Public Policy Making and Implementation in Nigeria: Connecting the Nexus

DR. DAHIDA DEEWUA PHILIP
Department of Public Administration, University of Abuja,P.M.B 117 Abuja-Nigeria
G.S.M. 08060366395
Email:dahida2008@yahoo.com
DR.MAIDOKI B. PETER
Department of Public Adminisration, Faculty of Management Sciences
University of Abuja,P.M.B 117 Abuja-Nigeria

Abstract
Public policy making and implementation is a very critical area that both government and non-governmental organizations are at divergent opinions in the process of making and implementing such programmes and activities. Public policy itself 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 to the community by a governmental agency or ministerial department. Public policy is thus a mechanism used in translating goals/objectives in to practical actions that can affect positively the lives of the people. We have noticed that in Nigeria, the process of policy formulation and implementation is essentially the work of government and its agencies. Whereas in principles the civil society organizations may have roles to play but in practice they are far away from the domain of policy processes. Secondary method of data collection was employed in this study where relevant literature was reviewed and elite's theory was adopted as framework of analysis. At the end, the study revealed that in Nigeria, there is a missing-link between the government and the public and also the government and its agencies when it come to policy formulation and implementation and that explain why policies grossly fail in Nigeria. Our conclusion was drawn on the premise that, Nigeria's problem is not policy formulation but that of accurate implementation. The study therefore, recommends among other things that; there should be a very strong connecting link between the elites who are the policy makers and the mass – public. If that is done, it will reduce the tendency of imposed policies from the top. An enabling environment should also be instituted where policy making should be participatory. Public awareness should be created; the civil society groups, professional bodies, organized private sector, and the mass public should be given the opportunity to present their proposals for policy making and implementation there by connecting the nexus between the government and other professional bodies.
Keywords:public policy,process. formulation and implementation

1. Introduction

Public policy is a familiar concept used on a daily basis by virtually everybody; but owing to the diversity of circumstances in which the term is applied, coupled with the fact that human beings by nature vary in their perceptions of things, there is a variety of meanings attached to the concept. Nonetheless, there is still a common reference point by all users of the concept from various disciplines. It is used mainly in reference to what government does in order to meet the yearnings and aspirations of the citizenry. This could be in the form of actions taken in the course of distributing, regulating and redistributing resources in the society. However, these actions do not necessarily have to emanate exclusively from the government, as the citizenry can initiate them as well. Nevertheless, these people's initiatives would have to be acted upon by the government before such actions could appropriately be labeled as public policy (Dlakwa, 2008).

The concept therefore is central to governments, private organizations and individuals. Government commits much time, energy and resources to the development of policies. Some even take years to make, but once made, they are so emphasized as the big guiding stick in related areas of activity. Officials in both public and private organizations spend much time in enunciating policies and explaining how actions fit into existing policies. In fact, the impression the ordinary man drives from the ado about policy is all what governments and organizations talk, make and do. The frequency of the concept in public discourse has made it more ambiguous and confusing. Individuals, families, clubs, cultural groups, communities, government departments, small business organizations as well as the large ones, all talk about their policies. (Ikelegbe, 1994) However, the concern is always focused on government policies because it is government policies that direct the economy and reposition the society in a manner where law and order is maintained.

In a developing nation like Nigeria, public policy is very critical since it is the spring -board to channeling development. In the Nigerian context however, more often than not public policies are easily made but the issue of proper implementation remains a great question to be answered.

2. Conceptualizing public policy

Public policy as a concept does not have a single meaning attached to it. It is variously looked at from different perspectives depending on the environment, geography and situation emanating from the subject matter. For instance, Robert and Clark (1982) considered public policy from 'goal attainment' and power configuration point of view. According to them, public policy making process refers to:

> *Series of steps taken by a government to solve problems, make decisions,*
> *allocate resources or values, implement policies and in general to do the*
> *things expected of them by their constituencies. (Robert and Clark, 1982)*

In a democratic environment, the role played by the political class in agenda setting lead to public policy is highly commendable. On that premise, public policy can be seen as a set of interrelated decisions by a political actor or group of actors concerning the selection of goals and the means of achieving them within a specified situation where those decisions should in principle be within the power of those actors to achieve (Jenkins, 1978). On the other hand, Sharkansky, (1978) defined policy as follows: "Policy can refer to a proposal, an on-going programme, or the goals of a programme, major decisions or the refusal to make certain decision". The above definition is highly controversial in the sense that it recognizes in –action on part of government as policy.

