

An Appraisal of Public Policy and Good Governance in Nigeria (2000 - 2013)

Musa Idris
Department of Public Administration
Faculty of Administration
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
GSM NO.: +2348034772717
E-MAIL:rnusaidrisaa@gmail.com

9.1 Introduction

The Nigerian state owes certain obligations to the citizens as much as the citizens owe certain duties to the state. For instance, the maintenance of law and order as well as the protection of lives and property of the people is the primary function of any government. Others include the provision of common services such as health, education, roads and other welfare services (Asogwa, 2010;51, Gauba, 2003;119, Laski, 2004;35 & Mazrui and Mazrui, 1997;35). This relationship between the state and the citizens is provided in chapter II, sections 13 – 24 of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria as Fundamental Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy (Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN), 1999). However, it is through governance that the will of the state is expressed and realised.

Therefore, the quality of governance in any state is dependent on how policies are initiated, formulated, legitimated, implemented and evaluated.

Successive administrations especially following the return of democratic governance to Nigeria enacted policies, reformed sectors and embarked upon projects and programmes aimed at ensuring good governance in the country. These policies cut across social, political and economic spheres of the nation, Abdullah 2007, Ali 2007, Kpakol 2007, Lambo 2007, Lawal 2007, National Institute for Legislative Studies (NILS) 2013, Ogunsanya 2007, Okebukola 2007, and Zebadi 2007. In spite of these efforts, Nigeria is still faced with the challenges of insecurity, illiteracy, health, infrastructural deficit, poverty and unemployment among others. Why has Nigeria continued to experience these challenges inspite of the policies made, reforms undertaken and projects and programmes embarked upon in order to ensure good governance in the country? The objective of this study is to briefly appraise some sectoral policies and their effect on the quality of governance in Nigeria from 2000 – 2013. It is the assumption of this study that the objectives of these sectoral polices have not been achieved and this has adversely affected the quality of governance in Nigeria.

This study spans for the period 2000 – 2013. This can be justified on the ground of been a time of return to sustainable democratic rule to Nigeria. Democratic regimes are expected to be more inclined to good governance than military dictatorships. It is also premised by the availability of secondary data from the MO Ibrahim Index of African Governance. Polices to be appraised in this study cover security, anti-corruption, health, education, infrastructural and poverty reduction. Others are transport, telecommunication and energy policies. The study has a national rather than regional or state coverage for maximum utility. The findings of the study are expected to provide information to policy makers on the effectiveness of earlier policies with a view to fine turning future policies. Data presented and analysed will also provide vital information to researchers.

9.2 Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

For a better understanding of this study, it is pertinent to acquaint ourselves with certain interrelated and interdependent concepts often used in policy discuss. These are the concepts of public interest, public problem, public policy and public policy analysis.

a) Public Interest and Public Problem

Governments justify their decisions and actions on the bases that they are in the public interest. It is also generally believed that government ought to promote public interest. What then, is the public interest? Public interest refers to public good, values that are good of the general public and are made with the welfare of society in mind (Sambo, 1992;284 - 285). Public interest therefore, refers to the values of the society, what the people cherish or hold dear and which they want the government to protect and promote. Examples include, security, law and order, healthy life, safe environment etc.

Olaniyi (1998,28) reiterates the view of Smith (1964) to define a policy problem as a condition which generates a human need, deprivation or dissatisfaction, self-identified or identified by others for which relief is sought. Using this definition, common public problems in Nigeria include insecurity, corruption, poverty, drug addiction, flood disasters, inadequate and irregular electricity supply etc. Thus, public interest and problem represents the two sides of the same coin. While public interest refers to the values or needs of the citizenry which they want the government to protect and promote, public problem arises when the public interest is in jeopardy.

b) Public Policy and Public Policy Analysis

Sambo (1999, 283) and Sapru (2004,5) espouse the view of Dye (1997) who defines public policy as "whatever governments choose to do or not to do" in reaction to perceived public problems. Berrett and Fudge (1981) cited in Olaniyi (1998, 15 – 17) asserts that public policy emanates from the public sector including both the institutions of Federal, State and Local Governments and their Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs). This definition points to the fact that public policies are made by governmental authorities. However, public

policies can be implemented through and directed at variety of individuals and organisations which may or may not be part of the state apparatus, and which may to a greater or lesser extent be independent of state control. In essence, public policy according to Anderson (1975) as reiterated by Sambo (1999, 283) is:

> Purposive or goal-oriented action rather than random or chance behaviour;
> consists of courses of action by governmental officials;
> what governments actually do, not what they intend to do or say they are going to do;
> involve some form of overt government action to effect a particular problem; and
> also involves a decision by government officials not to take action, to do nothing on some issues on which government involvement is sought, and it is authoritative.

public policy analysis on the other hand according to Chandler and Plano (1988) as quoted by Olaniyi (1998, 17) "is a systematic and data based alternative to intuitive judgements about the effects of policy or policy actions." Dye (1997) as espoused by Sapru (2004,8) describes policy analysis as the "thinking man's response." He observes that policy analysis has three basic concerns. Policy analysis: Involves a rigorous search for the causes and consequences of public policies through the use of the tools of systematic inquiry. It also involves an effort to develop and test general propositions about the causes and consequences of the public policies; and is concerned with explanation of policy rather than prescription of policy.

As comprehensive as Sambos's (1999) operational definition is, it fails to include the involvement of the private sector. This is because, as stated Berret and Fudge (1981) public policies can be implemented through and directed at non-governmental actors. To remedy this, the definition can be modified as purposive courses or action by any level of government and its officials acting through its MDAs or private sector to decide to take or not to take authoritative action in response to perceived public problems. Some of the public policies in Nigeria include; the Monetisation Policy, the National

Health Insurance Scheme, the Privatisation Policy, National Gender Policy and Educational Policies among others.

