



The Role of the Administrator in Policy Development and Implementation in Nigeria

***Aligbe, B. A. Ph.D; & **Momoh, M. M.**

**Department of Public Administration, Federal Polytechnic, Auchi, Edo state, Nigeria **Department of Accountancy, Federal Polytechnic Auchi, Edo State, Nigeria*

Abstract

This paper attempts a critical elucidation of the dynamics of administrative contributions in policy development and implementation in Nigerian federal system along the lines of inter and intragovernmental relations. It applies a descriptive research method to ventilate the views of varied scholars on the key issues affecting policy development and implementation in Nigeria federal system. The paper observes that there are inconsistencies in development policy formulation and implementation amongst the different organs and levels of government in Nigeria, the paper believes that the non-inclusion of the administrator has been the missing link. The current situation where the federal government is a towering overlord over the constituent states needs re-examination and possible realignment. In spite of this, the paper maintains that there is still hope for the consolidation of Nigeria's federalism through effective policy formulation, implementation, evaluation, communication, and feedback mechanism which are the hallmark of an astute and seasoned administrator. The paper recommends the inclusion of the administrator in the mobilization of adequate resources for effective policy actions.

Keywords: *Role, Administrator, Policy development, Implementation, Nigeria*

Introduction

The magnitude and complexity of contemporary problems faced by developed and developing countries need urgent intervention (Dye, 2002). Increasing resource and economic problems, the enlarging responsibilities of public authorities and the growing expectations of the citizenry for speedy and efficient resolutions have not only compounded the burden of most states but have raised the need for proper diagnosis of socio-economic problems. According to Ayuba (2012), these varied socio-economic problems need to be carefully studied while prescriptions and particularly the design, formulation, implementation and performance management of optimal and effective policies are substantially reviewed. As a way of providing solutions to these myriads of problems facing society, Ikelegbe (2006) opined that society is ordered, steered and directed towards desired ends by the state through policies which must include the administrator at the formative and execution stage. Exclusion of the administrator has been the albatross of some government policies in Nigeria as observed by (Aligbe, 2018).

Policy - Concepts and Meaning

There is no unanimity on the definition of policy. However, according to Egonmwan (2009), policy can be described as the overall framework within which the actions of

the government are undertaken to achieve its goals. It is a purposive and consistent course of action devised in response to a perceived problem of a constituency, formulated by a specific political process, and adopted, implemented, and enforced by a public agency. The word "policy" is not a tightly defined concept but a highly flexible one, used in different ways on different occasions (Ayuba, 2012). According to Dye (2002), Public policy is whatever governments chose to do or not to do, in other words policy can refer to a proposal, an ongoing programme, or the goals of a programme, major decisions or the refusal to make certain decision.

A policy is a deliberate system of principles to guide decisions and achieve rational outcomes (Ayuba, 2012). It is a statement of intent, implemented as a procedure or protocol. Policies are generally adopted by a governance body within an organization. Therefore, policy-making in a federal system entails the government deciding when, where, how to act or not **act** on a particular problem or concern (Egonmwan, 2009). Through linkage institutions, (that is political channels), people's concerns become political issues on the policy agenda, policies of government are reflective of the will of the populace.

To Sapru (2004), policy is a purposive course of action taken by those in

power in pursuit of certain goals or objectives. Webster's dictionary defines policy as a course or method of action selected (by government, institution, group or individual) from among alternatives and in the light of given conditions to guide and, usually, to determine present and future decisions. A policy enumerates the objectives, intentions, and guidelines. It is a course of action aimed at finding solutions to specific social problems.

On his part, Egonmwan (2009) sees policy as a formal document or framework in which a government or other institution outlines goals and the guiding principles and strategies for achieving those goals; and gives the authority to undertake actions in pursuit of them. Sound policies should include human and financial commitments, clear timelines, and the roles and responsibilities needed for achieving the stated goals, as well as benchmarks for ensuring accountability (Egonmwan, 2009).