Our major concern here is not the in-action by the government but the actions taken by government towards policy directions as it affect health, agriculture, education, poverty reduction and security etc.

Public policy therefore can be a decision taken by government in the areas that affect socio-economic and social development.

3.LITERATURE REVIEW

Policy conception

Public discourse today is saturated with the advocacy or criticism of various policies. It is common to hear of foreign policy, defence policy, economic policy, educational policy and policies in almost every area of government and private activity. We also hear of policy statements, enactment of policies, and declaration of policy intentions and the commitments of millions of naira to the implementation of certain policies. Our lives are in fact affected and influenced by policies made by governments and communities, social organizations, churches, labor groups, educational business and service organizations. The results of policies are also all around us. The provision of social services, the cost of fuel, the availability or non availability of imported goods, the scope of our economic activities, the availability of agricultural loans and employment opportunities, the security of our jobs and how much tax we pay or rate to pay are all determined by or are the results of policies (Ikelegbe, 1994).

It is against this backdrop that policy is defined 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 decisions (Presthus, 1875).

Dror (1973) wisely conceptualizes policy in this sense, as a "major guideline for action". The key characteristic of a policy is that, it involves a choice; it is an important choice or a critical or major decision taken by individuals, groups or organizations. This means that there has to be several policy alternatives. Second, policies are proposed courses of actions or projected set of decisions. Policies are prospective or are statements of future actions. Policies state what is going to be done or would be done. It outlines a course of contemplated or desired action in relation to certain desired objects or events in the real world. Third, a policy is goal oriented. It is directed at the attainment of certain end states or more simply objectives. A policy has certain purposes or intentions. Fourth, policies have to do with particular problems or problem areas. They are not abstracts, but rather relate to and are actually responses to the challenges and pressures arising from an environment. In fact, often times, policies are designed and targeted at dissolving existing or future problems or satisfying certain needs. Finally, a policy is a course setting action. It provides the direction, the guide and the way to the achievement of certain goals. It provides the frame within which present and future actions are taken (Ikelegbe, 1994).

After looking at what policy is, our attention now should be focused on public policy. Public policy, as a concept has a variety of uses. This is because; the perception of the meaning, impact and significance of public policy may vary   with the perspective of participants and observers (kroll, 1969). Also, the interdisciplinary nature of the concept constitutes another problem. However, 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, economists talk of "economic policies" while educationists often refer to policies relating to education as "educational policies". But when used in either way, it portrays different meanings. In addition to this, there is controversy in existing literatures in political science over the boundary of what constitutes public policy (Olaniyi, 2001). This has been better exemplified by Sharkansky (1978) who asserted that:

> Policy can refer to a proposal, an on going programme, or the goals

of a programme, major decisions or the refusal to make certain
decision.

What the above position suggests to us is that the focus of public policy may not necessarily be at the three stages of policy making process, but it can be mainly on a state. Consequently, we shall be right to argue that public policy concerns the formulation of a decision, its implementation and evaluation. On this note, Dimock, et. al, (1983) argued that, public policy is deciding at any time or place what objectives and substantive measures should be chosen in order to deal with a particular problem issue or innovation. It also includes the reasons they should be chosen. However, Chandler and Piano (1983) sees public policy as the strategic use of resources to alleviate national problems or governmental concerns.

We observed that these two definitions see public policy from the management point of view. First, there is the awareness on the part of the policy makers that human wants (problems) are insatiable. Two that the available resources to these want are inadequate. Consequently, this problem calls for prudent management of the meager resources to meet some of the pressing demands of the populace (Olaniyi, 2001).