While public policy is a problem solving activity by governments and their MDAs committing resources aimed at ameliorating public problems in the public interest, policy analysis is a scientific approach to the study of public policy. In other words, while public policy is a system of action, public policy analysis is a systematic field of study. It is concerned with determining the causes and consequences of public policy. It is significant as it increases the capacity to generate and present pertinent information in such a way as to improve the basis for policy makers to exercise judgement in the choice of policy alternatives.

c) Public Policy Making Cycle

Policy making involves phases, so many players, and so many issues and therefore, difficult to grasp it as a single phenomenon (Shafritz, Russel and Borick, 2011.46). Public policy making is a continual process of identifying problems, formulating governmental responses or policies, organising administrative mechanisms for carrying out the policies, and evaluating the extent to which policy objectives are achieved (Bryner, 2007). This definition identifies the stages of the policy cycle as problem identification, policy formulation, policy implementation and evaluation. It however, excluded policy legitimating which gives authority and legitimacy to policies. However, Denhardt and Denhardt (2009,50) identifies five stages in the policy cycle. These are: agenda setting, policy formulation, policy legitimating, policy implementation and policy evaluation. It is worthy to note that problem identification proceeds agenda setting and so the two though similar, differ from each other. In addition, not all problems identified get into policy agenda. Furthermore the stages identified overlap and are mutually interactive (Elaigwu, 2005;26).

d) Problem Identification and Agenda Setting

The beginning of the public policy making process is marked by government recognition that a public problem exist in the first instance and that remedial action is required to ameliorate the

problem. All policies originate from demands made upon public officials and institutions by the other actors private or official in the political system for action or inaction on some perceived public problems. (Sambo, 1999, 286). This involves the determination of the nature and dimension of the problem and drawing government attention to the public problem by placing it on policy agenda. Agenda setting refers to the stage in the policy process where officials attempt to narrow the number of subjects which come to their attention to the set which will actually become the focus of their attention (Sambo, 1999, 298). It is the process of by which ideas or issues bubble – up through the various political channels to windup for consideration by a political institution (Shafritz, Russel and Borick, 2011, 46). At these stage, public problems are filtered, certain problems are viewed as needing priority action, whereas others are postponed (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2009; 50).

Policy actors sometimes called policy entrepreneurs are the representatives of the people at the various levels of government (National Assembly, State Houses of Assembly and Local Government Legislative Councils), bureaucrats, scientific community, civil society and advocacy groups. These policy entrepreneur invest personal time, energy, and often money in pursuit of particular policies. They use different tactics such as publicity campaigns, direct contact with policy makers through letters, memo, petitions and delegations. Others include the use of the mass media, lobbying of political parties, and in extreme cases demonstrations and rioting. The academic staff union of universities had embarked on six months (July – December, 2013) old strike to draw government's attention to the problems in Nigerian universities. The National Association of Electricity Workers embarked on several demonstrations and threatened to embark on strike over government approach to the privatisation of the sector. Workers in the petroleum sector did the same.

e) Policy Formulation

After a public problem has been identified and placed on policy agenda, what follows is the formulation of the policy. Formulation of public policy involves development of formal policy statements (legislation, executive orders, administrative

rules etc) that are viewed as legitimate (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2009:52). The policy formulation stage is the stage at which the alternatives for dealing with the public problem are developed (Sambo, 1999, 287). It is the stage where the government or policy actors take decisions as to what is to be done and how it is to be achieved (Olaniyi, 1998:30).

At this stage, all the key technical and non-technical dimensions are closely scrutinised and assessed. Thus, before proceeding to the next stage, at least, the technical feasibility of the proposed policy is analysed and ascertained. These are: priotisation of goals of the policy and determination of projects and programmes to be embarked upon to solve the policy problem. Others are the time schedule for each activity and goal as well as the determination of the financial, physical and human resources required. Depending on the scale and complexity of the problem, the policy issue is submitted for careful study either within the bureaucracy or by a hired consultancy group after which recommendations are presented to the executive council (Federal, State or local) for consideration. Policy formulation is usually the responsibility of the executive arm of government especially the political executives. However, the bureaucrats work out the details of the draft proposals.

f) Policy Legitimation

After a public problem is identified, placed on policy agenda of government and policy formulated by the executive, what follows is the process of conferring authority and legitimacy to the policy. Policy legitimation according to Kraft and Furlong (2007) as quoted by Denhardt and Denhardt (2009: 53) is "giving legal force to decisions or justifying policy action." The policy formulated by the executive is usually submitted in the form of a proposed bill to the legislature for consideration and adoption.

In the course of the legislative process, public hearing when organised offer opportunities to interest groups to have input either in support or against the proposed policy. The legislative process also means that once adopted, the proposed policy is likely to enjoy popular support during implementation. Policy legitimation is the responsibility of the legislative arm of governments. That is the National Assembly, State Houses of

Assembly and Local Government Legislative Councils at the Federal, State and Local Levels respectively.

g) Policy Implementation

Public problems identified, policies formulated and legitimated will forever remain elusive without implementation. Policy implementation is therefore, the action part of public administration. "Implementation is the process of putting a government programme into effect. It is the total process of translating a legal mandate ... into appropriate programme directives and structures that provide services or create goals." (Shafritz, Russel and Borick, 2011,53).

Similarly, Denhardt and Denhardt (2009, 54) defines policy implementation as the set of activities directed toward putting a programme into effect. They reiterates the views of Kratt and Furlong (2007) who identifies policy implementation to include organisation, interpretation, and application. Organisation is the use of resources and methods to administer a particular programme. Interpretation refers to the translation of the language of the law into understandable form to the affected parties while application is the routine provision of services, goods, and other agreed upon programme objectives.

From the views of Shafritz, Russel and Borick (2011:53) as well as Denhardt and Denhardt (2009:54) policy implementation involves having a clear understanding of the policy legitimated, the creation of an administrative machinery to effect the policy, and the actual fulfilment of the objective of the policy. That is provision of goods and or services to ameliorate perceive public problems. In essence, policy implementation involves the translation of policy goals into concrete achievement through various programmes.

During implementation, the executive operating agencies and departments are activated and provided with the wherewithal to enable them translate the adopted policy into desired result. The need to mobilise skilled and experienced personnel and utilise them to execute the projects involved is crucial. There is also the need for close collaboration and consultation among the Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) concerned especially with the ministry of finance. The close supervision of

the MDAs so that project implementation is monitored and reported timely is also very important.