Dichotomy between Policy, Decision, Programme, and Project

In the words of Ikelegbe (2006), a policy is both related to and, different from a decision. A decision is a choice made from among alternatives. Policies are "made" and "implemented" in the same way that decisions are made and implemented. Yet it is possible to have policies that are not or cannot be implemented, so that, conceptually, actions that implement policies need not necessarily be part of policy itself. Although a policy is like a decision, it is not just a "vie-off", independent decision. A policy is a set of coherent decisions with a common long-term purpose(s) (Ikelegbe, 2006). When decisions are one-off, incoherent or opportunistic, complaints are made that a government or its agent "does not have a policy". Government policies are often supported by special legislation. The terms "policy", "plan", "programme" and "project" are progressively more specific in time and place (Ikelegbe, 2006). Policies are usually national policies (not district or provincial) and are not normally limited in time: one does not usually speak in terms of "2-year policies" as one does of "2-year programmes" or "5-year plans". Overall, policy-making may involve decision-making while decision-making may not necessarily embrace policy-making, (Egonmwan, 2009).

Policy is different from a programme; whereas a policy is a statement of actions and intentions, a programme is the means designed to achieve the actions and intentions. A programme according to Ikelegbe (2006) is the set or package of structures, processes, resources, activities, and action designed to implement a

particular policy. A *project*, on the other hand, has a defined lifespan or timeframe with specific objectives that, when attained, signify completion. A programme, therefore, is a group of related projects managed in a coordinated way to obtain benefits not available from managing the projects individually Makinde, (2005).

Policy Development in a Federal System

In a Federal System, policies are developed through consultative, participatory and transparent processes - particularly those that engender ownership among both the implementers and intended beneficiaries of the policy; they are more responsive and have greater chance for effective implementation than those that are not (Iyanda and Bello, 2016). Federalism, on the other hand, is a system in which the power of all government regulations is split among the local, national, and central or federal governments. Nigeria is one of the major examples of a federal system, where the authority is divided among various tiers of government, which includes federal (central), state and local authorities. Federalism is divided into two dimensions; constitutional and financial. They both play a major role in policy-making process (Gerston, 2007). A constitutional dimension of federalism in the United States of America (USA) highlights certain powers being provided to national government and, it also provides certain responsibilities to the state government. The 1789 constitution of the USA, which is among the oldest constitutions in the history of the world, highlights the overall structure and practices followed in the federal system (Inyang, 2015).

Policy-making in federalism is shaped by the financial dimension of federalism, where spending is divided among the three levels of government. Federalism plays an important role in identifying various perspectives and interests of the bureaucrats and policymakers, which helps them in developing and implementing policies (Makinde, 2005). In the Nigeria federal system, the best example of policymaking can be taken from the healthcare and education sectors. In the healthcare sector, the process involves contributions from primary actors through the national government; the state government plays a secondary but significant role. In the education sector, all three governmental levels play significant roles. The state government is involved in primary constitutional as well as monetary responsibilities, national government plays

secondary but very important role, whereas the local government involves in providing the educational services. (Ayuba, Charas, and Paul, 2012).

Policy-Making Process

Policymaking is when a government decides whether to act on a particular problem. If it chooses to act, the policymaking becomes choosing what action to take (Ikelegbe, 2006). Development policy-making, therefore, entails the reception of policy demands, arriving at policy decisions, formulating policy statements, which are implemented to generate policy outputs to derive policy outcome (Ikelegbe, 2006). The model below depicts a cyclical process of policymaking.

Policy formulation: Solutions or policies are then made in order to deal with the problem that was raised and discussed. Inaction or defeat of a proposal at this stage is still regarded as policy-making (Ikelegbe, 2006). At this stage, stakeholders raised concerns regarding a policy or issue that affects the public or organization. The problem is then defined in clear terms and mass media, parties or interest groups raise it in relevant forums for consideration. Sapru, (2004) asserts that analysis is carried out to identify issues and the root causes of those issues that require policy attention so as to have:

