Title Page

EFFECT OF PUBLIC POLICY IMPLEMENTATION BARRIERS ON FIELD LEVEL BUREAUCRATS: A STUDY OF SELECTED POLICIES OF THE NATIONAL AGENCY FOR FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND CONTROL

BY

Ogheneochuko OMAMUGHO
M.SC/ADMIN/11297/2011-2012

A Thesis submitted to the School of Postgraduate Studies, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Award of

Masters of Science Degree in Public Administration.

Department of Public Administration,

Faculty of Administration

Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria

MARCH, 2015

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the work in this thesis titled "Analysis of public policy implementation barriers: a study of selected policies of the National Agency for Food and Drug Administration and Control" was performed by me in the Department of Public Administration, under the supervision of Dr. Abdulkarim, B. Siraj and Dr Musa Idris. The information derived from the literature has been duly acknowledged in the text and a list of references provided. No part of this work has been presented for another degree or diploma at any institution.

Ogheneochuko_OMAMUGHO	_____	_____
Name	Sign	Date

CERTIFICATION

This Project (thesis) titled "Analysis of public policy implementation barriers: a study of selected policies of the National Agency for Food and Drug Administration and Control" meets the regulations governing the Award of the degree of M.Sc. in Public Administration of the Ahmadu Bello University and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation

Dr. Abdulkarim, B. Siraj **Chairman, Supervisory Council**	_____ Sign	_____ Date
Dr. Musa Idris **Member, Supervisory Council**	_____ Sign	_____ Date
Dr. Hamza Yusuf **Head of Department**	_____ Sign	_____ Date
Professor Hassan, A. Z. **Dean, School of Post-Graduate Studies**	_____ Sign	_____ Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I first would like to acknowledge the love, guidance and protection of God in my life, from birth up to this point, covering all activities I have engaged in, which has altogether brought me to this stage.

Second in line of the people whose support I acknowledge, are my parents and family members. So, to my parents, Peterkin Omamugho and Ese Omamugho, I say a big thank you for the financial and moral supports given to me throughout the course of this programme. Members of my family who provided support to me and who I thank include, my brother, Ogheneovo, my Sister, Avwerosuo and her husband, Otuvie. My Aunt, Ade for their financial support, and my cousins Keno, Uzuazor and his wife Zainab, Othuke and her husband Ochuko, Wendy and her husband Chima, for their financial support and Funafo, Esther, Momode, Evi, Elijah, Emus, Omena, Gammy, Natasha, Jane, for their moral support throughout this programme. I also would specially thank Aunt Igho for the love and support, which she gave to me throughout the duration of this programme.

Also, I acknowledge my friends, Rahimat, Victory, Dumebi, Fummi, Uncle Dave, Kehinde, Abraham, Oti and his wife Victoria, Iyuana, Ugu-uma, Bridget, Jessica, Mute, Uzoma, Big Sam, Gods-Decision and his Wife; Idoko, Isiah; my able class chairman Kantiok; Chika, Chalawa, Martins, Dayo, and all others too numerous to mentions for various kinds of support each gave to me during the course of this programme. I specially thank my friend Jenifer, her mother and her Sister Simha, for their warm love and support throughout my stay in Zaria. Of course I have not forgotten my good friend and father figure here in Zaria, Mallam Yahaya. I thank him and members of his family so much for their love and support (both financial and moral) throughout this programme. Also in the categories of friends, are my other Post-graduate colleges both of my department and other departments with whom I

stayed with at the post-graduate hostel and with whom I shared many laughter, play and arguments, basically making my stay in Zaria a wonderful one, I say a big thank you to you all.

I also acknowledge the support of some friends and menbers of the Eckankar family who showed me kindness, love and support during the course of this programme. Some of these individuals include Helen Ilijeze, Nnamdi Nwosu, Dr. Abelega and Nancy Abelega, Affy Ibebu, Osi and Victoria Imomoh, Emma Imomoh, Wisdom and Jane Wolo, and so on.

I also acknowledge the efforts of my thesis supervisors, Dr. Abdulkarim, and Dr. Mrs. Ogunlela, and My Coordinator Dr. Musa Idris for his unending support and guidance, throughout the duration of this programme. I also thank my lecturers for their tutoring and guidance, aiding my acquisition of the required knowledge and skills, necessary for the completion of this programme. I also specially thank my good friend and lecturer, Professor Ibrahim Abdulsalami, firstly, for accepting me warmly as a friend, and secondly for the many discussions we had together from which I learnt a lot.

I have not forgotten my examiners, Dr. Ati (my external examiner), Professor Ayodele Omojuwa from Depatment of Political science and Dr. Faruk Abubakar who made noteworthy contributions this work through their candid examination, I say a big thank you.

Also, to those who provided assistance that aided the completion of this project (thesis), I say a big thank you. I say a big thank you to Dr. Paul Orhii, the Director-General of NAFDAC for giving the approval for us to work with NAFDAC for this research. I also say thank you to the staff of NAFDAC, some of whom, even without face to face contact still completed the questionnaires and returned them as hoped. Then there are those who facilitated the processes to ensure that the required data are collected; some of these individuals (those who gave their names) are Mr. Ejor, Miss. Stephanie, Mrs. Anyakora and Mrs. N. B. Ughanze.

ABSTRACT

The aim of this thesis is to analyse the activities of field level bureaucrats to describe how they act to overcome barriers that affect policy implementation. While most polices rely on field level bureaucrats for their implementation, there is still a lack of empirical studies that provide an adequate understanding of how field bureaucrats can overcome the barriers, delays, and disincentives associated with implementing policies. For this reason the author decided to examine how field level bureaucrats are influenced by barriers and how the influences from the barriers affects their work – policy implementation. The research was conducted using a case study model, as such two policies – processed food regulatory policy and herbal medicine and related product advertisement regulatory policy of the National Agency for Food and Drug Administration and Control was studied. Both primary and secondary data was sourced for the research. Questionnaires containing both closed and open ended questions was distributed to selected field bureaucrats responsible for implementing the regulatory policies. The field bureaucrats were asked to identify how they would respond in behaviour, to selected types of barrier that have been identified to influence policy implementation negatively. Further, they were asked to rank the barriers that provide the most influence on their work. The results of the research show that field bureaucrats are more likely to respond to barriers by adopting a flexible role, which means, simplification of the policy implementation process, and further, are more influenced by time pressure than other forms of barriers. The author recommends that attention should be paid to the behaviour of field bureaucrats on duties, in such a way as to ensure that the behaviour they depict are those that will not compromise the policy in their care, so as to ensure more positive outcomes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS

ACAO	**Assistant Chief Administrative Officer**
E.g.	**For Example**
Etc.	**Etcetera**
HMRP	**Herbal Medicines and Related Products (Advertisement) Regulatory Policy**
i.e.	**That is/for Example**
NAFDAC	**National Agency for Food and Drug Administration and Control**
PFRP	**Processed Food Registration Regulation Policy**
Sic.	**As it was writing**
SPSS	**Statistical Package for Social Sciences**
Viz.	**Namely**

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Over the years the Nigerian Government has invested huge funds, of about an average of N2trillion annually (Nwosu and Okafor, 2014:883) to develop public policies to address many public issues, such as, the need to have a safe supply of herbal medicine, and that processed foods are safe for public consumption, in the society. Generally, the expected outcome of the public policies created by Government is to, in the long-run, make positive changes to identified public problems. Such changes could either be to eliminate such problem, or to manage it or to restructure its appearance to a more desirable one. For example, the Federal Government in 2005 created the Herbal Medicines and Related Product (Advertisement) Regulation, domiciled with the National Agency for Food and Drugs Administration and Control (NAFDAC) to bring to stop a situation of uncontrolled advertisement of herbal medicines, some of which are harmful for public consumption.

Concerns remain, however, about how quickly and effective policies in Nigerian are transformed into their desired outcomes. This is because policy implementation is a vital aspect of the policy process. It is at this point that intended outcomes which a policy was created to achieve can either be achieved or not achieved. Basically, terms such as “complete failure”, “White Elephant project”, and “graveyard of policies” have been used to describe the situation of policy implementation in Nigeria (Makinde 2005:67; Egonmwan, 1984:142), which of course, expresses the concern about the efficacy of public policies implementation in Nigeria.

However, and generally, studies in public policy implementation have indicated that policy implementation cannot occur without some form of disincentives, barriers or obstacles (Alesch and Petak, 2001:31; Olaoye, 2010:18; Sutton, 1999:26). These barriers basically mean that some form of distortion to the policy intent may occur when implementing a policy or that the policy outcome may take longer time before they are achieved (Sutton, 1999:15). The nature of effect a barrier might have on a policy outcome, be it distortion or delay in outcome provision, depends on a number of complex factors such as the type and source of the barrier in question, the extent to which such a barrier is allowed to persist, and the method through which the policy is to be implemented (Alesch and Petak, 2001:34; Sutton, 1999:8).

The complexity of the policy implementation process has challenged researchers to develop theories or models that predict how and under what conditions policies are implemented (Sutton, 1999:4; Smith, Richards, Geddes, &Mathers, 2011:5). One of such models is the "Street Level Bureaucrats model" developed by Lipsky (1980), wherein he explains that actors who work in bureaucracies where work is done more on the field, have a role to play, they are not merely cogs in an automatic transfer of policy-making to outcome in practice. Due to constraints on their time, and bureaucratic procedures at the local level, Lipsky argues that field-level workers may exercise considerable flexibility in implementing instructions. Winter (2002:352) provides technical insight into this approach, highlighting the 'agency' of individual actors (their knowledge and power), which enables them to act autonomously and mould outcomes.

Therefore, in order to improve understanding of public policy implementation barriers that emanates from the implementing actors, a study of policy that requires field work in its implementation is necessary. Policies such as the Herbal Medicines and Related Products (Advertisement) Regulations 2005; and Processed Food Registration Regulations 2005 which

are domiciled in NAFDAC require the use of field workers to implement them. This makes the NAFDAC a good agency in Nigeria to study the interplay of barriers, which emanates from field workers, in the policy implementation process.

1.2 Statement of the Research Problem

When we have a better understanding of the factors that affect the implementation process of public policies, policies will be able to produce outcomes that achieve the objectives for which they were made.

However, there is little or lack of empirical data about the activities of field level bureaucrats, that provide an adequate understanding of how to overcome the barriers, delays, and disincentives associated with implementing policies (Spratt, 2009:162; Alesch and Petak, 2001:32; Matland, 1995:75; Sabatier, 1991). This lack of understanding has important implications for policies that rely on field level bureaucrats for their implementation, such as the Processed Food Registration Regulatory Policy seeking to reduce the burden of food-burn diseases (diarrhoea, cholera etc), diabetes, heart diseases, cancer and other processed food related illnesses, and the Herbal Medicine and Related Product Advertisement Regulatory Policy seeking to reduce the burden of the cases of adverse effects, caused by the consumption of poorly processed foods and fake or sub-standard herbal medications respectively.

For example, Harries and Cullinan (2008:18) reported that 26% of childhood blindness in Nigeria is associated with the use of traditional eye medicine. Also, are the 37% cases of diarrhoea reported to generate from the consumption of "improperly prepared herbal mixture" (Aborishade, 2012:15). Further, 27% of reported diarrhoea cases are associated with processed food consumption, (Ifeadike et al, 2012:168). These cases and more could be

reduced if adequate understanding of how to overcome the barriers, associated with implementing policies as carried out by field level bureaucrats is gained.

Therefore, to gain some level of understanding, we would analyse the activities of field level policy actors to describe how they act to overcome barriers that affect policy implementation, drawing experiences from the implementation of the Herbal Medicine and Related Product Advertisement Regulatory Policy and the Processed Food Regulatory Policy of NAFDAC. The central question of this research is: how can field level bureaucrats, in carrying out their roles, act to overcome barriers faced by them, during policy implementation?

The following are sub-questions:

i. How do field level bureaucrats define their roles in policy implementation when faced with barriers?
ii. What type of barrier provides the most influence on field level bureaucrats during policy implementation?
iii. From the cases stated above, how have field level bureaucrats overcome the barriers to policy implementation?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this work is to analyse and describe how field level bureaucrats, in carrying out their roles, can act to overcome barriers faced by them, during policy implementation.

Specific objectives of this work are:

i. To ascertain what role field level bureaucrats play in policy implementation when faced with barriers.

ii. To identify the type of barrier that provides the most influence on field level bureaucrats during policy implementation.

iii. To analyse how field level bureaucrats have overcome the barriers to policy implementation.

1.4 Research Hypotheses

First Hypothesis:

H_0: Field level bureaucrats will preferentially choose a flexible role than a strict role when faced with barriers during policy implementation.

H_1: Field level bureaucrats will not preferentially choose a flexible role than a strict role when faced with barriers during policy implementation.

Second Hypothesis:

H_0: The barrier of information gap has more significant effect on field level bureaucrats during policy implementation than other barriers.

H_1: The barrier of information gap has less significant effect on field level bureaucrats during policy implementation than other barriers

1.5 Significance of the Study

A number of scholars have identified a serious lack of empirical data that provide an adequate understanding of how to overcome the barriers, delays, and disincentives associated with implementing policies (Alesch and Petak, 2001; Marland, 1995; Sabatier, 1991). Most research and discussions about policy implementation in Nigeria mainly have identified the obvious problems, but do little in the area of providing needed empirical data for improved understanding of how policy implementation can be improved. For example, Olaoye (2013:85) in his study of policy implementation failures, relied on secondary data, and did not examine the implementation process, to identify functional variables that contributes to, and could as well describe the cause of policy implementation failures. Also, the work of Sule et al (2013:32) viewed policy implementation as a collective factor among others, describing the process as a whole as a major problem of policy failures, but does not specifically study policy implementation as a process of itself, examining the variables within it that makes the process problematic.

