PUBLIC POLICY IMPLEMENTATION FOR SUSTAINABLE NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

*JAMIYAL DAUDA NATHAN; *YARI ZUWAIRA; AND *ISHAQ HASSAN ABUBAKAR; **ADAMU HASSAN SHINGA; AND **YAKUBU TABITHA-
*Department of General Studies, Gombe State Polytechnic, Bajoga. **Department of Public Administration, Gombe State Polytechnic, Bajoga.

Abstract

This paper has examined how the environment of a nation can be developed by proper public policy implementation. The ability to sustain the natural world and the need for humankind's stewardship of resources. To what extent does public policy implementation affect national development is a key question. Government

Keywords: *Public Policy, Implementation, Sustainable, National, Development.*

INTRODUCTION

Public policies are government policies or an embodiment of official pronouncements on what the government would want to do or to be done on behalf of the citizenry in other to address society problems at all levels of government (federal, state and local government). Birkland (2015:9) sees public policy as a statement by government at whatever level of what it intends to do about a public problem. Public policies are therefore used to address social problems in education, health, road, infrastructure and housing. Other social problems which can be addressed by public policy includes; insurgency, insecurity, rural-

239

is responsible for protecting the environment in the face of rapid industrial growth, but ineffectiveness in policy implementation compounded by a multitude of actors and interests, and often inadequate resourcing, threaten the possibility of development. The research adopted the Elites theory. The source of data was primarily, secondary. It was observed that challenges such as corruption, faulty programme theory, unclear goals and objectives, lack of coordinated planning, lack of standardization, complexity joint actions etc, limits public policy implementation. The research concluded that good leadership and continuous and close monitoring of projects and programs among others facilitate public policy implementation. It thus recommended that there should be good theoretical back up on policies, policy legitimization, set goals and objectives, proper resource allocation, organization design among others for effective policy implementation towards sustainable National development.

Urban migration, poverty and even unemployment. Such social problems cannot be addressed without an active government policy. Hence, a good government cannot seem to be active in addressing social problems without articulating public policy in dealing with issues affecting the society.

Over the years, Nigerian Governments has invested huge funds, of about an average of N220billion annually translating to an average of N73.3billion per annum (Nwosu and Okafor, 2017:883) to develop public policies to address public issues, such as, improving the quality of life, provision of affordable credit for medium, small and micro enterprises, reduction of inequality and wide disparities as well as increasing access to education and health services among others. Generally, the expected outcome of the public policies is to, in the long-run, make positive changes on identified public problems. Such changes could either be to eliminate problems, or to manage it or to restructure its appearance to a more desirable one.

Public policy implementation is a major problem confronting Nigeria in its effort to achieve national development. From experience, little attention is paid to the subject of policy implementation by policy makers. It is often taken for granted that once a policy is adopted by government, it must be implemented and the desired goals achieved. Large amount of energy and resources are spent on designing and preparing plans for all kinds with little or no thought given to the complex chains of reciprocal interactions and variables required and this can be seen usually in the widening gap between intentions and results. In Nigeria, policy implementation is hindered by high level of corruption as major reason.

The year 2015 marked a major shift in the international development agenda. The vision of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development differs from that of the MDGs in fundamental ways. It represents a more ambitious agenda that puts emphasis on wellbeing, prosperity and sustainability in all countries for all people of this generation and those to come. The Sustainable Development Goals are an indivisible set of global priorities that incorporate economic, social and environmental aspects and recognise their interlinkages in achieving sustainable development.

The 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) all, directly or indirectly, need an effective public service for successful implementation. This is because all of the Goals (17 SDGs, 169 targets and 231 indicators) require the provision of public goods or the implementation of a public sector policy and, therefore, depend on public service to coordinate, mediate or directly provide.

The 2030 Agenda will challenge the capacity of public service in scope, importance and urgency. An effective interface between politicians and public officials will be needed to turn the political vision for SDG implementation into a reality. Innovation and future-oriented mind-sets must strive for better solutions. Finally, a strong motivation in the public service to achieve the SDGs is essential to ensure sense of purpose.

Literature Review
Definition and Meaning of Public Policy
The study of public policy, including the methods of policy analysis, has been among the most rapidly developing fields in the social sciences over

the past several decades. Policy analysis emerged to both better understand the policymaking process and to supply policy decision makers with reliable policy relevant knowledge about pressing economic and social problems. In order to understand public policy, it is important to review some of its definitions.