- a clear understanding of the policy goals and the consequences of different policy options
- evidence-informed policy dialogue and stakeholder engagement across all aspects of policy formulation, implementation, and monitoring
- ongoing political will and leadership to put the policy into practice
- mobilization of human, financial, institutional, and other resources to implement the policy, including dissemination of the policy to implementers and beneficiaries
- monitoring mechanisms and feedback loops to both assess implementation and to reform policies and implementation approaches

Agenda setting: The problem identified is pushed through various organs in order to get it discussed. This push for discussion eventually leads to allocation of time for discussion by relevant authorities. The following are the policy-making agencies of a federal system of government as suggested by Egonmwan (2009):

- Executive Branch
- Legislative Branch

- Bureaucracy

Budgeting: Once a policy is authorized, relevant authorities allocate resources or money toward its implementation. This is called budgeting since it involves resource allocation for many policies.

Implementation: Executives in charge of putting policies into action are then given the opportunity to implement the requirements set out in the policy. Some common areas of policy concern according to Egonmwan (2009) are:

- Social Policies
- Economy
- Environment
- Budget
- National Security

Evaluation: Here various stakeholders examine the policies against the results or stream benefits to general population in order to know if the policy is working or not. According to the results of evaluation, improvement or change of policy may be recommended.

Policy types: Different types of policy exist at different levels. Sapru, (2004) identified the following:

- a) Global policies: Normative guidelines, development frameworks and goals, conventions, agreements, financial commitments, human rights instruments, and treaties developed by global bodies
- b) National or sub-nation (for example, provincial) policies: Constitutions, statutes of parliament, laws, multi-sectoral initiatives, national policies, national development strategies, strategic action plans, cabinet directives, budgets
- c) Institutional/agency policies: Strategies and regulations issued by line ministries and departments that specify how laws, decrees, and other high-level policies should be implemented
- d) Operational policies: Rules, regulations, codes of conduct, guidelines, plans, budgets, and service and administrative procedures and regulations that governments, organizations, professional associations, and health facilities use to translate national laws and policies into programs and services

Egonmwan (2009), Ikelegbe (2006) and Makinde, (2005) further opined that policy could also be categorized into the following typologies:

- a) Substantive Public Policy - These are the policies concerned with the general welfare and development of the society which may include, the provision of education and creating employment opportunities, economic stabilization, law enforcement, anti-pollution laws. It does not cater to any particular or privileged section of society and has to be formulated keeping in mind the goals and characteristics of the constitution and direct principles of state policy as well as the current and moral claims of society.
- b) Regulatory Public Policy - These policies are concerned with regulation of trade, business, safety measures, public utilities, etc. performed by independent organizations working on behalf of the government like National Electricity Regulatory Commission (NERC), National Broadcasting Commission (NBC), and National Communication Commission (NCC) etc. Policies pertaining to these services and organizations rendering these services are known as regulatory policies.
- c) Distributive Public Policy - These are the policies meant for specific segments of society especially the needy ones. Public assistance and welfare programmes, adult education programme, food relief, social insurance, vaccination camps, public distribution systems, etc. are all examples of such policy.
- d) Redistributive Public Policy - These policies are concerned with rearrangement of policies concerned with bringing basic social and economic changes. Certain assets and benefits are divided disproportionately amongst certain segments of society and so those need to be redistributed to assure equity and fairness with a view to reaching to a larger number of the population.
- e) Capitalization Public Policy - These policies are related to financial subsidies given by the Centre to State and Local Governments and central and state business undertakings, etc. The policy may not be directly linked to public welfare as the others listed above but it contributes indirectly. It is basically infrastructural and development policies for government business organizations to keep functioning properly.
- f) Constituent Public Policy - It is the policies relating to constituting new institutions/mechanisms for public welfare.

- g) **Technical Public Policy** - It relates to the policies framed for arrangement of procedures, rules, and framework which a system shall provide for discharge of action by various agencies on the field.