This research therefore takes such a step, and providing empirical data that helps improve our understanding of policy implementation barriers. The result from this work could benefit policy executives (those at the top cadre of the public service) who can use this information when they develop strategies or plan for policy implementation. Information that show how field bureaucrats respond to the barriers they face and how such responses can affect the success of a policy is very vital for the success of further and present policies.

Secondly, field bureaucrats themselves can understand how the decisions they make in response to existing barriers can affect the objectives of the policy they are implementing, hence they can therefore choose the most suitable behaviour to address barriers and improve policy outcome.

From an academic perspective, this work contributes to knowledge by investigating what could be the most influencing barrier to field level bureaucrats in the process of policy implementation. The literature though has identified various barriers that influence policy implementation, the literature has not provided information as to which barrier provide the most influence. This study therefore goes further, to identify the barrier that provides the most influence for policy implementation.

1.6 Scope of the Study

From a list of fifteen (15) sub-regulatory policies the National Agency for Food and Drug Administration and Control (NAFDAC) is responsible for implementing, this study investigates the two policies, viz:

i. Herbal Medicines and Related Products (Advertisement) Regulations 2005; and
ii. Processed Food Registration Regulations 2005

Our choice for selecting two policies is based on the fact that, studying more than two policies will be too numerous to be covered in this present research programme under the prevailing circumstance; time within which to complete the research programme, while studying the two policies will give room for comparison and deeper understanding.

These sub-policies are chosen at random, from the list of regulations which the agency has responsibility of implementing.

Data collected on this policy covers a 7 year period, 2006 – 2013. This period covered the period in which the policies have been implemented, since its creation in 2005. However, for the processed food policy which was amended in 2005, we collected retrospective data

covering the period from the time it was created, as the Food Products Registration Regulations 1996.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

In carrying out the study we encountered some challenges that provided limitations to this study. These limitations are:

i. Access: Upon data collection our access to documents at NAFDAC was limited. Also, some of the staff declined to be interviewed, which warranted our inclusion of some of the intended interview questions into the questionnaire which was then distributed to all selected participants.

ii. Lack of Available Data: Some of the secondary data which would have enabled us make further analysis, and perhaps shape our findings were not available. Data such as number of existing Herbal medicine practitioners and products could not be found. The availability of this data would have enabled us make proper assessment on the relationship between the number of registered herbal medicines and existing products, and further, help us build a connection between the choice behaviour of by field bureaucrats, when faced with barriers and their work output. However, we extended our source of data to include incidence of diseases that are usually associated with the consumption of processed foods and herbal medicine, to build a link between field bureaucrats' behaviour choices, as a result of implementation barriers, and social consequences of such behaviours.

iii. Instrument Used to Collect the Data: Our analysis was limited by the instrument which we used to collect the data. We discovered that using the questionnaire limited the number of questions, and possible follow-up questions that we would have asked

if another instrument (i.e an Interview) was included in the data collection method. Consequently, our analysis was limited to what was available. And this made it impossible to measure the third objective of this research work.

However, these limitations could not challenge the validity of this research, it could only have been better.

1.8 Definition of Terms

Clients:

Producers of herbal medicines or processed food who are to be regulated by the Herbal Medicines and Related Products Advertisement Regulatory policy, and the Processed Food Registration Regulatory policy, respectively.

A client is the word used by NAFDAC to describe the individuals or group whom they regulate or serve.

Field Level Bureaucrats:

Public Service employees who carry out their jobs in the fields. As such a field work could be visiting clients for inspection and for implementing sanctions

Policy Implementation:

All field actions related to carrying out of duties towards the achievement of the objectives of a policy, which could be

- Carrying out inspections (CI)

- Testing of products (TP)
- Registration of products (RP)
- Sanctioning of defaulting clients (SDC).

Definition of variables from the first hypothesis: The two variables in the first hypothesis are exercising considerable flexibility, and following directives strictly.

1. **Exercising Considerable Flexibility**

- Helping clients meet requirement for registration
- Overlooking some requirement for registration when conducting inspections
- Giving grace period to clients to meet requirement for registration to avoid been sanctioned
- Giving warning to clients for not meeting requirements rather than sanction.

2. **Following Directives Strictly**

- Never helping clients to meet requirement
- Never overlooks any requirement for registration when conduction inspections
- Always apply sanctions to clients for not meeting registration requirements

Definition of variables from the second hypothesis: The four variables in the second hypothesis are barrier from information gap, barrier from level of motivation, barrier of bureaucratic procedure, and barrier of time constraints.

1. **Barrier from Information Gap**

- Poor knowledge of the intent of the policy

- Poor knowledge of how implementation is affecting the society in general (feedback)
- Poor knowledge of challenges faced by clients in accessing the informants services
- Poor information about the existence of some clients and their locations

2. Barrier from Level of Motivation

- Nature of opposition for the policy from the community, the press, or the client
- Satisfaction of the condition upon which tasks are to be carried out (stressful vs. easy; readily available materials vs. non readily available materials)
- Personal desire to serve

3. Barrier from bureaucratic procedures

- Length of time it takes to get approval to carry out an assignment
- Complexity of documentation to do in order to get a job done

4. Barriers form time constraints

Length of time in which a specific task is to be completed (inadequate vs adequate)

1.9 Plan of the Study

This study has five chapters. The first chapter, which is the introductory chapter, presents the background to this study. In this chapter we discussed the problem this study address, the objective and significance and the scope the study covers. In the second chapter, literatures related to this study was reviewed review, and the theoretical framework upon which this study was structured is discussed. Chapter three contains the methodology for which the data

for this study was collected and analysed. In the fourth chapter, the data collected are presented and analysed and the major findings derived from the data are also presented. Finally, the last chapter, chapter five, contains the summary of this work, the conclusion, as well as, the recommendations based on the findings.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Literature Review

There is a broad and diverse literature relevant to barriers in public policy implementation. Much has been written about policy content and political system constituting the main source of barriers to policy implementation and much has also been written about barriers emanating from the process of implementation of a policy. There are, however, a much smaller number of accounts dealing specifically with the relationship between the characteristics of information and motivation of the policy implementing actors and policy implementation.

2.1.1 Policy Content and Political System as Barriers to Policy Implementation

Some researchers have carried out researches that provide conclusions that support the idea that policy barriers are policy-centred. The public policy (decision) identifies the problem(s) to be addressed, stipulates the objective(s) to be pursued and, in a variety of ways, structure the implementation process. In this sense, implementation is seen as the process between the enactment of policy and its ultimate impact on the society (Sabatier and Mazmanian, 1980:551). Therefore, one could rationalize that faults in the implementation of any policy will only emerge due to the existing faults in the policy document.

Olaoye (2013:85) presents this type of argument. In his study of agricultural policies in Nigeria, he notes that failures to the policies emanated from incompatibility of the policies with the political system, technology gaps, globalizations and lack of feed-backs among others. In his argument, he pointed out that in formulating the policies (agricultural policies in

Nigeria) consideration was not given to the possibility of these factors to influence the policy outcome. This major deficiency he argues, relates to why the agricultural policies has not been so successfully implemented. However, in contrast, Sule, Alinno, and Ikwegbe, (2013:32) in their work emphasized that public policy implementation is not due to lack of effective policies but that of lack of political will, corruption and misdirected priority.

This argument holds that policies are policies and that any policy created, has been so created to achieve an objective or some set of objectives. What will prevent such policies from been implemented is the desire held by the political officials towards that policy. Public policies tend to be implemented when political bosses considers such policies to be important (Smith, Richards, Geddes, and Mathers, 2010:986).

However, policies, particularly in developing nations, still face implementation problems even when they are considered important by the political bosses. These barriers come from the conditions prevalent in the political system itself. Dean (1972) in his study of plan (policy) implementation notes that the political system contributes the main barriers. His explanation points out that inadequate executive capacity and economic performance are the variables within the political system that hampers plan implementation. Also, Yaro (1991:79) who studied plan implementation at state government level in Nigeria adds that political manipulation and official interference, over-dependence on external funds (from the Federal Government), which are weaknesses in the political system occasioned the failure of plans at state level governance.

Policies are meant to solve societal problems. While a societal problem may not be said to have been completely solved, policies made to address them must continue to exist (although should be reviewed and modified over time). The continued implementation of a policy requires a political system that supports it and an administrative system that constantly

innovate itself to meet changing demands to implementing the policy (Omololu&Olayide, 2004:45; Smith et al, 2010:65). The work of Paki and Ebienfa (2011:54) shows that lack of political will, poor implementation design, conception and discipline; lack of resources, poor program leadership and management, and corruption as the paradox surrounding policy implementation in Nigeria. Makinde studied the Better Life Programme and the Family Support programme (2005). It was found that "implementation gap" is caused by corruption, lack of continuity of such policies, inadequate human and material recourses as the factors responsible for limiting implementation of policies in Nigeria.

Edevbaro (1996:6) shows that policy implementation barriers can emanate from both the policy content, as well as, the political system in which the policy is to operate. He reviewed educational policies in Nigeria, and concludes that the positive correlation between poor policy implementation and the political system arises as a result of state monopoly in attempting to provide social services. Further, he states that policy implementation is affected by the existence of "structural adjustment conditionalities" and incoherent policies.

2.1.2 Barriers from Policy Actors and the Implementation Context

Studies in the field of policy implementation have touched on issues that locate barriers emanating from policy implementing actors and the context of the implementation itself. These studies consider individual implementers as the central focus of analysis (Lewis and Flynn, 1979:139). Further, implementers operate not under any hierarchical organization structure but within "implementation structure." This structure comprises both officials and private actors who interact within a Policy field (Wali, 2010:261). Investigation by Spratt (2009:61) identified low motivation as a barrier to policy implementation. He explains that the low motivation stems from the implementing organisation's inability to provide the

necessary factors that would effectively motivate the policy implementing actors to effectively carry out their duties.

Park et al (2005:9) who studied implementing technology-enhanced PBL (Program-Based Learning) in school, uncovered barriers existing in forms such as lack of feedback, reward and incentives for implementation, and misplacement of vision between teachers and administrators. In these studies, Spratt and Park et al, we see evidence that show how the implementing actors play a significant role in how a policy is implemented. Further, their discussion reviled that what difficulty exist in implementing respective policies, rest on how motivated they are and on the nature of information flow within their respective organization. However, these studies does not show which of these variable provides the most negative impact on policy implementation.

Aminu, Tella, and Mbaya, (2012:56) observed that the problem of policy implementation is directly masterminded by bureaucrats. Further, they pointed out that the system works to ensure policies are not implemented; notable as such policies do not fall within their line of interest or does not involve their inputs. The striking factor here is the notion that a policy will not be implemented if such a policy is not of interest to those who are to implement it. Since the policy implementers are in control of the mechanism for implementation, it becomes easy for them to tout the system (see for example Okotoni, 2001:43). Although, this thought falls within the spectrum of motivation (e.g. policy implementers will be motivated to implement a policy, if such policy falls within their interest), the work does not discuss the subject within this construct. However, it does provide a useful understanding to policy implementation barriers.

Employees motivation and organisational performance is positively correlated (Chaudhary, 2012:32). Motivation brings about commitment of employees which leads to

performance. Job involvement, working environment and incentives are variables that enhance employees' commitment (Danish &Munir, 2011:63). Also, empowerment and recognition increases the desire of employees to work (Manzoor, 2012:23). These works, as well as, other works have extensively discussed employee motivation and organisational effectiveness (see for example, Omar, Jusoff, &Hussin, 2010; Reena et al, 2009; Cheng & Robertson, 2006; Butkus& Green 1999; Bartol and Martin, 1998 all in Denish and Munir, 2011:15). To this extent, employee motivation is seen as a policy of managers to increase effectual job management amongst employees in organisation (Shadare et al, 2009 in Chaudhary, 2012:11). The emphasis here is that, how much managers can implement this phenomenon of motivation, will determine how effective employees will be in the long run. However, what is not seen here is how related organisational effectiveness and public policy implementation is.

Further, the application of motivation in these works relates solely to private organisation. In a public organisation, the manager-employee dichotomy is not very pronounced, as those who manage are not owners of the organisation, as in the case of private organisations, but are also employees themselves (Sutton, 1999:18). To this end, they (public managers) also need the motivation to implement policies under their care. Consequently, how do public managers derive the motivation to implement policies and would the absence of such motivation pose a barrier in their implementation of policies? While research works that may have answered these questions have not been sited, research on policy implementation should investigate this problem. It does however fall outside the scope of this study.

Increasing information is particularly important in developing countries (Mallett, Nye, Sorrell, 2011:5). Information in this case, is important to those who hold the responsibility for

the country's development (e.g. the policy formulators and implementers). However, this work did not discuss how important information is to policy implementers, as well as the characteristics of such information. But in Blandford (2007:16) availability of information is not enough but also that such information must be sufficient and these constitute the fundamental requirement for implementing public policies. Further, available information must be timely, reliable and comparable (Statistics Denmark, 2009:8).

Problems in implementation and enforcement are caused by the poor understanding of state officials of the relevant technical part of their jobs (Young, 2010:25). This poor understanding stems from the unavailability of information to make accurate judgments (Blandford, 2007:19) and the inability of the officials to interpret the information when available (Spratt, 2009:21). In this way information becomes a barrier to policy implementation, and making efforts to improve access to information would lead to improved policy implementation (Sonneveldt, Shaver, &Bhuyan, 2008:53).

From the work of May (2004:6) barriers in regulatory process, emanates from red-tape and the multiple process required to effect regulations. This study focused more on the context within which the policy is implemented. May, explains that these conditions make the process tiresome, hence limiting proper implementation. A variety of regulations potentially impinge upon different facets of the availability of a public good or service (Schill, 2002:17). Schill, notes that most times, more regulations are created to implement other regulations, and these multiple regulations limits how much the initial regulation can be implemented.

