

Essay on Development Administration

Chinedu V. Ofoma^{[a],*}

^[a] Department of Public Administration, Federal University Lokoja, Nigeria.

*Corresponding author.

Received 15 February 2022; accepted 16 March 2023
Published online 26 March 2023

Abstract

The need for reading materials such as books, journals and newspapers in academic environment is immeasurable as they are not only effective teaching aids but also most importantly enhance learning among students. Development administration as a field of study is not an exception to the above, hence, the rationale behind this paper on development administration and other relevant issues such as underdevelopment, development and national development plans etc. This paper was driven by secondary data complemented with critical discourse of the issues. It is clear and simple to the understanding of undergraduate and post graduate students of Nigerian universities and beyond. Policy makers in developing countries may find it very useful as practical examples and lessons on issues of development administration were drawn from Africa especially Nigeria.

Key words: Development; Underdevelopment; Development administration; Foreign aid and national development plan

Ofoma, C. V. (2023). Essay on Development Administration. *Higher Education of Social Science*, 24(1), 29-41. Available from: URL: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/hess/article/view/12937>
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/12937>

INTRODUCTION

The struggle with poverty, disease, conflict, paucity of social amenities and other challenges in the means of abundance natural resources in the then emerging

independent countries informed certain concerted efforts made by citizens of developed countries in order to address the challenges. It was believed that the less developed countries or developing countries lack the administrative competence and technical know-how to drive good governance which includes but not limited to formulation and implementation of good policies and programs. As a result, the perspective of “development administration” was invoked. Development administration is not just a concept or/and mechanism but a strong perspective through which issues around development are better explored together with effective strategies for overcoming them. As averred by Frank (2017), development administration is one of the numerous viewpoints from which scholars can comprehend the underdevelopment of many developing nations, particularly in Africa and other regions of Asia, and what can be done to remedy it. This suggests that development administration is a panacea to capacity issues challenging the bureaucracies of these countries. Given the above, this paper basically aims to serve as a reading material that provides a deep understanding of Development Administration and other relevant issues around it. The paper made use of secondary data such as textbooks, journals articles, newspapers and government publications.

EMERGENCE OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

The exploration of historical trace of development administration is a gateway to understanding the idea behind the introduction of the concept together with what it stands to achieve. Contributing to the discourse, Kotze (2008) observed that development administration is a relatively new phenomenon that emerged as a result of American academics’ interest in foreign aid programs and more specifically, in the transfer of administrative

knowledge, institutions, and training initiatives to Third World nations. Similarly, Frank (2017) submitted that development administration was one of the United States government's post-war efforts to spur growth through technical support to newly emerging developing countries. Development administration was born out of the understanding that it was necessary to rebuild and reenergize governments and their bureaucracies so as to reform society in less developed nation (Hope, 1984).

It suffices to state that development administration came into being as result of concerted efforts made by certain Americans after the war to bring the governance systems of less developed countries to a very reasonable level considering the challenging tasks of nation building. The *raison d'être* was to put in place effective administrative mechanisms that were capable of driving the socio-economic development of the Third World countries and by extension achieving nation-building. The vision of development administration was very apt and cogent in view of the herculean tasks of national development faced by the then emerging independent nations. Accordingly, efficient and effective administrative system was sacrosanct to hit the ground running especially in the areas of policy and program initiation, formulation, implementation and monitoring.

CONCEPT OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Development administration is the term used to describe the administration of development programs, the methods used by major organizations, particularly governments, to implement policies, and plans created to achieve their development objectives. According to Hope (1984), the objectives of development administration are to promote and facilitate clearly defined programs for social and economic advancement. Put differently, development administration is the management of policies, programs, and projects for the benefit of development. It denotes the intricate network of organizations, managerial frameworks, and procedures government establish to accomplish its development objectives. It therefore includes setting up new organizations like planning organizations and development corporations, guiding established organizations such as departments of agriculture, delegating administrative authority to development agencies, and developing a cadre of administrators who can serve as a driving force behind initiatives for social and economic improvement.

Development administration is the branch of public administration which deals with the development of a country's economy and society. It is a multi-disciplinary or inter-disciplinary approach. As such, it is a part and parcel of administration which is responsible for carrying out development programs and projects (Rathod, 2010, p.4).

The foregoing demonstrates that development administration is naturally developmental as it is a conveyor belt as well as means to an end. It drives development process and without which development of a country may be imaginary.

NATURE OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

There has been serious debate among scholars over the true nature of development administration as some scholars believe that it is a science whereas another school of thought view it as an art. According to Siffin (1991), the advocates of development administration as a science view it as a positive and experimental branch of public administration whereas the opposing school of thought considers it to be a normative branch of public administration.

In the context of science, Arora (1977) observed that development administration is a branch of the largest family of social sciences. Its approach is cross-disciplinary. It is characterized as a scientific field of study, teaching, and research. In a similar view, Rathod (2010) submitted that development administration is researchable. It is naturally scientific and done scientifically. It collects data using the scientific approach and verifies it. The data is gathered, collated, examined, and contrasted with the hypothesis. Finally, hypothesis are confirmed or refuted.

On the other hand, the practical aspect of development administration which centres on administering the affairs of government lends credence to it being an art. According to Rathod (2010), a development administrator is an artist. An administrator is a talented individual. The practical aspects of administration are what development administration as an art is concerned with. As a practice, it stands for the activity or process of managing governmental affairs. It is a fine art or discipline as well as an art. Art is more than just theory; it is also the application of theory. Development administration is not just theory but also practice.

Drawing on the above opposing views, it is safe to submit that development administration is a science as well as an art since it inherently has the attributes of both science and art.

ATTRIBUTES OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Features of development administration are discussed below:

Development administration is people oriented: This characteristic explains that development administration is designed to meet the needs and

aspirations of the masses especially certain categories of people such as the poorest of the poor, less privileged, the marginalised, internally displaced people and terrorism affected group/communities among others. The socio-economic growth of these target groups becomes the yardstick for measuring the impact of development administration as well as its operations. According to Sinha (2016), development administration focuses on planning for the people as well as with the people. It is people-centered, must empower society as a whole and not product or profit-centered. To this end, the adoption of development administration will result to formulation and execution of policies and programs that will target the poorest of the poor in a country. The components of the policies and programs should be the improvement of standard of living, provision of security, quality social services, human development, infrastructure and reduction of poverty rate together with inequality. Furthermore, unlike traditional administration where the people are only considered as beneficiaries of policies and programs; development administration provides an ample opportunity for the people to participate in development planning, policy and programs formulation and execution. No meaningful development can take place without the involvement of the people in the developmental processes. Hence, development administration localizes and strengthens public institutions thereby giving the citizens especially those at the grassroots level the opportunity to make quality inputs in issues that concern them. The era of development administration is the one that provides the people an avenue to be actively involved in the developmental process rather than being mere beneficiaries of development. It also involves civil society organizations, non-governmental organizations and community based organizations among others.