Theories of Public Policy

Egomwan (2009) and Makinde (2005) identified the following theories of policy:

- **Policy Process Theory** described as a good model to describe public policymaking, but it has little explanatory power. In other words, you cannot make predictions from this model. It simply states that a policy first begins on an agenda, it is then formulated, adopted, implemented and evaluated. But it has no theoretical framework to allow one to predict how a policy ends up on the agenda, or if a policy will be adopted.
- **Political Systems Theory** is another descriptive model which treats the government as an organism which responds to inputs and stimuli and creates outputs. The inputs are demands and support. These go through a filter, enter the government system, are processed into public policy and then the results feedback as an input.
- **Group theory (pluralists)** assumes the following is true for public policymaking: (i) most demands and supports for policy are manifest through organized groups; (ii) no single group can monopolize power; (iii) the most influential group will be decided by the amount of competition and the qualities of the competing groups; (iv) policy results from compromise; (v) political actors are objective referees who state which group won.
- **Elite Theory** posits that society is stratified with the masses at the bottom and ruling-class elite at the top. These elites are the rich and well-educated, who share common beliefs and use their influence to dictate public policies. The most serious flaw in this theory is that no such ruling-class can be identified. Yet, if this class could be found, then any policy which went against this class could be predicted to fail. This theory also focuses attention on the role of leadership in policymaking
- **Game Theory:** Game Theory is a situation where decision maker takes a decision keeping in mind the opponent's strategy as the topmost priority and to have the minimum loss and risk. Foreign policy, export-import policy etc. may be seen as examples that follow this theory.

- **The rational-choice theory** argues that policymakers pursue their own self-interest instead of any national interest. They also vote based on their own goals instead of any other reason. Anderson gives the example of a politician who will approve of an agency which will trouble his constituents so that he can help them out and get re-elected. This model alludes to the importance of self-interest in policymaking. If voting for a policy will hurt a politician on Election Day, then this model allows us to predict that the politician will not vote for it.
- **Incrementalism** views public policy as a continuation of past government activities with only incremental modifications. Incrementalism is conservative in that existing programs; policies and expenditures are considered as a base, and attention is concentrated on innovative programs and policies and on increases, decreases, or modifications of current programs

Models of Public Policy Making Process

Sapru, (2004) and Ikelegbe (2006) identifies the following models in public policy analysis:

- **Institutional Model:** Under this model, certain institutions in society are seen as competent institutions for determining public policy objectives and processes. The institutions are chosen on the basis of democratic participation, bureaucratic specification and judicial adjudication and the functions performed by these institutions are the major determining factor to implement various policies. This model also specifies and suggests the relationship between various institutions and how they together to collectively contribute to a successful policy implementation.
- **Systems Model:** Proposed by David Easton. A system is a set of interconnected elements that function together in tandem to make up the whole being. So, a Systems approach administration is described as a system comprising sub-system, structure, people, action, and interaction that enable it (administration or organization) to perform certain functions. Every system influences its subsystems and is also influenced by its subsystems.
- **Rational Model:** This model according to Ikelegbe (2006) focuses on the means of attaining rational decision making. It believes that the

decision maker is a rational actor who wants to make rational decisions or net benefit policies.

- **Elite Model:** Public Administrators and politicians belong to the elite club of knowledge possessing group that is fully equipped to frame and implements policies and people are to follow it as they are not equipped to understand and know the same.
- **Market Exchange Model:** It believes in a free market with minimum state regulations of the affairs, a lot of public-private partnership as well as a lot of private organizations taking over the government's functions and directing the policymaking. It is believed that this will lead to higher competition and thus higher economic growth which will, in turn, benefit the government in funds for its policies.
- **Bounded Rationality Model:** Propounded by Herbert Simon, bounded rationality model is the idea that when individuals make decisions, their **rationality** is limited by the tractability of the decision problem, the cognitive limitations of their minds, and the time available to make the decision.
- **Incrementalism Model:** The incremental model is popularized by Charles E. Lindblom. The model reasoned that instead of **making** one huge leap towards solving a problem, the **incremental model** breaks down the **decision-making** process into small steps. The process of then moving between the steps is known as muddling through and is based on the combination of experience, intuition, guessing, and using different techniques.
- **Optimal-Normative Model:** Yehezkel Dror's suggested a combination of rational factors as well as extra-rational factors linked with the decision and situation. He proposed a qualitative approach through a feedback mechanism. He also supports studying decision making as a subject of social science and making it interdisciplinary where knowledge and techniques from other social science subjects can be mixed and applied to decision making to broaden its scope and achieve maximum results.