Poor legal framework and poor regulatory guide also provides barriers to policy implementation (Sotola and Ayodele, 2011:31). In Watt, Sword, and Kruger's (2005:21) study, barriers to policy implementation arise from organisational context. In their view, the facilities, available in the organisation, can go a long way to determine how much

implementation can be done. Further, the actors in the organisation provide barriers by refusing to adapt new behaviours outside the regular traditional practice, which the new policy may suggest for implementation.

2.1.3 Other Barriers to Policy Implementation

In this category of research works we find conclusions that situate barriers to policy implementation outside the context of political factors and from the implementing actors. These researches expose other variables that are responsible for policy implementation barriers. One of such researches suggests that barriers to policy implementation are product of the end users. Stephenson and Hennink (2005:16) studied service user and barriers faced by users. Their study reveals that the existing economic, administrative and cognitive barriers to service use were largely influenced by individual and household socio-economic factors on one hand, whilst psychological and physical access barriers are closely associated with indicators of female autonomy. Enang and Ushie (2012:12) added that policies fail during implementation, when such policies do not take into consideration the "cultural pluralism" of a society (Nigeria), but did not give empirical evidence to show this.

McKenzie (2012:35) established that conditions exist that bring about less impact from policy action. He explains that at no time will a policy be implemented 100%. However, effort should be made to ensure that increased capacity to implement policies take place. This would reduce the gap faced with policy implementation. The study did not show or tell what variables exists that prevents policies from been implemented 100%.

In a study that did a comprehensive review of policy documents on HIV/AIDS treatment, followed with in-depth interview, Omololu and Akanni (2004:52) reveals variables

such as quality of programme operation, inadequate involvement of stakeholders, high cost of treatment of infection; training and human resources, and logistics of supplies as the barriers to implementing the policy.

The existing literature stresses that policy implementation barriers is a multidimensional construct, which ranges from the policy content, the political system, the policy implementing actors and the context within which the policy is implemented. Within the construct of the policy implementing actors (field level bureaucrats) and the context within which policy implementation occurs, further constructs such as information and motivation have been well written about. Nonetheless, existing research on the motivation of, and information available to, the policy implementer, and how they affect performance, have analysed these dimensions separately. In respect to the context in which policy implementation occur, bureaucratic procedures have been identified as one of the contributory factors that limits policy implementation. But which of these factors provides the most influence for field bureaucrats who are directly involved with implementing a policy and on who these barriers could affect most? The literature has not looked into this area therefore, there is less evidence on how this applies to public policy implementation, in relation to public policy implementing actors. Hence, a lack of systematic empirical investigation into policy implementation barriers channelled towards identifying the barrier that provides the most influence on field bureaucrats in Nigeria does call for further research. Therefore, this study contributes to the existing policy implementation literature, by systematically investigating how field bureaucrats behave when faced by implementation barriers, and how such behaviours can affect the policy implementation process.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

2.2.1 Theory of Street-Level Bureaucracy

The theory of Street-Level Bureaucracy was first introduced by Michael Lipsky in 1969, and a later revised version was presented in 1980, still my Lipsky. According to Lipsky, street-level bureaucrats use special coping mechanisms because they experience a gulf between the many demands, which are made for their service, and their own limited resources. These mechanisms tend to bias the implementation process in a way that hampers the achievements of the policy goals. The purpose of this theory is to explain how field workers behave in the face of limited resources or barriers, and how such behaviour impact on the outcome of the policy they implement.

The theory assumes that every Street-Level Bureaucrats (field worker) interacts constantly with citizens (clienteles) in the regular course of his job. The Street-Level Bureaucrats, although works within a bureaucratic structure, has discretionary powers to make decisions in relating to his clients, based on resources available to him. The attitude and general approach of a Street-Level Bureaucrats towards his client may affect his client significantly.

Street-Level Bureaucrats requires two classes of resources to perform adequately. These are organisational resources and personal resources. When these resources are inadequate, Street-Level Bureaucrats then develop coping mechanisms to make the tasks easier. These mechanisms when employed in the implementation process, affects the clientele group, the Street-Level Bureaucrats is meant to serve negatively, thereby, a distorted policy outcome in the long run.

The theory also identified other conditions, apart from inadequate resources, that makes Street-Level Bureaucrats develop coping mechanism for dealing with clients. These are, the sense of threat under which they operate; and the ambiguous and conflicting nature of their role expectations.

From this model specific relationships can be deduced, for example:

1. Street-level bureaucrats who are faced with resources inadequacy are more likely to develop coping mechanisms to deal with such problems.
2. Where such coping mechanisms are used in implementing a policy, there is the tendency for the policy to experience negative outcomes, etc.

In relation to this study, where we are analysing public policy implementation barriers, the use of inadequate organisational resources and personal resources represents the barriers identified barriers selected for this study. Barriers such as information gap, bureaucratic procedures in this study are conceived as organisational resources, while time constraints and low motivation are conceived as personal resources. These barriers are majorly those that has been identified from the literature review that does affect policy implementation. However, what many of the studies have not shown is how these barriers influences the behaviour of those that implement the policy, particularly Street-Level Bureaucrats(field bureaucrats), in implementing the policies under their care.

The coping mechanism which the theory spoke of, involves behaviours such as "routinization and simplification" (Lipsky, 1980). This implies, according to Lipsky, that street-level bureaucrats, in adopting and working with such mechanisms, diversions to the policy which they are implementing will begin to occur. In this study we equate the use of such mechanisms to being flexible when carrying out their duties. By being flexible, field

bureaucrats are considered to make compromises, which could hamper the achievements of the policy objectives.

The relationship we are looking at here is, if these barriers influence the field bureaucrats to be flexible in the discharge of their duties or not (being strict). Hence we hypothesized: When faced with barrier during policy implementation, field level bureaucrats will preferentially choose the role of exercising considerable flexibility than the role of following directives strictly

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The research design for this study is a case study design. Yin (1999:4) defines the case study research design as an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used. This fits well with this study notably because the study tries to further understand how field level bureaucrats, in carrying out their roles, can act to overcome barriers faced by them, during policy implementation. Understanding this requires studying field level bureaucrats in a real life context, and using multiple source of evidence (which we discussed in later parts of this chapter) to analyse the phenomenon, hence the need for a case study.

Further, there are three types of case study research viz.: descriptive case study, exploratory case study, and explanatory case study (Yin, 1999:6). The definitions of these case study types are giving by Yin (1999:6) as:

1. **Descriptive Case Study** describes the account of the main characteristics of a real world example to clarify an idea or reinforce an argument;
2. **Exploratory Case Study** attempts to understand what happened within a case by looking beyond descriptive features and studying surrounding context; and
3. **Explanatory Case Study** attempts to explain why certain behaviours occurred by determining causes and effects.

Of the three types, this study uses the explanatory type case study, because in building an understanding of what can be done to overcome policy implementation barriers, we analysed and explained the cause and effect relationship of the variables in the study. For example, we analysed the relationship between the roles a field level bureaucrat plays in the process of policy implementation and the effect such roles have on policy outcome.

3.2 Sources of Data

Case study research requires the use of multiple data types for making analysis (Yin, 1999:12). The data in a case study research can be primary data or secondary data, or both. Also the primary data and secondary data could be in the form of quantitative data or qualitative data, or both (Yin, 1999:12). However, the type of data determines the source. A primary data according to Kent (1993:4) are first hand data that the researcher gathers for the problem under investigation, while a secondary data according to Dawson and Catherine (2002:11) can be defined as information already compiled and readily accessible to the researcher, who knows how to find and use the data. Dawson and Catherine (2002:15) generally identify some sources secondary data can be found to include information from books, journals, news prints, as well as, official documents.

3.2.1 Primary Data Source: The primary data for this work was sourced from selected field level staff of our case study: NAFDAC. The data are both quantitative and qualitative in form and are from responses provided by the participating staff of the organisation (see method of data collection on page 31 for further discussion).

3.2.2 Secondary Data Sources: The secondary data was sourced from official documents of NAFDAC; newspaper publications retrieved online, and published articles from journals.

3.3 Population of the Study

A research population is generally a large collection of individuals or objects that is the main focus of a scientific query (Dey, 1993:43). Although, Yin (1999:16) asserts that the "purpose of case study research is to generalize to theoretical propositions, and not to population as in statistical research," there is need to state the total number of element from which specified number will be collected for examination.

In this study, NAFDAC is the umbrella organisation which includes members of staff who are field level bureaucrats which are our main concern. The NAFDAC provided the number of field level bureaucrats within their organisation, across the country to be **847**.

3.4 Sampling Technique and Sample Size

Sampling may be defined as "the selection of some part of an aggregate or totality on the basis of which a judgment or inference about the aggregate or totality is made" (Haque, 2011:3). However, as we noted in the population, and about the purpose of a case study, the element which we are studying still does belong in an organisation where other staff types operate. The application of sampling here becomes necessary as a tool for extracting the element we intend to study (field level bureaucrats, who are engaged with the responsibility of implementing, each of the policies) from the entire population of staff in the organisation, NAFDAC.

3.4.1 Sampling Technique

The purposive sampling technique was used for this study, given the reason earlier stated. Purposive sampling involves selecting the most productive sample to answer the research questions (Marshall, 1996:7). Hence, we selected informants (informants is the term used for

respondents in a case study research; (Yin, 1999)) of the NAFDAC organisation who carry out field work in respect to the policies being studied. We developed a selection criterion which we used for the selection of informants. Using criteria helps provide a guide and a boundary when using purposive sampling (Marshall, 1996).

3.4.1.1 Informant Selection Criteria

i. Staff that has direct or associated responsibility for implementing the policies.
ii. Staff who conduct field work such as inspection and sanctioning in respect to implementing the policies.
iii. Staff who has direct contact with clients in respect to implementing the policies

3.4.1.2 Sampling Procedure

The sampling procedure is the process with which the sample criterion was used at arriving at the study's sample size. First, there was the issue of spread of staff. That is, the field officers are not located in one office (or state office) of NAFDAC. Hence, to get a larger sample size, multiple state offices were used. On recommendation from the Assistant Chief Administrative Officer from the Head Office of NAFDAC in Abuja, the offices: FCT EID (sic) Office, the Lagos office, Delta office, and the Kaduna offices were used. He advised that these offices have more staff strength and they have more experiences dealing with the policies in question.

Secondly, each of these offices was contacted by phone. With the help of the Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, the number of field officers responsible for each of the policies under study was gotten.

3.4.2 Sample Size

The following are the number of field level staff in each of the offices selected for each of the policy under study:

1. **Herbal Medicines and Related Products (Advertisement) Regulations 2005**

EID Office, Abuja	12
NAFDAC Office Complex, Lagos	18
Zonal Head Quarters, Kaduna	14
NAFDAC Unit Office, Delta	11
Total	**56**

2. **Processed Food Registration Regulations 2005**

EID Office, Abuja	28
NAFDAC Office Complex, Lagos	34
Zonal Head Quarters, Kaduna	21
NAFDAC Unit Office, Delta	15
Total	**98**

Total Sample Size: 56 + 98 = <u>154</u>

3.5 Method of Data Collection

Method of data collection involves the instrument and procedures by which data used for a research analysis is collected (Marshall, 2006). For this work we used the sample survey, for the collection of the primary data. A sample survey is "a process for collecting data on a

sample of observation which are selected from the population of interest" (Haque, 2011). This method is applicable in case study research, and it helps for easy organisation and processing of collected data (Yin, 1999). We also used what McCaston (2005:23) calls "analysis of documents" for collecting secondary data for this study.

3.5.1 Instrument for Data Collection

In case study research, and through the use of sample survey, a questionnaire can be used as an instrument for retrieving data (Yin, 1999). Hence we used a questionnaire to collect the primary data for this study. The questionnaire was designed to provide both quantitative data and qualitative data. In other words, the questionnaire had both closed ended questions and open ended question. We used Leung (2001:3) guide on "How to design a questionnaire" for the development of the questionnaire. A three-point Likert response scale is provided for the measurements of the variables for the first hypothesis, while a five-point Likert response scale is provided for the measurements of the variables for the second hypothesis (See appendix 1 for the questionnaire).

3.5.2 Data Collection Process

The process for collecting data was done in four main parts: Obtain participants; administration of instrument for primary data; collection of secondary data; and final collection of data.

Obtain Participants: Obtaining participants for the research was done with the help of the Assistant Chief Administrative Officer (ACAO) at the Head Office of NAFDAC in Abuja. Following the approval by the Director-General of NAFDAC allowing the researcher to conduct the research in the institution, the researcher

was referred to the ACAO to assist the researcher complete the data collection processes. The ACAO recommended the offices other than the Abuja office from where more participants can be obtained to increase the number of participants. The additional offices are the NAFDAC office complex in Lagos, Zonal Head Quarters in Kaduna State and NAFDAC Unit Office in Delta State. These offices were called by the ACAO to provide the number of staff who fall within the criteria of staff needed for the research.

Administration of Instrument (Questionnaire): Two methods was used to administer the questionnaires. The first was through direct, face-to-face administration. This method was used at the Abuja office and the Kaduna office. The Second method was via mail. Mail method for administering questionnaire, according to Marshall (2006), can be used when the respondents who are to fill the questionnaire are located in a distant area. The ACAO notified the destination offices of the questionnaire and requested that upon completion the questionnaires be mailed back to the Abuja office. The researcher bore the cost of mailing the questionnaires to the destination offices, and back.

Collection of Secondary Data: Official documents from the NAFDAC office which the organisation gave permission to give were collected. The information required from the documents were extracted.

We also expanded our search to online newspapers and journal to get further data that would supplement the data collected from NAFDAC.

Final Collection of Data: The data collection period lasted for 9 weeks. Within this period the mails (questionnaires) expected form the Lagos and Delta state Offices of NAFDAC had been delivered.

3.6 Method of Data Analysis

Once the researcher had completed the fieldwork, by gathering the data needed to solve the research problem, the data was organised and presented to facilitate analysis. The quantitative data, closed ended questions in the questionnaire was presented using tables. The qualitative data or the open ended question was presented using narratives. The narrative method was used based on the format described by Knafi and Howard (2004:12) in their article "Interpreting and reporting qualitative research."