Development administration is goal oriented:

Development administration is goal-oriented and as such entails getting together efforts to realize those objectives set by the government. Its operations and activities are carried out with a view to realizing policies and programs result. Time frame is of high importance as policies and programs are put in place within a certain period; hence, results are measured against time, cost and impact on the masses. Development administration is an administrative mechanism that is dominantly goal-oriented which has to do with the realization of political, economic, social and cultural goals. It is concerned with the formulation and implementation of the four P's which are plans, policies, programs and projects (Sharma et al, 2012). Corroborating this assertion, Donald C. cited in Sharma et al (2012) observed that development administration is concerned with achieving national development. The goals, values and strategies of change may vary but there are always generic processes through which agreement on goals is reached and plans, policies, programs and projects (4P's)

are formulated and implemented. Sinha (2016) submitted that a model of development administration must contain certain points. It should reject status quo and be directed towards change and more so towards results. It is result oriented at its core and every development function should have a defined objective. Development administration is a goal-oriented administrative system as well as an action-oriented paradigm (Weidner cited in Rathod, 2010).

Development administration is change oriented:

Unlike traditional administration which is basically hinged on the premise of maintenance of status quo characterized by structures controlled by government at the centre with little role of component units (state, regional or local government), development administration is a wave of departure from the status quo and is decentralization friendly. According to Okon (1986) in Emordi & Onuegbu (2020), prior to the introduction of development administration in Nigeria, the majority of community-based educational development plans were highly centralized and typically implemented using a top-down strategy, with the interests of the elite taking precedence over those of the local populace. However, development administration modified this elitist approach to educational planning by using a bottom-up strategy that allowed the local people to articulate their issues and suggest workable solutions. As a catalyst for socio-economic development of a nation, an effective administrative system is required hence the manifestation of change attribute of development administration by way of repositioning the bureaucracy when it is not functioning effectively. The changes can include reforms in the bureaucracy, modifications of recruitment processes and reward system among others. That is why Harry Friedman cited in Ijje & Iyoriobhe (2018) viewed development administration as a means of program implementation for socio-economic progress; effective monitoring of the nation-building process; and administrative modifications to keep the establishment updated. Meanwhile, the change or reforms must be able to eliminate the conflict between bureaucracy as an institutionalized form of social control and development for better living conditions for the people. The change in this context is not anti-rules and procedures but aims at institutionalizing flexibility of operations in line with current realities and evidence with a view to fostering the acceleration of development.

Development Administration is innovative:

This particular feature suggests that development administration is ground-breaking as it aims at identifying and applying new strategies, measures, approaches and methods towards addressing old and emerging developmental issues. For instance, the application of digital tools in Nigeria bureaucracy is development administration in action. As observed by Ofoma (2021), digital tools and technologies are now used to facilitate government processes. Transactions with government institutions

such as Federal Revenue Inland Service, Federal Road Safety Corps, universities, polytechnics, and colleges of education are now carried out electronically using remittance platform. Increasing an administrative system's capacity to adapt to its external environment and providing a method to activate its internal structures are both indicators of innovation of development administration. More so, this attribute of development administration entails formulation and implementation of new policies and programs so as to meet developmental needs of a country. For example, Nigeria has introduced and implemented a good number of innovative programs such as National Poverty Eradication Program, Youth Empowerment Scheme, Rural Infrastructures Development Scheme, You-Win and National Social Investment Programme (N-Power Programme, Government Enterprise and Empowerment Programme, National Home-Grown School Feeding Programme and Conditional Cash Transfer Feeding Programme) etc. N-Power scheme is a home-grown youth empowerment programme of Buhari led government (Okonkwo et al cited in Ofoma, 2022).

ECOLOGY OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Development administration is not an island and cannot detach itself from the environment. Environmental influence plays a significant role in development administration. Development administration affects the environment the way it is being affected by the environment. According to Rathod (2010), ecological approach of development administration is predicated on the idea that an administrative system may not always function as an independent variable. It has its own unique environment which comprises of social, political, economic, and cultural environment. Development administration must adapt to the changing political, economic, social, and cultural environment in order to exist. Furthermore, ecology of development administration places a strong emphasis on creating domestic administrative strategies and measures to address various developmental issues.

Therefore, in this study, ecology of development administration is going to be viewed in the context of environment within which development administration operates and they include political, economic and socio-cultural environment.

Political Ecology: Political environment influences development administration as long as effective and efficient administrative performance requires the backing of political executive. The discussion of administrative reform(s) in a country is naturally an issue of political leadership, hence must be shaped by the political environment. Similarly, Rathod (2010) observed that political system has a direct impact on development

administration. The political system affects the composition and operation of development administration. Politics significantly influences progress. It is impossible to study development without considering political factors. Almost every facet of development administration is influenced by politics. The political milieu or atmosphere is where the entire area of administration operates. Politics has an impact on every facet of development administration. The administrators' actions are governed and regulated by politics.

In addition, the State through the elected political leaders determines the direction of development administration because it is believed that the administrative structure is a vehicle owned and used by the government in getting to the promise land of national development. Therefore, in the course of doing this, development administration is influenced to suit the political environment as well as achieve national development.

Economic Ecology: Wealth is a subject of economics and it encompasses practically all facets of economy of human life. Pricing, money, banking, planning, budgeting, production, distribution, consumption, and exchange are all economic terms and they have impact on development administration. Imports, exports, taxation policies, wealth accumulation, human saving capacity, purchasing power, and industrial development are all factors that affect development administration (Rathod, 2010). Riggs (1964) inferred that the most essential factor that has impacted development administration is economic productivity. Therefore, the type and characteristics of development administration are influenced by the production and consumption of material goods. Undoubtedly, the mode of production and production relations has an impact on development administration.