Policies are not limited to government activities, as human conduct is generally governed by what is sometimes loosely referred to as "policy". Individuals, families, clubs, cultural groups, communities, small as well as large business organizations and governments enunciate policies. (Ikeanyibe, 2013:1)

The above quotation presupposes the fact that policy is a pervasive term that is both consciously or unconsciously utilized on daily basis. It is on this premises that Kirst-Ashman (2007) defines policy as rules that govern people's lives and dictate expectations for behaviors. Ikelegbe (2005:3) however, proceeded to define a policy as "simply actions taken or to be taken or not to be taken by government or private organizations". It is according to him, a statement of what an organization wants to do, what it is not doing, what is doing and what would be done. The definition major emphases are: intentions/plans, actions, non-actions and prohibitions. It can also be regarded as general rules, regulations, guiding practices or actions in a particular activity or problem area. It specifies the line of action or proposed line of action in relation to certain activity area. (Ikeanyibe, 2013:5)

Presthus (1975:14) defined policy as a definite course or method of action selected from among alternatives and in the light of given conditions to guide and usually determine present and future actions. It is an integrated programme of actions which an actor (or group of actors) is accustomed to or intends to undertake in response to given problems or situation with which he is confronted. From the above, one cannot but agree that policy is a common term and its making and implementation is equally general. Its utilization and practices is found with individual, private and governmental organization. It can simply be put as framework or guidelines within which actions and inactions are involved towards their accomplishment. Thus, public policy is wider in scope that sets the paradigm, and the guideline within which economic, social, political and

administrative decisions important to individuals, groups and corporate organizations within the society are made. Public policy according to Shaw & Eichbaum (2011:5) is a complex phenomenon and settling on a single definition limits the need to make sense of such complexity and to build a richer understanding of the multi-faceted nature of policy.

Dye (1978:3) defined public policy as whatever governments choose to do or not to do. This definition introduces the elements of choice and alternatives from among which the choice is made. This definition has been criticized too. In the words of Anderson (1979:5):

There is a rough accuracy to this definition, but it does not adequately recognize that there may be divergence between what governments decide to do and what they actually do. Moreover, it could be taken to include such actions as personnel appointments or grants of licenses which are usually not thought of as policy matter.

This goes to mean that, not all government chooses to do for they may not do some, and not all governmental actions can be regarded as public policy. Olaniyi (2001:14) maintained that public policy as a concept in politics does not have a straight forward definition, but a variety of uses. He averred that the interdisciplinary nature of the concept constitutes another problem, pontificating that the only way by which we can demarcate one from another is to add the "epithet" that will reflect our area of interest. For instance, economic policies, educational policies are policies relating to different areas and portray different meanings. Chandler and Plano (1988:107) defined public policy as the strategic use of resources to alleviate national problems or governmental concerns. From these perspectives, public policy refers to all authorized means devised by government in order to solve society problem by utilizing the nation's available resources.

Dlakwa (2008:2) defined public policy as the principles, guidelines or orientation adopted by a governmental body in guiding the affairs of a polity. To him, public policy consists of series of guidelines for actions to be taken in order to improve the welfare of the citizens prepared by the government or its designated agents and it can equally be seen as all the legally sanctioned and duly documented intentions of a government, such as executive orders, Acts of parliament, development plans and all other

official pronouncements that might have received a legal backing. In the same vein, Birkland (2015:9) define public policy as a statement by government at whatever level of what it intends to do about a public problem. Such statements can be found in the Constitution, statutes, regulation, case law (that is, court decisions), agency or leadership decisions, or even in changes in the behavior of government officials at all levels. This definition has been criticized too in the word of Schneider (1997:10) "Policies are revealed through texts, practices, symbols, and discourses that define and deliver values including goods and services as well as regulations, income, status, and other positively or negatively valued attributes." This definition means that public policies are not just contained in laws and regulations; once a law or rule is made, policies continue to be made as the people who implement policy. That is, those who put policies into effect make decisions about who will benefit from policies and who will shoulder burdens as a result.