The definitions by Chandler and Piano (1988) and Dimock, et. al (1983) appreciates the fact that "planning" forms the bedrock of public policy. Whereas planning is explained by Chandler and Piano (1988) as:

Conceiving meaningful goal and developing alternative choices for
future action to achieve these goals. Planning involves a systematic
procedure for the reduction of many alternatives to an approved
course of action. It determines not only goals but the sequential
order in which they are pursued, the need for coordination and the
standards for maintaining control.

In essence, anything that involves planning has a goal to achieve therefore; we can argue that Chandler and Piano/Dimock, et.al definitions of public policy also see the concept from the point of view of goal – attainment (Olaniyi, 2001).

3.1 Attributes of Public Policy

Public policy has so many characteristics that make it to be unique in the eyes of many people. However, Dlakwa (2008) offers us with the following characteristics of public policy:

1.   A statement of intention in the form of goals and objectives to be accomplished
2.   A choice of action or selection of alternative strategies for achieving the objectives among various orientations by governmental organs.
3.   An exercise of authority by a governmental institution or political actor in a bid to achieve objectives
4.   A very complex exercise that is conducted amidst high degree of uncertainty, thus involving intelligent guesswork or hunches
5.   A teleological or purposive action taken by governmental institutions or political actors, ostensibly aimed to achieve what is in the public interest
6.   Action that requires flexibility in order to cope with changing desires of the people, shaped in consonance with their socio-cultural environment

From the characteristics of public policy as seen above, one can rightly observe that in most instances, government involve itself in guesswork in the course of trying to formulate certain policies. This could be true because often time's government take decision without empirical data or scientific tools before arriving at certain policy-decisions

3.1.2 Actors Involved In Policy Making Process in Nigeria

Public policy in any given country is being directed by both government and non-governmental bodies. These institutions constituted themselves as actors in policy making process. For us to vividly look at these actors, we adopted the works of Ikelegbe (1996) who sum the actors as follows:

3.1.3 Governmental Actors

a) The Legislative Bodies: Legislative influence over policy range from its initiation and formulation to its implementation, control and review. The influence over policy emanates from the legislative function of representation and expression of popular opinion, law making, control and oversight of the executive branch and control of expenditure. The legislators represent the citizenry and therefore articulate and aggregate citizenry interests and demands by initiating and formulating policy proposals in the legislature. In fact, the legislature is the major arena in many political systems in which demands made on the political process by various individuals, communities, groups and institutions are identified, communicated, discussed, reconciled, compromised, mediated and sometimes concretized into policies. Legislatures may enact bills or draft policies emanating from the citizenry, its members or the executive branch in to law or policies.

b) The Executive: The executive here refers specifically to the chief executive, cabinet, top political officials, advisers and assistants. The executive has responsibility and powers for the implementation of polices. It is also charged with constitutional responsibility, though not exclusively or overseeing, supervising, surveying,

directing, coordinating and managing the administrative agencies, departments and corporations of government. The executive possesses enormous influence on the initiation, enactment, implementation, performance and modification of public policies through its powers, responsibilities and activities. The executive branch is clearly a major actor in the initiation, drafting and formulation of public policies. The executive articulates and formulates policies, which it passes to legislative bodies where they exist. Even at the legislature, the executive mobilizes leads and influences legislators to enact the policies through the use of its enormous resources. The executive influence on policy formulation is because of its primacy   and resources in the political process.

c) The Judiciary: This refers to the body of judges and courts that interpret the constitution and the laws and adjudicates conflicts and crises between the various institutions of government, groups and individuals. The judiciary also posses the power of judicial review through which they could examine and determine the constitutionality of legislature, executive and bureaucratic actions and policies. Through this, the judiciary ensures that every governmental action confirms to the intent and letter of the laws. These powers of adjudication, interpretation and review make the judiciary an actor in the policy process in the sense that it could make pronouncements as to the propriety, fairness, legality and constitutionality of laws or proposed laws. The judiciary could therefore make laws; kill laws by declaring them null and void and unconstitutional. Change the course of policy activity and action; enhance policy choice by lending the weight of legality and propriety to a policy alternative and moderate implementation activity particularly the conduct and manner of bureaucratic officials and implementation. Judiciary in fact, is a moderator, an umpire and mediator of conflicts and judge of propriety in the process. It moderates the actions and activities of governmental policy actors, in relation to themselves and between themselves on the one hand and groups and individuals on the other hand.