Policy implementation and the Administration in Nigeria

In his 1983 treatise, *'The Trouble with Nigeria'*, Chinua Achebe pinpoints the dominant development challenges facing Nigeria. Among the dominant feature

of policymaking process in Nigeria is the principle of federal supremacy, which is a constitutional conditionality in Nigeria (Inyang, 2015). This, Stephen, Jan, and Glenda (2015) observed is partly responsible for numerous agitation from the federating units. Under the constitution, the federal government is expected to provide the overall direction and leadership in the planning process from the formulation stage through the implementation and evaluation stages. The decision-making under the federal supremacy principles requires the National Economic Council, which is presided over by the Vice President, to advise the president concerning the economic affairs of the federation, and, in particular, on measures necessary for the co-ordination of economic planning efforts or the economic development programs of various states government of Nigeria (Inyang, 2015).

The Institutions that are involved at the early stage include the ministries of Finance and National Planning. Policy inputs come from the various ministries and departments of Ministry of National Planning in the National planning office. Here policy alternatives are examined, evaluated, and then translated into programs within the financial parameters stated by the Ministry of Finance (Iyanda and Bello, 2016).

The key agency in the Ministry of National Planning is the National Planning Office, which is divided into four directorates, each headed by a director who is responsible to the permanent secretary of the ministry. Besides the National Planning office, there two other offices or boards that report to the Ministry of National Planning: The National Manpower Board (NMB) and the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS). The functions of National Manpower Board consist of determining personnel needs and formulating programs for personal development. The National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) is the national agency responsible for collecting social and economic data throughout the federation (Gberevbie, 2017).

A number of other interdepartmental and intergovernmental agencies and institutions also participate in the decision-making process. The most notable among them are (a) the Joint Planning Board (JPB) and (b) the conference of Ministers and Commissioners for National and Economic Planning, (Dibie, 2000). Thereafter, proposals from various ministries, parastatals, agencies, commissions, and departments are carefully studied and forwarded to the President sometimes as budget proposal who finally presents them to the legislature for vetting and passage. When they are passed by the legislative, Mr.

President finally gives assent to them and the bureaucrats are directed for the implementation of such programs, policies, and activities. The public bureaucracy is, therefore, a very strong institution where public policies are implemented in Nigeria (Stephen, Jan, and Glenda, 2015).

Olaniyi (2001) summed up the problems of public policy implementation which also affect Nigeria as follows:

- a) The multiplicity of agencies involved in implementation – policymakers generally under-estimate the complexity and the difficulty in coordinating the task of agencies involved in implementing programmes.
- b) Lack of coordination or inadequate communication can hinder effective implementation. Its intention are not spelled out clearly through the right organizational channels established for the transmission of policy to those involved in policy formulation, and then the policy will not be put into effect.
- c) Policy or a programme may be implemented by agencies whose interests do not necessarily coincide with those of the policymakers. This is often the case during the era of party politics, when for instance, top bureaucrats with diverse political interests, are saddled with the responsibility of implementing policies. Their inaction may frustrate the intention(s) of the policymakers
- d) Implementation will not automatically follow from policy decisions but needs to be treated as a “positive purposive process in it” consequently, substantial effort and continuity of efforts is required to follow policy from intention to action.

Some Policies in Nigeria Federal System

- **Industrial Policy:** Government believes that rapid industrialization is key to the country’s economic development. A densely populated country with a population of around 180 million living on a land area of 47,570km², its economy is dependent mainly on agriculture, which accounts for one-fifth of GDP but provides employment to as much as 50 percent of the country's labour force. Now to ensure the fastest development as other countries, government makes policy for Industrialization, Policy can be developed to influence and improve secondary production through, forward or backward integration and granting of special relief (Egonmwan, 2009).