Resenbbloom. Kravchuck and Clerkin (2009. 353) reiterates the view of Drucker (1982) in identifying conditions that are fatal to effective policy implementation. These include lack of clear measurable roads (as with the current Transformation Agenda of President Goodluck of Nigeria which has not stated the specific sectors to be transformed) and several objectives addressed at once, with no clear priorities; as with the seven point agenda of the President Yar'adua of Nigeria. Other problems include policies on a grand scale and assumption that personnel and funds only will solve complex problems; failure to learn from feedback; and inability to abandon policies when they become unnecessary or fail to achieve the desired results. Policy implementation is the major responsibility of the executive arm of the federal, state and local governments through their respective MDAs. However, public policies can be implemented by a private firm on behalf of the government or through public private – partnership. This is common in highly technical programmes such as space programme and in defence industries. Typical examples include the launching of the countries satellites into orbit in China and Russia in 2007 and 2012 respectively.

h) Policy Evaluation

\After a policy has been implemented what follows is the systematic examination of activities undertaken by the implementing agencies in order to make a determination about their effects, both for the short term and the long-range (Shafritz, Russel and Boricks, 2011, 55). Implementation is concerned with determining the worth or social utility of a policy (Sapru, 2004, 172). Policy evaluation is an assessment of whether the policy that has been implemented has met its goals and objectives (Denhardt and Denhardt. 2009.54). Policy evaluation differs from monitoring. Monitoring is however, a prerequisite for evaluation. Monitoring is concerned with establishing factual premises about public policies. It is fundamentally about control. Evaluation is retrospective and occurs after actions have been taken. Evaluation is primarily an effort to analyse policy outcomes in terms of some objectives.

Individual scholars and institutions identified different criteria for policy evaluation. These according to Sapru (2004; 173 – 177) are effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy, and equity. Effectiveness refers to whether a given course of action results in the attainment of the out/input ratio of a policy and its often equated with economic rationality. Adequacy ascertains whether a given level of effectiveness results in the satisfaction of needs while equity is concerned with whether the costs and benefits of a given policy are evenly distributed among the contending groups. The operations and Evaluation Department of the World Bank added relevance and sustainability criteria according to Huther and Shah (2000).

The United States General Accounting Office (GAO) (1998) identifies four types of evaluation. These are; process evaluation, outcome evaluation, impact evaluation and cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analsyis. In evaluating a policy ,it is desirable to take a more comprehensive approach for reliable results. However, the criteria chosen should be within the competence of the evaluating agency. The evaluation of a policy can be undertaken either by the operating staff of the MDAs or by MDAs. It could also be by the relevant committees of the legislature through oversight functions or by a public commission of inquiry. Whoever the actors may be, policy evaluation requires a lot of sincerity and competence.

1 Problems of Public Policy Making in Nigeria

The problems of public policy making in Nigeria like any other developing country are many and varied. These range from dearth of accurate and reliable data, policy inconsistencies and executive incapacity. Others include the problem of elusive value system, corruption and apathy on the part of the citizenry (Sapru 2004; Sambo 1999 and Olaniyi 1998).

Sound and effective policy making requires adequate and reliable information. However, more often than not, information coming to the desk of policy makers are often falsified (Olaniyi, 1998). Adequate and reliable health statistics, educational statistics and statistic on macroeconomic variables remain unreliable. Both the Nigeria National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC), the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) and the Ministry of

Finance differed on the amount of money paid as subsidy on the import of petrol in 2011 in Nigeria Tell (2012:22-28)

During the long era of military rule in Nigeria, every regime change was followed by policy reversals. Even with the return to democratic governance and same political party in power, the incumbents usually discontinue the policies of their predecessors. Typical example include the sales of the Kaduna, and Porthacourt refineries in the twilight of Obasanjo regime and the reversal of the deal by his successor, late Umaru Musa Yar Adua immediately he assumed office. Likewise the Seven – Point Agenda of late Umar Musa Yar'Adua was discontinued for Transformation Agenda by his successor and former vice president Dr Goodluck Jonathan. The situation at the state and local government levels is not better either.

The implementation of policies and programmes require technically competent and professionally oriented civil service. However, almost all cadre of the Nigerian civil service has a large number of staff who are either trained in the wrong courses or are products of marginal institutions. Yet, the majority were employed based on patronage rather than merit. These personnel also receive little or no further training to acquaint them with the dynamics of the service. State and local government services are however overstaffed with cleaners, messengers, drivers and revenue collectors.

Public policies are required to reflect the values of the society. However, in a heterogeneous society like Nigeria, a Nigerian value system is yet to emerge. Rather, diverse ethnic and religious values dominate the Nigerian value. Therefore, stakeholders in policy making assume that analysis undertaken by other participants cannot adequately serve their interest. An example is the introduction of Islamic Banking which was vehemently opposed by the Christian Association of Nigeria (CAN).

Many anti-corruption agencies have been established in Nigeria through enabling laws sequel to the return to democratic governance in 1999. These include the Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Commission (ICPC) through the ICPC Act, 2000 and the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) established by the EFCC Act,

Finance differed on the amount of money paid as subsidy on the import of petrol in 2011 in Nigeria Tell (2012:22-28)

During the long era of military rule in Nigeria, every regime change was followed by policy reversals. Even with the return to democratic governance and same political party in power, the incumbents usually discontinue the policies of their predecessors. Typical example include the sales of the Kaduna, and Porthacourt refineries in the twilight of Obasanjo regime and the reversal of the deal by his successor, late Umaru Musa Yar Adua immediately he assumed office. Likewise the Seven – Point Agenda of late Umar Musa Yar'Adua was discontinued for Transformation Agenda by his successor and former vice president Dr Goodluck Jonathan. The situation at the state and local government levels is not better either.

The implementation of policies and programmes require technically competent and professionally oriented civil service. However, almost all cadre of the Nigerian civil service has a large number of staff who are either trained in the wrong courses or are products of marginal institutions. Yet, the majority were employed based on patronage rather than merit. These personnel also receive little or no further training to acquaint them with the dynamics of the service. State and local government services are however overstaffed with cleaners, messengers, drivers and revenue collectors.