d) The Bureaucracy: In the modern world, the bureaucracy is a major organizational context, within which policy making, implementation and evaluation takes place. So important is the bureaucratic input in the policy process that the concepts of administrative policy making and bureaucratic policy system have become common place in policy studies. The traditional conception of public bureaucracy's role in public policy is that of bringing to bear on policy making and implementation, expertise, skill and competence. The bureaucracy then is only conceived instrumentality in terms of enabling goal attainment. Through advice and exclusion; this conception precludes bureaucratic officials from policy activity and goal setting. Second, the public administration in many modern states, are conceived as being politically neutral, anonymous and insulated from the socio-political sub-process of policy making. This conception as the previous insulates administration from politicization. The first conception, the politics/policy and administration dichotomy is not valid today, because of executive dominance of policy making. Consequently, public administration has assumed considerable policy making power. The second conception of neutrality and anonymity is no more rigidly held in some societies because administrators are increasingly becoming powerful, influential and active in the socio-political process.

3.1.4 Non-Governmental Actors

The non-governmental actors include:

a) Political Parties: Political parties influence public policy and the policy process in several ways. Much of the influence arises from their role in the political process. Political parties are concerned primarily with seeking to win control of governmental machinery. To do this, they choose party leaders, select candidates and programmes and mobilize people to support, identify with and vote for them. A party's electoral victory is consequently a victory for certain persons, with their perceptions, values and preferences on the one hand and policy beliefs, choices and programmes on the other viewed from this perspective, parties propose or present policy options to the citizenry such that elections are actually choices and judgments over policies and policy performance respectively.

Parties help therefore, in the articulation and aggregation of policy issues and in the initiation and formulation of proposed policies. Political parties articulate the needs, demands and interests of their members and supporters and mediate compromise and aggregate them into courses of policy actions. The party formulates its programmes on the basis of these policy activities. The party machinery researches and considers policy issues and alternatives, and decides on courses of action.

d) Interest Groups: An interest group is a collection of individual, with some common characteristics, interests and interactions. They exist principally to project, pursue and protect their common interests. Interest groups necessarily interact with governmental and non governmental actors in the policy process because a lot of their interests are affected and dictated by governmental interventions and regulations. This is why interest groups are actors in the policy process. Interest group influence on the policy process occurs at every stage. They are active in the initiation, generation, formulation of public policies and in the determination of their content and direction. Groups constitute a linkage between the public and the government. They articulate the interests and demands of their members to governmental actors in the policy process and seek to influence them to enact their demands and choices into policy actions. Interest groups in fact initiate policy. This, they do by suggesting and

recommending policy solutions to problems that pertain to their activities and interests. Sometimes, groups cooperate with governmental actors in the design and formulation of policies

e) The Citizenry: The citizenry or populations of a nation are also important actors in the policy process. In fact, they could be considered as the core or base actor for several reasons. First, they constitute the human environment of policies. The human environment's perceptions, values, preferences and demands constitute the major environmental influence on public policies. Thus, the citizens are the dominant constituent of the environment which has been found to have major influence on the determination of policy actions. Second, the citizens make the demands for public policy and constitute the clients and targets; policies are made for the benefit of citizens. Third, the citizenry contribute the resources for the provision of policy goods and services; public taxes are the major sources of funds for policies. Finally, the citizens have the power of electing, supporting or rejecting the major governmental actors and the policies they stand for. The citizens attributes to particular policies or proposed policies is therefore the most critical in terms of continuity and performance (Ikelegbe, 1996).

