Bureaucracy and Social Welfare Administration in Nigeria: A Case Study of Internally Displaced Persons in Maiduguri, Borno State

By

Ken Nwoko
Department of Political Science,
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education,
Rumuolumeni, P.M.B. 5047, Port Harcourt,
Rivers State, Nigeria.
Emails: kennydeprof@yahoo.com
&
Kenneth Nweke, PhD
Department of Political Science,
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education,
Rumuolumeni, P.M.B. 5047, Port Harcourt,
Rivers State, Nigeria.
kenneth.nweke@iaue.edu.ng

Abstract

The fundamental thrust of this study was to undertake a holistic assessment of the institutional responsiveness and capacity of the Nigerian bureaucracy in relation to, not only the provision of social services, but the administration of welfare services to the less privileged aspect of the Nigerian population. Hence, the study chose as its case study, the Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) camps in Maiduguri, Borno State. In the course of reviewing relevant literature, coupled with the reliable data obtained from field work, the study assessed the degree of positive impacts the statutory obligations of the Nigerian bureaucracy have had on social welfare befitting Nigerians. Consequently, this study unearthed some administrative inadequacies and institutional incapacitations that impinge on bureaucratic performances with regards to effective

administration of social welfare services in Nigeria. This study revealed that the Nigerian bureaucracy has performed very dismally in relation to providing quality and effective social welfare services to the target beneficiaries on account of administrative malfeasance bordering on bureaucratic corruption, political interferences, red tape and etc. The study anchored on the theory of structural functionalism and data gathering was basically from secondary sources and the analysis was literature/desktop based. This study recommended a total overhauling of the Nigerian bureaucratic system and a re-definition of the constitutional duties of the various Ministries, Departments and Agencies of government. The study concluded that except stern measures are taken to address bureaucratic issues associated with the efficient administration of welfare services to the IDPs in Maiduguri, efforts aimed at improving their conditions would remain a mirage.

Keywords: Administration, Bureaucracy, Effectiveness, Governance, Nepotism and Political Interference.

1.1 Introduction

There exists, a globally conceived impression about effective and sound governance structures which expectedly should derive from a quick response by the bureaucratic set-up of any government in terms of effecting improvement in the living standard of the people. Any government that bears a democratic countenance strives to ensure a steady and unbridled improvement in the living standard of its subjects, through a concretised system of social welfare packages (Chinweuba, 2017). Modern democracies, the world over, deem social welfare administration as a common or usual characteristic of governance which performance is evaluated on the basis of the positive impartation of the various state-conceived social welfare policies and programmes in the people (Umar & Tafida, 2015; Odife, 2014).

The Nigerian bureaucracy, over time, has been bedevilled with a lot of administrative inadequacies and lapses which are known to be responsible for poor, ineffective and inefficient performances of the public sector. The latter's conventional duty is to effectively utilise its statutory mandate to provide basic social goods and services such as education, primary healthcare services as well as cater for the social welfare needs of the less privileged of the society (Lawal, Kirfi & Balarabe, 2013).

Bureaucratic nepotism and favouritism are debilitating factors which have, over the years, preyed on the activities of the Nigerian bureaucracy. Asonye, (2015) submits that the nepotistic tendencies, exhibited in the running of the various ministries and agencies of government hamper effective service delivery.

Poor funding of social welfare programmes in Nigeria and mismanagement of public funds have also been identified as factors militating against efficient delivery of social welfare services by the public sectors. Olaopa, (2009) holds that the above cited variable has been known, over the years, to have a crippling effect on service delivery by any agency saddled with the responsibility of providing services to the public. The consequences always manifest in the areas of outright lack of service delivery, less and seriously-compromised services, rendered to the public and conventional delays in the provision of the said services to the public (Olufemi, 2015).