3.6.1 Coding

Jarboe (1999:18) describes coding as the system for establishing meaningful categories for responses, so that the responses can be grouped into usable classifications to facilitate analysis.

The quantitative data was pre-coded when drawing the questionnaire, with the response options being the codes upon which the analysis was based. These codes from the questionnaire was then computed onto a Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) v16 spreadsheet.

The qualitative data was coded by highlighting expressions given by the respondents that are similar. These similar responses are then presented and analysed based on various focus groups as distributed by the participants' demographic characteristics.

3.6.2 Tabulation

Susan (2012:3) defines tabulation as the counting of the numbers of cases falling into various categories. Susan further present two methods of tabulation: manual tabulation and mechanical/electronic tabulation. In this study we used the mechanical/electronic tabulation, using a computer based software, SPSS v16. All calculations of the data and their corresponding tables were done using the Software. The calculation includes both the count of each respective cases and their corresponding percentages.

3.6.3 Test of Hypotheses

Two tools for testing hypothesis was used in this study, one for each hypothesis. For the first hypothesis, a chi-square test was used. A chi-square test can be described as a test applied to nominal data and is concerned with whether the differences between an observed set of frequencies and a theoretical, expected set of frequencies are significant, thus determining the likeliness that the row and column variables are related (Maben, 2004). This tool is the best to measure this hypothesis because, through the hypothesis we measure the present observable behaviour of the field bureaucrats, looking to see if it is significantly different from the already established theoretical expected behaviour.

The level of association is indicated by “p”, the probability that the variables are not related. The smaller the value of p, the higher are the chances that the variables are related. P must be < 0.05 in order to indicate a significant relation (95% or more) thus we reject the null hypothesis in favour of the alternative hypothesis. If $p > 0.05$ there is not a significant relation between the two variables, thus the null hypothesis is not rejected.

The one sample t-test was used to test the second hypothesis. A One sample t-test is a statistical procedure used to examine the mean difference between the sample and the known

value of the population mean(Clark-Foos, 2010:2). This tool is best to measure this hypothesis because it provides information about the mean difference between the different variable within the hypothesis, and also the extent of the difference. Further, it is best for multi variable hypothesis, which this variable has. Again, the level of association is indicated by "p", the probability that the variables have difference in mean. The smaller the value of p, the higher are the chances that the variables have similar mean. P must be < 0.05 in order to indicate a significant relation (95% or more) thus we reject the null hypothesis in favour of the alternative hypothesis. If p > 0.05 there is not a significant relation in the mean between the variables, thus the null hypothesis is not rejected.

Both hypotheses test was calculated using the SPSS v16 software. Each test was calculated at 95% confidence level. For reference purposes the formulas for each hypothesis test tool are denoted as:

Chi-Square:

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$$

Where:

"X^2"represents chi-square (calculated value)

"O" represents the observed frequency

"E" represents the expected frequency

One-Sample t-Test:

$$S = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (X - \overline{X})^2}{n-1}}$$

Where:

S = Standard deviation

$\overline{X}$ = Sample mean

n = number of observations in sample

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Data Presentation

In this chapter we presented and analysed the data collected for this research. As noted in the previous chapter (chapter three), One hundred and fifty-four questionnaires (154) was distributed for data collection. However, One hundred and forty-one (141) questionnaires was returned, fully completed. These 141 questionnaires,which is 91.56% of the total questionnaires distributed, are what provides the primary data for this work, presented in this chapter.

Table 4.1 Questionnaire Distribution Between the two Policies

	Valid		
	Herbal Medicine Regulatory Policy	Processed Food Regulatory Policy	Total
Frequency	47	94	141
Percent	33.3	66.7	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2014

As early noted, 141 questionnaires were returned, fully completed out of 154 questionnaire distributed. The distribution of the 141 questionnaire between the two policies being studied is presented in table 4.1. The Herbal Medicine Regulatory Policy (HMRP) has 47 returned questionnaires out of the 56 questionnaires distributed to participants under this policy. The 47 questionnaires from the herbal medicine policy group forms 33.3 percent of the 141 questionnaires presented in this chapter. The Processed Food Regulatory Policy (PFRP) on the other hand, had 94 questionnaires returned from the 98 questionnaires distributed to this

group of participants. This 94 questionnaires forms 66.7 percent of the total 141 questionnaires used for this study.

In presenting the data, the responses from each group of policies will be presented side by side for proper organisation and ease of understanding.

4.2 Data Analysis

The questionnaire generated two forms of data viz., quantitative data and qualitative data. For proper organisation these two data forms are analysed separately. First the quantitative data is analysed in item 4.2.1 while the qualitative data is analysed in item 4.2.2 Also, this research work also made use of secondary data. These data are analysed in item 4.2.3.

4.2.1 Quantitative Data Analysis

Under this section or item we analysed the quantitative data collected with the questionnaire for this research. The data here are of three groups. First is the **demographic profile** of the participants to this research (item 4.2.1.1). Second is the data that measure the first hypothesis for this study, tagged as **role of field level bureaucrats** (item 4.2.1.2). The third group of data are those that measure the second hypothesis for this work. This is tagged as **level of influence from barriers** (item 4.2.1.3).

4.2.1.1 Demography of Respondents

The first section of the questionnaire was devoted to identifying the demographic profile of the respondents that are relevant to the analysis and further understanding of the data presented. Although no hypothesis was stated that measures the relationships between these

demographic profiles, however, the demographic distribution of the respondents help us to know how different groups responds to various sets of questions.

Table 4.2 Gender of Respondents

			Herbal Medicine and Processed Food Policies		
			Herbal Medicine Regulatory Policy	Processed Food Regulatory Policy	Total
Gender of Respondents	Female	Count	20	60	80
		% within Sex of Respondents	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	Male	Count	27	34	61
		% within Sex of Respondents	44.3%	55.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	47	94	141
		% within Sex of Respondents	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%

Source: Field survey, 2014

The result in table 4.1 indicates that 80 of the participating field bureaucrats are female, while 61 are male. Of the 80 females, 20 (25.0%) are under the HMRP while, 60 (75.0%) are with the PFRP. In the male category, 27 (44.3%) are under the HMRP, while 34 (55.7%) are with the PFRP. Also from the table we see that there are more males (27) than females (20) in the HMRP category.The opposite is however the case with the PFRP, where the females (60) have more counts then males (34). Although the total number of field bureaucrats of NAFDAC is unknown, we can however deduce from this data that more females than males hold field level operations of the organisation.

Table 4.3 Length of Service

			Herbal Medicine and Processed Food Policies		
			Herbal Medicine Regulatory Policy	Processed Food Regulatory Policy	Total
Length of Service	0 – 10	Count	8	20	28
		% within Length of Service	28.6%	71.4%	100.0%
	10 – 20	Count	19	56	75
		% within Length of Service	25.3%	74.7%	100.0%
	20 – 30	Count	20	18	38
		% within Length of Service	52.6%	47.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	47	94	141
		% within Length of Service	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%

Source: Field survey, 2014

Table 4.2 shows the totals of each category of length of service. That is 0 – 10 years has a total of 28 participants; 10 – 20 years has 75 participants, and 20 – 30 years has 38 participants. The bulk of participants fall within the 10 – 20 year category. In comparison however, PFRP has its bulk of participants in the 10 – 20 year category, HMRP on the other hand show a higher count of 20 in the 20 -30 year category.

Table 4.4 Organisational Status

			Herbal Medicine and Processed Food Policies		
			Herbal Medicine Regulatory Policy	Processed Food Regulatory Policy	Total
Organisational Status: (Do you Supervise Employees?)	No	Count	43	86	129
		% within Do you Supervise Employee?	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Yes	Count	4	8	12
		% within Do you Supervise Employee?	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	47	94	141
		% within Do you Supervise Employee?	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%

Source: Field survey, 2014

Table 4.3 distributes the field level bureaucrats into those who are supervisees and those who are supervisors. As shown in the table, 129 of the participating field bureaucrats are not supervisors, while 12 are supervisors. Of the 129 non-supervisory field bureaucrats, 43 (33.3%) are with the HMRP group, while 86 (66.7%) are with the PFRP group. On the other hand, 4 (33.3%) of the supervisory workers are with the HMRP group, while 8 (66.7%) are with the PFRP group.

Table 4.5 Task Carried out by Participants

			Herbal Medicine Policy and Processed Food Policies		
			Herbal Medicine Regulatory Policy	Processed Food Regulatory Policy	Total
Task Carried out by Participants	Carrying out Inspections	Count	27	34	61
		% within Task Carried out by Participants	44.3%	55.7%	100.0%
	Testing of Products	Count	9	33	42
		% within Task Carried out by Participants	21.4%	78.6%	100.0%
	Registration of Products	Count	4	9	13
		% within Task Carried out by Participants	30.8%	69.2%	100.0%
	Sanctioning Defaulting Clients	Count	7	18	25
		% within Task Carried out by Participants	28.0%	72.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	47	94	141
		% within Task Carried out by Participants	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%

Source: Field survey, 2014

Table 4.4 distributes the participants into the various tasks they perform in the process of implementing the policies understudy. Sixty-one (61) are responsible for carrying out inspections of facilities, forty-two (42) engage in product testing, thirteen (13) do registration of products, while twenty-five (25) are responsible for implementing sanctions on defaulting clients. Further, in the category of those who perform inspection of facilities, 27 (44.3%) work for the HMRP, while 34 (55.7%) work for the PFRP. In the category of those performing product texting, 9 (21.4%) work for the HMRP, while 33 (78.6%) work for the PFRP. In the third category, registration of products, 4 (30.8%) and 9 (69.2%) work for the HMRP and the PFRP respectively. Lastly, for those who sanction defaulting clients, 7

(28.0%)are with the HMRP, while 18 (72.9%) are with the PFRP. We can conclude here that most of the field bureaucrats are engaged in carrying out facility inspection making that activity the most sensitive for implementing the policies understudy.

4.2.1.2Role of Field Level Bureaucrats

The second part of the questionnaire deals with the role field level bureaucrats play in relations to policy implementation. What is expected as stated in the theory framework, is that field bureaucrats will lean towards acting in a flexible way in light of the existing barriers in their work environment.

Table 4.6 Role When Carrying out Inspections while Faced with Barriers
n = 61

		Herbal Medicine Regulatory Policy		Processed Food Regulatory Policy	
		Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Time Constraints	Flexible	15	55.6	17	50.0
	Strict	11	40.7	15	44.1
	Undecided	1	3.7	2	5.9
	Total	27	100.0	34	100.0
Information Gap	Flexible	18	66.7	20	58.8
	Strict	9	33.3	13	38.2
	Undecided	0	0.0	1	2.9
	Total	27	100.0	34	100.0
Bureaucratic Procedures	Flexible	5	18.5	11	32.4
	Strict	22	81.5	23	67.6
	Undecided	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Total	27	100.0	34	100.0
Low Motivation	Flexible	12	44.4	12	35.3
	Strict	15	55.6	22	64.7
	Undecided	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Total	27	100.0	34	100.0

Source: Field survey, 2014

Table 4.6 shows what role field level bureaucrats who engage in carrying out inspections for each respective policy, play when faced with different types of barriers while they perform their duties. From the table, when asked how they react when faced with the first barrier, time pressure, more field level bureaucrats(15 or 55.6% for HMRP and 17 or 50.0% for PFRP) indicated that they demonstrate flexibility when carrying out their duties. Eleven (40.7%) of the HMRP workers selected Strict, while 1 (3.7%) selected undecided. On the other hand, 15 (44.1%) of the PFRP participants selected Strict, while 2 (5.9%) chose undecided. This means that time pressure influences field level bureaucrats, making them make some form of compromises while carrying out their responsibilities of inspecting clients facilities.

For the second barrier, information gap, for those responsible for the HMRP, 18 (66.7%) selected flexible, while the remaining 9 (33.3%) of the 27 bureaucrats, selected strict. In the case of the PFRP, 20 (58.8%) selected flexible, 13 (38.2%) selected strict, while 1 (2.9%)selected Undecided. The flexible role has the most selection in both policies, suggesting that information gap does influence field bureaucrats, and likewise, making them to make compromises while carrying out their responsibilities.

For the third barrier, bureaucratic procedures, in the case of HMRP, 5 (18.5%) selected flexible, and the other 22 (81.5%) selected strict. For the PFRP, 11 (32.4%) selected flexible and the other 23 (67.6%) selected strict. In this case, bureaucratic procedure does not influence field bureaucrats to make compromises.

The fourth barrier, low motivation, also does not influence field bureaucrats to make compromises. In the HMRP, 12 (44.4%) selected flexible, while the other 15 (55.6%) selected strict. For the PFRP, 12 (32.3%) selected flexible, while the other 22 (66.7%) field bureaucrats selected strict. The majority of field bureaucrats who selected strict role,

indicating that low motivation low motivation does not influence field bureaucrats to be flexible.

Table 4.7 Role When Carrying out Product Testing While Faced with Barriers

n = 42

		Herbal Medicine Regulatory Policy		Processed Food Regulatory Policy	
		Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Time Constraints	Flexible	5	55.6	22	66.7
	Strict	4	44.4	11	33.3
	Undecided	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Total	9	100.0	33	100.0
Information Gap	Flexible	9	100.0	18	54.5
	Strict	0	0.0	15	45.5
	Undecided	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Total	9	100.0	33	100.0
Bureaucratic Procedures	Flexible	1	11.1	12	36.4
	Strict	8	88.9	21	63.6
	Undecided	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Total	9	100.0	33	100.0
Low Motivation	Flexible	2	22.2	7	21.3
	Strict	7	77.8	26	78.8
	Undecided	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Total	9	100.0	33	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2014

Table 4.7, show field bureaucrats who engage in product testing of both policies, responses to various barriers they face when carrying out their work. In the case of the first barrier, time pressure, 5 (55.6%) of the 9 bureaucrats who implement the HMRP, selected flexible while the other 4 (44.4%) selected strict. For PFRP, 22 (66.7%) of the 33 field bureaucrats selected flexible, while the other 11 (33.3%) selected strict. In both policies, HMRP and PFRP, the

flexible role has the major counts, which indicates that time pressure influences the field bureaucrats who perform the task of product testing make compromises in carrying out their duties.