3.1.5 Policy making process in Nigeria

The dominant feature of policy making process in Nigeria is the principle of federal supremacy which is a constitutional conditionality in Nigeria. 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 by the vice President, to advice 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. 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 and evaluated and then translated in to programs within the financial parameters stated by the ministry of Finance. The key agency in the Ministry of National Planning is the National Planning office, which is divided in to 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 Federal Office of Statistics (FOS). The functions of National Manpower Board consist of determining personnel needs and formulating programs for personnel development. The Federal Office of Statistics is the national agency responsible for collecting social and economic data throughout the federation. 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 give 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.

4. Theorizing Public Policy

So many theories abound in public policy; however, for the purpose of this paper, the elite theory is adopted. Dlakwa, (2008) argued that the elite theory has been developed by Gaetano Mosca, Wilfredo Pareto, Robert Michel and Ortega Gasset as a complement to conflict theory and pluralism.

4.1 The thesis of the Elite theory

This model posits that contrary to the belief that pluralism has in-built mechanism for ensuring equity in the share of power and influence in the society, in reality public policy is by and large the mirror image of the ruling elite's interest. Vilfredo Pareto in his book "mind and society" argues that "persons of ability actively seek to confirm and aggrandize their social position". The elite group is divided into governing and non-governing ones. These few that posses unique qualities such as skills, material wealth, cunning and intelligence have the rights to supreme leadership, while the bulk of the population (masses) is destined to be ruled. Thus social classes are formed. Mosca in a similar vein describes the virtues of the ruling class as a representative of the elite in the following words:

> In addition to the great advantage accruing to them from the fact of
> being organized, ruling minorities are usually so constituted that the
> individuals who make them up are distinguished from the mass of
> the governed by qualities that give them a certain material,
> intellectual or even moral superiority; or else they are the heirs of

individuals who posses such qualities. In other words, members of a ruling minority regularly have some attribute, real or apparent, which is highly esteemed and very influential in the society in which they live (Mosca, in Dlakwa, 2008).

Although Mosca on the other hand gives the impression of an impregnable separation between the elite and the masses, and virtually blaming the masses as the cause of their own predicament owing to their inability to properly comprehend and worry about or even challenge the status quo, Pareto on the other hand believes that the masses have the leverage to gradually but slowly penetrate the barrier to the elite stratum. The underlying premise of Mosca's proposition is that the masses though large in number are basically apathetic; hence elites that are fewer but well coordinated are left to dominate the making process. To assert their dominance over the masses and subdue them completely, the elite use the weapon of propaganda, which they mount continually by inculcating in the masses the belief that the elite are making huge sacrifice on behalf of the entire society. By the same token the power elite use all sorts of bonds such as business-interest, old school ties, and lineage or kingship to capture power and exert perpetual control over the masses who either lack such bonds or are prevented from taking advantage of cementing relationship via such bonds through elite manipulation.

Pareto, like Mosca, acknowledges the division of society into the elite and the masses. However, he refuses to accept the perpetuity of such division as he observes that eventually some leeway is created through perseverance on the part of the masses to break or soften the class barrier. He says, "In an effort to rise in to the elite of the upper strata, privileged members of the lower-class groups continually strive to use their abilities and thus their opportunities". Ultimately, "the best equipped persons from the lower class will rise to challenge the position of the upper class elite" and be recruited or co-opted into that class (Encyclopedia Britannica 2006 Deluxe Version, in Dlakwa, 2008). This brings into play the phenomenon referred to by Pareto as the "circulation of elite". In other words, without stating it explicitly, Pareto has a position for the formation of a "middle-mass" stratum among the masses, who ultimately could be co-opted into the elite stratum if they fulfilled some stringent conditions.