The Nigerian bureaucracy, over the years, has not been effective in administering social welfare services to the Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs). There is in existence, an alarming rate of socio-economic despair in the Internally Displaced Persons Camps (IDPs) in Nigeria (Itumo & Nwefuru, 2016). Hence, the fundamental purpose of this research study is to generally evaluate overall impact of the Nigerian bureaucracy on social welfare administration of services, identify its shortcomings and proffer stern solutions to address the problems. This study, therefore, seeks to answer the following questions:

(i) What are the general impacts of bureaucracy on social welfare administration in Nigeria and IDPs in Maiduguri, Borno State?
(ii) What are the bureaucratic constraints to the administration of social welfare services in the IDPs in Maiduguri, Borno State?
(iii) What strategies could be adopted to enhance the capacity of the Nigerian bureaucracy to administer social services in the IDPs in Maiduguri, Borno State?

2.1 Conceptual Review

2.1.1 Bureaucracy

Kramer (2009) views bureaucracy as a hierarchical management that exists in organisations depending on a line of authority and division of labour. Gbenga and Ariyo (2006) in their submission depict the term as the machinery of governmental administration which comprises professionals, workers who are placed under strict hierarchical supervision and performing their official responsibilities in an orderly method and supported by rules and regulations from their superiors. Eme and Onwuka (2010) consider bureaucracy to mean a system of authoritative relationship that exists among individuals, offices and processes that government exploits to execute its policies and programmes. Bureaucrats, according to Eme and Onwuka preclude political office holders; rather, they comprise civil and public servants.

Accordingly, Bureaucracy refers to structures and institutions, constitutionally created by any sovereign state to perform statutory obligations of government. These obligations consist of the fundamental services of the government to the citizenry. In other words, the bureaucratic set-up of the state is the medium through which the government performs its constitutional duties to the masses in the form of conscious and systemically patterned processes of provision of basic social benefits.

2.1.2 Social Welfare Administration

Friedlander, in Dolgoff (2012) defined social welfare administration as "an organised system of social services and institutions, designed to aid individuals and groups to attain satisfying standard of life and health, and personal and social relationships that permit them to develop their full capacities and to promote their well being in harmony with the needs of their families and the community" (p. 19). Friedlander in his definition aptly captures the exigency and criticality of institutionalizing social welfare services. According to Ijadunola (2013), the institutional appendage to social welfare services fundamentally presupposes the superintending involvement of the state in pioneering, coordinating and implementing social welfare programmes for its citizens and specifically, to the socially disadvantaged and exploited section of the general society. Nwagwu (2011) posits that the government of any 'relevant' state has the constitutional responsibility of conceiving the social welfare policy plan, prioritising courses of action, determining the various approaches and alternatives aimed at achieving a pre-determined set of objectives and directing and coordinating the various human and material resources to carry out efficiently, the social welfare programmes to the deserving beneficiaries.

2.1.3 Social Welfare vis-a-vis Social Welfare Administration

Social welfare can generally suppose services or organised efforts initiated by an individual, groups, corporate entities, and charity bodies which sole aim is to improve the living standard of a group of people in the society and alleviate their sufferings (Dolgoff, 2012; Ogbonna, 2017). From the submissions of the two authors as expressed above, it can be conveniently deduced that social welfare as distinct from social welfare administration is explained from the standpoint that while the former involves activities which do not have a statutory obligation, the latter emphasises the unavoidable constitutional responsibility of the government. Again, while social welfare can be carried out without recourse to observing set policies, social welfare administration is governed by established procedural

policies and laws. In line with the view expressed above, Daura (2016) asserts that:

> Social welfare administration is the process of efficiently providing resource and service to meet the basic needs of the vulnerable group in a given society. It is a wide range of activities which include social problem and need identification, welfare policy formulation and provision of policy benefits to the targeted members of the community. (p.14)

Put differently, the most striking distinguishing factor between social welfare and social welfare administration is that the former could be initiated and executed by any individual or group, other than the government, while the latter is an exclusive constitutional obligation of the government. Nevertheless, the government can also integrate non-governmental organisations in social welfare administration.

In the light of the above submissions by different scholars, on the conceptual explanations of Social Welfare Administration, this study seeks to define the term as an integrated and all-inclusive national effort, initiated by the government to address myriad of identified social problems, bedevilling some target populations of the society. These target populations may include the less privileged of the society, like the destitute, the orphans, the physically challenged, and the unemployed, among others. Also, these may involve a set of the society's population which is afflicted by natural disasters like war or insurgency, flood, fire, among other things. The government reaches out to these target population through the enactment and implementation of social policies and laws, as well as the allocation of resources in human, material and financial capacity. To achieve the above objectives, the government utilises the services of its various Ministries, Departments and Agencies.