Public policies are required to reflect the values of the society. However, in a heterogeneous society like Nigeria, a Nigerian value system is yet to emerge. Rather, diverse ethnic and religious values dominate the Nigerian value. Therefore, stakeholders in policy making assume that analysis undertaken by other participants cannot adequately serve their interest. An example is the introduction of Islamic Banking which was vehemently opposed by the Christian Association of Nigeria (CAN).

Many anti-corruption agencies have been established in Nigeria through enabling laws sequel to the return to democratic governance in 1999. These include the Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Commission (ICPC) through the ICPC Act, 2000 and the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) established by the EFCC Act,

2004. Others include the Fiscal Responsibility Act 2007, the Public Procurement Act 2007 and the Nigeria Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative (NEITI) Act 2007. In spite of these efforts Nigeria's Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) according to Transparency International Still remains low. The CPI for the country was 2.7 in 2008 only to slip back to 2.5 in 2009 and further to 2.4 in 2010 and 2011. Committee of the House of Representatives to probe the alleged subsidy scandal ended up in a another scandal as the committee overseeing the affairs of the Security and Exchange Commission (SEC) was also alleged to have demanded and received bribes from the Director-General of the Commission. If public policy is to be in the public interest, then their participation in the process are significant. However, majority of Nigerians do not have much interest in policy issues either due to lack of awareness or mistrust in the institutions of governance.

J) The Concept of Good Governance

The concepts of governance and good governance are being increasingly used in recent times in development literature. While the former is not new (United National Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, (UNESCAP) 2010; 1 – 2) the latter is relatively more recent (Santiso, 2010: 1). Scholars and institutions alike advanced different definitions of governance. For instance, UNESCAP (2010) defines governance as "the process of decision making and the process by which decisions are implemented or not implemented" involving both the formal and informal actors. UNESCAP (2010:2) asserts that good governance depends on the extent to which it is participatory, consensus oriented, transparent and accountable. Other attributes of good governance are the rate to which it is responsive, equitable and inclusive, effective, efficient and adherent to the rule of law.

Adamolekun (2002:3) defines governance as the exercise of political power to manage a nations affairs. He also identified the elements of good governance as rule of law, freedom of expression and association, electoral legitimacy, transparency and accountability, and development oriented leadership. Mogislevsky (2010, 2) in his contribution sees governance as the

traditions and institutions by which authority in a country is exercised. He adds that governance involve the formation and stewardship of the formal and informal rules that regulate the public realm, the arena in which state as well as economic and societal actors interact to make decisions.

Abdullatif (2003;2) reiterating the view of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) opines that governance denotes the use of political authority and exercise of control in a society in relation to the management of its resources for social and economic development. This broad definition acknowledges the role of public authorities in establishing the environment in which other actors operate in determining the distribution of the benefits as well as the nature of the relationship between the government and the people. Similarly, Davidson (2004;3) describes governance as both a means and an end involving both formal and informal actors and asserts that governance is the process of translating societal demands into choices, resulting in policy formulation and implementation. He adds that governance is concerned with the overall institutional environment in which citizens interact and within which economic, legal and administrative authority are exercised in managing a country's affairs at all levels.

Agere (2000;4 – 5) also opines that good governance is a means and also an end involving interaction of the state, private and civil society actors. It is an end in itself if it addresses the elements of governance satisfactorily. These elements are; transparency and accountability, combating corruption, promoting citizen participation and creating enabling legal framework. Governance is also a means to an end since it is expected to ensure security, maintain law and order, enhance citizen participation, create sustainable economic opportunity and promote human development.

Mo Ibrahim Foundation (2012; 9 – 10) views governance from the point of view of the citizen as supply of political, social and economic goods and services that citizen has the right to expect from the state and that any state has the responsibility to deliver to the citizen. The foundation also identified the elements of governance. These are, safety and rule of law, participation

and human rights, sustainable economic opportunity and human development. This definition is however, silent of the actors in governance.

From the views of UNESCAP (2010), Adamolekun (2002), Abdulateef (2003), Dowidson (2004), Agere (2000) and the Mo Ibrahim Foundation, governance is both a means an end. Government is only one of the actors but not the sole actor. Other actors include the private sector and civil society organisations. Governance is a means of translating the will of the state into reality through the maintenance of law and order, protection of lives and property and providing the socio-economic and political needs of the people. This can be done through MDAs, and or the private and the civil society.

k) Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study is the theory of social contract. The exponents of the theory include Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Jean Jacques Rosseau (Gauba, 2003, 180 – 181). The theory of social contract explains the origin of the state from the liberal perspective. The theory sees the state as a product of mutual agreement of men with a definite purpose to serve certain social needs. It postulates that the state is not a natural institution, but an artitifical device invented by men for their mutual benefit. It is intended to serve the interest of citizens since it is the product of the will of society. It is for this reason that as part of the contract, the sovereign state undertakes to among others provide security and maintain law and order. The citizens on the other hand must fulfil their part of the contract by paying their taxes and being patriotic among others. In relation to this study, the Nigerian state is in contract with the citizens. The contract document is the constitution wherein among others it provides for the Fundamental Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy in chapter II, sections 13 – 24 of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999. Therein, the constitution provides for the political, social, educational and economic obligations of the Nigerian state to the citizens and the citizens duties to the Nigerian state.

9.3 Methodology

The research design for this study is content analysis of secondary data as published by the Mo Ibrahim Foundation from 2000 – 2013. The Mo Ibrahim Foundation is the leading afro-centric non-governmental organisation committed to making data available on the quality of good governance in Africa. It is also committed to promoting and rewarding good governance in the continent of Africa. The foundation's data is the most robust, relevant and user-friendly. It uses the Ibrahim Index of African Governance (IIAG) in scoring and ranking African Governance in terms of percentage (%) using four major categories, eighty eight component indicators and sourcing data from twenty three organisations (Mo Ibrahim Foundation, 2011, and 2012, 2).

