians and public administrators from the deeply entrenched classical or neo-classical orientations to embrace modern tendencies of development, yet it can be mentioned that one consequence of the evolution of development for bureaucracy has been an

unprecedented expansion in the functions of government and its administrative arm.(Ibid). That has posed enormous demands on bureaucracy.

The relative sudden awareness of the upward growth of the public sector in its enhanced participation in directing the national economy, compared to the private sector has forced varied governments to recognize development as centre piece of politics. This thinking has been particularly manifested in national economic planning or central guidance of the general direction of the economy; technological innovation through research and development; necessary institutional changes through revitalization and development of research and development of essential organization; capital mobilization for economic and social development; the training and education of skilled manpower; exercising greater control over natural resources/in terms of availability and quality; increase in government's initiative in entrepreneurship in economic ventures through the setting up of public enterprises; increase in regulatory functions or modernization of the law; and necessary application of the principles of democracy and social justice.(Ibid). In effect, the functions of government have since grew in size, magnitude, importance and complexity.

In response to these challenges, bureaucratic orientations, since the twentieth century, have been a development of new tendencies which have continued to inform certain significant modifications of the nineteenth century orthodox theory of public administration.(Ibid) These new tendencies, in turn, have necessitated bureaucratic innovations to make public administration more responsive to the environmental forces that shape the character and direction of the administrative capacity of bureaucracy for development.

One relevant development has been the tendency of bureaucracy and indeed public administration to be increasingly innovative by being more involved in politics in terms of public policy making. Related to development, public policy orientation manifest majorly in political system as a whole from a traditional to a modern state.(Ibid). Historically, political development in terms of governmental capacity of transformation, meant during the era of individualism the establishment of legally established impersonal order, in which public policy making was taken for granted, against the backdrop of legal obedience as a strengthening force for the administrative arm of government. With collectivism, political development has been seen increasingly from the view point of the capacity of bureaucracy of the political system to achieve national objectives through executive innovations, management of change and adaptation to environmental conditions. In short, individualism treats bureaucracy as a static closed system of national development in which all known forces of societal progress or decay are at play.

It is this paradoxical situation of the evolution of development that impinges on the crisis of development, particularly with the increasing role of the bureaucracy in

championing national development on the one hand; and on the other hand, its inability to engage in desirable planned change through innovations regarding the peculiarity of environmental forces shaping the direction of national development. Thus, from the view point of national development, paradoxical context of bureaucracy, as manifested in the movement from individualism to collectivism, has been synthesized thus:

The first industrial revolution was basically a mechanistic revolution; and it required a bureaucratic form of organization to provide the basic support, especially in the public administrative system. As the second industrial revolution is both a continuation and an expansion of mechanistic technology (especially through the invention of the computer) and a new departure from 19th century technology, today's public administration system should be both a continuation of the traditional bureaucratic system and a departure from its important changes since First World War.(Ibid:191).

The above picture may well go down on record as the watershed of the bureaucracy and crisis of development in human historical land marks.

Consequent upon the impact of bureaucracy on the crisis of development, public administration has had to re-examine its tools of analysis to incorporate orientations that poses the capacity to infuse into bureaucracy the need to be development oriented. In the first place, the whole area of human relations represents a major departure from the rational approach of the ideal type bureaucracy; giving special attention to the role of informal organization, motivational forces, human attitudes and interpersonal relations within the context of the exercise of formal authority of the bureaucracy (Ibid).

Secondly, in order to strengthen the role of the bureaucratic specialists in policy initiatives and advice of the line authority, as well as encourage the evolution of more flexible forms of organization with the capacity to induce desirable level of development, extra-bureaucratic organizations have been engineered: negative-hierarchy, ad-hocracy and polyarchy(Ibid). Negative-hierarchy, unlike the information flow from top to bottom of the positive-hierarchy that is bureaucracy, represents information flow from bottom to top to widen the participatory base of organizational members in policy initiatives. Ad-hocracy is about the creation of temporary organizations; while polyarchy covers organization emphasizing external co-operation.

Thirdly, where the bureaucracy is deemed handicapped, various efforts have been made to create suitable forms or organization capable of meeting different

development needs.(Ibid) In this regard, special consideration has been made for different types of economic organizations among others including planning mechanisms, public enterprises, regulatory administration and adhoc organizations.

Fourthly, in terms of what planners or policy conscious administrators must bear in mind in their effort to build individual organization, the institutuion building school concentrates attention on identifying institutional variables as well as their network of linkages with other organizations.(Ibid) Five institutional variables are identified by this school as: leadership, doctrine, programme, resources or inputs and internal structure. Leadership is about those who are responsible for directing the building of the organization; doctrine comprises both the goals, objectives and values as well as the operational methods of action; programme, comprises the translation of doctrine into practical action of result in addition to the allocation of technological and informational inputs; and internal structure represents the processes of division of labour, distribution of authority and internal communication coupled with the alignment of individual objectives of personnel with organizational objectives.