3.1 Theoretical Framework

For the purpose of appropriateness, this study is anchored on the theory of structural-functionalism. The theory of structural-functionalism evolved from the works of the French and British philosophers, Comte, Spencer and Durkheim. The theory of structural-functionalism by these scholars was developed in response to the quest to apply biological indices in understanding and analysing society. Its aim was primarily focused on explaining social relations, needs and systems in the society (Urry, 2000; Harper, 2011).

Vella, Potts, Dale and Sipe (2014) inform that the theory of structural-functionalism was introduced in the field of Political Science in the 1960s as a method of comparing different political systems and also to establish, by means of analysis, the nature of interdependence of the different structures within a political system.

The salient assumptions of structural-functionalism are based on the following:

(i) Every society comprises structures and functions that are interrelated, interconnected, and dependent and centred on sustaining societal balance (Arnoldi, 2001).

(ii) The society is made up of structures and functions that are vital for the survival of the political system, (Vella, Potts, Dale & Sipe, 2014).

(iii) The assumption that Structures exist in the society to satisfy the myriads of needs of the system (Merton, 1949, in Vella, Potts, Dale and Sipe, 2014).

(iv) The assumption that various parts of the system exist and also work to ensure the reinforcement and stability of the system. This is in the view of the dynamic, intricate and erratic nature of the system.

Two definitions of the two key concepts that make up structural functionalist theory the theory under study include:

Structures: Sewell (1992, in Vella, Potts, Dale and Sipe, 2014) considers structures to consist of 'static' components of the system. By implication however, Sewell does not suggest the immobility of structures, rather, he is of the opinion that changes in structures occur at an unhurried pace than what is obtainable in functions. The latter experiences regular permutations alterations, improvements and modifications. Kalu, (2011) sees structures as components which comprise government agencies, ministries, institutional affiliations and various public sectors. He further avers that these structures are interrelated as they are independent.

Functions: Almond and Coleman (1960, in Vella, Potts, Dale and Sipe, 2014) assert that in the governance cycle, certain functions must be carried out to enable the system to thrive and stabilise. Eisenstadt, (1990) describes 'functions' as the qualities that explain how governmental 'structures' discharge their responsibilities. Also, Parsons, (1951, in Vella, Potts, Dale and Sipe, 2014) contends that the features of 'functions' portray the social consequences of the relationship between 'structures and functions'.

There is no doubt that the relevance of structural-functionalist theory to this study cannot be over-emphasised.

Admittedly, this study has a strong relationship with the theory of structural-functionalism. Establishing a veritable point from the implication of the definition of the two concepts that make up the compound word, structures represent the bureaucratic set-up of the government. Again, functions stand for the various social welfare services which the structures (the bureaucracy) have to perform. In structural-functionalism, the emphasis is pitched on the fact that the relevance and survival of the system wholly depend on the functions the structures are expected to perform. In the same vein, the relevance attached to the existence of the state rests on the effective and efficient performances of its various ministries, departments and agencies in carrying out a comprehensive social welfare administration to the less privileged and

socially disadvantaged persons, in this case, the Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in Maiduguri, Borno State.

4.1 Challenges of Bureaucracy Vis-À-Vis Social Service Delivery in Nigeria

In Nigeria, the provision of core services of government has, over the years, been scored very low. This administrative insufficiency also impinges on the delivery of social welfare services to the socially afflicted and underprivileged section of the society. Some factors have been adduced by scholars to include:

Bureaucratic Corruption: Aluko and Adesopo (2003) have observed that the corrupt practices perpetrated by civil/public servants in the various Ministries, Departments and Agencies of government in Nigeria are responsible for the lethargic socio-economic development of the Nigerian state. Asonye (2015) asserts that bureaucratic corruption in the various institutions of government in Nigeria is fundamentally motivated by a progressive erosion of our value-system. The gross mismanagement of our collective public fund and other State owned resources by public servants has overtime, devastated the economic fortunes of the Nigerian state and has also frustrated adequate investment in social service delivery to the people. This is in so far as the administration of welfare packages to the socio-economically advantaged section of our society has not recorded tangible successes. Scholars have posited hat despite the huge economic buoyancy that Nigeria enjoys from her rich crude oil resources, there still exists, a high population of poverty stricken masses. According to Chinweuba (2017), a Global Financial Integrity Initiative Report (2011) estimated that corruption in the oil subsidy saga has led to the loss of $500billion between 1960 and 2011.In his opinion, corruption has led to funding graft-rich projects at the expense of investing in education and health services. His study equally discloses that the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) in 2010 revealed that 65% of Nigeria's wealth was owned and controlled by just 20% of the entire population. This, according to him,