The four major categories are: safety and rule of law which comprises of rule of law, accountability, personal safety and national security. The second category is participation and human rights which comprises of participation, rights and gender issues. The third category is sustainable economic opportunity. This consist of the quality of public management, conduciveness of business environment, standard and adequacy of infrastructural facilities and the development of the rural sector. The level of human development constitute the fourth category comparising of the provision of health, education and welfare services. NILS (2013), identified similar indicators viz; voice and accountability, political stability and absence of violence, regulatory quality, rule of law nd control of corruption. However, it is the IIAG that will used for analysis as it is more encompassing. Nigeria's scores and rankings from 2000 – 2013 in each of these categories will be presented in tables and analysed using averages and percentages. Nigeria's performance will also be compared with those of other African countries. The overall performance (composite score) of the country in governance from 2000 – 2013 will also be presented and analysed.

9.4 Summary of Findings and Discussion

Overview of Selected Sectorial Policies in Nigeria

In search of good governance in Nigeria, successive administrations enacted many policies, embarked on reforms,

project and programmes. This section briefly overviews some of the sectoral policies.

a. Security

The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 in Section 14(2b) provides that the security of lives and property of the people shall be the primary purpose of the state (FRN, 1999). Pursuant to this the security policies and reforms centred on four broad areas. These are: political, economic, social and institutional dimensions (Zebadi; 2007). The core task of the security policies and reforms in the economic dimension is to have good governance where the security forces operate within their constitutionally defined roles, due process and accountability. It also include the capacity and ability of the civil society such as the Mass Media, Non-Governmental and Community. Based Organisations, research institutes and the public at large to debate on security priorities. Civilian oversight of the security forces also remains a key feature of the policy reforms.

Economically, the security sector has been receiving the lion-share of our national budgets especially in the last four years for efficiency and effectives. From social perspective, the policies and reforms tend to view security as a holistic concept encompassing both state and human security. There was also institutional separation of the various forces and organisations to ensure clearer definition of responsibilities. Inspite of these efforts, there are still disturbing incidences of high rates of armed robberies, ethno-religious conflicts, ritual killings, hired assassinations, kidnappings and terrorism (NILS, 2013, 115 – 118). The adverse effects of these include spread of fear in the system to the extent that residents no longer move and associate freely and also discourages investment, job creation, income generation and overall socio-economic development.

b. Anti-Corruption

As part of the Federal Government policy for achieving good governance, many anti-corruption agencies were established. The Independent Corruption Practices and Other Related Offences Commission (ICPC) was established vide the ICPC Act of 13th

June, 2010 with the major objective of prohibiting and prescribing punishments for corrupt practices and other related offences. Specifically, the agency is to banish impunity for corrupt practices and other related offences through system study, education, public enlightenment and Mobilisation (ICPC, 2000).

The Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) was established by an Act of National Assembly and amended in 2004 vide the EFCC Act, 2004. It was established with the objective of sanitising the national economic environment by enforcing all economic and financial laws. In addition, the Code of Conduct Bureau (CCB) was also established through Decree No. 1 of 1989 and enshrined in section 153 of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 as one of the Federal Executive Agencies. The CCB was established to establish and maintain a high standard of morality in the conduct of government business and to ensure that the action and behaviour of public officers confirm with the highest standard of public morality and accountability.

Other anti-corruption legislations include the Fiscal Responsibility Act, 2007, Public Procurement Act 2007, the Nigerian Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative Act, 2007 and the Freedom of Information Act 2011. In spite of these efforts, Ali (2007) reiterating the view of Mier (2000) observes that corruption still remains the fastest way of getting anything done in Nigeria. Transparency International's Corruption Perception Index staggers between only 10(10%) 2.7(2.7%) transparent for the period 2000 – 2013.

c. Education

Nigeria's educational policy outlines government's philosophy and goal for the sector. It also defined the structures by which education would be delivered. The 1977 Educational Policy which was revised over the years but the philosophy and goal remained unchanged. The policy behave in education as an instrument for national development recently, the Federal Government in its Transformation Agenda 2011 – 2015, stressed the rate of education, in its human capital development programme. The priorities of the policy include; promotion of

primary enrolemnet of all children in school gang-age irrespective of the income profile of the parents and provision of infrastructure such as classrooms across all levels, so as to ease overcrowding increase access and reduce pupil/teacher ratio. The other priority issue is to enhance the efficiency, resourcefulness and competence of teachers and other educational personnel through capacity building and motivation (NILS, 2013, 28). The educational policies and reforms are aimed at raising the level of literacy in the country which enhances communication of ideas and facilities public enlightenment, increasing knowledge and skills which are critical factors in the stimulation of production and increasing the output of goods and services. Other are improving the health of the people and improving the quality of life generally (NLLS, 2013, 29).

d. The National Health Policy

The 2004 National Health Policy established an integrated and coordinated national health system and also defined the levels of care as; primary, secondary and tertiary health care. It also clearly defined the responsibilities of each of the levels. The objectives of the policy are to; strengthen the national health system such that it (be) able to provide effective efficient, quality, accessible and affordable health services that will improve the health status of Nigerians through the achievement of health related Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (NILS, 2013, 45).

The targets of the policy were also the same as these of the MDGs thus:

- Reduce by two-third under-t mortality rate between 1990 and 2015
- Reduce by three-quarter the maternal mortality rate between 1990 – 2015
- Halt by 2015, and begin to reverse, the spread of HIV/AIDS, and
- Halt by 2015, and begin to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases (NILS, 2013, 46).

e. National Policy on Transport

This encompasses road, water and air transport subsystems. According to NILS (2013. 56 – 70) a draft of the first coherent national policy on transport was produced by the Federal Government in 1993 to tackle what was described then as 'a crises situation in all the subsystems. The draft policy was not approved due to political instabilities and so the system limped on with uncoordinated and often ineffectively in implemented measures in some of the subsystems.