- **Environmental Policy:** Environmental policy refers to the commitment of an organization to the laws, regulations, and other policy mechanisms concerning environmental issues and sustainability. These issues generally include air and water pollution, solid waste management, biodiversity, ecosystem management, maintenance of biodiversity, the protection of natural resources, wildlife and endangered species. Policies concerning energy or regulation of toxic substances including pesticides and many types of industrial waste are part of the topic of environmental policy.
- **Electoral Policy:** To ensure credible and free-fair elections by an independent Electoral Commission; focuses on rules and operational modalities and oversight of political parties and the conduct of elections at the different state/governance levels.
- **Overseas Policy:** This relates to the plan of how the State intends to actualize their national development objectives through interaction with other states through economic, social, cultural, political strategies that border on statecraft and governance.

Why Policy Fail in Federal Systems

Ambiguous policy statement

A policy of deliberate ambiguity (also known as a policy of strategic ambiguity or strategic uncertainty) is the practice by a country of being intentionally ambiguous on certain aspects of its foreign policy or whether it possesses certain weapons of mass destruction (Egonmwan, 2009). It may be useful if the country has contrary foreign and domestic policy goals or if it wants to take advantage of risk aversion to abet a deterrence strategy. Stephen, Jan, and Glenda (2015) assert that such a policy can be very risky as it may cause misinterpretation of a nation's intentions, leading to actions that contradict that nation's wishes.

Overambitious policy goals

With regard to over-ambition in policy formulation, in developing countries like Nigeria, many policies tend to be over-ambitious, sweeping and fundamental in nature. This is as a result of some of the countries are influenced by special conditions that affect how programmes and policy goals are decided. Grindle (1990) as cited in Egonmwan (2009) highlighted that the enormity of human

and physical needs in poor countries, the desire to establish legitimacy, the desire to improve conditions, and the feelings that the deprivations of the colonial past must create a situation in which political leaders are likely to formulate policies that will lead to radical and rapid improvement in the conditions of life.

A good example was Nkrumah's ambitious rapid development programmes for Ghana when he was the Prime Minister of Ghana after independence. Nkrumah was motivated to embark on very ambitious programmes in the early 1960s. The construction of Akosombo Dam for rapid industrialization of Ghana was a good example. Although the Dam was successfully constructed, part of the programmes that were to follow flopped because Ghana ran out of money due to a drop in the price of cocoa which was the basis of the country's budget. Grindle (1990) went further to state that over-ambitious policies are frequently beclouded in ideological context that may hide the actual problems involved in executing them. If, at the planning stage, consideration had been given to the fact that the source of income for Ghana depended on international market forces which may swindle up and down, perhaps the project would have been pruned down to a size that would be manageable whichever way the market forces go (Stephen, Jan, and Glenda, 2015).

Many policies pursued by government tend to be overambitious which largely affect how programmes and policy goals are decided. According to Egomnwan (2009) "the desire to establish the legitimacy of the political regime by providing tangible evidence of improving conditions, create a situation in which the political leaders are likely to espouse policies that lead to improvements in the conditions of life of their citizenry, but maybe not be realized because of its overambitious nature", Therefore, the scope, comprehensiveness, and operationability of policies formulated gave rise to serious bottlenecks during implementation. Vision 2020 and the present nine-point agenda are some of such policies (Stephen, Jan, and Glenda, 2015).

Non-inclusion of skilled personnel

Implementing agencies in most cases lack appropriate modern technology, managerial skill and administrative capacity that are prerequisite for effective policy implementation, the procedures adopted in policy implementation are such that are not consistent with policy goals. And sometimes cultural consideration hampers adoption of modern technology in areas of programme

implementation (Iyanda and Bello, 2016). Examples can be seen in the people's resistance to the use of fertilizer because of traditional beliefs some decades ago; or the rejection of polio vaccines in some northern states.

Problems of continuity and commitment to policy

Change in government more often than not is accompanied by change in priorities. The situation tends to make implementation more difficult in terms of switch over to entirely different priorities and objectives which requires new organizations, personnel, resources and technology which are not always easy to provide. This led to abandonment of many policies.