Socio-cultural Ecology: Just like political and economic environment, socio-cultural environment influences development administration as the administrative system cannot isolate itself from behavioural patterns, norms, dos and don'ts of the society. Gerald (1971) submitted that social system is a broad concept that encompasses a variety of subsystems, social change, or social reform, and it can be brought about by social policies. Administrators are responsible for carrying out social policies. The hurdles facing a development administrator are numerous social issues. Therefore, all of these new challenges must be faced by development administration. On the other hand, culture according to Jone (1965) in Rathod (2010) has quite a direct and immediate impact on development administration. The philosophy of development administration is unique, and culture has impact on it. The culture of the people binds it. Culture is alive and an influential force. All government development policies and programs have cultural dimension, in reality, both culture and development

administration are tools for bringing about social and economic change (Sidney 1965).

DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: THE NEXUS

As interconnected as development administration and public administration may seem, it is apposite to situate the two concepts properly so as to better bring out their similarities. Bamigbose (2020) observed the symbiotic relationship and complementary nature of development administration and public administration. Meanwhile, giving conceptual meanings of development administration and public administration before dissecting their meeting points would better prepare the minds of readers for this particular section. To this end, development administration is defined according to Arora (1979) from two perspectives. First, it refers to the procedures adopted by major organizations, most notably governments, to carry out the plans and policies created to achieve their developmental objectives. Second, development administration implies an indirect way of improving administrative capacities. However, these two perspectives of development administration are closely linked. On the other hand, public Administration refers to both activities of bureaucrats concerned with the administration of government organizations, and the study of these activities (Ezeani, 2005). The nexus between development administration and public administration is therefore discussed in the following ways:

Provision of quality social services/amenities: Delivery of quality services to the people is embedded in both development administration and public administration. The two concepts serve as an instrument used in making essential goods and services available to the masses. As submitted by Mbieli (2010), public Administration is a necessary mechanism used for providing the people with essential goods and services. He further observed that these services are made available to the masses by government departments, corporations and commissions in the country. Also, Waldo (1995) opined that with the instrumentality of public administration, the state brings positive changes to the people. Development administration comes in by strengthening the bureaucracy to be more effective and efficient in delivering these services to the people and by extension guaranteeing national development. This assertion is supported by Frank (2017) who opined that the ideals and ideas of development administration are sacrosanct in building a strong and vibrant bureaucracy that can drive government policies and programs of a country towards development.

Academic field of study: Development administration is not just an academic field of study but also a component of public administration discipline and these have further increased their relevance to the society. Contributing to

the discourse of public administration and development administration both as academic disciplines, Ezeani (2005) conceived public administration as a study of activities of public organizations while Heaphey (1968) submitted that since the primary focus of comparative public administration is the study of administrative systems across different countries at various phases of development, the study of development administration is a meeting place for nearly all approaches in comparative public administration due to its primary focus. Since 1950s, the study of development administration has been regarded as a component of the study of public administration (Siffin, 1991). This elucidates that both development administration and public administration have provided a training ground through which highly skilled bureaucrats, public policy analysts and administrative consultants are produced. These certified bureaucrats and administrative consultants with requisite knowledge of complexities of human and organizational life greatly help the political leaders either as government employees or consultants in championing the course of national development.

Working structure: The objectives of development administration can only be met within an effective working parameter. This working structure is made available by public administration in the form of bureaucracy. That is why Bamigbose (2020) argued that development administration is the use of public administration as a parameter to bring about change in the society which reflects socio-cultural conditions, including a consistent effort to start and advance managerial and other staff training as well as to offer specialized education. Similarly, Obiekezie & Anthony (2004) posited that the notion of development administration is the most suitable means of transiting from one administration, which is essentially traditional in its operation, to an administration which is capable and specifically tailored to development. Therefore, development administration requires structure (public administration) which each country should provide for itself and then make it work. Development administration evokes the idea that public administration can be used to start and carry out projects such as schools, roads, wells, electricity, health centers, and hospitals, as well as to enhance the general welfare and well-being of the citizenry. Instead of being strict to regulations and loyalty to the status quo, development administration is transforming administration to be development-oriented (Obiajulu et al, 2004 in Bamigbose, 2020).

Environmental/Ecological Influence: Both development administration and public administration are greatly influenced by environmental factors such as political, economic and socio-cultural within which they operate. As observed by Heady Ferrell, bureaucracies and other political and administrative institutions can be better understood if the factors that shape and modify them are

recognized, ranked as accurately as possible according to their relative importance; and the reciprocal impact of these institutions on their surroundings also investigated. Similarly, Ibietan (2014) argued that the theory of ecology of administration views all administrative systems or organizations as being situated within a larger environment. Consequently, when systems are thought of as living things, they interact both within themselves (among component parts) and within themselves and the larger environment. Because of this, anything that has an impact on the environment as a whole will inevitably have impact on all of the systems present there. Therefore, if we think of development administration as a system, we also have to think of it as operating in a larger national context. More so, since development administration is considered as the effective use of public administration, the ecological influence on public administration automatically impacts development administration. All these explain that another meeting point of the two perspectives is the environment such as political, economic and socio-cultural which separately or collectively sets their tone.

UNDERDEVELOPMENT

Undoubtedly, underdevelopment does not really equate to lack of development, as every nation has seen some level of development in one form or another. Only when comparing levels of development does underdevelopment suffice. Underdevelopment is intimately connected to the reality that human social development has been unequal, and from a purely economic perspective, some human cultures have evolved further by generating more and amassing greater riches. When one group suddenly seems to be wealthier than another, some investigation into the cause of the disparity is unavoidable (Rodney, 1973).

The expression of a specific exploitation relationship, implying the exploitation of one country by another, is a second and even more crucial aspect of contemporary underdevelopment. The underdevelopment with which the world is currently preoccupied is a result of capitalist, imperialist, and colonialist policies, and all of the nations designated as “underdeveloped” in the globe are exploited by others (Rodney, 1973).

However, underdevelopment is viewed in this study as a concept used to describe a low degree of development characterized by low real per capita income, widespread poverty, high level of illiteracy, short life expectancies, and underutilization of resources among others.

HISTORICAL TRACE OF UNDERDEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA: NIGERIA IN FOCUS

Under development in developing countries especially

in Africa is gradually becoming a conundrum as these nations over the years have been characterised by rising poverty, illiteracy, poor standard of living, insecurity, dwindling economy and lack of social amenities. There is low per capita income, epileptic power supply, lack of access to health care services, safe water, and education and sanitation facilities. The aforementioned challenges of development are evident in Nigeria.