However, in 2010, the Federal Government observed that the transport system was still characterised by crisis situation. In response to this unfortunate development, the Federal Government practiced another comprehensive draft policy document. The 2010 draft policy still remains a draft as there is no evidence of the integrated projects promised in the document and activities and practices in the subsystems are still based on the limited perspective of each subsystem without linkages among them.

f. National Energy Policy

The Federal Government's effort to organise the energy sector begin in 1979 with the establishment of Energy Commission of Nigeria (ECN) for the Strategic Planning and Coordination of National Policies in the field of energy in all its ramification (NILS, 2013. 70). The ECN 1993 produced a draft National Energy Policy which was reviewed by an inter ministerial committee in 1996. However, nothing was reported thereafter. In preparation for the privatisation activities in the energy sector, the government in 2003 set up another inter-ministerial committee to review the 1996 proposals. The output of the 2003 review is what has become the National Energy Policy.

The policy is aimed at developing various energy resoruces available in the country in a cooridanted manner. This including the development in a coordinated manner. This including the development of relevant knowledge through research with adequate attention to the environmental consequence of the operations of energy-related activities. The ECN become the responsible for the monitoring and coordinating of the relevant activities. In spite of this Nigeria's Electric Power

Production (KWH) was far below other developing countries like Brazil, Argentina South Africa, Egypt and Algeria. The country generated 19,777,26.121 and 27,034 in 2009,2010and 2011 respectively as against Brazil's 466,158,515,798 and 531,758 for the same period (NILS, 2013,77).

g. National Telecommunication Policy

The National Telecommunication Policy adopted in 2000 introduced one of the must successful reforms in the sector in recent years. The policy thrust was the total liberalisation and promotion of a private sector-led industry. The Federal Government removal restrictions in the sector and introduced incentives to induce private investors and granted operating licences to several digital mobile operators. In 2003, the government created the Nigerian Communication Commission (NCC) as a regulator or the sector under the ministry of Communication Technology. Nigeria recorded as many as 88,348.026, 109,829.223 and 117.412.363 subscribers in 2010, 2012 and as at January, 2013 (NILS, 2013, 88 and 84).

h. Poverty Reduction

The Federal Government of Nigeria has over the years embarked on programmes aimed at reducing the incidence of poverty in the country. These include the establishment of the National Directorate of Employment (NDE), the Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI) between 1987 – 1990 and the National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) in 2000. Others are were the establishment of the peoples Bank of Nigeria (PBN), Nigerian Agricultural Cooperatives and Rural Development Bank (NACRB) in 2000 – 2004 and the Micro-Finance Banks in 2005 (Akanji, 2002, 1 – 3; FRN, 2004, 4 & CBN, 2005, 1 – 9). In spite of these efforts in incidence of poverty still remains alarming. From as low as 27.2% in 1980 and 54.4% in 2004, the rate of poverty in Nigeria over time rose to 69.0% in 2010 and an estimated rate of 71.5% in 2011 (National Bureau of Statistics (NB) 2010.

i. Quality of Governance in Nigeria

Using the ITAG, the indicators of good governance are in four broad categories and enlighten eighty components indicators. Nigeria's scores and ranking out of the fifty two African countries covered in the survey were presented in table 1.

Table 1: Nigeria's Scores and Ranking in Governance (2000 – 2013)

Year	*Safety & Rule of Law*			*Participation and Human Rights*			*Sustainable Economic Opportunity*			*Human Development*		
	Score	*AV**	*Ranking*	*Score*	*AV**	*Ranking*	*Score*	*AV**	*Ranking*	*Score*	*AV**	*Ranking*
2000	42.8	54.6	38	45.8	45.2	24	37.1	42.1	34	37.5	46.3	38
2001	41.9	54.6	42	41.9	45.6	27	35.6	42.3	35	40.4	51.1	40
2002	41.9	55.3	43	42.8	45.7	28	35.3	42.3	37	40.4	61.7	41
2003	41.2	54.8	42	40.2	44.9	28	36.1	42.5	35	39.6	51.4	41
2004	38.7	55.2	44	41.4	45.9	30	35.9	42.6	35	40.8	52.1	41
2005	42.3	55.4	42	39.9	46.6	33	36.0	43.6	36	42.1	52.2	38
2006	43.1	55.4	41	41.0	47.7	32	39.4	44.6	33	43.7	52.7	35
2007	44.4	55.1	41	40.0	47.9	32	39.9	45.2	34	44.1	53.9	37
2008	48.1	55.1	36	37.5	45.7	34	39.2	46.1	36	44.8	54.3	36
2009	45.8	53.7	38	33.7	45.5	41	41.8	46.8	33	46.5	55.4	33
2010	46.5	53.5	34	37.3	46.6	36	41.3	47.5	36	47.8	55.6	37
2011	40.6	53.3	44	38.5	47.6	37	41.1	47.3	37	47.8	56.6	39
2012	41.0	52.7	42	37.7	48.4	36	42.2	47.0	34	52.7	58.3	33
2013	38.1	51.7	44	48.9	49.9	26	43.3	45.6	31	53.0	58.7	34

Source: Adapted from Mo Ibrahim Foundation; 2012, 2013 and 2014 Ibrahim Index of African Governance Summaries

AV African Average*

j. Safety and Rule of Law

This category consists of rule of law, accountability, personal safety and national security (MO Ibrahim Foundation 2014). The constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999) in chapter II, section – provides for rule of law while section 15(5) provides that the state shall fight all corrupt practices and abuse of power as section 14(2b) states that the security of lives and property shall be the primary purpose of the Nigerian state. Policies have been made and reforms undertaken in pursuit of these objectives.

However Nigeria's score in this category as presented in table 1 have been poor for the period 2000 – 2013. These range from the highest of 48.1% in 2008 which was below the African average of 55.1% for the same year to as low as 38.1% in 2013, far below the continental average of 51.7%. The country's rankings have not impressive either. Nigeria's best ranking was 34th in 2010 out of 52 countries covered by the survey. The country consistently ranked between 42nd and 44th for the fourteen years. This is contrary to the provisions of the theory of social contract and the provisions of the constitutions.

k. Participation and Human Rights

This category comprises of participation, right and gender components and eighteen indicators (MO Ibrahim Foundation, 2014). The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria provided for both citizen participation and protection of human rights in sections 15 – 17 and 33 - 46 respectively. Nigeria's scores in this category for the period 2000 was 45.8% above the African average of 45.2% for the same year. The country's scores in the subsequent years 2001 – 2014 were all below the continental averages of the correspondence years. The highest score obtained was 48.9% in 2013 but which was still less than the year's continental average of 49.9%. The country's average performance for the period 2000 – 2013 was 40.47%.