Dlakwa further argued that in using the elite model to understand public policy, one has to examine the socio-economic status, as well as power relations within the community. To recapitulate the points raised earlier, the main proposition of the elite model can be summarized as follows:

a) Society is divided into the few who are cohesive, well –organized and self-protective and hence have the power to allocate values for society; and the many that are diffused and uncoordinated and hence do not have political power and also do not decide public policy

b) Elites are drawn mainly from the upper socio-economic strata of the society and they possess unique qualities that give them superiority over the masses. Such as superb organizational skill, astuteness in political ability and military powers. It is note worthy, however, that Riggs (in: Dlakwa, 2008) differentiate between the "elite" and the "elect" in society. To him, the elite are defined exclusively in terms of their possession of power, whereas the "elect are those who bond high position in terms of all socially prized values, not only power, but also wealth, learning, prestige, skill, and so on".

c) Elites are basically cohesive and always try to defend the status quo ante, so as to protect and preserve their undue advantages over the masses. The instruments used include coercion through the military, police or militia groups; manipulation and domination of education system to their advantage; control over the mass media and limiting the awareness of the masses about elite manipulation through all forms of obscurantism, and the indoctrination of the masses to come to terms with their deprivation through ideological propaganda.

d) However, in order to create safety for themselves, the elite avoid a situation that would over heat the masses and cause them to revolt. This is done by creating an institutional framework that permits the gradual movement of non elite to the elite class, which Gaztano Mosca and Pareto refer to as the circulation of elite. This, which is inevitable, must be slow but continuous so as to maintain stability and avoid revolution in the society. In order words, co-optation in the instrument through which the masses are appeased by the elite. This is done through the giving of token compensation in the forms of material and non-material rewards to restricted, but influential, members of the masses by the ruling elite.

e) Influence and power always flow from the elite at the top downward to the masses, through elite-biased public policy (Anderson, Dye and Zeigler in: Dlakwa, 2008).

The above discussion on the elite theory is very functional in the Nigerian context as far as the makings of public policies are concerned. The elites even though very few in number but dictates policy- issues of the country. The elite theory is therefore very suitable for this paper.

4.2 Institutional Framework for Implementation of Public Policy in Nigeria
Apart from the human factor, one essential instrument in public implementation is the institutional and structural

arrangement for achieving the desired policy goals. It is essential because without the effective and efficient application of the instruments for implementing policies, such policies will only be good as the paper on which they are formulated. It is in this context that the administrative structures and facilities for policy implementation become very critical in the policy making process. The institutions for attaining this highly desirable goal may take the form of committees, panels of implementation, ad-hoc task forces, and agencies of government, ministries and departments, among others. Examples of this type in Nigeria include the various committees and task forces set up by the various regimes to implement speedily government decisions; for example, the supply of essential commodities as well as the procurement and distribution of rice, cement, fertilizer and petroleum productions. These institutions may be the creation of enabling laws, in which case they exist as subsidiary legislations. They may just come into existence through the exercise of discretionary powers by the minister in whose official portfolio the matter falls. The subsidiary legislation constituting and appointing Code of Conduct Tribunal comprising the chairman and members is a good example of institutions created by the enabling parent law. The subsidiary legislation is captioned as the "instrument constituting the Code of Conduct Tribunal under the Code of Conduct Bureau and Tribunal Act. The discretionary power exercised by the minister in setting up ad-hoc task forces for say port decongestion and fertilizer distribution is an example of the latter (Sani, 1999). Other examples are:

a)   The implementation of industrial policy was carried out by the Federal Ministry of Industries which also created the Industrial Development Coordinating Committee (IDCC)

b)   The 6-3-3-4 education policy was implemented by the federal ministry of education, Universal Basic Education (UBE) State Ministries of Education and the 774 local governments in Nigeria.

4.3 Problems of policy implementation in Nigeria

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

i.   Multiplicity of agencies involved in implementation – policy makers generally under-estimate the complexity and the difficulty in coordinating the task of agencies involved in implementing programmes.

ii.   Lack of coordination or inadequate communication can hinder effective implementation. Its intentions are not spelt 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 in to effect.

iii.   Policy or a programme may be implemented by agencies whose interests do not necessarily coincide with those of the policy makers. 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 policy makers

iv.   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.