Rose (2004:20) views public policy as not a decision; it is a course or pattern of activity. From this perspective, public policy is a dynamic process that is characterized by a course of action or pattern of activities carried out with the aim of achieving predetermined objectives. It is in the light of the above that Anderson (1984:4) sees public policy as a purposive course of action followed by a political actor or set of actors in dealing with a problem or a matter of common concern for a given community. Similarly, Sapru (2004:3) sees public policy as a purposive course of action taken by those in power in pursuit of certain goals or objectives. Sapru and Anderson's definitions are very similar in terms of viewing public policy as actions governments, groups, and/or organizations choose to accomplish. The two definitions are more closely aligned as the meaning; as well as the premise into the debate of policies that never see the light of day with the problem and agenda setting process. While reaching some level of consensus on the definition of public policy remains a daunting and seemingly difficult task, the purpose for striving for an agreement is vital. Anderson acknowledges that, "The goals of a policy may be somewhat loosely stated and cloudy in content, thus providing general direction rather than precise targets for its implementation.

Although many scholars have defined public policy, Dlakwa (2008:2) argue that public policy can be seen in the following ways:

I. **Policy as a Statement of Intention:** Seen from this perspective public policy is regarded as an embodiment of official pronouncements on what governments would want to pursue. It consists of series of guidelines for action by government or its designated agent. Viewed from this angle one can regard public policy as all the documented intentions of a government, such as executive orders, Acts of Parliament, development plans and other official pronouncements that might have legal backing.

II. **Policy as a set of Governmental Activities:** From a descriptive perspective, public policy is defined as a dynamic process that is characterized by a course or pattern of activities aimed at achieving predetermined objectives. Public policy thus consists of the -constellations of activities carried out by governmental agencies, or their representatives, with the sole purpose of achieving stated objectives. From this perspective, public policy refers to all authorized means devised by government in order to achieve its stated goals and objectives. This can take the form of rendering social services or solving societal problems by the governmental agency or ministerial department.

III. **Policy as Decision-making or Choice:** Goals and objectives are not normally found in cut and dried or ready-made form in any community no matter how small the community might be. They have to be conscientiously identified, defined, re-defined and articulated by the government and its citizenry. Therefore, any government wishing to succeed in its official endeavor has to make a concerted effort at determining the desirable objectives to pursue for its people. This entails the taking of specific actions "to set goals, develop plans, implement and evaluate programmes" It is in this light that Dye (1980) considers as public policy as anything that governments choose to do or not to do.

Having seen the different views and perspective of different scholars on public policy, no matter from which perspective one views public policy

one would still imply one or more of the following characteristics as stated by Ikeanyibe (2013:4)

a. Public policy originates from the government.
b. It is meant to resolve social problems requiring collective action such as in the economy, education, health, defense, foreign affairs, social welfare, transportation and housing.
c. It can be positive, that is, it can involve some form of government action to tackle a particular problem or it can be negative, that is, not taking any action or to do nothing concerning an issue on which government intervention is sought.
d. It usually requires government enactment, that is, official pronouncement regarding the intention of government through laws, executive orders, and judicial decision.

Because of the legislative/authoritative status, public policies usually entail the use of state resources including the state coercive agencies to achieve policy goals.

The argument is that, public policy has to do with the fact that, it is a product of government process and activities; it affects a large spectrum of issues and sectors of the society which government have something to do. This includes the economy, housing, defense, transportation, health care, education, etc. and expression of public policy embraces, laws, judicial decisions, executive orders and rules government budgets, organizational directives or any rule of conduct behind which stands the enforcing power of the principal system. Public policies are in essence designed to resolve social problems particularly those considered to require public or collective action.

Many scholars regard policy implementation as a separate activity which takes place after policy has been formulated. Although this view is held because there is little appreciation of the fact that building support for policies is an integral part of designing them. This widely held view on separation of policy design from implementation has been attacked by scholars like Pressenca and Wildavsky (1973) as fatal from any sense of direction. They argued that "the separation of policy formulation from implementation is fatal. It is not better than mindless implementation

without a sense of direction, though we can isolate policy formulation and policy implementation for a separate discussion" (cited in Egonmwan 2009). However, a number of implementation scholars make a conceptual distinction between policy formulation- and policy implementation. Example Sabatier (1986), Sabatier and Mazmanian (1983). Chronologically, implementation is thought to occur after the adoption of a policy.

Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

A concern with implementation emerged as an outgrowth of the renewed interest in the substance of policy among post behavioural era. Political scientist and scholars such as Repley (1985) Austine Rannley (1968) and Sharkansky (1970) argues that it become imperative and legitimate for political scientist to relate policy content to characteristics of the policy making process. They emphasize that government performance can only be improved through study and analysis of implementation. According to Pressman and Wildavsky (1984) "By concentrating on the implementation of programs, as well as their initiation, we should be able to increase the probability that policy promises will be realized".