Nigeria underdevelopment is not unconnected to her contact with the Britain and post-colonialism which were characterised by slave trade, colonial rule, parochial interests and weak institutions among others. Prior to her contact with the Europeans, every part of what we have today as Nigeria was making substantial progress economically, socially and politically. There was high rate of production of cotton, palm and kolanuts, cereals, grains, maize and rice. Yam, cocoyam and cassava equally flourished during the period. There were “inter-regional economic exchanges” in that farm produce gotten/harvested from a particular region was exchanged for other crops in another region which resulted to food sufficiency among other benefits. Hunting, fishing and pastoralism were also thriving. According to Sesan (2013), hunters in Nigeria created paths in addition to their primary duty of producing food and using animal skin as clothing during that pre-colonial era. These trails were later turned into roads, and their cities and villages grew out of their settlements. Killing elephants whose tusks contained ivory was one of the hunters’ main economic activities. Ivory from these elephants was then exported across the Atlantic. Bairoch (1988) corroborated this assertion with his view that Benin City, which is located in modern day Nigeria, had a population of roughly 70 000 people, was a well-organized urban area with a system of functional water conduits, and had sizable artisans who were skilled in their craft. There was no significant difference between the economic and social development of African countries and those of other societies in the world prior to interaction with colonial masters. The mechanisms through which leaders were chosen during this time were calm and transparent (Nunn, 2005). African societies created systems for settling disputes and maintaining order in the form of customs, conventions, or rituals. Many African civilizations upheld order through a system of lineages, where disputes were settled by consensus or an older council (Bohannan & Curtin, 1998; Adejumobi, 2000).

But this progressive trend in Africa particularly Nigeria was truncated as a result of the contact with the Europeans during slave era. Nigeria was one of the countries in Africa where slave traders and warlords had a field day during the “exploitative and dark era”. The slave trade in Nigeria which was associated with animalistic and cruel treatments against Nigerians by the Europeans with the help of what Nunn (2005) called “Unproductive

Entrepreneurs” (locals) is one of the remote causes of underdevelopment in the country. The “Unproductive Entrepreneurs” were the local bandits, raiders, warlords and mercenaries who the Europeans used to capture the “Productive Entrepreneurs” (the peasants etc.) for slavery (Nunn, 2005). Linguists’ research has shown that before the trans-Atlantic slave trade, the people of Nigeria and other West African nations lacked words for “slave” or “slavery” (Hilton, 1985; Vansina, 1990). With a few notable outliers, like Hawkins, it is undeniable that European buyers bought African captives on the African coastlines, and their exchange with the Africans was a type of trade. The fact that a captive was frequently sold and then resold as he travelled from the interior to the port of embarkation is also accurate, and this was also a type of trade. On the whole, though, the method for obtaining prisoners on African soil was not trading. Armed conflict, deception, banditry, and kidnapping were all used. It is crucial to understand that, rather than assessing the impact of trade in the traditional sense, one is measuring the impact of societal violence when attempting to quantify the impact of European slave trade on the African continent (Rodney, 1973).

Nunn (2005) observed that the contact between Africa and Europe was primarily slave trade across trans-Atlantic. To this end, about 12 million slaves were transported to America (Lovejoy, 2000). Slave raiders, traffickers, and other middlemen were hired to capture slaves and transport them to coastal ports for transatlantic commerce. The indigenous people who weren’t directly involved in the slave trade organized into bandit gangs that raided nearby agricultural towns, while others turned into highway bandits (Miller, 1988). The raiding, theft and banditry were pervasive especially in Nigeria and Benin among others (Falola, 1996). Manning (1990) maintained that slavery in Africa was corruption because it involved deception, theft, bribery, and the use of excessive force. Similarly, Nunn (2004) asserted that in Africa, using either real per capita (GDP) or the rate of economic development as a criterion, a country’s level of appalling economic performance in the second half of the 20th century was inversely correlated with the number of slaves taken from that country during the slave era.

Early in the 19th century, as the slave trade started to decline, the idea of colonizing the continent (Africa) emerged. This led to the Berlin Conference of 1884-1885 where the countries of the continent were shared with interested European countries to govern, which signaled the beginning of colonial rule as well as another phase of exploitation. According to Nunn (2005), although there were differences between colonial rule and the slave trade, the Europeans continued to make it very difficult for Nigeria and other African nations to resume productive activities because all their policies and actions were carefully directed against “Productive Entrepreneurs”

(Peasants, etc.), with land expropriation being particularly pronounced. Taxes were imposed on Nigerians and other colonized Africans and were used as instruments of extraction. Buell (1928) & Nzula et al (1979) gave a better explanation of this barbaric action in form of taxes by the Europeans where they observed that annual taxes were typically equal to around 30 days of labour and could only be paid in the legal colonial currency. In order to get the requisite funds for paying taxes, Africans were therefore forced to formally come to an arrangement of restrictive labor contracts that would last for around two years. Breach of these agreements was punishable by harsh fines. During this period, indigenous (peasants) in Nigeria and other African nations frequently engaged in forced, paid, and mandatory labor against their will. The societies of Africa and Asia were growing independently before they were either directly or indirectly seized by the capitalist powers. As a result, there was an increase in exploitation and a subsequent export of surplus, robbing the societies of the benefits of their labor and natural resources (Rodney, 1973).

The post-colonial Nigeria which is the current period appears not to have made much progress developmentally as impunity, parochial/elites interest, corruption and secessionist agenda are the realities. Those who have found themselves in corridors of power have greatly abused the power with their blatant and unapologetic pursuit of parochial and sectional agenda which has resulted to tribalistic appointments, execution of projects and programs in favour of one ethnic group against the other among others. According to Easterly & Levine (1997), the diversity which exists in ethnic groups of African has led to social polarization and entrenched interest groups, which have raised the rate at which socially unsatisfactory policies are adopted. Corroborating this assertion, Englebert (2000) observed that many scholars have developed a theory of African stagnation which argues that the leaders in the continent, having inherited artificial political systems from colonial governments, have turned to neo-patrimonial policies that are inherently redistributive and use the resources of the state to further their political ambition, which is fundamentally power maximization. In return, there is weak state and absence of policies and programs that will guarantee development.

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE/FOREIGN AIDS: EXAMPLE FROM NIGERIA

Foreign aids can be conceptualized as donation of money, goods, or services from one country to another country. Such donations may be given for humanitarian or altruistic reasons or to advance the national interests of the nation giving them. Aid can be provided between two (bilateral) or several (multilateral) countries or agencies.