4.4 The Missing-Link

On several occasions my discussion with the masses has always been that there is a disconnect in policy formulation and implementation in Nigeria. And this has caused us a very serious problem that policy miscarriage or abortion is always reoccurring. This has caused untold hardship on the citizenry since service delivery has been in the shape of comatose. The stratum nature of the society has also worsened the situation because of differential in class struggle among the elites themselves. Today in Nigeria, the differential is hinged on inter and intra-party rivalry, ethnicity, religion, regionalism among others. There has been a missing-link between the elites who are policy makers and the masses that are at the receiving end of any poorly formulated and implemented policy.

4.5 How do we connect the nexus?

For us to connect the nexus that can guarantee perfect public policy formulation and implementation in Nigeria, we need to look at public policy as an agenda which concerns not only the elite by also the masses. The mass – public has to be mobilized all the time with proper education on a particular public policy. Their inputs must be respected through media social networks. Wider consultative and mass participatory governance must be ensured so as to connect the masses with the elites during the process of public policy formulation and implementation in Nigeria. There must be a very strong synergy between inter-governmental agencies, ministries, parastatals, commissions, departments, the executive and the legislature to serve as coordinate units where public policies are effectively formulated and implemented. In order to further connect the nexus, both the executive and the legislature must always work together on the same page so as to guarantee the incubation, delivery and sustainability of public policy in Nigeria. Previous polices by past administrations should not be seen by incumbent governments as a crime for their contiuity.The act of scrapping past policies by incumbent government has become a norm or tradition in Nigeria. There is no nexus connecting former policies to present

ones. To address this ugly trend, previous polices by past administration should not be scrapped but instead re-defined, remouldelled and refine them for their perfect continuity. The process of reviving former policies and linking or connecting those to present policies will bring about policy coherency and sustainability in Nigeria.

5. The Summary and Concluding Remarks

Public policy is a dynamic process that is characterized by a course or pattern of activities carried out with the aim of achieving predetermined objectives. Public policy thus consists of all the constellations of activities carried out by governmental agencies, or their representatives, with the sole purpose of achieving stated objectives.

The process of policy formulation and implementation varies from one country to the other. In Nigeria for instance, adequate attention is given only to government and their agencies for the formulation and implementation of public policy. The non-governmental organizations, professional bodies, organized private sector and the civil society groups are completely ignored in this process. Over the years, we have seen so many beautiful policies formulated by the successive governments covering agriculture, health, education, poverty reduction, unemployment and social security among others.

However, it seems such beautiful and well articulated policies are not fully implemented. One can therefore conclude that the problem in Nigeria is not policy formulation but that of implementation. And this is caused by conflicting interest by the elite-class whom they differ sharply in ideological setting, self serving interest and manipulation of the instrument of policy making to their advantage. Thus, creating a gap or missing-link in the structure of public policy formulation and implementation in Nigeria.

Owing to the multiple problems associated with public policy formulation and implementation in Nigeria, the paper made the following recommendations.

a. That there should be a very strong connecting link between the elites who are the policy makers and the mass – public. If this is done it will reduce the tendency of imposed policies from the top. An enabling environment should be created where policy making should be participatory. Public awareness should be created; the civil society groups, professional bodies, organized private sector, and the mass- public should be given the opportunity to present their proposals for policy making and implementation, there by connecting the nexus between the government and other professional bodies.

b. One of the problems associated with policy implementation in Nigeria is that of lack of adequate funds. In Nigeria, more often than not, programmes and policies are beautifully designed but he matching revenue to implement these policies is a big problem. It is therefore recommended that monies should always be released to ministries, parastatals, department and agencies. So as to enable them implement their programme and activities.

C. Finally, it is recommended that corruption should be reduced in the public service so as to allow free-flow of policy formulation and implementation in Nigeria.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, J. (1975) *Public policy making.*Thomas Nelson and Son Ltd

Aldrich, J. Miller, G. Ostrom Jr., G. and Rhode, D. (1986), *American government: people, institutions and policies.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company

Almond, G. and Verba, S. (1963), *The civic culture: political attitude and democracy in five nations.* Princeton: Princeton University Press

Anderson, J. (1984), *Public policy making.* New York: Holt Reinhart and Winston.