Public policy implementation has been described as one of the major problem confronting developing countries. Egonmwan (2009) argues that "relativity, the successful implementation of public policy is difficult in first world countries; it is more difficult in the third world, and may be most difficult in reform oriented governments in the third world such as Africa and Latin America and most usually it is the problem of widening gap between intentions and result".

Implementation scholars exhibit wide differences on a number of crucial issues. Where implementation starts or end is riot settled. While implementation is commonly referred to a stage, boundaries are not clear. Authors vary in their selection of critical factors affecting implementation. Criteria for evaluating implementation success are conflicting. Moreover, the simplest, most straight forward path for implementation has proven to be difficult.

Public policy implementation involves translating policy objectives into concrete reality. When all the laws required to give effect to policies

247

adopted have been put in place. The next logical stage is the actual implementation of policy. Implementation refers to the process of converting inputs financial, information, materials, technical, human, demand and support etc, into outputs -goods and services" (Egonmwan, 2009). It is the stage that the earlier preparations, plans and designs are concretized. Brown and Wildavsky (1984) view implementation "as a process of mutual adaptation in which policies and programmes adapt to their environment and each alter the other". This suggests that implementation is a place in the life cycle of policy and indeed the most crucial of all the other phases.

While there are several theories in the study and analysis of public policies, this research relies on the **Elite theory** of public policy for its analysis and discussion. Dye (1978), is one of the prominent contributors to the elite theory. The theory was developed as an alternative paradigm to pluralism. In other words, the elite theory rejects the pluralist view concerning the distribution of political powers in the hands of minority groups. "Elitism is therefore, a pattern of decision making characterized by limited mass participation in community issues and their domination by small groups of specialized or general leaders" (Egonmwan 1991: 59). The key tenet of the theory is that the elite who are few in the society share common values, have more resources via power, education, wealth etc, and hold leading and strategic positions in the society while the masses are atomized, not recognized for concert action, lack of resources and are politically incompetent (Ikeanyibe, 2013:40). It is the elite who are few that dominate the policy process and shape public policy. Ujo (1994:36) stated that, the elite are not necessarily those in government but are found in all sectors of the society and within the political, military, economic, traditional, and even religious circle acting from the scene, tele-guiding and manipulating political power and policies. The source of the elite powers includes access to formal political office, wealth, technical expertise, knowledge etc. Thus, public policies reflect the values and preferences of the elite rather than the demand of the masses.The theory presumes that the elite consensus is based on class interest but admits some degree of paternalism and altruism to the masses for the purpose of maintaining the status quo (Ikeanyibe, 2013:41). In other word the elite theory does not entirely disagree with the

fact that public policies can be to attenuate to the demands of the mass. Thus Ujo (1994:36) stated that, public policies in most societies reflect and continue to reflect the values and preferences of the elite. Because the elite have common interest in the preservation of the status quo in the society, policies are bound to be conservative, non-innovative and marginal rather than those with bold and high change potentials. Policies might sometimes be in the masses interests even though at the long term interest may be that of the elites, but this happens as concessions to or reactions to the threats of the status quo by the masses.

Dye and Ziegler (1984:1) summarized the central arguments of the elite to include the following:

I.   Society is divided into the few who have power and the many who do not. (Only a small number of persons allocate values for society; the masses do not decide public policy).

II. The few who govern are not typical of the masses who are governed. Elites are drawn disproportionately from the upper socioeconomic strata of society.

III. The movement of non-elites to elite positions must be slow and continuous to maintain stability and avoid revolution. Only non-elites who have accepted the basic elite consensus can be admitted to governing circles.

IV. Elites share a consensus on the basic values of the social system and the preservation of the system. (In the United States, the elite consensus includes private enterprise, private property, limited government, and individual liberty).

V.   Public policy does not reflect demands of the masses but rather the prevailing values of the elite. Changes in public policy will be incremental rather than revolutionary. (Incremental changes permit responses to events that threaten a social system with a minimum of alteration or dislocation of the system).

VI. Active elites are subject to relatively little direct influence from apathetic masses. Elites influence masses more than masses influence elites (Dye and Ziegler, 1984:1)

Dye (1981) summarize the implication of this theory as indicating that public policy reflects elite values, serves elite ends, and is a product of the elite. The consequence of this assumption is that the general citizenry or the masses are apathetic and ill-informed and do not determine or influence policy through their demands or actions.