demonstrates the extent of income inequality and also the inability of the government to create a formidable platform that can promote social welfare services.

Nepotism/Favouritism: This refers to the unwholesome and administratively-sabotaging tendency, exhibited by civil servants whereby they show preferences or described in the Nigerian local parlance, 'who know who' in the discharge of their official responsibilities. Goni (2015) observes that in most of the IDP camps in Borno State, government staff deployed to those IDP camps resort to adopting ethno-religious and fraternity based criteria in the sharing of food and other relief materials among IDP inmates.

The Issue of Red Tapism: This presupposes protracted and rigorous administrative processes undertaken by civil servants before embarking on the execution of policies and programmes of government. Ochiagha (2012) stresses that red-tapism in the Nigerian situation causes economically destructive delays in the execution of social welfare projects.

4.2 Social Welfare Administration and the Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) In Nigeria

Mooney (2005) tenders a comprehensive United Nation's definition of Internally Displaced Persons to mean:

> Persons or group of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or man-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized State border. (p. 11)

Asplet (2013) observes that internal displacement involves an outsized number of persons who are temporarily dislodged from their original place of settlement. Consequently, these displaced persons, in their large number are relocated to a different region which did not anticipate such a massive influx of people in that area. The more worrisome is the fact that in most cases, the host regions might be adversely under-resourced in diverse aspects to accommodate and gratify the socio-economic needs of these displaced persons. Hence, the government of the state assumes a constitutional responsibility to fend for the overall needs of such a socially devastated group of individuals.

Akuto (2017) in his contribution is of the view that the government has the constitutional obligation to sufficiently address the myriad of challenges faced by internally displaced persons. Akuto holds that the government, through its MDAs should be mandated to:

(i) have adequate data which should be credible enough to aid the formulation of valuable policies and programmes to cater for the welfare of the IDPs.

(ii) provide comprehensive medical care for the IDPs, most especially children, pregnant women and nursing mothers.

(iii) provide balanced diet and nutritious meals, to check incidences of illnesses that are associated with malnutrition, especially in children.

(iv) make available, adequate security for the protection of lives and property of the inmates in IDP camps across the country.

(v) educate the IDPs on the need to observe hygienic lifestyle with a view to checking the spread of communicable diseases.

However, Itumo and Nwefuru (2016) observe that the reverse has been the case as experiences in IDP camps in Nigeria have continued to be characterised by hunger, malnutrition, persistent insecurity, spread of communicable diseases and overcrowding.

Research Question one: What are the general impacts of bureaucracy on social welfare administration in Nigeria and IDPs in Maiduguri, Borno State?

Table 1: Percentage response to questionnaire items on the general impact of bureaucracy on social welfare administration in Nigeria.

S/N	The general impact of bureaucracy on social welfare administration in Nigeria and IDPs in Maiduguri, Borno State.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Total SA/A	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Total SD/D	Grand total
1	Social welfare administration is a constitutional obligation of government.	150 43%	165 47%	315 90%	20 6%	15 4%	35 10%	350 100%
2	The Nigerian bureaucracy has been effective in administering welfare services to the IDPs.	69 20%	71 20%	140 40%	106 30%	104 30%	210 60%	350 100%
3	The various ministries and agencies of government formulate and initiate sound social welfare policies and programmes for the IDPs.	141 40%	106 30%	240 70%	50 14%	55 16%	105 30%	350 100%

4	Social welfare programmes and policies are strictly implemented by the various ministries and agencies of government.	49 14%	56 16%	105 30%	144 41%	101 29%	245 70%	350 100%
5	The IDPs sufficiently benefit from social welfare programmes in Nigeria.	71 20%	69 20%	140 40%	103 29%	107 31%	210 60%	350 100%

Research Question Two: What are the bureaucratic constraints to the administration of social welfare services in the IDPs in Maiduguri, Borno State?