For the second barrier, information gap, all 9(100%) of the bureaucrats who implement the HMRP selected flexible. In the case of the PFRP, 18 (54.5%) selected flexible, while the other 15 (45.5%) bureaucrats selected strict. In both policies, information gap influences the field bureaucrats, therefore they become flexible in carrying out their duties.

For the third barrier, bureaucratic procedures, in the case of the HMRP, 1 (11.1%) selected flexible, while 8 (88.9%) selected strict. And for PFRP, 12 (36.4%) selected flexible, while 21 (63.6%) selected strict. The higher counts for strict in both policies indicates that field bureaucrats work of testing products is not affected necessary affected by bureaucratic procedures.

The forth barrier is low motivation. In the case of the HMRP, 2 (22.2%) selected flexible, while the other 7 (77.8%) selected strict. In the case of the PFRP, 7 (21.3%) selected flexible, while 26 (78.8%) selected strict. Similar, to bureaucratic procedure, low motivation has very low influence on the role field bureaucrats who carry out product testing play in carrying out that activity.

Table 4.8 Role When Doing Product Registration While Faced with Barriers

n = 13

		Herbal Medicine Regulatory Policy		Processed Food Regulatory Policy	
		Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Time Constraints	Flexible	1	25.0	0	00.0
	Strict	3	75.0	9	100.0
	Undecided	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Total	4	100.0	9	100.0
Information Gap	Flexible	4	100.0	7	77.8
	Strict	0	0.0	2	22.2
	Undecided	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Total	4	100.0	9	100.0
Bureaucratic Procedures	Flexible	2	50.0	5	55.6
	Strict	2	50.0	4	44.4
	Undecided	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Total	4	100.0	9	100.0
Low Motivation	Flexible	0	00.0	2	22.2
	Strict	4	100.0	7	77.8
	Undecided	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Total	4	100.0	9	100.0

Source: Field survey, 2014

Table 4.8shows the responses of field bureaucrats of the influence fromvarious barriers on their responsibility of product registration. In the case of time pressure, of the 4 field bureaucrats who implement the HMRP, 1 (25.0%) selected flexible, while 3 (75.0%) selected strict. For the PFRP, all 9 (100%) bureaucrats selected strict. In this activity on like other, time pressure has no influence on how the bureaucrats carry out their job i.e. they follow the guidelines strictly as spelt out.

For information gap, all 4 (100%) of the HMRP implementing bureaucrats selected flexible. In the case of the PFRP, 7 (77.8%) selected flexible, while the other 2 (22.2%) selected Strict. With the majority of counts on the flexible role, information provides an influence on field bureaucrats who perform product registration in respect to these policies.

In the case of the third barrier, bureaucratic procedures, for HMRP, 2 (50%) of the four respondents selected flexible and the other 2 (50%) selected strict. For PFRP, 5 (55.6%) selected flexible, while the other 4 (44.4%) selected strict. In this case, there is no clear cut majority, hence the result are inconclusive. However, we can deduce that some level of influence exist from bureaucratic procedures, but such influence is not consistent.

For low motivation, all 4 (100%) of the field bureaucrats implementing the HMRP, selected strict. In the case of the PFRP, 2 (22.2%) selected flexible, while the other 7 (77.8%) selected strict. The high count for strict indicates that low motivation does not influence the work of those who carry out product registration for each respective policies.

Table 4.9 Role When Giving Sanction to Defaulting Clients While faced With Barriers

n = 25

		Herbal Medicine Regulatory Policy		Processed Food Regulatory Policy	
		Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Time Constraints	Flexible	2	28.6	8	44.4
	Strict	4	57.1	10	55.6
	Undecided	1	14.3	0	0.0
	Total	7	100.0	18	100.0
Information Gap	Flexible	2	28.6	3	16.7
	Strict	5	71.4	15	83.3
	Undecided	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Total	7	100.0	18	100.0
Bureaucratic Procedures	Flexible	6	85.7	14	77.8
	Strict	1	14.3	4	22.2
	Undecided	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Total	7	100.0	18	100.0
Low Motivation	Flexible	0	00.0	1	5.6
	Strict	7	100.0	16	88.9
	Undecided	0	0.0	1	5.6
	Total	7	100.0	18	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2014

Table 4.9, shows the responses of the field bureaucrats regarding the influence of some barriers on their role of sanctioning defaulting clients for both policies, HMRP and PFRP. For the first barrier, time pressure, 2 (28.6%) of the 7 field bureaucrats implementing the HMRP selected flexible, 4 (57.1%) selected strict, while 1 (14.3%0 selected undecided. For the PFRP, 8 (44.4%) selected flexible, while the other 10 (55.6%) of the 18 respondents selected strict. The strict option has the higher counts, indicating that time pressure does not influence

those responsible for carrying out this function to make compromises when carrying out their duties.

For information gap, 2 (28.6%) of the 7 field bureaucrats implementing the HMRP, selected flexible, while the other 5 (71.4%) selected strict. In the case of the PFRP, 3 (16.7%) selected flexible, while the other 15 (83.3%) selected strict. Strict has most counts, hence information gap do not influence these field bureaucrats decision on sanctioning of defaulting clients in both policies.

In the case of the barrier, bureaucratic procedures, 6 (85.7%) of the 7 respondents implementing the HMRP, selected flexible, while only 1 (14.3%) selected strict. For the PFRP, 14 (77.8%) selected flexible, while the other 4 (22.2%) selected strict. Flexible has the most counts, indicating that the sanctioning function, carried out the field bureaucrats being studied are influenced by bureaucratic procedures.

For low motivation, all 7 (100%) of the respondents implementing the HMRP selected strict. For the PFRP, 1 (5.6%) selected flexible, 16 (88.9%) selected strict, and 1 (5.6%) selected undecided. Strict has the most counts, which indicates that low motivation has no influence on the field bureaucrats' decisions while implementing the part of the policies which gives sanctions to clients who contravenes the guidelines of each respective policies, HMRP and PFRP.

Test of First Hypothesis

H_0: Field level bureaucrats will preferentially choose a flexible role than astrict role when faced with barriers during policy implementation.

H_1: Field level bureaucrats will not preferentially choose a flexible role than astrict role when faced with barriers during policy implementation.

Table 4.10 Chi-Square Tests of First Hypothesis

Herbal Medicine and Processed Food Policies		Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Herbal Medicine Regulatory Policy	Pearson Chi-Square	2.501	6	.868
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.032	1	.859
	N of Valid Cases	47		
Processed Food Regulatory Policy	Pearson Chi-Square	7.784	6	.254
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.210	1	.647
	N of Valid Cases	94		

From the table (4.10), the Pearson Chi-Square statistics, for 6 degrees of freedom, for HMRP, is 2.501. Additionally, it indicated that the significance value or Asymptotic Significance (P-Value) is 0.868, which is greater than the threshold value of 0.05. This means that we do not reject H_0 which states that, field level bureaucrats will preferentially choose a flexible role than astrict role when faced with barriers during policy implementationy.

In the second policy, PFRP, thePearson Chi-Square statistics, for 6 degrees of freedom is 7.784. Additionally, it indicated that the significance value or Asymptotic Significance (P-Value) is 0.254, which is greater than the threshold value of 0.05. Again, we do not reject H_0 which states that, when faced with barrier during policy implementation, field level bureaucrats will preferentially choose a flexible role than astrict role when faced with barriers during policy implementation.

4.2.1.3Level of Influence by Barriers

The third part of the questionnaire was used to determine which barrier from a list of giving barriers influenced field bureaucrats work output the most. From the literature review, information gap provide the most influence on field bureaucrats, above other barriers such as time constraints, bureaucratic procedures and low motivation. The tables below presents the data collected to find out if this is the case.

Table 4.11 Influence of Time Constraints

			Herbal Medicine and Processed Food Policies		
			Herbal Medicine Regulatory Policy	Processed Food Regulatory Policy	Total
Time Constraints	Very Low	Count	3	6	9
		% within Time Constraints	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Low	Count	4	14	18
		% within Time Constraints	22.2%	77.8%	100.0%
	Fair	Count	11	25	36
		% within Time Constraints	30.6%	69.4%	100.0%
	High	Count	13	23	36
		% within Time Constraints	36.1%	63.9%	100.0%
	Very High	Count	16	26	42
		% within Time Constraints	38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	47	94	141
		% within Time Constraints	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%

Source: Field Survey, 2014

Table 4.11 indicates how field bureaucrats rate the influence they receive from time constraints on their jobs. Nine (9) participants considers in the influence to be very low, while eighteen (8) considers in to be low. Thirty-six (36) gave a middle rate of fair, while also,

thirty-six (36) considers the influence to be high, and another forty-two (42) believes the influence to be very high. Those who considers the influence to very high and high (i.e. 78) are far more than those that considers it to be low and very low (i.e. 27).

Looking at each particular policy, the same trend of result in evident. In the HMRP, those who considers the influence to be very high and high (i.e. 29) are far more than those that considers it to be low and very low (i.e. 8). Also in PFRP those who consider the influence to be very high and high (i.e. 49) are far more than those that consider it to be low and very low (i.e. 11). We can conclude that time constraints does influence the work output of the field workers surveyed in this study.

Table 4.12 Influence of Information Gap

			Herbal Medicine and Processed Food Policies		
			Herbal Medicine Regulatory Policy	Processed Food Regulatory Policy	Total
Information Gap	Very Low	Count	1	1	2
		% within Information Gap	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	Low	Count	11	31	42
		% within Information Gap	26.2%	73.8%	100.0%
	Fair	Count	18	23	41
		% within Information Gap	43.9%	56.1%	100.0%
	High	Count	9	31	40
		% within Information Gap	22.5%	77.5%	100.0%
	Very High	Count	8	8	16
		% within Information Gap	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	47	94	141
		% within Information Gap	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%

Source: Field Survey, 2014

In table 4.12, we present the rate of influence information gap has on field bureaucrats work output. In total, Two (2) rates the influence as very low, while forty-two (42) selected the low option. Forty-one (41) choose fair, while forty (40) choose high. Lastly, Sixteen (16) of the participants considers the influence of information gap to be very high. The bulk of choices are within the borders of the scale. With this it is difficult to determine the true rate of influence information gap have on field workers work output based on their opinions. However, the scale "low" has more counts than others (i.e., 42) as such we can imply that the influence of information gap on field bureaucrats' work output is low.

Table 4.13 Influence of Low Motivation

			Herbal Medicine and Processed Food Policies		
			Herbal Medicine Regulatory Policy	Processed Food Regulatory Policy	Total
Low Motivation	Very Low	Count	9	37	46
		% within Low Motivation	19.6%	80.4%	100.0%
	Low	Count	16	30	46
		% within Low Motivation	34.8%	65.2%	100.0%
	Fair	Count	12	12	24
		% within Low Motivation	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	High	Count	5	10	15
		% within Low Motivation	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	Very High	Count	5	5	10
		% within Low Motivation	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	47	94	141
		% within Low Motivation	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%

Source: Field Survey, 2014

In table 4.13, also from the totals, forty-six (46) of the participants selected Very low, and another forty-six (46) selected low as the rate of influence on their work output received from low motivation. Twenty-four (24) selected fair, while fifteen (15) selected high, and lastly ten (10) selected very high. The weight of the scale tilts more to the side of very low and low which combined count of Ninety-two (92) of the total participants. This is also evident in each policy cases. The HMRP and PFRP have combined counts for low and very low to be Twenty-five (25) and Sixty-seven (67) respectively, which is higher than the combined counts for high and very high which are ten (10) for HMRP and fifteen (15) for PFRP. With this we can conclude that low motivation has little influence on the work output of these field bureaucrats.

Table 4.14 Influence of Bureaucratic Procedures

			Herbal Medicine and Processed Food Policies		
			Herbal Medicine Regulatory Policy	Processed Food Regulatory Policy	Total
Bureaucratic Procedures	Very Low	Count	12	15	27
		% within Bureaucratic Procedures	44.4%	55.6%	100.0%
	Low	Count	5	26	31
		% within Bureaucratic Procedures	16.1%	83.9%	100.0%
	Fair	Count	23	35	58
		% within Bureaucratic Procedures	39.7%	60.3%	100.0%
	High	Count	5	15	20
		% within Bureaucratic Procedures	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	Very High	Count	2	3	5
		% within Bureaucratic Procedures	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	47	94	141
		% within Bureaucratic Procedures	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%

Source: Field survey, 2014

Table 4.14 indicates that twenty-seven (27) considers bureaucratic procedure's influence on their work output to be very low. Thirty-one (31) selects low, while fifty-eight (58) selected fair. While twenty (20) considers its influence to be high, five (5) believes it to be very high. The bulk of the responses are at the lower side of the scale with very low and low combining to take fifty-eight (58) participants. Also we see the middle scale taking another fifty-eight (58) participants as well. The high section of the scale are rather low (i.e., 25). With this we

can conclude that bureaucratic procedure as a barrier has low influence on the work output of these field bureaucrats.

Test of Second Hypothesis

H_0: The barrier of information gap has more significant effect on field level bureaucrats during policy implementation than other barriers.

H_1: The barrier of information gap has less significant effect on field level bureaucrats during policy implementation than other barriers.