From the foregoing, the theory attempts a realistic explanation of the source of policy by predicating it in the elites rather than the masses. The theory has also attracted criticisms. It has been accused of being a provocative theory for assuming a conspirational character of the elites against the wishes of the masses and for that matter relegating the roles of the masses in policy making to the background perceiving them as apathetic, ill-informed and passive. It is also argued that, strategic placement in elite position as a source of power is hardly a scientific conclusion (Sambo 1999: 295). This means that, the position held by elite theorists, that the position of elites in the society enable them play influential and powerful roles in policy formulation is not scientific, particularly that, the specific roles of the masses in policy formulation is not known. Another limitation of the model is that; the elite theory explains the "who" of public policy but does not actually explain how the actual participation of the elites in the policy process are achieved especially as the elites are not found only in government. The theory however, subscribes to the incrementalist model of decision making since it does not accede to radical and innovative policies.

The relevance of the theory to this study rests in several positions. First, public policy can be regarded as reflecting the values and preferences of governing elite. Every public policy in Nigeria are determined and pursued by the ruling elites i.e. President, Vice President, Ministers, Legislatives, Governor, the Deputy-Governor, the Commissioners, Special Advisers, Personal Assistants, Members of the State House of Assembly and Permanent Secretaries in various Ministries. Secondly, the policy decisions represent the preferences of the elites, thus policies flow downward from the elite to the masses. Lastly, policies are made to reflect the elite value and they defend and sustained their status quo so as to protect and preserve their undue advantages over the masses, they perpetually kick people out of power and benefit, and sometimes provide minimal changes to avoid situations that would overheat the masses and cause them to revolt.

Factors Militating against Implementation of public policy

Among the most important contributions of the implementation literature has been to heighten sensitivity to the numbers of factors that may adversely affect implementation. Many discoveries of factors affecting implementation were not really new, but reformulations of public administration insights concerning bureaucratic behavior and relations. The principals distinguishing feature of implementation analysis was the overarching concern with policy consequences rather than structure or processes.

Many scholars have identified factors that are significant in the analysis of policy implementation. Example Van Meter and Van Horn (3975) identified factors such as the characteristics of implementing agencies, predisposition of implementers and resources as critical. Miolbrey McLaughlin (1978) emphasized the amount of interest, commitment and support evidenced by principal actors had a major influence on the prospect for success. However, there is *a* good deal of controversy in the implementation literature over which factors are most important in determining implementation success or failure.

Lynn and Wildavsky (1992) further suggested that the challenge presented to implementers depends very much on rhe problems passed along to them by policy formulators, success in implementing must be evaluated within the context of particular problems, and critical factors affecting implementation will vary with what is being attempted.

The performance of implementation be categorised into three dimensions such as; (1) output, outcome, and ultimate outcome of policy; (2) impact of policy; and (3) measurement whether the policy leads to the development of country/society as a whole. Brinkerhoff and Hoff (2002) state that successful policy outcomes depend not only upon designing good policies but upon managing their implementation. Until the early 1970s, implementation was considered unproblematic, and was regarded as simply putting the policy into practice. This viewpoint changed with the publication of Pressman and Wildavsky"s "Implementation" in 1973. They studied the implementation strategies of the Economic Development Administration (EDA) in Oakland, California, USA. EDA was commissioned to create employment opportunities for the Black people through various measures such as; business loans, training and public works.

Despite having a very good intention, the program could not be successfully implemented. The major factors for failure of EDA"s programme include:

251

1. Faulty Program Theory: if a policy needs to be successful, it needs sound theoretical validity. But it was not the case with EDA. The economic theory of EDA was faulty because it aimed at the wrong target and such defect also exacerbated bureaucratic problems.
2. Unclear Goals and Objectives: Clarity of goals, targets and objectives encourages and fosters prompt implementation. EDA had difficulties in clarifying goals and targets because of its theoretical defects. For example; Pressman & Wildavsky (1973) observed that EDA wrongly subsidised the capital of business enterprises rather than paying the employees a subsidy on wages. They also asserted, "when objectives are not realised, one explanation is the assertion of faulty implementation".
3. Lack of Coordinated Planning: Lack of coordinated planning leads to policy failure. For example; EDA"s terminal project seems to have suffered from lack of coordinated planning. Pressman & Wildavsky (1973), therefore, stated, "one must choose the right implementation plan- one must know the right way to apply the implementation plan".
4. Lack of Standardisation: A policy fails because of failure to follow a standard procedure. For example; EDA"s "technical details" did not follow any standard procedure.
5. Intra-agency Antipathies: The arrangement of Mr. E. P. Folly, in charge of the EDA, had created intra-agency antipathies between his task force agents and programme superiors. Such intra-agency antipathy resulted in implementation delay.
6. Complexity of Joint Actions: One of the most important reasons for failure of EDA programme was complexity of joint action.