	Bureaucratic constraints to social welfare administration in Nigeria and IDPs	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Total SA/A**	**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Total SD/D**	**Grand total**
1	Poor funding is a major constraint.	93 27%	71 20%	164 47%	95 27%	87 25%	164 53%	350 100 %
2	Misappropriation of social welfare funds by civil/public servants is a militating factor.	200 57%	108 31%	308 88%	21 6%	21 6%	42 12%	350 100 %
3	Favouritism, nepotism and other forms of bureaucratic corruption are militating factors.	113 32%	90 26%	203 58%	97 28%	50 14%	147 42%	350 100 %

4	High emoluments for public/civil servants impinge on the successful welfare administration for the IDPs.	88 25%	80 23%	168 48%	102 29%	80 23%	182 52%	350 100 %
5	Political interference on the activities of the Nigerian bureaucracy is a factor.	109 31%	140 40%	249 71%	51 15%	50 14%	101 29%	350 100 %

Researchers' Field Work, 2019

Research Question three: What strategies could be adopted to enhance the capacity of the Nigerian bureaucracy to effectively administer social welfare services in the IDPs in Maiduguri, Bornu State?

	Strategies to enhance the capacity of the Nigerian bureaucracy.	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Total SA/A**	**Strongly Disagree**	**Disagree**	**Total SD/D**	**Grand total**
1	Reduction in political interferences on the activities of civil/public servants can enhance bureaucratic performance in Nigeria.	126 36%	130 37%	256 73%	47 13%	47 13%	94 27%	350 100%

2	Adequate funding will optimally improve the capacity of the Nigerian bureaucracy, in relation to social welfare administration.	90 26%	78 22%	168 48%	92 26%	90 26%	168 52%	350 100%
3	Periodic training of civil/public servants will improve service delivery in Nigeria.	90 26%	71 20%	161 46%	110 319%	79 23%	189 54%	350 100%
4	Value re-orientation for civil/public servants will arrest bureaucratic corruption in Nigeria.	163 47%	110 31%	273 78%	47 13%	30 9%	77 22%	350 100%
5	Severe disciplinary measures against corrupt civil/public servants will minimally curb bureaucratic corruption in Nigeria.	130 37%	129 37%	259 74%	30 9%	21 6%	51 26%	350 100%

Researchers' Field Work, 2019

5.1 Discussion of Findings Based on responses from Researchers' Field Work Culled from the research questions

Research Question 1 conveyed a question on the general impact of bureaucracy on social welfare administration in Nigeria, especially for the IDPs. The researcher commenced by trying to access the respondents' awareness of the constitutional obligation of the government to provide social welfare services to the citizenry. Accordingly, a surging number of the respondents concurred with the assertion that the provision of social welfare services is a statutory mandate of the government. By implication, the respondents are aware that the provision of social services, as well as the administration of welfare services is an exclusive and constitutional right of Nigerian citizens. Hence, the government, through its Ministries and Agencies is bound by the compelling significance of such a social contract to provide the needed basic services to its citizens. This position was supported by Unigwe (2014) as he asserts that the provision of basic and fundamental means of livelihood for the populace is the rationale for the existence of the government. Unfortunately though, majority of the respondents, from their responses via distributed questionnaires established that the Nigerian bureaucracy, which supposedly should be the machinery through which the government fulfils its constitutional responsibility of providing basic services to the people has overtime, failed to live up to its constitutional task. Their claims are buttressed by the position of Ngajiuba (2015) which asserts that the Nigerian bureaucracy has degenerated into a 'disturbing liability status' instead of being a prolific asset to the nation.