In order to gain support and achieve institutionality in the sense of being legitimized and thus incorporated into the behavior of inter-faced organizations and groups located in the larger society, the institutional building school identifies four variants of possible linkages of an organization with outer society, namely: enabling, functional, normative and diffused linkages. Enabling linkages relate to organizations performing complementary functions and services; normative linkages affect organizations which incorporate objectives, norms and values relevant to the institution's doctrine and programme; and diffused linkages with elements in the system which are extra-legal rational.

Giving the complex networks of linkages and relations among organizations in society as a whole, it may be necessary, from time to time, to have major administrative reforms. By administrative reform or improvement is meant induced change in the administrative structures, functions, processes or procedures, with a view to enhancing the administrative capacity of government. Administrative capacity of government for development being "the capacity to obtain intended results through organization"(United Nations Publications, Op cit) It has also been conceived of as the ability to mobilize, allocate and combine the actions that are technically needed to achieve development objectives.(Katz,1965). Thus, administrative capacity may mean the management capacity of specific development projects or programmes. In any of these senses, administrative capacity is a major factor in the success or failure of development efforts giving the bureaucratic framework. And policy initiatives or reforms become decisively critical, if not for anything else but to create the enabling atmosphere meaningful for collective participation in national development.

Conclusion

A review of the pertinent literature on bureaucracy and development raises certain issues that illuminate the possible direction of development, particularly of developing polities like Nigeria. In this write-up, we have attempted to show that while bureaucracy represents a formal structure characterized by an inflexible and impersonal behavior, development, on the other hand, has been suggested to mean the collective capacity of the individual to freely participate in deciding the transformational strategies of society by engaging in socio-economic and political activities that would maximally enhance the welfare of the people. In essence, the centre piece is man and his freedom to utilize his creative ability in the service of collective good. In this sense, the bureaucratic element of impersonality, relating to abstract things rather than human beings, becomes anti-developmental. And especially so as impersonalization, according to Reading (1978:105) is "to confer an impersonal character on social relationships" thus giving rise to organization without people.

It is this impersonality trait of bureaucracy that has incapacitated the bureaucrats in their discretionary and creative abilities to influence meaningfully transformational programmes, policies and decisions. Thus, when the bureaucracy is entrusted with the tasks of transformation, crisis becomes the inevitable end-product. And the adverse consequence for the larger society is immense.

Thus in Nigeria, a developing polity, bureaucracy and crisis of development continue to manifest irrespective of structural and process modifications made towards revitalizing bureaucracy. This situation partly finds explanations in the legacies of the pre-colonial, colonial, military and democratic modes of governance that have had to be adopted in Nigeria and other developing polities. In other words, curbing bureaucratic excesses will require, first and foremost, an exploration of the constraining environmental forces that have helped to sustain impersonality in social relationships of developing societies.

Pre-colonially, ruler-subject relationship in greater parts of developing nations, was based on impersonality. This is aptly suggested by a renown scholar on local government:

"....the position of the local ruler... had been vitually important since the pre-British era... The structure of authority... was centred around the office.... Considered the recipository of religious, executive, legislative and judicial functions.....He ruled by the divine right of Kings.... his rule was not dependent on the popular will of his subjects. His administrators or palace bureaucrats were chosen on the basis of their individual loyalty to him rather than on merit or any universalistic criteria".(Ola,1984:23).

Colonially, impersonality in subject-ruler relationship was also reenacted and reinforced by the colonial regime. Thus, the existing local ruler or traditional political institution of the pre-colonial order formed the instrument for the institutionalization of the bureaucratic command: "... around him (local ruler) was established a system of administration based on the acceptance of Complete obedience to chiefly rule".

In this light, Greene (1965:48) writes on the bureaucratization of the colonial states using the British colonial experience as example thus:

"Through Indirect Rule, the European keeps himself a good deal in the background and leaves the mass of native individuals to understand that the orders which come to them emanate from their own chief rather than from.... the whiteman".

Militarily, Ball(1979:218) does not mince words in equating the structure of the armed forces with bureaucratic obedience or impersonal relationships, in his words:

"The structure of the armed forces is hierarchical and centralized, putting a premium on rapid communications. Discipline and obedience to higher commands are considered of fundamental importance, and here, one should note the bureaucratic obedience, in Weber's sense, to the rank and not to the individual who holds that rank".

And because "...implicit in the concept of coup d'etat (coup) is a process of usurpation...."(West,1980:113). Adebayo (1981:162) writes to illustrate this case of military usurpation, and the resultant crisis for the Nigerian bureaucracy during the Murtala Mohammed/Obasanjo military regime. In the reproduced words:

"....for far too long civil servants, especially in the upper echelons of the service, have had things their way. Not only were they involved in the normal execution of policy, they were to a considerable degree, the actual formulators of policy. This is of course, contrary of their traditional role. In the process some of them became so powerful...."