Nigeria's best ranking out of 52 countries covered by the survey was 24th and 26th in 2000 and 2013 respectively. The country could not rank among the first half (26) of 52. Nigeria average score of 40.47% for the period 2000 – 2013 was not a good performance.

l. Sustainable Economic Opportunity

The components of this category are; the quality of public management, business environment, infrastructure and development of the rural sector. The category also comprises of thirty one indicators. Nigeria's scores in this category were generally poor-ranging from the lowest of 35.3% in 2002 to highest 43.3% in 2013. The country's scores reached 40s from 2009 with the peak of 43.3% in 2013. However the changes were negligible. Nigeria's scores were all less than the continental averages for the corresponding years. The country's average score for the fourteen years covered by the survey was 38.87%. Nigeria's best ranking was 34th 2000 out 52 countries covered by the survey. The country ranked as low as the 37th in 2002 and 2011.

m. Human Development

The human development category consist of the extent of the provision of welfare services by the government to vulnerable and the quality of educational and health services. It comprises of Twenty Indicators (MO Ibrahim Foundation, 2014). Although Nigeria's scores in this category were higher than those of the other categories, they were all less than the continental averages for the corresponding years. Nigeria scored as high as 53.0% in 2013 while the lowest was 37.5% in 2000. In spite of this seeming impressive performance, the country could not rank between 1st to 32nd in any of the fourteen years. This means that though the country's annual scores were better than those of other categories, many other African countries fared better than Nigeria. Thus, in spite of the educational, health and welfare policies and centrality of these services as part of the Fundamental Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy, these policies have not yielded the desired objectives. This has also fallen short of the view of the theory of social contract.

n. Nigeria's Composite Scores and Ranks

Having presented and analysed Nigeria's scores and rankings in each of the four categories of governance, it is pertinent to present data and analyse the country's composite scores and ranks as presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Composite IIAG; 2000 – 2013 Scores and Ranks for Nigeria

Year	Score (%)	African Average	Ranks
2000	40.8	47.0	36
2001	39.9	48.4	37
2002	40.1	48.8	36
2003	39.3	48.4	37
2004	39.2	49.0	38
2005	40.1	49.5	40
2006	41.8	50.1	37
2007	42.1	50.5	38
2008	42.4	50.3	38
2009	42.0	50.3	40
2010	43.2	51.0	41
2011	42.0	51.2	43
2012	43.4	51.6	41
2013	45.8	51.3	37

Source: Adapted from Mo Ibrahim Foundation: 2012 Ibrahim Index of African Governance Data Report 2012 and 2013 and 2014 IIAG Summaries.

The overall scores of Nigeria in quality of governance as presented in table 2 shows the poor state of governance in the country. The scores range from the lowest of 39.2% in 2004 to the best of 45.8% in 2013. The country's scores in each of the fourteen years were far below each corresponding year's African average. Nigeria's total average score in governance for the fourteen years was 41.58% which was below the continental average of 49.80%. The country's best rank was 36th out of 52 in 2000. The country ranked 43rd in 2011 far behind South Africa, Ghana and Egypt that were placed 5th, 7th and 14th respectively.

9.5 Conclusion and Recommendations

Successive administrations in Nigeria enacted many policies and embarked on projects and embarked on projects and programmes aimed at achieving good governance. These include security, anti-corruption, educational and health and policies. Others are transport, telecommunication, energy and poverty reduction policies. However, these policies have so far not achieved the desired objectives. The incidences of insecurity, corruption and poverty still remains high. Though, the telecommunication policy has achieved much, the country's transport policies are yet

to be integrated, infrastructure still remains largely decayed as electricity supply still remains inadequate and regular. Contrary to the view of the social contract theory public policies in Nigeria have not achieved the desired quality of governance in the country for the period 2000 – 2013.

Factors responsible for minimal effect of these policies include dearth of adequate, accurate and reliable policy knowledge, policy inconsistencies, and corruption. Others are the elusive value systems of the Nigerian society and policy apathy on the part of the citizenry. In view of these, the study recommends that the Nigerian state should be equally concerned with personal as national safety. There is the need for strict enforcement of anti-corruption legislations and review of judiciary for speedy dispensation of justice. There is also the need for policy continuity for sustainability especially in a developing society like Nigeria. Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAS) need to establish and strengthen policy research for adequate and reliable data. Programmes that enhances nation-building should be encouraged in search of the emergence of a Nigerian value system. Mass mobilisation and integration of the citizens by the National Orientation Agency and other relevant agencies is also essential to citizen participation and ownership of public policies in Nigeria.

References

Abdullah, S.A. (2007). The civil service reforms. In H. Saliu, E. Amali and R. Olawepo (Eds). *Nigeria's reform Programme; Issues and Challenges* (pp. 342 – 362). Ilorin; Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, University of Ilorin.

Abdullatif, A.M. (2003, May). Good governance and its relationship to democracy and economic development. Presented at Workshop IV on Democracy, Economic Development and Culture, Organised by Global Forum III on Fighting Corruption and Safeguarding Integrity. Soul, 20 – 31.

Adamolekun, L. (2002). Governance context and reorientation of government. in L. Adamolekun (Ed). *Public Administration in Africa. Main Issues and Selected Country Studies (pp. 3 – 16).* Ibadan, Spectrum Books Limited.

Agere, S. (2000). *Promoting good governance, principles, practices and perspectives.* London; Common Wealth Secretariat.

Akanji, O.O. (2002). Micro-finance as a strategy for poverty reduction. *Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) Economic and Financial Review, 39(4).*

Ali, Y.O (2007). The Anti-Graft War. In H. Saliu, E. Amali & R. Olawepo (eds). *Nigeria's reform programme, issues and challenges,* (pp. 511 – 540) Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, University of Ilorin. Ilorin.