The Effects of public policy implementation On Sustainable National Development

Given the ample limitations to public policy implementation, the question of sustainable national development looks quite not obvious. National development been multi-faceted phenomena, that is concerned with total transformation of the political economic, social and cultural aspects of the society, requires, commitment and structures conducive to implementation of development programmes. The impact of implementation of policies on any economy is of vital importance. "The

greatest problem hindering development of less developed countries like Nigeria is a lack of implementation and or improper implementation of plans, programmes and projects". (Bernard N. Olewel995) In recent times, there has been increasing pressures on the Nigerian government to provide basic essential services such as education, health infrastructures, etc which was resulted from growing number of population, coupled with high level of insecurity that engulfed most parts of the country. This is attributed to the high level of poverty and unemployment. And it is evident, that where policy goals are over ambitious, not well articulated and made explicit, implementation becomes more difficult and complicated, and it amounts to overstretching the available resources for maximum impact and at the end nothing concrete is achieved. Secondly, in the absence of Modem technology, managerial skills and administrative capacity in our public agencies responsible for implementing projects and programmes, the resultant effects will be inefficiency and ineffectiveness in the utilization of resources which lead to serious misappropriations and mismanagement. Thirdly, constant change in policies or shifts in priorities that led to abandonment of many projects across the country, largely due to change in government has the potential of making our national developments more difficult and led to compromises in our development plans. At the end, government may likely lose focus and direction, which will invariably affect our national development.

Lastly, national development will never be possible in the face of high level corruption that pervaded all nooks and crannies of the country. The situation was so bad to the extent that it caught the attentions of International organizations such as the World Bank and Transparency International, and Nigeria was ranked among the most corrupt countries in the world. It can be' seen in the way billions of US dollars were squandered in NEPA and NNPC in recent years, At some point, the transparency international is showing accusing finger st Aso Rock as been the most corrupt place in the country. The effects of these corrupt practices will no doubt lead to lack of basic essentials like education, health, food and shelter, and poverty, unemployment, armed robbery, kidnapping, militancy and terrorism will be on the increase and the question of National development will be unrealisable.

Conclusion

Essentially, success in implementation must-be evaluated within the context of particular problems and critical factors affecting implementation varies, and "success prone" policies are not always

253

obvious. Effective implementation is said to be partially preordained by good leadership that can be the significant political hidden hand that guides disorganized and desperate interest to converge in support of implementing policy. External monitoring of the implementation process was also a crucial variable. Constant and closer monitoring and intervention on continue basis can greatly facilitate action.

Effective and successful policy implementation is the key to national development, it is a building block that facilitate socio-economic and political progress and can only be achieved not only through a continuous political commitment and clear definition of responsibilities and coordination, but also through genuine commitment to eradication of corruption at all levels of government.

Recommendations
The following recommendations are suggested to overcome policy failure:

1. Good Theoretical Back-up: It is impossible to implement a policy that is defective in its theoretical conception (Bardach, 1979). EDA is the perfect example as such. Implementation requires appropriate „causal theory" (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1989). A good policy should have theoretical validity, and must be formulated based on appropriate theoretical basis. Without proper theoretical validity, a policy will give wrong directions in all ways.

2. Policy Legitimisation: In order to make progress with implementation, key decision-makers must view the proposed policy as legitimate (Brinkerhoff & Crosby, 2002).

3. Goals and Objectives: A policy must have clear, specific, measureable, attainable, rational and time-bound (SMART) goals and objectives. In addition to that, there must be consensus on the set goals and objectives as it is a critical feature of the policy (Meter & Horn, 1974).

4. Resource Accumulation: Money is critical in policy implementation and it also requires appropriate human and technical resources (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1989). In fact, to implement a new policy, human, technical, material and financial resources must be allocated to the effort. There should be steady flow of resources (Brinkerhoff & Crosby, 2002). At the same time, appropriate technology also leads to implementation success.