It is noteworthy that the issue here is not whether the involvement of the bureaucrats in policy making was appropriate, but the hangover effect of the military culture of usurpation on civil servants in post military era in Nigeria which, in fact, would make the casual observer to question the appropriateness of their involvement in policy making rather than appreciate it.

The pertinent question is: how can we fashion out a bureaucracy that adequately places man fully liberated, at the centre of development, and encourage an

enhanced administrative capacity of man and structures for development? Simply put, the natural response would be to attempt to devise ways and means of substituting impersonality with improved personal relations among bureaucrats, enabling them to develop the creative and innovative potentials useful in collectively participating in decision that would translate their environment in socially desirable ways.

How is this to be done? First, there is the increasing need to institutionalize the democratic culture. This will not only transform antipeople and anti-development tendencies that flow from the past into the present, its resultant economic and political liberties and democratization will further assist in encouraging the institutionalizations of the participatory culture in bureaucratic setting. Second, the adoption of an educational system that prioritise re-orientation and mass literacy capable of sustaining the culture of participatory democracy in the service of mankind that will emerge. Third, administrative reforms will continue to be encouraged so as to sustain or consolidate gains from devised democratic and educational practices. Fourth, extra-bureaucratic organizations will need to increase in their numbers to address the management of specific national efforts and challenges at development. Finally, there is the need to encourage the emergence of a smaller public sector (civil service) relative to the private sector so as to fully harness the gains of the more relaxed and enterprising atmosphere of the private sector, particularly in terms of regard for human or individual dignity, better human relations and the exercise of freedom over the use of creative initiatives to the process of national development. In this way, the welfare of society will be enhanced and sustained. Bureaucracy then becomes humane and instrumental to man's continued quest for survival and happiness.

References

- Adebayo,A (1981) *Principles and Practice of Public Administration in Nigeria*, Ibadan, Spectrum Books Ltd.
- Blau,P (1952) *The Dynamics of Bureaucracy*, Chicago;Chicago University Press.
- Ball, A R (1979) *Modern Politics and Government*, London, Macmillan Press.
- Coleman,J S (1968) "Modernization:Political Aspects" in *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, New York; Macmillan Co; Apter D (1965) *The Politics of Modernisation*, Chicago,Chicago University Press; Almond,G A, and Powell, B (jr) (1966) *Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach*; New York;Little Broom.
- Greene,K (1965)*The principles of Native Administration in Nigeria: Selected Documents,1900-1947*, London, Macmillan Press.
- Hicks,G H and Gullet, C R(1982) *Organization: Theory and Practice*, New York, MC Grana Hill Inc.
- Hyden, G etal(1970) *Developmental Administration: The Kenyan Experience*, London,

Oxford University Press.

Ilchman,W and Schaffer, C (1968) "The Unproductive Study of Productivity" in *Comparative Political Studies*,Vol1, No 2.

Ilchman,W (1965)"Rising Expectations and the Revolution in Developing Administration" in *Public Administrative Review*, Vol 25,No 4.

Katz S M (1965) "A Systems Approach to Developmental Administration," Papers in *Comparative Public Administration*, Special Series,No 6,Washington D C, American Society for Public Administration.

Nnoli, O (1981) "Development and Underdevelopment: Is Nigeria Developing" in Nnoli's (ed) *Path to Nigeria Development*, Dakar, Senegal: Codesria.

Ola R F (1984) *Local Administration in Nigeria*, London; Kegan Paul Press.

Popper,K R (1974) *The Open Society and its Enemies* Vol 2 and Hagel and Marx, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Reading,H(1978)*A Dictionary of Social Sciences*, London, Macmillan Press.

Riggs F (1964) *Administration in Developing Countries*,Boston; Hought Mifflin; and Esman M J (1967) " The Ecological Style in Comparative Administration" in *Public Administrative Review*; Vol 2 No 3, September.

Riggs F (1977) "Bureaucracy and Development Administration" in S.I.C.A, *America Society for Public Administration*, Washington.

Schaffer,B B (1969) "The Deadlock in Development Administration" in Collins Leys(ed),*Politics and Change in Developing Countries*; London: Cambridge University Press.

Shafritz,J M and Hyde(1970)ed *Between the Wars in Classic of Public Administration*, Illinois, Moore Publishing Co.

See United Nation's Department of Economics and Social Affairs Publication entitled *Development: Current Approaches and Trends in Public Administration for National Development* (1975) New York.

See *Approaches to Administrative Capacity for Development*,United Nations Publications (1971) Sales No E 6911N2 and " Preliminary notes of the working group to explore the possibility of formulating concrete measurement for administrative capacity", No 42, October.

Weber,M "Bureaucracy" in Shafritz,J M, and Hyde,A C (1970) (ed), *Classic of Public Administration*, Illinois; Moore Publishing Company, Inc