Table 4.15 One-Sample t-Test for the Second Hypothesis

	Test Value = 0				
				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Lower	Upper
Time Constraints	35.033	140.000	.000	3.393	3.799
Information Gap	36.628	140.000	.000	3.013	3.356
Low Motivation	22.016	140.000	.000	2.066	2.473
Bureaucratic Procedures	29.214	140.000	.000	2.433	2.787

Table 4.15 shows the result of the hypothesis test using the t-test of hypothesis formula on the SPSS v16 platform. The table shows the t-test statistics for each of the barriers, i.e., time constraints being 35.033; information gap being 36.628; low motivation being 22.016; and bureaucratic procedures being 29.214. Also each barrier has a degree of freedom of approximately 140. The Significance text is 0.000 for each barrier which is lower than the threshold value of 0.05. This means that the Null Hypothesis (H_0) can be rejected in favour of the alternative Hypothesis (H_1), which states that, the barrier of information gap has less significant effect on field level bureaucrats during policy implementation than other barriers.

Table 4.16 One-Sample Statistics Showing the Mean of each Barrier

	N	Mean
Time Constraints	141	3.60
Information Gap	141	3.18
Low Motivation	141	2.27
Bureaucratic Procedures	141	2.61

Table 4.16 shows the mean of each of the barriers that help us to know which of the barriers has the most influence on the work output of the participating field bureaucrats. From the table, therefore, time constraints has a mean score of 3.60; information gap has 3.18; low motivation has 2.27; and bureaucratic procedures has 2.61. Time constraints has the highest mean score of 3.60 which means that it provides the most influence on the participating field bureaucrats work output, which further validates the result of the hypothesis test. Low motivation provides the least influence on their work output, providing a mean score of 2.27.

4.2.2Qualitative Data Analysis

In this section we present the qualitative data collected through the questionnaire. This section is divided into two sub-sections, first, is the sub section that deals with the role field level bureaucrats play in policy implementation. The second sub section presents field bureaucrats' views on barriers.

4.2.2.1Field Bureaucrats' View on Their Role in Policy Implementation

Younger workers, those who are working or have worked for a length between 0 – 20 years expressed increased interest in following directives strictly when carrying out their respective

duties. Some of the much older field workers, 20 – 30 years of work, place greater degree of value in being flexible, than they were as young officers.

When asked to identify what values was most important to them with regard to carrying out their jobs, **doing the job as directed, to ensure that mistakes are not made,** and **to please my boss** were frequently mentioned by those who are still younger on the job. However, the motivation for following directives strictly, varied between the group who are 0 – 10 years on the job and those who are 10 – 20 years on the job. For the former group, "job security" was the central motivating factor. For example one of the respondents in this category said, "Doing my job perfectly is my main interest because job are hard to come by and I can't afford to lose this one," and another said, "If my boss continues to be pleased with my work, my job will be safe, I will get promotions, so I have to do my job as directed."

For the latter group, 10 – 20 years on the job, "self-fulfilment" was their major motivating factor for following directives strictly. For example, "I carry out my responsibilities as directed mostly because when the job is done properly I feel satisfied that I have done a good job," was said by one respondent, while another respondent said, "I believe jobs are to be done as directed. From my experience the society becomes better…and in a way you feel happy knowing you have contributed to the improvement in the society."

Some of the workers who have spent more years on the job, 20- 30 years, also identified with **following directives strictly**. The bulk of these groups are those who hold supervisory positions and for them, "leading by good example"and "upholding the corporate image" are their main motivating factors."I value a job well done, I value focus, and I value playing by the rules. As a staff of NAFDAC, it is my responsibility to uphold the corporate image of NAFDAC…," was said by one of the respondents, and another also said, "It is

important that we continuously stick to the rules. We must lead by example, so that those who are coming behind us can continue to do the good job NAFDAC is currently doing."

On the other hand, for those who value being **flexible**, terms such as **helping out** and **beingaccommodating** were frequently used. For example, a respondent said, "There are some people you encounter on the job, looking at their situation you just try to be human and help them out." A similar opinion was shared by another respondent, "I know how had things are in the country. So sometimes I personally try to accommodate people and help them."

Those who have spent 10 – 30 years on the job expressed this view the most. Of note, this group, from spending more years on the job, have grown in confidence and known when and in what circumstances they can give privileges to clients when carrying out their jobs.

When asked how they deal with clients who do not meet mandated requirement as requested by the established policies, responses such as, **referring such cases to the boss** and **discontinuing the process** were frequently mentioned which indicated strict following of directives.Some others mentioned that they"sometimes overlook"such short comings and help their clients "scale though" the process.

Generally, those thatare in line with being strict, are much more in number than those who are in line with being flexible in carrying out their jobs. While the reasons varies for being strict, those who do so with the idea of keeping their jobs and pleasing their bosses are much more in number. Next to this are those who do so (act strictly) because of the personal fulfilment they get from knowing that their jobs are well appreciated and impacts the society generally.For those who opt for being flexible, they do so bearing in mind the challenges their clients may have, predicating their judgment in what they describe as the harsh situation in the society.

4.2.2.2Barriers Encountered by Field Bureaucrats

Apart from the four major barriers that we used in the quantitative phase of this study, we were interested in finding out what other barriers field level bureaucrats face when carrying out their jobs. Therefore, we asked participants to identify the kinds of barriers they encounter when carrying out their duties, which barrier they feel provides the most influence on their work, and what they do to overcome the barriers they face.

Generally, a number of barriers was mentioned. Frequent among them are time pressure, administrative bottle necks, uncooperative clients, lack of knowledge by some clients, locating the address of some clients, inability of some clients to meet mandated requirements, and inadequate information from the public.

The type of barrier mentioned was rather based on the type of job done in the implementation process, and not necessarily on the length of time spent on the job.Importantly, some of these barriers mentioned featured across board, such as time pressure, information inadequacy, and administrative bottle necks.

Specifically, barriers such as, uncooperative clients, and lack of knowledge of the guidelines by some clients, were significantly experienced by those who engage in carrying out facility inspections and who conduct product testing. Two such examples of respondents opinions related to this are, "A particular challenge at work is when I have to deal with clients who do not have knowledge of what is expected of them," and, "There are sometimes you meet with clients that are impossible to deal with. Sometimes, it would just spoil your whole day."

Lack of Information as a barrier, was more frequent among those who engage in sanctioning of defaulting clients. The participants tried to describe the nature of this barrier,

stating that there is still a significant gap in communication from the "general public and the institution" and "We still do not receive a lot of information from the public about product quality and illegal products, so it's a big barrier for us…we could do more if information are always available." (Group who implement sanctions on defaulting clients)

Barrier with the most Influence

When asked to identify the barrier that provides the most influence on their work, time pressure was mostly mentioned among all other barriers. Some participants went further to mention that most other barriers could be "easily managed" if there was time to do so. Three examples of such opinions from our respondents are firstly, "Time pressure for me is the main problem. The time giving to us to do most of our tasks is too short," Secondly, "Time pressure. In fact everything is based on time. If we have more time, we can easily manage all other barriers that we face," and thirdly, "For me it is time. If we have more time we can do some testing of products more carefully rather than rushing them like we currently do."

Followed by time pressure was the barrier of some clients not knowing what was mandated of them. This barrier was identified mostly by those who engage in carrying out inspections and those who conduct product texting, and further, by those who are responsible for the HMRP. For example, a respondents shared, saying that, "Lack of knowledge by our clients for me is the most influential barrier because I see this every now and then, and it is terrible dealing with such people." Another respondent said that, "The problem where one has to deal with people who cannot read or write is the most disturbing barrier."

Overcoming the Barriers

Irrespective of the barriers mentioned above, the participants in this research are still able to carry out their respective jobs. Participants were asked what they do toovercome the barriers

they face in their daily work activities. This question basically, linked the barriers faced by field bureaucrats with the role they play in policy implementation.

Significantly, what they do centre on "referring cases to their immediate bosses", "doing whatever we can within the limited time" and "helping out clients." Those who are younger on the job (0 – 10 year) noted that referring cases which they feel they cannot handle is what they mostly do.

For those who have spent more years on the job, doing what they can within the limited time available, which include helping clients, is what they rely on in completing task in the face of daunting challenges. Three examples of opinions shared by our respondents includes firstly, "We cannot stop work because there are barriers. We just do what we can." Secondly, "Most times we just help clients out. Nothing is perfect. We do the best we can." And lastly, "We rush the procedure most of the time. If we have to wait nothing will be done. Although a little more time will ensure a proper work."

4.2.3Secondary Data Analysis

In this section we analysed the secondary data collected for this work. Secondary data for each policy was collected and are analysed separately. Generally, the secondary data show the extent of implementation carried out by NAFDAC on each of the two policies.

4.2.3.1 Herbal Medicine and Related Products (Advertisement) Regulation, 2005.

The Herbal Medicine and Related Products (advertisement) regulation, 2005 is a regulatory policy by NAFDAC, used for the control of "false claims" by herbal medicine producers, about the efficacy of their products.

The regulatory policy requires that herbal medicine practitioners have their products first, registered with NAFDAC,and then, such product must get "pre-clearance and approval by the Agency" before it is advertised to the general public (NAFDAC, 2005).

Also the regulation spells out the penalty for any herbal medicine practitioners who contravenes the provision of the policy. According to the regulation, evidence of acts of violation is, for an individual, is subject to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year or a fine not exceeding N50,000 or both imprisonment and fine; and in the case of a body corporate, a fine not exceeding N100,000.

Therefore we collected data that show the number of registered herbal medicines which also indicates pre-clearance for advertisement, the number of existing herbal medicines practitioners and products in Nigeria, as well as number of sanctions for violation of the regulations.

Data Showing the Number of Registered Herbal Products and the Number of Existing Herbal Medicine Practitioners and Products

Table 4.17 shows the number of herbal medicines that has been registered and giving pre-clearance and approval for advertisement by NAFDAC under the HMRP.

Table 4.17 Number of Registered Herbal Medicines with Pre-clearance for the Period 2006 – 2013

Year	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	**Total**
No. of Registered Products	78	126	289	258	259	126	157	143	**1436**

Source: NAFDAC official documents on herbal medicine advertisement approval: **"Final Report onpre-clearance and approval for advertisement of herbal products**" dated 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013.

Within the period 2006 – 2013 a total of **1436** herbal products has been registered and given pre-clearance and approval for advertisement. The period from 2008 to 2010 shows a high number of registration, 289, 258 and 259 respectively. Registration however fell in 2011 to about 126,and fluctuating from 2011 to 2013.

There was no source from where the number of existing herbal medicine practitioner and the existing number of herbal products in Nigeria can be found.

Data showing cases of unapproved herbal medicine advertisement and the number of sanction for flouting the HMRP provisions

Data collected showsthat many of the advertised herbal medicines are not registered and do not have approval for advertisement. The first indication of this is reflected in the statement by the Director-General of NAFDAC, who mentioned the need to improve sanctions on illegal Herbal medicine advertisement:

> *We have to weed out the fake from the legitimate practitioners and that is why we are stepping up enforcement from today, illegal advertisement of herbal medicines will attract severe sanction and even a jail term. There is need for sanity in the practice. But we are not going to seat back and watch people take advantage of Nigerians by advertising medicines that has no proven efficacy.* (Source: Vanguard Newspaper, 2013)

Below is a report of a survey that identifies cases of herbal medicines that are advertised without approval from NAFDAC in Nigeria.

Table 4.18 Observed Cases of Unapproved Advertisement of Herbal Medicines in Nigeria

		State								
		Lagos	Abuja	Enugu	Anambra	Kaduna	Rivers	Kano	Oyo	**Total**
Medium of Ads.	[a]Street	168	32	65	87	102	68	175	142	**839**
	[b]Media	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Total		**168**	**32**	**65**	**87**	**102**	**68**	**175**	**142**	**839**

Source: Nwaokocha (2012:240), Journal of Ethnopharmacology. In the report, a: include use of open market spaces, vehicles and hacking. b: include use of newspapers, magazines, television and radio.

In the table above (4.18), cases of herbal medicines advertised without approval form NAFDAC is presented. The survey categorised the medium of advertisement into two viz. street advertisement and media advertisement. The data show that all observed cases (839) of unapproved advertisement were carried out using the street medium. There was no recorded cases for the media category. This indicates that Herbal medicines practitioners rely on street medium for advertising their products. This medium "present lesser probability for their products to be scrutinized by NAFDAC or other regulatory agencies." Further, the average number of cases from the above shown cases is **104**. When multiplied by the number of states we have in Nigeria, Abuja inclusive we would have an estimated total of **3848** cases.

Table 4.19Number ofCompleted Sanctions on Unapproved Herbal Products Advertisement

Year	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	**Total**
No. of sanctioned products	0	0	0	2	7	1	5	2	**17**

Source: NAFDAC official documents on herbal medicine persecutions. Legal Office, Abuja

Table 4.18 shows the number of completed sanctions on unapproved herbal products advertisements. A total of 17 herbal practitioners have been sanctioned for advertising their products without getting registering their product and getting pre-clearance and approval for

advertisement from 2006 to 2013. The highest so far in 7, which was in the year 2010, and which drastically dropped to 1 the following year (2011).

4.2.3.2 Processed Food Registration Regulation, 2005

With the creation of the processed food registration regulation 2005, the Food Products Registration Regulations 1996 was repealed. The new regulation stipulates that "Every processed food manufactured, imported, exported, advertised, sold, or distributed in Nigeria shall be registered in accordance with the provisions of the regulations." It further spell out the penalty for individuals or corporate body who contravenes the provisions of the regulation, thus "Any person who contravenes any of the provisions of these regulations is guilty of an offence and shall be liable on conviction: in the case of an individual, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years or to a fine not exceeding N50, 000 or both imprisonment and fine; and in the case of a corporate body, to a fine no exceeding N100, 000. (NAFDAC, 2005)"

The data collected in the case of processed food registration include the number of registered processed foods; and cases of conviction of unregistered processed food marketers or producers.

Number of Registered Processed Foods

The table below (table 4.20) shows the number of registered processed food in Nigeria from 2006 – 2013.