When asked about the effectiveness of the bureaucracy in the provision of welfare services for the IDPs, especially the IDPs in Maiduguri, Borno State, which is the case study of this research work, majority of the respondents answered in the negative. These negative responses confirm factual cases of negligence, and by extension, the collapse of the responsiveness of the Nigerian bureaucracy to the provision of quality social welfare services to

the aspect of the Nigerian population who are less privileged. Admittedly, it follows, judging by the result of the finding in this respect, that the Nigerian bureaucracy has performed poorly, with regards to effective administration of social welfare services in Nigeria. Hence, the position of the respondents is supported by the finding of Akuto (2017) which describes medical attention and accommodation in the IDP camps in Maiduguri as 'unspeakably deplorable'. Itumo and Nwefuru (2016) in their finding also corroborated the position of the respondents when they likened the meals that are served inmates in the IDP camps with the kind that are given to prisoners in the most dilapidated prisons.

From the majority opinion of respondents, this study unearths that the institutional incapacitation associated with the performances of the Nigerian bureaucracy with regards to the provision of quality social welfare administration, does not lie with absence of good and appropriate social welfare policies and programmes. Among the civil servants in Nigeria, there are a good number of personnel who are sufficiently versed in the articulation and formulation of sound and fertile social welfare policies. However, institutional incapacitations, expressed in obvious forms of bureaucratic anomalies and unwholesome political/bureaucratic bond have always frustrated the performances of the Nigerian bureaucracy, with regards to administering social welfare services. To lend credence to the above claim, Ochiagha, (2012, p. 29) holds that the culpability of the Nigerian bureaucracy with regards to failure to deliver efficiently cannot be blamed on the absence of proper policy initiatives and programmes, rather, on overall systemic fallibilities.

Research Question 2 provided the respondents with questions which were anchored on bureaucratic constraints to social welfare administration in Nigeria, especially in relation to the IDPs in Maiduguri, Borno State. The researcher discovered from the responses of majority of the respondents that negative administrative variables and attributes like bureaucratic

corruption in the forms of misappropriation of funds meant for the IDPs, rigidity of bureaucratic rules, political interferences on the activities of bureaucrats, e.t.c. as the factors that impinge on the efficiency and responsiveness of the Nigerian bureaucracy with regards to social welfare administration, especially to the IDPs.

In the aspect of rigidity of bureaucratic rules, the finding from this research is corroborated by Akuto, (2017) which stresses that the plight of IDPs in Nigeria is made worse by the unnecessary bureaucratic delays experienced, before social welfare policies and programmes are carried out. The plight of the IDPs, occasioned by bureaucratic delays and rigidity represents what obtains in the overall plight of Nigerians who are in need of social welfare services. The rigorous legislative processes involved in the articulation, adoption and passage of social welfare policies in Nigeria, render the pace of bureaucratic processes lethargic. This situation is most times worsened by the activities of the executive arm, with regards to assenting to social welfare bills. A condition that warrants the Chief executive to withhold assent to bills, especially in an era of existing rift between the legislature and the executive, delays the execution of social welfare policies and programmes by various Ministries and Agencies of government.

Again, in the area of political interferences on the activities of bureaucrats, the finding from this study is supported by Ochiagha (2012) which submits that the unwholesome interplay between political office holders and public servants is inimical to the realisation of goals and objectives. He contends that while the former have superintending and overbearing influence on the latter, the latter's performances are regrettably undermined. The imposition of superior influence by political office holders on the official performances of civil/public servants in Nigeria makes the bureaucracy ineffectual, thus, worsening the already existing poor state of social welfare administration.

Research Question 3 presented the respondents with statements distilled from the principal subject which is on strategies to enhance the capacity of the Nigerian bureaucracy to effectively administer social welfare services, especially to the IDPs. The researcher, from the opinion of majority of the respondents discovered that value re-orientation; reduction in undue political interferences and flexibility of bureaucratic rules will optimally strengthen the capacity of the Nigerian bureaucracy to be service providers of the last resort, especially to the IDPs. Further, it is a finding from this study, going by the contributions of majority of the respondents that severe disciplinary measures against corrupt civil/public servants will help reduce bureaucratic corruption.