Bilateral aid is usually conditional, requiring beneficiaries to buy goods and services from the donor country whereas multilateral aid is unrestricted and can be used in any area of the recipient nation (Ukpong, 2017). In its broadest definition, foreign aid is described as the transfer of all

resources from donors to recipients, including tangible products, technical know-how, financial grants (gifts) or loans (at low interest rates), and support in international negotiations (Ogah & Aliyu, 2022). Below are some of the foreign aids received by Nigeria.

S/N	Donor	Year	Amount/Service/Project	Purpose
1.	US	2010-2015	\$3 billion grant	Human security, Global HIV/AIDS Initiatives and Development assistance etc.
2.	US	2016	Intelligence sharing assistance	Human security
3.	China	2003-2007	Agricultural training	Agricultural growth
4.	UK	-	£250million annual grant	
5.	UK	2015	£140 million	Energy privatization
6.	UK	2013	£275million	Education and poverty reduction
7.	Japan	2013	\$14.8 million	Classrooms & toilet projects
8.	Japan	2013	\$8.5 million	Classrooms project
9.	Japan	2013	Building of Bridge	Economic growth
10.	World Bank	2001-2010	\$ 96.28 million	To fight HIV infections
11.	World Bank	2009-2017	\$ 230.00 million	To fight HIV infections
12.	World Bank	2015	\$500 million	Revival of irrigation farming

Source: Compiled by the Author from Ogah & Aliyu (2022).

NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS IN NIGERIA

National development plan is not just an aspect of governance but an indispensable activity or exercise to meaningful development which is futuristic and helps a country to have its national development objectives clearly stated together with measures or strategies of achieving them. UNPD (2008) conceptualized development planning as a long-term program intended to bring about some long-lasting structural changes in the economy and it is linked to government participation in the economy whereby it sets objectives for how it wants the economy to evolve in the future and then intervenes to try to achieve those objectives. Todaro (1992) in Iheanacho (2014) defined development planning as the deliberate government attempt to influence, direct, and in some circumstances, even control changes in a country's main economic variables over the course of time in order to accomplish a predetermined set of objectives. Meanwhile, national development plans in Nigeria are discussed below.

Pre-Independence Plan: The Ten-Year Plan of Development and Welfare for Nigeria, which was introduced in 1946 by the colonial government (1945-1956) in response to a circular from the Secretary of State for Colonies to all British colonies, directing the establishment of a Central Development Board, marked the beginning of Nigeria's planning experience (Onah, 2010). However, Egonmwan & Ibodje (2001) observed that the Plan was primarily a list of uncoordinated projects

in various regions, hence could not be considered a plan in the true sense of the word. Though not explicitly stated, the plan's objective was to satisfy the colonial government's perceived needs rather than make any conscious effort to affect the general performance of the Nigerian economy at that time. Corroborating this view, Onah (2010) opined that producing agricultural goods that the British factories needed, such as cocoa, palm oil, and groundnuts, was the colonial government's main goal. No effort was made to articulate and take into account the interests and requirements of the Nigerian people in the development plans' goals and priorities. Consequently, the plan did not result to any meaningful national development principally because it was not meant for that purpose.

First National Development Plan (1962-1968):

The first National Development Plan, which ran from 1962 to 1968, commenced as soon as the country gained independence in 1960. The objectives of the plan included equalizing income distributions across the country, accelerating economic growth, creating savings for investments to lessen the country's reliance on foreign funding for its development, raising the standard of living for the majority of the population, particularly in terms of food, housing, health care, and clothing, and improving the nation's infrastructure (Onyenwigwe, 2009). According to Obi (200) in Iheanacho (2014), a total investment expenditure of roughly ₦2,132 million was proposed for it. The remaining investment expenditure of ₦780 million was expected to be made by the private

sector, with the public sector expecting to contribute approximately ₦1,352.3 million. Contributing to the discourse on weaknesses of the plan, Nnadozie (2004) observed that 1962-68 plan's targets and objectives were excessively lofty and ambitious, which made them inconsistent with the nation's managerial, technical, and budgetary capacities. As a result, the plan lacked specificity and clarity in targets and objectives (Onah, 2010). There were some significant projects executed during that time despite the plan's shortcomings. These included the Nigerian Security and Minting Plant, the Jebba Paper and Sugar Mills, the Niger Bridge, the Niger Dam, Onitsha, and the Kaingi Dam, as well as the Port Harcourt Refinery (Iheanacho, 2014).

The Second National Development Plan (1970-1974): The plan was launched soon after the end of the civil war during the General Yakubu Gowon government. In order to create a united Nigeria with a strong feeling of mutual respect and social justice, the plan concentrated on the fundamental nature and values of equity, social justice, and peaceful coexistence. Its objectives included repairing civil war-damaged infrastructure, revitalizing and resettling war refugees, establishing an effective economic infrastructure, creating effective administrative services, particularly in the new states, creating jobs, enhancing rural and urban areas, and raising GDP (Shuaibu, 2020). The plan contained the estimated 4.9 billion in total capital expenditures. Out of this sum, 3.3 billion was the intended public sector investment, while 1.6 billion was expected from the private sector (Obi, 2006). Some of the most significant ideals of the plan were indigenization policy and creating a society that is driven by ideals of democracy. According to Onah (2010), Nigerians were encouraged to actively participate in the nation's economic operations through the meticulous formulation of the indigenization policy. In order to achieve the objectives of this policy, several indigenization decrees were made. However, it is a sobering observation that, nearly two years after the first indigenization Decree (1972) was passed, out of about 950 affected enterprises, only 314 enterprises or 33 percent were recognized to have fully complied with the decree's provisions. In the aspect of a democratic society as envisioned in the plan, Iheanacho (2014) observed that the objective was established without taking into account any reference to political development in the plan document or any possible means of restoring to civilian government. Despite the shortcomings of the plan, there were successes in the aspects of industry and agriculture. Other achievements included the creation of technical institutions and trade centers by state governments, as well as the reconstruction of nearly 3000 kilometers of roads (Egonmwan & Ibodje, 2001).