Ayo, E. (1988) *Development planning in Nigeria.* Ibadan: University Press Ltd

Barrett, S. and Fudge, C. (1981) Examining the policy-action relationship in Barrett, S. and Fudge, C. (eds). *Policy and action: essays on the implementation of public policy,* London and New York. Methuen

Betarlanfy, L. (1969), *General systems theory: foundations, development, applications.* New York: G. Braziller

Braybrooke, D. and Lindblom, C.E. (1963), *A strategy of decision.* New York: The Free Press

Chandler, R.C. Plano, J.C. (1988) *The public administration dictionary.* England: ABC – CLIO

Dahl, R. (1967), *Pluralist democracy in the United State,* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Dlakwa, H.(2009), *Concepts And Models In Public Policy Formulation And Analysis,* Maiduguri: Pyla-mark services Ltd

Dror, Y. (1968), *Public policy making reexamined,* Chandler: Scranton

Dye, T. (1980 & 1997), *Understanding public policy,* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Dye, T. and Ziegler, H. (1996), *The irony of democracy,* Wadsworth, CA: Duxbury Press

Dimock, M. et al. (1983) *Public administration.* New York: Saunders College Publishing

Easton, D. (1969) The flow characteristics of policy making in Lyden, F.J. et al. (eds) *Policies and decisions organizations.* New York: Meredith Corporation

Engonmwan, J. (1991), *Public policy analysis: concepts and applications,* Benin City: SMO Aka and Brothers

Press

Hague, R. and Harrop M. (1982) *Comparative government:* An introduction. London and Basingstoke: the Macmillan Press

Howard, L. (1982), *Policy management education for the eighties, inaugural lecture series No. 12,* University of Maiduguri, delivered on June 6, 1982

Ikelegbe, A. (1996), *Public policy making and analysis* Benin City: Uri Publishing Ltd

Jenkins, W. (1978), *Policy analysis: A political and organization perspective,* Mortin Robertson

Jones, C. (1977), *An introduction to the study of public policy.* North Situate, Mass: Duxbury Press

Landau, M. (1962), "The concept of decision making in the field of public administration", in Mallick, S. and Van Ness, E.H. (eds). Concept and issues in administration behaviour, Englewood Cliff, New Jersey Prentice Hall

Lindblom , C. (1980), "The science of muddling through", Stillman, R.J. II, (ed), *Public administration: concepts and cases,* 2nd Edition, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company: 203 - 213

Roberts and Clark (1982) *Power and politics in the third world.* New York Santa Barbara: John Wiley and Company

Rondinelli, D. (1983), *Development projects as policy experiments: An adoptive approach to development administration,* London and New York: Methuen

Sambo, A. (1999), "What is public policy?", Anifowose, R.a nd Enemno, F. (eds)), *Elements of politics,* Lagos: Malthouse Press Ltd. Pp. 281 – 310

Sani, H. (1999), *Public policy analysis: theoretical and applied approaches,* Okene: Deeesmon Tutu Publishers

Sharkansky, I. (1978) *Public administration: policy making in government agencies.* Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.

Simon, H. (1947) *Administrative behaviour.* New York: Macmillan

Simon, H. (1955) A behavioural model of rational choice. 69 Quarterly *Journal of Economics* (February)

Smith, G. (1964), Pragmatism and the group theory of policy. *American political science review* LVIII (Sept.)

Snyder, R. (1966), *A decision making approach to the study of politics* in: Young, R. (ed*) Approaches to the study of politics.* Evanston Illinois: North Western University Press

Prince, G. (1970), *The practice of creativity: A manual for dynamic group problem solving,* New York: Harper and Row Publishers

Varma, S. (2982) *Modern political theory,* Navin Shadena Delhi Vikas Publishing House PVT Ltd

Wade, L. (1972), *The elements of public policy.* Columbus Ohio: Charles   E. Merill Publis hing Comp.