Table 4.20 Number of Registered Processed Food Products, 2006 – 2013

Year	Pre-2006	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
No. of Registered Products	10,922	1,372	1,229	1,348	1,573	1,670	1,843	1,561	1,835	23,353

Source: NAFDAC Official Documents on number of registered processed food (extract) 2005, 2008, 2011, 2013.

From the table, a total of 23, 353 processed food products has been registered by NAFDAC, covering a span of 17 years (1996 – 2013). However, the table shows the registered products with specific figures for the period 2006 – 2013. The total for this period can be calculated to be 12, 431 products. The data covers all forms of processed foods, as figures for specific categories could not be obtained.

Number of Cases of Conviction of Unregistered Processed Food by NAFDAC

We could not find data that show us the number of existing cases of unregistered processed food in Nigeria,however:

> *"Many processed foods are routinely illegally smuggled into Nigeria through the land boarders, by sea and by air without having gone through the registration process"* (Rondon&Nzeka, 2011).

To control this, the NAFDAC has done much in the area of conviction of those who try to sell such unregistered processed foods as shown in table 4.21 below.

Table 4.21 Number of Conviction Cases of Unregistered Processed Foods in Nigeria

Year	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	**Total**
No. of Sanctioned Products	12	23	34	25	12	23	14	21	**164**

Source: NAFDAC official documents on illegalprocessed foods persecutions. Legal Office, Abuja

In the table, for the period 2006 to 2013, NAFDAC has been able to persecute **164** individuals for sales of unregistered or illegal processed food in the market. 2008 recorded the highest number of persecutions, of 34, and the lowest being 12 in both 2006 and 2010.

Data Showing Incidence of illnesses Caused by Consumption of Processed Foods

The effective regulation of the processed food policy would require a reduction of in incidence of food-burn diseases such as diarrhoea, cholera, and cancer. Data on the incidence of this diseases show a consistent rise. Researchers have associated this increase to come from an increase in the intake of processed foods such as processed meat, milk, and high intake of processed Salt etc(Nigeria Health Watch, 2015). These product are considered to have substantial high level of diarrhoea and cholera causing bacteria (salmonella, Escherichia coli (E. coli)), as well as chemicals and high level of processed salt that leads to cancer.

Table 4.22 Cases of illness and deaths associated with processed food intake

		Estimated minimum number of cases and deaths					Total
		2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	
[a] Diarrhoea	Cases	20,434	68,532	73,456	85,356	76,783	324,561
	Deaths	1,329	1,467	1,730	1,749	778	7,053
[a] Cholera	Cases	9,345	23,458	67,892	12,455	30,398	143,548
	Deaths	576	1,353	2,355	1,245	1,343	6,872
[b] Heart Diseases	Cases	4,677	12,649	12,975	13,874	13,346	57,521
	Deaths	682	8,351	7,543	8,865	8,776	34,217
[c] Cancer	Cases	66,756	76,456	84,431	92,428	102,565	426,633
	Deaths	12,842	17,839	16,824	18,774	19,364	85,643

Sources:a: Nigeria Intergrated Animal and Human Health Management project, 2014
b: Cardiovascular Disease – the Global Virus, 2014
c: Policy and action for cancer prevention, 2014

Between the years, 2009 – 2013, the number of cases of processed food related illnesses has totalled 325,561 for diarrhoea, 143,548 for cholera, 57,521 for heart diseases and 426,633 for

cancer. Also, a larger number of deaths has been recorded from these illness; 7,053 in the case of diarrhoea, 6,872 died from cholera, 34, 217 died from heart diseases and 85,643 from cancer (Table 4.22). These large number of incidences clearly suggest that processed foods in Nigeria are not practically safe for consumption. Table 4.23 shows the percentage increase of the incidence of these diseases.

Table 4.23 Percentage of cases of illness and deaths associated with processed food intake

		2010	2011	2012	2013
Diarrhoea	Cases	335.4%	107.2%	116.2%	90.0%
	Deaths	110.4%	117.9%	101.1%	44.5%
Cholera	Cases	251.0%	289.4%	18.3%	244.1%
	Deaths	234.9%	174.1%	52.9%	107.9%
Heart Diseases	Cases	270.5%	102.6%	106.9%	96.2%
	Deaths	1224.5%	90.3%	117.5%	99.0%
Cancer	Cases	114.5%	110.4%	114.2%	106.4%
	Deaths	138.9%	94.3%	111.6%	103.1%

The average increase in all categories of illness is about 150%. This indicates an alarming increase of these illnesses. Linking this to behavioural role of field bureaucrats at NAFDAC, we can confidently say that the visible flexible role that they adopt in the light of existing barriers, could have resulted in producers, and marketers of these products to carry out the process of producing and distributing processed foods in somewhat lower than the required minimum standard.

4.3Major Findings

Exercising considerable flexibility is the preferred choice of behaviour by field level bureaucrats who are faced with barriers while implementing public policies. This result is consistent with barriers such as time pressure and information gap, but less significant with barriers such as bureaucratic procedures and low motivation. This role of flexibility or of being flexible means that field level bureaucrats in light of being faced with barriers develop simplification mechanisms which allows them to complete their task easily. From a theoretical standpoint, this behaviour hampers the proper implementation of the policy concerned, however we could not make any observation to this fact in both polices which we studied, not necessary because they may not exist, but largely because of unavailability of data. However, with the observation of the behaviour of exercising flexibility, we can assume that the policies are not implemented in the way as to effectively achieve fully the objectives they are set up to achieve.

Time constraint, as a barrier, was found to provide the most influence on the behaviour of field level bureaucrats, in contrary to what the literature suggested, which identified information gap to have the most influence. The function of time in this case, is largely the specific time target that the particular set of field level bureaucrats are giving to complete their tasks. We say specific, because we are aware that public policies do not necessary have termination points, however, within the organisation where in people work so as to bring the policy goals to reality, some set of time frames can be created, by the managers of such institution, as a strategy to motivate its employees to achieve set goals. This time structure, can therefore stand as a barrier as we have observed in the case of NAFDAC and can direct the bureaucrats to resort to simplification of roles or becoming more flexible in

the discharge of their duties, so as to complete their task(s) within the stipulated time frame given.

When field level bureaucrats resort to simplification of role (i.e become flexible) in the discharge of their duties, as a result of barriers, there result a continuous increase of social problems or anomalies. In this case, is saw a continuous increase in the advertisement of herbal products are not verified for their claims, as well as, an increase of illnesses associated with the consumption of unwholesome processed foods.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

This study was set out to further our understanding of how field level bureaucrats, in carrying out their roles, can act to overcome barriers faced by them, during policy implementation, and. The study has also sought to know what field bureaucrats do in order to overcome the barriers they face in their day to day working activities. The benefits of this study are twofold. Firstly, policy executives (those at the top cadre of the public service) can use this information when they develop strategies or plan for policy implementation. Information that show how field bureaucrats respond to the barriers they face and how such responses can affect the success of a policy is very vital for the success of further and present policies. Secondly, the field bureaucrats themselves can understand how the decisions they make in response to existing barriers can affect the objectives of the policy they are implementing, hence they can therefore choose the most suitable behaviour to address barriers and improve policy outcome.

The information for the study was collected in two parts. The first part (**vide chapter two and three**) is a theoretical discussion based on relevant literature and theory on policy implementation barriers, and systematic explanation of how the practical collection of data for the study was carried out. The second part (**vide chapter four and five**) is a practical collection of information directly from the field bureaucrats who are responsible for implementing two policies, the Herbal Medicine and related products Advertisement regulation and the Processed Food Registration Regulation, of the National Agency for Food

and Drug Administration and Control. The rest of this chapter (chapter 5) is a discussion of the conclusions and recommendations, based on the information obtained from this study.

5.2 Conclusion

This study was able to identify what can be considered as the natural behaviour that field level bureaucrats adopt when faced with various kinds of barriers when implementing a policy, and has been able to establish that one thing is not true: that information gap provides the most influence as a barrier on field bureaucrats in respect to policy implementation. What is true, therefore, is that time constraints provides the most influence as a barrier.

The behaviour which we thus consider as a natural response of field bureaucrats to barrier, arise in the fact that, the findings is consistent with theoretical postulations made by Lipsky (1980) and other empirical research findings, among which were carried out by Brodkin (1997:28), Meyers and Vorsanger (2003), both in America, and Winter (2002) in Denmark. With this study providing the same result, we can conclude that the result can be generalized, therefore implying that, field level bureaucrats wherever they are ones faced with barriers are more likely to adopt coping mechanisms (being flexible) by simplifying the implementation procedures of a policy which may hamper the overall policy achievements. What re-enforces this behaviour on the part of the field bureaucrats, is the idea they have that developing such coping mechanism or being flexible with procedures, is the ideal method in which theycan use to overcome the barriers and provide some level of implementation, successful or skewed.

Although what this research could not answer, what is the direct implication on the policies, these field bureaucrats implement, as a result of their coping behaviour. What is needed to be known here is what kind of impact does the coping mechanisms field

bureaucrats develop have on policy implementation. However, what we have presented provides a strong foundation to build on, and surely as we do so, we can provide solid knowledge which we can use to ensure increased policy implementation success.

5.3 Recommendations

Following the conclusion made, from the finding of the study,we make the following recommendations:

1. Attention should be paid to the behaviour of field bureaucrats on duties, in such a way as to ensure that the behaviour they depict are those that will not compromise the policy in their care, so as to ensure more positive outcomes. This may be done by paying more attention toorganisational structure at the lower hierarchical level where field bureaucrats operate; strengthening the structure to ensure more productive behaviour.
2. Policy executives can adopt a workable time management system that would ensure that field bureaucrats are not constrained as a result of time, which will help them manage other barriers that challenges them.

Areas Needing Further Research

3. Already in our conclusion we highlighted the fact that this study was unable to answer the question, what is the direct implication on the policies, these field bureaucrats implement, as a result of their coping behaviour? Engaging in further research to find the relationship between field bureaucrats coping behaviour and policy implementation, particularly within the Nigerian context, will further improve understanding of the analysis of public policy implementation barriers.

4. Also, further research can be carried out to identify more, specific, coping behaviours that field bureaucrats develop, in a range of diverse context of field level bureaucracy. For example, of teachers, doctors, police officers etc. Such researches can produce result than can help us determine if field bureaucrats adopt the same coping behaviours and if not what differences exist. And further, if the impact on policy are similar or different.

REFERENCES

Aborishade, S. A. (2012) Food safety and foodborne disease in 21st century home: A Nigerian perspective. *International Journal of Environmental Research 12*(4): S142 – 9 In Press: PubMed.

Aminu, A. A., Tella, C. M., &Mbaya, P. Y.(2012) Public policy formulation and implementation in Nigeria. *Public Policy and Administration Research.(2)*5 Retrieved from www.iiste.org on January 11, 2013

Blandford, D. (2007). Information deficiencies in agricultural policy design, implementation and monitoring. *OECD Food, Agriculture and Fisheries Working Papers*, No. 6, OECD Publishing. doi:10.1787/067228574571

Bressers, H. (2004) Implementing sustainable development: how to know what works, where, when and how. In W. M. Lafferty & E. Eldgar, *Governance for Sustainable Development: The Challenge of Adapting Form to Function*. London: Cheltenham. Pp. 284–318

Brodkin, E.Z. (1997). Inside the Welfare Contract: Discretion and Accountability in State Welfare Administration. *Social Service Review* (March): Pp 1 – 33

Chaudhary, P. (2012). Effect of employees' motivation on organisational performance – A case study. *International Journal of Research in Economics and Social Sciences 2*(9). Retrieved from: www.eurosiapub.org on April 15, 2013

Clark-Foos, A. (2010) Hypothesis testing with t Tests. Retrieved from www.personal.umd.umich.edu/~acfoos/Course/381/Hypothesis%Testing%20with%20t%20Tests.pptx on August 21, 2014

Danish, R. Q. &Munir, Y. (2011). The Impact of motivation on employees' commitment: Evidence from public and private sector of Pakistan. Retrieved from www.wbiconpro.com/421-Rizwan.pdf, on April 15, 2013

Dawson, A. & Catherine, O. (2002). Practical research methods, New Delhi: UBS Publishers

Dean, E. (1972) Plan Implementation in Nigeria: 1962 – 1966. Ibadan: Oxford University Press

Dey, I. (1993) Qualitative data analysis: A user friendly guide for social scientist. London: Routledge Publishers

Edevbaro, D. (1996) A review of social policy implementation in Nigeria with emphasis on education. *UNU World Institute for Development Economics Research (UNU/WIDER)* Helsinki. Retrieved from www.wider.unu.edu>publications>workingpaper>previousseries, on February 20, 2013

Egonmwan, J. A. (1984). Public policy analysis: concepts and applications, Benin City: S.M.O. Aka and Brothers Press

Enang, E. E. &Ushie, M. (2012) Culture and policy implementation: An appraisal of population policy in Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* Vol. 2 No 17. Retrieved from www.ijhsset.com/../23.pdf, on February 20, 2013

Ezema, C. C. (2009) Monetary policy framework in Nigeria: Formulation and implementation challenges. *African Institute of Applied Economics Monthly Seminar,* August. Retrieved from www.aiaenigeria.org/publications, on February 20, 2013

Harries, A. D. and Cullinan, T. (2008) the dangers of traditional eye medicine. In Igweze Nkeiruka, OrisakweEbere and ObianimeAtuboyedia (2012) Nigerian herbal remedies and heavy metals: Violation of standard recommended guidelines. *Asian pacific Journal of Tropical Biomedicine.* Retrieved from www.apjtb.com/zz/2012s3/44.pdf, on May 14, 2014

Haque, M. (2011) Sampling methods in social research. West Bangal. VisvaBharati Publisher.

Hesketh, E. A. &Laldlaw, J. M. (2003) Quantitative research. *Education Development Unit NHS Education for Scotland.* Retrieved from www.

http://www.edu.plymouth.ac.uk/resined/quantitative%20methods%202/qualrsh m.htm, on March 5, 2013

Hood, C. (1976) The limits of administration. London: John Wiley and Sons.