The Third National Development Plan (1975-1980): The plan's objectives were to enhance per capita income, achieve more equitable income distribution,

lower unemployment rates, boost the supply of higher-level manpower, diversify the economy, promote balanced economic growth, and increase indigenous economic activity (Obi, 2006). The strategy of the plan was to use oil resources to expand the economy's productive capacity and thus permanently raising the standard of living of the populace. The plan was founded on the need for the public sector to provide amenities for the poorest of poor, such as electrification, water supply, health services, urban housing, and education (Egonmwan & Ibodje, 2001). A massive investment of ₦30 billion was projected for the Third National Development Plan, and it was later raised to ₦43.3 billion. This was equivalent to about 15 times the First Plan and 10 times the Second Plan (Obi, 2006). Iheanacho (2014) however, noted that the government's insufficient funding for social development and agricultural programmes did not show a real desire to achieve the objective. In a similar vein, Okigbo (1989) revealed that only 5% of the financial allocations in the Plan went for agricultural programmes while 11.5% was allocated to social development programmes (education, housing, health, welfare, etc.), which directly affected the living conditions of the rural population. Consequently, the achievements of the Plan were very insignificant when placed side by side with its objectives.

The Fourth National Development Plan (1981-1985): This was the first national development plan prepared by a civilian government led by Alhaji Shehu Shagari. Obi (2006) highlighted the objectives of the Plan to include (i) an increase in the real income of average citizen; (ii) a more equitable distribution of income among people and socioeconomic groups; (iii) a decrease in the rate of unemployment and underemployment; (iv) a rise in the supply of skilled labor; (v) a decrease in the economy's dependence on a small number of activities; (vi) increased citizen involvement in the ownership and management of productive enterprises; (vii) more reliance on local resources to help fulfill society's various objectives; (viii) technological advancement etc. ₦82 billion was estimated to be the Plan's capital investment. The private sector was expected to invest ₦11.7 billion, while the government sector was to invest ₦70.5 billion. The Fourth Plan projected that exports of goods dominated by petroleum products would provide sufficient revenue to carry out the Plan. In the end, the earnings from exports were far lower than expected. Only 54% of the export revenue expected for the time period was actually attained in 1984, which is a depressing observation. For instance, it was projected that between 1980 and 1984, petroleum exports would generate ₦79.449 million in revenue, but only ₦52.78 million, or roughly 66.4% of the predicted amount, was actually generated (Okigbo, 1989). Debt servicing and balance of payments issues, along with a high degree of inflation, plagued the economy. As a result, most of the projects that were initiated at the beginning of

the Plan period could not be completed, and they, along with other spillover projects from previous plans were abandoned (Jaja, 2000). According to Alapiki (2009), the plan era of 1981-85 proved to be the most depressing in Nigeria's economic history at that time. However, some achievements were recorded which include the commissioning of the Egbin Power Station, the Dry Dock Project at Snake Island, Lagos, and the 87 telephone exchanges spread throughout the federation increased the number of telephone line subscribers from 188,000 in 1981 to 297,000 in 1985 and successful implementation of Agricultural Development Program (ADP) in most of the states (Egonmwan & Ibodje, 2001).

The Fifth National Development Plan: The abysmal failure of Fourth National Development Plan due to majorly to poor implementation necessitated the preparation of Fifth National Development Plan. The Plan's main objective was to fix the fundamental flaws of the economy and build a more self-sufficient economy that would be mostly governed by market forces. Because of this, it was expected that the economy would be reformed in favor of the production sector, particularly those in agriculture and manufacturing. Other objectives were to: (i) diversify the economy away from the mono-cultural one that the oil industry's fortunes had pushed it to; (ii) revive the agricultural sector in order to achieve comprehensive integrated rural development programmes; (iii) domestically produce raw materials for local industries in order to reduce the importation of locally manufactured goods; and (iv) promote the nation's cultural diversity (Onyenwigwe, 2009). However, the Fifth National Development Plan did not materialize which resulted to its incorporation in the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP).

The Perspective and Rolling Plans (1990-1998): The abandonment of Fifth National Development Plan by Babangida's military government resulted to this Plan which was prepared to cover a period of 15-20 years that would provide an avenue for a realistic long-term view of the challenges faced by the country, and the rolling plan, which was expected to cover three years and be reviewed annually to determine the degree of the country's economic improvement. According to Adubi (2002), the Perspective plan expected to commence along side with the Rolling Plan in 1990 did not start in 1996 that Abacha's government constituted Vision 2010 Committee. The major report of Vision 2010 which was delivered to the Abacha's government in September 1997, proposed, among other things, that the Vision serves as the focal point for all plans, including long-term (perspective), mid-term (rolling), and annual plans (budgets). Despite the fact that the Vision did not continue after Abacha's death in 1998, it nonetheless became the first perspective plan for the country. With the implementation of the First National Rolling Plan in 1990, the three-year rolling plan went into

effect (1990-1992). The Rolling Plan's main objective was to give the nation the chance to revise itself thereby overcoming socio-political and economic challenges (Ikeanyibe, 2009).

National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (2003-2007): This was a medium-term plan with a four-year timeline covering the years 2003 to 2007. The State and Local Governments were expected to have their own counterpart Plans called the State Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (SEEDS) and the Local Government Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (LEEDS) respectively. It was a comprehensive plan that aimed to cooperatively engage not just all tiers of government but also the commercial sector, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and the general public in the pursuit of developmental objectives. The much-heralded Obasanjo reforms originated from the NEEDS plan, which included all of the federal government's expected policies and programmes for the years 2003 through 2007 and beyond (Ikeanyibe, 2009). Iheanacho (2014) further observed that approximately seven million jobs were expected to be created by NEEDS by the year 2007, however in reality, most of the government initiatives implemented to achieve this goal were detrimental to job creation. Many staff members actually lost their jobs as a result of the efforts to overhaul government organizations. NEEDS also fell short of its stated objectives in the aspect of infrastructural development. One of the government's top policy priorities which was electricity, coincidentally appeared to have dropped significantly rather than improved (Ikeanyibe, 2009).

Vision 20-20: Nigeria's Vision 20:2020 is a long-term strategy plan that aimed to establish an environment that is conducive and catalytic to broad-based private sector-led economic growth and development in Nigeria by the year 2020. It largely drew on the knowledge of countries such as China, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Brazil, whose economies had developed with tremendous success using principles of methodical strategic planning. The foundation of the Vision 20:2020 was based on two clearly defined, mutually reinforcing goals which were ranking among the top 20 economies in the world with a GDP of US \$900 billion and an annual per capita income of US \$4000. The targets of Vision 20-20 were based on a dynamic comparison examination of the country's prospective growth rate and economic structure against those of the other top 20 economies in the world using GDP and HDI. Three (3) medium-term plans; the First National Implementation Plan (2010-2013), Second NIP (2014-2017), and Third NIP (2017-2020) were created under Nigeria's Vision 20:2020. These were based on three (3) main pillars: ensuring the people's productivity and well-being; maximizing the main drivers of economic growth; and encouraging long-

term social and economic development. These were also based on five strategic thrusts with eighteen predicted results. The projected results of strategic thrusts 1 and 2 were eradication of poverty and production of wealth, as well as improvements in health, housing, education, and environment for business. The predicted results of strategic thrusts 3 to 5 were high-quality infrastructure, a sound legal system, effective judicial procedures, safety, and effective government (Udoudo & Ubi, 2016). Just as the previous national development plans, Vision 20-20 failed to achieve its objectives as Nigerian citizens became poorer with the condition of health, housing and education in the country being deteriorated. The Vision equally failed to achieve its objective of providing conducive environment for businesses as the country has continued to face security challenges among other indicators of unfavorable atmosphere for businesses.

The Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (2017-2020): The ERGP was a medium-term economic framework designed to jump-start Nigeria's faltering economy back to rapid, sustainable growth and medium-term economic expansion (2017-2020). The Plan aimed to increase investment in infrastructure through strong public-private partnerships, restore growth and macroeconomic stability, and promote economic diversification. It also aimed to invest in the Nigerian people by continuing to support those who are economically disadvantaged, create jobs, and improve accessibility and affordability to quality healthcare nationwide. The Plan specified ten distinct targets over the plan period in order to conveniently pursue these objectives. These targets were divided into four sections, including those that are related to oil, FOREX, taxes, agriculture, and unemployment. It was expected that GDP will increase by 2.19% in 2017 and by an average of 4.62% through 2018 and 2019 before reaching 7% by 2020. The energy-related objectives include raising oil production from 1.4 million barrels per day to 2.5 million. Nigeria was also expected to export refined oil on a net basis. Additionally, a significant asset sale for Nigeria was expected, notably in the oil sector etc. This would mostly be accomplished by investing in agriculture to promote tomato paste independence in 2017, rice independence in 2018, and wheat independence in 2020 (Kyarem & Ogwuche, 2017). It could be said that the Plan was to a certain extent able to achieve its objective in the aspect of investment in infrastructure because of the execution of some projects such as reconstruction of Apapa-Oshodi-Oworonshoki-Ojota Road in Lagos State (34 km), reconstruction of Obajana-Kabba Road in Kogi State (43km) and construction of Bodo-Bonny Road and Bridges across Opobo Channel in Rivers State (38km) among others. However, other objectives of the Plan such as supporting the economically disadvantaged and job creation were not in any way met as the number of these

categories of people in the country has continued to rise.

National Development Plan (2021-2025): Nigeria's National Development Plan (NDP), 2021-2015, was developed by various facets of the private sector, sub-national governments, civil society organizations (CSO), and the Federal Government of Nigeria with the goal of maximizing the nation's potential in all economic sectors for a sustainable, comprehensive, and inclusive national development. To ensure that no one is left behind, this was done on purpose for inclusivity, participation, and citizen engagement. Throughout the duration of the Plan, the government will concentrate on industries that have a large potential to create jobs for the citizens and have a multiplier effect on other industries. There will be continuous investments in vital infrastructure such as power and alternative energy, rail, roads, and housing to ensure macroeconomic stability, improve the business and investment climate, and raise living standards for Nigerians. By 2025, it is expected that the Plan would have produced average economic growth of 4.6%. The result would have been the creation of 21 million full-time jobs and the lifting of 35 million people out of poverty. The population's health and education would have improved, and the revenue to GDP ratio would have increased to 15%. A total commitment of ₦348.1 trillion in investments is needed to fulfill the objectives of the Plan. An estimated ₦49.7 trillion will be invested by the government (federal, state, and local governments), with the remaining ₦298.3 trillion coming from the private sector (Federal Ministry of Finance, Budget and National Planning, 2021).

It will be premature to assess the achievement of the objectives of National Development Plan (2021-2025) because it is still in force. However, it is instructive to observe that the failure of previous national development plans in the country was basically due to poor implementation together with lack of continuity by successive governments. Government is continuum so in an event of inability of a government to fully implement national development plan before its exit, the successive government is governmentally expected to take it up but abandonment is lugubriously the case in Nigeria, hence the continuous failure of national development plans in the country.

CONCLUSION

In an attempt to provide a clear and comprehensive explanation of development administration as well as various issues around it to Nigerian universities students and beyond, this paper presented an in-depth analysis of development administration which includes the emergence of development administration, its conceptual clarification, nature, attributes, ecology and its meeting points with public administration. The origin of underdevelopment

in Africa with particular reference to Nigeria was also underscored bringing out factors such as slave trade, exploitative disposition of colonial government and post-colonial bad leadership. Development assistance/foreign aid and national development plans in Nigeria were equally examined thereby elucidating various efforts made by successive governments in Nigeria and foreign countries/international organizations towards developing the country (Nigeria).