5.1 Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1.1 Conclusion

The strengthening and repositioning of the bureaucratic structure in Nigeria would in the long run, promote effectiveness and efficiency in the administration of social welfare services to the socio-economically disadvantaged/afflicted portion of the Nigerian population. The response to the clarion call for advancement and subsequent pursuit of excellence in the administration of social welfare services in Nigeria can only be realised through the restructuring, rehabilitation and re-branding of the bureaucratic system. The rationale behind this claim is that the bureaucracy comprises career civil/public servants who execute services on behalf of the government. Hence, the bureaucracy is the machinery through which the government reaches out to the people through delivery of social services (Kalu, 2011). Therefore, it is pertinent and unavoidably needful for Nigerian bureaucracy to be viable enough to be responsible and responsive to its numerous constitutional tasks. The various incapacitations and weaknesses associated with bureaucratic performances can be tackled forthwith if the government expresses the political will to implement recommendations from the findings in this study. The study concluded that except stern measures are taken to address bureaucratic issues associated with the

efficient administration of welfare services to the IDPs in Maiduguri, efforts aimed at improving their conditions would remain a mirage.

5.1.2 Recommendations

This research work provides the following recommendations based on inferences from findings in the study.

(i) The Nigerian government should create a separate institution, within the bureaucratic domain that would ensure a mandatory access to social welfare services by the supposed beneficiaries of any institutionalised social welfare package.

(ii) The government should create an independent body from the civil society that should serve as a watchdog to the activities of civil/public servants. Such institutions should exist in the three tiers of government.

(iii) The government should place 'a compulsorily achievable target' to the services rendered by civil/public servants. This suggestion is anticipated to instil a sense of seriousness and commitment to duty by civil/public servants.

(iv) This study recommends that the Nigerian government should develop a high level of technological mechanism to check incidences of misappropriation of funds meant for the delivery of social welfare services.

(v) The Nigerian government should place premium on deploying to the IDPs camps, civil/public servants who are morally poised to undertake the delivery of social welfare services in our IDPs camps.

(vi) The culture of delay in the implementation of social welfare programmes by the Nigerian bureaucracy has overtime, constituted an impediment to the desired successful social welfare administration. Therefore, the researcher recommends a review of the over-rigidity of bureaucratic rules.

(vii) The ability of bureaucrats to bring their expertise to bear on the dispensation of viable and quality social welfare services in Nigeria cannot thrive in an environment of 'a cultured pattern' of compromise of functions, occasioned by undue political patronage and alignment. A system that

encourages administrative distortions of the exclusive but constitutional discharge of functions, statutorily bequeathed to trained civil/public servants by elected members of the political class, sabotages effective and efficient administration of social welfare services to the people. Various cases of bureaucratic incapacitations, with regards to the administration of efficient social welfare services in Nigeria, have most times been traced to such administrative misnomer. Therefore, this study recommends that the overall control on the activities of civil/public servants be strictly and exclusively managed by the body(s) lawfully mandated to perform such roles.

References

Akuto, G.W. (2017). Challenges of Internally displaced persons (IDPs) in Nigeria: implications for counselling and the Role of Key shareholders. *International Journal of innovative psychology & social Development* 5(2), 21-27.

Aluko, M.A.O. & Adesopo, A.A. (2003). Bureaucratic corruption in Nigeria: a general and sociological insight into the problem. *Journal of Social Sciences, 7*(1), *47-54.*

Arnoldi, J. (2001). Niklas Luhmann: an introduction theory. *Culture and Society*, *18*(1), 1-13.

Asonye, C. (2015). *Towards revitalisation of Nigeria's bureaucratic system*: *its origin, challenges and prospects.* Owerri: God's time Press.

Asplet, M. (2013). Internal displacement: responsibility and action UNHCR. Retrieved June 20, 2019 from https://www.ipu.org/pdf/publications/displcement.e.pdf.

Chinweuba, M. (2017). Capitalism, Globalisation, and Social Welfare Services in Nigeria: an appraisal of the effects of colonial and post-colonial experiences in social welfare administration Nigeria. *A paper presented during a seminar organised by the Faculty of Social Science, Abia State University, June 10, 2017.*

Daura, H.A. (2016). PAD 409: social welfare administration, centre for distance learning. Maiduguri: University of Maiduguri.

Dolgof, R. (2012). *Understanding social welfare - a search for social Justice* (9th Ed.). Maryland: Pearson Publishers.

Eisenstadti, S. (1990). Functional analysis in anthropology and sociology: an interpretative essay. *Annual of anthropology, 19,* 243-260.