Corruption

The corrupt tendencies of public officials and politicians in connivance with private organizations and individuals have no doubt had a far-reaching consequence on effective implementation of policies in the country. Corruption has pervaded every aspect of our societal life (Egomnwan, 2003) and (Achebe, 1983). It can be seen not only in inflation of contract figures or over-invoicing, but outright diversion of billions of naira meant for one programme or another. Agencies like EFCC and ICPC created to control and convert corruption have turned out to be toothless bulldogs with nothing to show compared to the high-level corruption in the country. These corrupt practices can easily be seen in the diversion of billions of US dollars aimed at providing enough power supply that will boost the national economy, a case that is yet to be investigated.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The formulation and implementation of every policy in a federal system is a dynamic process, which involves the interaction of many variables as was discussed. Communication is an essential ingredient for effective implementation of public policy (Gaus, 2006).

Through communication, orders to implement policies are expected to be transmitted to the appropriate personnel in a clear manner while such orders must be accurate and consistent. Inadequate information can lead to a misunderstanding on the part of the implementers who may be confused as to what exactly is required of them. In effect, implementation instructions that are not transmitted, that are distorted in transmission, that are vague, or that are inconsistent may cause serious obstacles to policy implementation. Conversely, directives that are too precise may hinder implementation by stifling creativity and adaptability.

Where implementation orders are clear, consistent and accurately transmitted, the absence of adequate resources will result in implementation problems.

Resources include both the human and material such as adequate number of staff who are well equipped to carry out the implementation, relevant and adequate information on implementation process, the authority to ensure that policies are carried out as they are intended, and facilities such as land, equipment, buildings, etc. as may be deemed necessary for the successful implementation of the policy.

References

- Achebe, C. (1983). *The Trouble with Nigeria*. New Hampshire: Oxford and Heinemann Educational Publishers.
- Aligbe, B. A. (2018). *Fundamentals of public policy and analysis: An analytical approach*. Auch. Bestway printing press.
- Ayuba, A. A. Charas M. T., & Paul Y. M., (2012). Public policy formulation and implementation in Nigeria. *Public Policy and Administration Research*, Vol. 2, No.5
- Asuelimen, B. I. (2018). Policy development and implementation in Nigeria federal system. *International institute of tropical agriculture*, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328853757>
- Dye, T. R. (2002). *Understanding Public Policy* (10th edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Egonmwan, J. A. (2003). *Policy Failure in Developing Countries, an Issue Deserving Analysis*. Benin City, Ambil Press Otiki-Odibi.
- Egonmwan, J. A. (2009). *Public Policy Analysis, Concepts, and Application*. Benin City, Resyin Nig. Company.
- Gaus, J. M. (2006). *Reflection on Public Administration*. Alabama: University of Alabama Press.
- Gberevbie, D.E. (2013). Ethical issues and Nigeria's quest for development. *Rwanda Journal, Series B: Social Sciences*. Volume 1(1). pp. 21-35.
- Gberevbie, D. E. (2017). *Public Administration: A Conceptual Perspective*. Ibadan, Cardinal Publishers.
- Ikelegbe, A. O. (2006). *Public Policy Analysis: Concept, Issues and Cases*. Lagos: Imprint Services.
- Inyang, B. (2015). Contending issues in the management of intergovernmental relations in the Nigerian federal administration system. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol 5(3).
- Iyanda, K. A., & Bello, S. D. (2016). Problems and challenges of policy implementation for national development. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*. Vol. 6 (15). www.iiste.org
- Sapru, R. K. (2004). *Public Policy: Formulation, Implementation, and Evaluation*. New Delhi, Sterling Publishers PVT Ltd.
- Stephen, D. B., Jan R. G. & Glenda C. (2015). Why do policies fail in Nigeria? *Journal of Education & Social Policy* Vol. 2, No. 5.
- Makinde, T. (2005). Problems of *Policy implementation in Developing Nations: The Nigerian experience*. *Journal of Social Science*, 11(1): pp 63-69