REFERENCES

- Adejumobi, S. A. (2000). Politics and government. In T. Falola (Ed.), *Africa 2: African cultures and societies before 1885*. Durham, North Carolina: Carolina Academic Press.
- Adubi, A. A. (2002). *Pre-budget link in Nigeria: An exploratory investigation*. NCENI Policy Analysis Series.
- Alapiki, H. (2009). *Politics and governance in Nigeria*. Owerri: Corporate Impressions.
- Arora, R. K. (1977). *Introduction to the ecological dimensions of development-administration*. New Delhi: S. A. Faisal, AI-Salem, Associated Publishing House.
- Bamigbose, J. O. (2020). *Public administration and development administration: The nexus*.
- Bairoch, P. (1988). *Cities and economic development: From the Dawn of history to the present*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bohannon, P., & Curtin, P. (1988). *Africa and Africans*. Illinois: Waveland Press Inc.
- Buell, R. L. (1928). *The native problem in Africa*. The Bureau of International Research of Harvard University and Radcliffe College.
- Denhardt, R. B. (1992). Public administration theory: The state of the discipline. In N. B. Lynn and A. Wildavsky (Ed.), *Public administration: The state of the discipline*. New Jersey, USA: Chatham House Publishers.
- Easterly, W., & Levine, R. (1997). Africa's growth tragedy: Policies & ethnic divisions. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112, 1203-50.
- Egonmwan, J. S., & Ibodje, S. (2001). *Development administration: Theory and practice*. Benin City: Thesyin (Nig) Company.
- Emordi, P. J. & Onuegbu, E.M. (2020). Development administration and the challenges of neo-liberal reforms in the expansion of Nigerian education system. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, IV(IX), 154-161.
- Englebert, P. (2000). Pre-colonial institutions, post-colonial states, and economic development in tropical Africa', *Political Research Quarterly*, 53, 7-36.
- Ezeani, E. O. (2005). *Fundamentals of public administration*. Enugu: Zik-Chuks Publishers.
- Falola, T. (1996). Brigandage and piracy in Nineteenth Century Yoruba Land. *Journal of the Historical Society of Nigeria*, 12, 83-105.
- Federal Ministry of Finance, Budget and National Planning (2021). *National Development Plan 2021-2025, 1*.
- Frank, L. K. O. (2017). Development administration. *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*, 1-6. DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_934-1
- Gerald, C. (1971). *The dynamics of public administration*. Holt Rinehart.
- Heady, F. (1966). *Public administration: A comparative perspective*. New York: Marcel Decker.
- Heaphey, J. (1968). Comparative public administration: Comments on current characteristics. *Public Administration Review*, XXVIII.
- Hilton, A. (1985). *The kingdom of Kongo*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Hope, K. R. (1984). *The dynamics of development and development administration*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Ibietan, J. (2014). Conceptual issues in development administration. *International Journal of Innovative Education Research* 2 (2), 19-31.
- Iheanacho, E. N. (2014). National development planning in Nigeria: An endless search for appropriate development strategy. *International Journal of Economic Development Research and Investment*, 5(2), 49-60.
- Ijic, B. A., & Iyoriobhe, M. O. (2018). Contemporary issues in development administration. *University of Port Harcourt Journal of Management*, 3(1), 183-195.
- Ikeanyibe, O. M. (2009). Development planning in Nigeria: Reflections on the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) 2003. 2007. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 20, 3.
- Jaja, S. (2000). History of budgeting and planning in Nigeria: Lessons for the fourth republic. In Akpuru-Aja, A. and Emeribe, E. (Eds.), *Policy and contending issues in Nigeria national development. strategy*. Enugu: John Jacobs Publishers.
- Kyarem, R. N. & Ogwuche, D. D. (2017). Nigeria's economic recovery & growth plan: Tackling the macroeconomic downside risks. *International Journal of Advanced Studies in Economics and Public Sector Management*, 5(3), 1-10.
- Kotzé, D. A. (1985). Development administration: The state of the discipline. *Development Southern Africa*, 2(2), 218-225. DOI: 10.1080/03768358508439148
- Lovejoy, P. E. (2000). *Transformations in slavery: A history of slavery in Africa* (2Ed). UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Manning, P. (1990). *Slavery and African life*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mbieli, P. (2010). *Public administration: A broad view*. Lagos, Nigeria: West African Books Publishers Limited
- Miller, J. C. (1988). *Way of death: Merchant capitalism and the Angolan slave trade*.
- Nnadozie, U. (2004). *The state civil service and underdevelopment in Nigeria: An analysis of public policy making process in a neocolonial society*. Enugu: Johnkens J and Willy Publishing Co. Nig. Ltd.
- Nunn, N. (2004). *Slavery, institutional development and longrun growth in Africa*.

- Nunn, N. (2005). *Historical legacies: A model linking Africa's past to its current underdevelopment*.
- Nzula, A., Ivan, P., & Aleksander Z. (1979). *Forced labour in colonial Africa*. London: Zed Press.
- Obi, E. A. (2006). *Development administration*. Onitsha: Bookpoint Ltd.
- Obikeze, O. S., & Anthony, O. E. (2004). *Public administration in Nigeria: A developmental approach*. Onitsha: Bookpoint Ltd.
- Ofoma, C. (2021). Digitalization driven public service and service delivery: The Nigeria's experience. *Journal of Public Administration, Finance and Law*, 22, 73-80. <https://doi.org/10.47743/jopafll-2021-22-05>.
- Ofoma, C. V. (2022). Unemployment and youth restiveness in south-east Nigeria (2010-2022). *Cross Cultural Communication*, 18(4), 56-63. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/cc/article/view/12864> DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/12864>
- Ogah, M. A., & Aliyu, T. S. (2022). Foreign aid and Nigeria's quest for development. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention (IJHSSI)*, 11(2), 29-37. DOI-10.35629/7722
- Okigbo, P. (1989). *National development plan in Nigeria 1900-1907*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers Ltd.
- Onah, F. O. (2010). *Managing public programmes and projects* (2nd ed.). Nsukka: Great AP Express Publishers.
- Onyenwigwe, P. I. (2009). *Principles of development administration: Third world perspectives*. Owerri: Ambix Printers Nigeria.
- Rathod, P. B. (2010). *Elements of development administration: theory and practice*. Indian: ADB Publishers.
- Riggs, F. W. (1964). *Administration in developing countries: The theory of prismatic society*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Rodney, W. (1973). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle-L'Overture
- Schaffer, B. B. (1969). The deadlock in development administration. In: Leys C (ed). *Politics and change in developing countries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sesan, M. J. (2013). *The nature and structure of the economy of pre-colonial Nigeria*.
- Sharma, M. P., Sadana, B. L., & Kaur, H. (2012). *Public administration in theory and practice*. Allahabad: Kitab Mahal.
- Shuaibu, M.S. (2022). *Trends and nature of national development planning in Nigeria*. Available at: <https://www.scooparticles.com/news-society-articles/economics-articles/trends-nature-national-development-planning-nigeria-1789214.htm>. Accessed 9th September, 2022.
- Sidney, V. (1965). Comparative political culture. In L. Pye and S. Verba (Eds.), *Political culture and political development*. Princeton University Press.
- Siffin, W. J. (1991). The problem of development administration. In A. Farazmand (Ed.), *Handbook of comparative and development public administration*. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.
- Sinha, K. (2016). Development administration and bureaucracy in developing countries, *Research Review of International Journal of Multidisciplinary*, 1(12).
- Udoudo, M. P. & Ubi-Abai, I. P. (2016). Vision 20: 2020 and economic development in Nigeria: Gleaning from past national development plans. *International Journal of Development Strategies in Humanities, Management and Social Sciences*, 6(2), 201-214.
- Ukpong, U. A. (2017). Foreign aid and African development: Lessons from Nigeria. *J. Pol. Sci. Pub Aff*, 5, 274.
- UNDP (2008). *Human development report*. New York: UNDP.
- Vansina, J. (1990). *Paths in the rainforests*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Waldo, D. (1995). *The study of public administration*. Garden City: Doubleday and company INC.