Eme, O. & Onwuka, L. (2010). Bureaucracy and challenges of good governance in Nigeria. *Journal of Business and Organisational Development, 2.*

Eme, O.I. & S.C. Ugwu (2011). Developmental state, bureaucracy in Nigeria: restructuring for Effectiveness (1999-2007). *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review, 1*(4).

Gbenga, L. & Ariyo, T. (2006). Bureaucracy, corruption, good governance and development: the challenges of institution building in Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Sciences Research, 2, 1332-4646.*

Goni, A. (2015). *Agonies of displacement (The Borno State Experience*). Maiduguri: Maina Digital Printing Press.

Harper, D. (2011). *Structural functionalism: grand theory or methodology*. Leicester: University of Leicester.

Ijadunola, K.J. (2013). Free health services in Nigeria: how beneficial to the poor? Retrieved June 30, 2019 from https://www.oauifeeding/wp-content/upload/2013/05/Dr.K.T.Ijadunola…

Itumo, A. & Nwefuru. N.H. (2016). Nigerian state and responses to plight of persons internally displaced by Boko Haram insurgents: implications for socio-economic and political development. *Research on humanities and social sciences, 6*(15), *24-38*.

Kalu, K. (2011). Institution building not nation building: a structural functional model. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *77*(1), 119-137.

Kramer, F.A. (2008). Dynamics of bureaucracy: An introduction to public administration. In,

Attah, A.P. & Baba, D.D. (2016). Bureaucracy and development in Nigeria: issues and perspectives. *Journal of Developing Countries Studies, 1*(2).

Lawal, M., Kirfi, W. & Balarabe. A. (2013). Bureaucratic corruption and service delivery in Nigeria: the 21st century dilemma of the Nigerian public service. *International Journal of Innovative Research & Development*. *2*(8).

Mooney, E. (2005). The concept of internal Displacement and the case for internally displaced persons as a category of concern. *Refugee Survey quarterly*, *24*(3), 9-26. -doi-10.1093/rsq/hd1049.

Ngajiuba, K. (2015). *A resilient Civil Service: a panacea for poor service delivery in Nigeria*. Nsukka: Liberty Printing Press.

Nwagwu, C.C. (2011). The environment of crises in the Nigerian Education system. *The comparative Education, 33* (1), *87-96*.

Ochiagha, A. (2012). *The Nigerian Bureaucracy*: a *functional or dysfunctional system*? Lagos: Oluwatosin Publishing Co. Ltd.

Odife, U. (2014). *Structures and institutions of governance*: *their contributions to service delivery in Nigeria*. Enugu: Moontime Publishers.

Ogbonna, B. (2017). Social welfare scheme: component of public health care services in Nigeria. *MOS Public Health, 5*(3). 1-32. *DOI: 10.15406/mogph.2017.05.0013.*

Olaopa, T. (2009). *Innovation and best practices in public sector reform*s: *ideas, strategies and conditions.* Ibadan: Ibadan University Press plc.

Olufemi, O. (2015). Low income and diminishing productivity in Nigerian public sector. *Arts and social science Journal. 6*(113). *doi:10.4172/2151-6200.1000113*.

Onaedo, C, Oni, S. & Sejoro, J.V. (2017). An assessment of the impact of internal displacement on human security in Northern Nigeria (2009-2016). *Acta Universitatis Danubius*, *10*(1).

Umar, S. & Tafida, D. (2015). Democracy and social welfare services in Nigeria: a perspective of the fourth republic. *Public Policy and Administration Research, 5*(2).

Unigwe, J. (2014). *Bureaucracy and efficiency of Service delivery in Nigeria: a critical review of the role of bureaucracy in delivering effective service in government; ministries between periods (2007 and 2012)*. A seminar presented during a two-days staff induction/appraisal workshop by the Enugu State Civil Service Commission, Enugu, 4th-5th May, 2014.

Urry, J. (2000). *Sociology beyond societies: mobilities for the twenty-first century*. London: Routledge.

Vella, K., Potts, R., Dale, A. & Sipe, N. (2014). Exploring the usefulness of structural, functional approaches to analyse governance of planning system. *Sagepub.co-use Journals Permissions.*