5. Mobilising Resources and Actions: If policy has to achieve results, then resources and actions must be mobilised in the appropriate directions. Mobilisation of resources includes preparation of complete plans, clarification of performance standards and conduct appropriate action plans (Brinkerhoff & Crosby, 2002).

6. Organisation Design and Modification: Appropriate organisational design is a necessary condition for successful implementation of a policy. Delegation of authority, harmonious organisation culture will enhance capability of the organisation in implementing a particular policy. Because of the difficulty in establishing new routines or tasks in organisations, it is politically more feasible to create new structures rather than overhaul older one (Brinkerhoff & Crosby, 2002).

7. Commitment and Skills of Frontline Implementers: Frontline implementers are the focal resources in policy implementation. They need commitment to policy objectives and necessary skills in using available resources to achieve policy objectives since incompetency of frontline implementers lead to implementation failure (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1989). Frontline implementers must be motivated in their commitment and must be imparted necessary training so that non-compliance from their part does not take place. Competent personnel make implementation easier.

8. Monitoring: Implementation should not be done in isolation. Mechanism for monitoring the implementation process from internal and external authorities will enhance implementation performance.

References

Anderson, J. E. (1979), Public Policy-Making: Decisions and their Implementation, 2nd ed, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Anderson, J. E. (1984), Public Policy-making, New York: Holt Reinhart and Winston.

Birkland, T. A. (2015). An introduction to the policy process: theories, concepts, and models of public policy making, 4th ed, New York: Routledge publishing.

Chandler, R.C and Plano, J.C (1988), The Public Administration Dictionary, England: ABC-CL10.

Colander, D. (2001) An Introduction to the Study of Society. Boston, M.A Allyn and Bacon Company.

Dele, A.O et al (2009) An Empirical Investigation of Leadership Style and Their Effect on Organizational Performance in Nigeria. Business Management Topics, Vol 1. Edited by EULImaga&UJFEwurum. Enuguoktek Publishers.

Dlakwa, H. D. (2009), Concepts and Models in Public Policy Formulation and Analysis. Kaduna: Pyla Mark Service Ltd.

Dye, T. R (1980), Understanding Public Policy, Englewood Cliffs, N. J: Prentice- Hall

Dye, T. R. and Ziegler (1996), The Irony of Democracy; USA: Wadsworth C.A.

Dye. T. R. (1976), Policy Analysis: What Governments Do, Why They do it and What Differences it Makes, Alabama: University of Alabama Press.

Egonmwan, J.A. (1991): Public Policy Analysis: Concepts and Applications. Benin City: SMO Aka & Brothers Press.

Ikeanyibe, O.M. (2013) Public Policy in Nigeria; Perspectives on Social Policy and Administration, John Jacobs Classic Publishers Ltd.

Ikelegbe, A. (2005) Public Policy Analysis: Concepts, Issues and Cases, Benin City: imprint Services.

Lynn B.N. Wildavasky A. (1992). *Public Administration, The state of the discipline:* Chatham House Publishers Inc. New Jersey.

Obikeze, O. S. (1980) Public Administration in Nigeria: A Development Approach. Onitsha: Book Point Limited.

Ogunlela, Y.I. (2012). Impact of the Programmes of the National Directorate of Employment on Graduate Employment and Unemployment in Nasarawa State of Nigeria.Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences, 9 (1): 40-45

Ojo, F. (1998). Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice. Lagos: Panaf Publishing Inc.

Olaniyi, J.O. (2001) Foundations of Public Policy Analysis; Ibadan: Sunad Publishers Ltd.

Presthus, R. (1975), Public Administration; NewYork: The Ronald Press Co.

Rose, R. (2004). Learning from Comparative Public Policy. A Practical Guide, London & Newyork; Routledge.

Sambo, A. (1999), "Public Policy" in Anifowose, R. and Enemuo, F. (eds), Elements of Politics; Lagos: Sam Iroanusi Publications.

Schneider, L.A (1997); Policy Design for Democracy: Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Shaw, R. Eichbaum, C. (2011) Public Policy in New Zealand: Institutions, Processes and Outcomes. Pearson, Auckland, New Zealand.

Sparu, R.K. (2004) Public Policy, Formulation, Implementationand Evaluation, Sterling Publishers, Private Limited, New Delhi.