Asogwa, M.N. (2010). Public Policy formulation and Implementation; Analysis of the National Policy on Integrated Rural Development for Nigeria. In T. Wuam and T.N. Sunday (Eds). *Governance and Economic Development in the Fourth Republic* (PP 51 – 73). Otukpo; Department of History and Archaeology, IBB University, Lapai.

Bryner, G.C. (2007). Public Organisations and Public Policies. In B.G. Peters & J. Piere (Eds). *The Handbook of Public Administration* (PP 189 – 198) London; Sage Publications.

Davidson, S. (2004). The role of governance in achieving millennium development goals. Vietnam; the World Bank.

Denhardt, R.B. & Denhardt, J.V. (2009). Public Administration: Action Oriented, (Sixth Edition). Boston; Wadsworth Carnage Learning.

Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (Establishment) Act, Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004).

Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (Establishment) Act, Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004).

Elaigwu, J.I. (2005). *Nigeria yesterday and today for tomorrow; essays in governance and society*. Jos; Aba Publishing House.

Fayeye, J.O. (2007). Reforming the security sector. In H. Saliu, E. Amali and R. Olawepo (Eds). *Nigeria's Reform Programme; Issues and Challenges* (pp 142 – 157). Ilorin; Faculty of Business and Social Sciences. University of Ilorin.

Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999). Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999. Lagos: Federal Government Press.

Fiscal Responsibility Act, Federal Republic of Nigeria (2007).

Fiscal Responsibility Act, Federal Republic of Nigeria (2007).

Freedom of Information Act, Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2011.

FRN (1999). Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999. Lagos; Federal Government Press.

FRN (2005). Micro-*finance policy, regulatory and supervisory framework for Nigeria*. Abuja; CBN.

GAO (1998). Performance Measurement and Evaluation; Definitions and Relationship GAO/GGD – 98 – 26.

Gauba, O.P. (2003). *An Introduction to Political Theory*. (Fourth Edition). New Delhi. Macmillan India Ltd.

Huther, J. and Shah, A. (2000). Anti-Corruption Policies and Programmes; A Framework for Evaluation. Operations and Evaluation Department (OED), the World Bank Policy Research Working Paper WPS2501.

Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Act, Federal Republic of Nigeria (2000).

Kpakol. M. (2007). Poverty eradication efforts. In H. Saliu, E. Amali & R. Olawepo (eds). *Nigeria's reform programme. issues and challenges*. (pp. 445 -470) Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, University of Ilorin. Ilorin.

Lambo. E. (2007). An overview of the health sector reforms. In H. Saliu, E.g. Amali and R. Olawepo (Eds). *Nigeria's Reform Programme: Issues and Challenges* (pp 109 – 121). Ilorin; Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, University of Ilorin.

Laski, H.J. (2004). *Grammar of politics*. Delhi; Surject Publications.

Lawal, A. (2007). A cybernatic appraisal of reforms in the education sector. In H. Saliu, E. Amali and R. Olawepo (eds) Nigeria's Reform Programme; Issues and Challenges (pp 91 – 108). Ilorin; Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, University of Ilorin.

Mazrui, A. and Mazrui, A.A. (1997). Interaction between State and the Nation in Africa's Experience: Four Decades of Independence. In E. Oyedele (Ed), *Africa National Unity, Stability and Development* (PP 33 – 51) Ibadan; Sibon Books Limited.

Mo Ibrahim Foundation (2012). 2012 Ibrahim index of African governance data report. Accessed from Moibrahimfoundation.orgon/22ndoctober.2012

MO Ibrahim Foundation (2013). Ibrahim Index of African Governance Summary.

MO Ibrahim Foundation (2014). Ibrahim Index of African Governance Summary.

Mogiyevsky, R. (2010). What is good governance? main aspects and characteristics. Kurgystan; Centre for Social and Economic Research.

National Planning Commission (NPC) (2004). Nigeria, national economic empowerment and development strategy (NEEDS). Abuja, NPC.

NBS (2010). Nigeria's poverty profile.

Nigeria Extractive Industry Initiatives (NEITI) Act, Federal Republic of Nigeria (2007).

NILS (2013). *Nigeria's social indicators*. Abuja; NILS.

Ogunsanya, A. (2007). Transport Sector Reforms. In H. Saliu, E. Amali & R. Olawepo (eds). *Nigeria's reform programme. issues and challenges*. (pp. 285 -302) Faculty of Business and Social Sciences. University of Ilorin, Ilorin.

Okebukola, P. (2007). The educational sector reforms. In H. Saliu, E. Amali and R. Olawepo (Eds). *Nigeria's Reform Programme; Issues and Challenges* (pp 83 – 90). Ilorin; Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, University of Ilorin.

Olaniyi, J.O. (1998). *Foundations of public policy analysis.* Ibadan; Sunad Publishers Limited.

Public Procurement Act, Federal Republic of Nigeria (2007).

Rosenbloom, D.H. Kravachuk, R.S. & Clerkin, R.M. (2009). *Public administration; understanding management, politics and law in the public sector.* Boston; McGraw-Hill International Edition.

Sambo, A. (1999). What is public policy. In R. Anifonose & F. Enewo (Eds). *Elements of politics* (PP 281 – 310) Lagos; Sam Iroanusi Publications.

Santiso, C. (2001). Good governance and aid effectiveness; the world bank and conditionality. The George Town Public Policy Review Vol. 7, No. 1, 1 – 22.

Sapru, R.K. (2004). *Public policy formulation implementation and evaluation.* Delhi; Sterling Publishers Private Limited.

Shafritz. J.M. Russel, E.gW. & Borick, C.P. (2011). *Introducing public administration.* (Seventh Edition). Boston; Longman.

Tell (2012, April; 30). A diary of executive theft. Tell pp. 22 – 28.

Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index (2000 – 2013 Editions). http//www. transparency.org

UNESCAP (2010). What is good governance? retrieved on 2/12/2010 from http://www.unescap. org/pdd/prs/projectactivity/ongoing/gg/governance.asp

Zebadi, I.S. (2007). Security sector reforms. In H. Saliu, E. Amali and R. Olawepo (Eds). *Nigeria's Reform Programme; Issues and Challenges* (pp 122 – 141). Ilorin, Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, University of Ilorin.