Hjern, B. & Hull, C. (1982) Implementation research as empirical constitutionalism. *European Journal of Political Research* 10: 105 – 115

Ifeadike, C. O., Ironkwe, O. C., Adogu, P. O. U., Nnebue, C. C., Emelumadu, O. F., Nwabueze, S. A., and Ubajaka, C. F. (2012) Prevalence and pattern of bacteria and intestinal parasites among food handlers in the Federal Capital Territory of Nigeria. *Nigerian Medical Journal, 53*(3) pp 166 -171 doi: 10.4103/0300-1652.104389

Ifenkwe, G.E. (2012) Food safety regulations: reducing the risk of food-borne diseases in rural communities of Abia state, Nigeria. *Agricultural Science Research Journals 2*(7), pp. 384-389, Retrieved from www.resjournals.com/ARJ, on April 21, 2013

Jarboe, G.R. (1999) The marketing research project manual. Fourth edition. Ohio: South-Western College Publishing

Kent, R.A. 1993. Marketing research in action. New York: Routledge

Krejcie, R. V. &Knafl, K. A. and Howard, M. J. (2004) Interpreting and reporting qualitative research. *Research in Nursing and Health 7*pp 17 – 24. Retrieved from www.arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/bitstream/10150/186048/1/azu_td_9307707_sip1_m.pdf, on April 15, 2013

Leung, W. C. (2001) How to design a questionnaire. *Student BMJ Vol. 9.* Retrieved from www.studentBMJ.com, on April 23, 2013

Lewis, J. & Flynn, R. (1979) The Implementation or urban and regional planning policies. *Policy and Politics 7*, 2: 123 – 142

Lipsky, Michael (1980). Street-Level Bureaucracy. Dilemmas of the individual in public services. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

Maben, A. F. (2004) Chi-square text. Retrieved from http://www.enviroliteracy.org/pdf/materials/1210.pdf, on May 3, 2013

Makinde, T. (2005) Problem of policy implementation in developing nations: The Nigerian experience. *Journal of Social Science11*(1) pp 63 – 69. Retrieved from www.krepublishers.com/02-journals/.., On February 20, 2013

Mallet, A., Nye, S., & Sorrell, S. (2011). Policy options to overcome barriers to industrial energy efficiency in developing countries, *United Nations Industrial Development organisation (UNIDO), working paper 13.* Retrieved from www.unido.org/../wp132611.Ebook.pdf, on April 15, 2013

Manzoor, Q. (2012). Impact of employees' motivation on organisational effectiveness. *European Journal of Business and Management 3*(3). Retrieved from www.iiste.org/.../150, on April 15, 2013

Marshall, C. (2006) Data collection methods. SagePublication. Retrieved from www.sagepub.com/ump-data/10985_Chapter_4.pdf, on April 15, 2013

Marshall, M. N. (1996) Sampling for qualitative research. *Family Practice 13*(6). Great Britain: Oxford University Press

May, P. J. (2004) Regulatory implementation: Examining barriers from regulatory processes. *Prepared for HUD workshop on Regulatory Barriers, April, 22.* Washington D. C. Retrieved from www.huduser.org/rbc, on February 20, 2013

McCaston, M. K. (2005) Tips for collecting, reviewing and analysing secondary data. *Partnership & Household Livelihood Security Unit.* Retrieved from www.egyptdocs.doc, on April 15, 2013

McKenzie, A. (2012) Strengthening the policy implementation gap – State/Federal working relationship in the Nigerian health sector. *Submitted to PRRINN- MNCH and PHI*. Retrieved from www.medicusmundi.org/en, on February 20, 2013

Meyers, M. K. and Vorsanger, S. (2003) Street-level bureaucrats and the implementation of public policy. . In Handbook of public administration, ed. B. Guy Peters and John Pierre, 245-255. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publishing company.

Morgan, D.W. (2004) Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*30, pp 607-610.

NAFDAC (2005) Herbal medicine and related products (advertisement) regulation. Retrieved form www.nafdac.gov.ng, on March 12, 2013

NAFDAC (2005) Processed food registration regulations. Retrieved form www.nafdac.gov.ng, on March 12, 2013

NAFDAC. Final report on pre-clearance and approval for advertisement of herbal products (official Documents) dated – 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013.

Nigeria Health Watch (2015) How Safe is our food? Retrieved from www.nigeriahealthwatch.com/how-safe-is-our-food/ on April 16, 2015

Nigeria Integrated Animal and Human Health Management project (2014) Assessment of risks to human health associated with meat from different chains in Nigeria: using the example of the beef value chain. International Livestock Research Institute

Nwaokocha, A. E. (2012) The growth and relevance of herbal medicine in modern Nigeria. *Journal of Ethnopharmcology 111*pp 233 – 245 Retrieved from www.sciencedirect.com, on August 24, 2014

Nwosu, D. C, and Okafor, H. O. (2014) Government revenue and expenditure in Nigeria: A disaggregated analysis. *Asian Economic and Financial Review 4*(7): 877-892

Obinna, C. (2013, April 9) Illegal advertisers of trado-medicine will be jailed – NAFDAC. *Vanguard Newspaper.* Retrieved from http://www.vanguardngr.com/2013/04/illegal-advertisers-of-trado-medicine-will- be-jailed-nafdac/,on April 23, 2013

Olaoye, O. (2013) Why policies fail in Nigeria: An evaluation of agriculture policies made from 1972 – 1985. *Journal of Sustainable Development.* Retrieved from www.papers.ssrn.com, on February 21, 2013

Omololu, F. &Akanni, O.(2004) Slow progress: An analysis of implementation of policies and actors on HIV/AIDS care and treatment in Nigeria. *Journalist against Aids* Retrieved from www.nigeria-aids.org/documents, on March 3, 2013

Omotayo, R. K. &Denloye, S. A. (2002)The Nigerian experience on food safety regulations.*FAO/WHO Global Forum of Food Safety Regulators:*Marrakesh. Retrieved from http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/004/ab538e.htm, on April 28, 2013

Orhii, P. (2013) in Obinna, C. (2013) Illegal advertisements of trado-medicine will be jailed – NAFDAC. *VanguardNewspaper*. Retrieved from http://www.vanguardngr.com/2013/04/illegal-advertisers-of-trado-medicine-will-be-jailed-nafdac/, on May 3, 2013

Polski, M. M. &Ostrom, E. (1999) An institutional framework for policy analysis and design. *Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis*. Retrieved from www.mason.gmu.edu/../PolskiOstromIAD.pdf, on March 29, 2013

Paki, F. A. E. &Ebienfa, K. I. (2011) Public policy in Nigeria: An implementation paradox. *Journal of Social Science and Public Policy,* Volume 3. Cenresin Publications. Retrieved from www.cenresinpub.org, on January 10, 2013

Park, S. H., Lee, E. H., Blackman, J., Ertmer, P. J., Simons, K. &Belland, B. R. (2005) Examining the barriers encountered when planning and implementing technology- enhanced PBL in the middle school classroom. Retrieved from www.futurescholars.rutgers.edu, on March 29, 2013

Riggs, F. (1969) The future: Research problem and priorities. In M. D. Reagan, Administration of public policy. Illinois: Scott, Freeman and Company

Sabatier, P. &Mazmanian, D. (1980) The implementation of public policy: A framework of analysis. *Policy Studies Journal Symposium on Successful Policy Implementation* 8: 538 – 560

Sabatier, P. & Jenkins-Smith, H. C. (1999), The advocacy coalition framework: an assessment. In P. Sabatier (Ed.), *Theories of the policy process*, Boulder: Westview Press, pp. 117-168.

Schoenbach, V. J. (2004) Data analysis and interpretation. pp 451 – 499 Retrieved from www.epidemiolog.net, on January 10, 2013

Smith, M. J., Richards, D., Geddes, A., &Mathers, H. (2011) "Analysing policy delivery in the United Kingdom: The case of street crime and anti-social behaviour." *Public Administration an International Quarterly 89*(3) pg 975 – 1000 Oxford: Blackwell publishing Ltd. doi: 10.1111/j.1467- 9299.2010.01892.x

Sonneveldt, E., Shaver, T., &Bhuyan,A. (2008) Understanding operational barriers to family planning services in conflict-affected countries: Experiences from Sierra Leone. *USAID/Health Policy Initiative*. Retrieved from www.healthpolicyinitiative.com, on March 6, 2013

Sotoye, O. &Ayodele, T. (2011) Public-Private Partnership: Will it fix infrastructure in Nigeria? *Initiative for public policy analysis: Policy paper:* November. Retrieved from www.indefenceofliberty.org/story, on January 10, 2013

Spratt, K. (2009) Policy Implementation Barriers Analysis: Conceptual Framework and Pilot Text in Three Countries. Washington, D. C: Futures Group

Statistics Denmark (2009) The importance of reliable and available information for development. Denmark.Retrieved from www.dsk.dk/~/media/sc4/Guide/about-..., on April 15, 2013

Stephenson, R. &Hennink, M. (2005) Barriers to Family Planning Service Use among the urban Poor in Pakistan. Retrieved from www.eprints.soton.ac.uk, on March 8, 2013

Sule, J. G. Alinno, F. C. &Ikwegbe, D. (2013) Rural economic development: Policy implementation in Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences(3)*2. Retrieved from www.hrmars.com/journals, on January 11, 2013

Susan, E. W. (2012) Benefits of using cross tabulation is survey analysis. Retrieved from www.snapsurveys.com/blog/benefits-cross-tabulations-survey-analysis,on August 21, 2014

Sutton, R. (1999) The Policy Process: An Overview. *Overseas Development Institute*: London. Retrieved from www.eldis.org/../doc7279.pdf, on January 11, 2013

Turner, D. W. (2010) "Qualitative interview design: A practical guide for novice investigators". *The Qualitative Report 5*(3) 754-760 Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR15-3/qid.pdf, on April 26, 2013

Wali, M. A. (2010) The Dynamics of Policy Implementation in Nigeria: The Case of Sokoto State. New York: Iuniverse, Inc.

Watt, S., Sword, W., & Kruger, P. (2005) Implementation of a health care policy: An analysis of barriers and facilities to practice change. *BMC Health Service Research: (5)*53. Retrieved from www.biomecentral.com, on January 10, 2013

Winter, S. C. (2002) Explaining street-level bureaucrats' behaviour in social and regulatory policies. *Danish National institute of Social Research.* Paper prepared for the 2002 annual meeting of the American political science association in Boston. Retrieved from www.sfi.dk/Admin/Public/Download.aspx/file=Files%2FFForskerfiler%2Fsoren_winter%2FAPSA02_SCW3.pdf on May 12, 2014

World Cancer Research Fund (2014) Policy and action for cancer prevention. Food, nutrition and physical activity: a global perspective. Washington DC: AICR

Yaro, K. (1991) An Evaluation of Plan Implementation in Gongola State 1981 – 1985. Unpublished Project (MPA) Located at Department of Public Administration Library, ABU Zaria

Zaman, J. (2014) Cardiovascular Disease – the global virus. Norfolk: University of East Anglia press

Yin, R. K (1994). Case study research: Design and methods. (2nd Edition) Thousand Oaks: Sage

APPENDIX 1

QUESTIONNAIRE

C/o Dept. of Public Admin.
Faculty of Administration
Ahmadu Bello University
Zaria
12th May, 2014

Dear Participant,

We kindly request your participation in an ongoing research that looks into **understanding the barriers facing the implementation of public policies**. The questionnaire attached represents a section of data to be collected for the completion of the research work. The questionnaire was designed to mask the identity of participants to this research, hence participant confidentiality is guaranteed.

As a participant we may like to hear your stories, experiences gained from carrying out your work. We would be very grateful for your time and stories. Also, information provided will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Thank you.
Faithfully,

Omamugho, O.
Lead Researcher

Below are various questions which if completed would help achieve the objectives of this research.

Tick the boxes that best describes your opinion. ☑

Section A (Background of Respondents)

1. Sex: Male ☐ Female ☐

2. Length of service

0 - 10 years	
10 - 20 years	
20 - 30 years	
30 - 35 years	

3. Organisational Status (Do you supervise employees?):

Yes ☐ No ☐

Section B

4. When carrying out you duty of inspections of facilities what role do you adopt when faced with the following barriers:

Time Constraints	Flexible	
	Strict	
	Undecided	
Information Gap	Flexible	
	Strict	
	Undecided	
Bureaucratic Procedures	Flexible	
	Strict	
	Undecided	
Low Motivation	Flexible	
	Strict	
	Undecided	

5. When carrying out you duty of testing of products what role do you adopt when faced with the following barriers:

Time Constraints	Flexible	
	Strict	
	Undecided	

Information Gap	Flexible	
	Strict	
	Undecided	

Bureaucratic Procedures	Flexible	
	Strict	
	Undecided	

Low Motivation	Flexible	
	Strict	
	Undecided	

6. When carrying out you duty of registration of products what role do you adopt when faced with the following barriers:

Time Constraints	Flexible	
	Strict	
	Undecided	

Information Gap	Flexible	
	Strict	
	Undecided	

Bureaucratic Procedures	Flexible	
	Strict	
	Undecided	

Low Motivation	Flexible	
	Strict	
	Undecided	

7. When carrying out your duty of sectioning clients who contravene the policy what role do you adopt when faced with the following barriers:

Time Constraints	Flexible	
	Strict	
	Undecided	

Information Gap	Flexible	
	Strict	
	Undecided	

Bureaucratic Procedures	Flexible	
	Strict	

	Undecided	

Low Motivation	Flexible	
	Strict	
	Undecided	

Section C

Rate the level of influence the following barriers have on your work output

8. Influence of Time Constraints

Very Low ☐ Low ☐ Fair ☐ High ☐ Very High ☐

9. Influence of Information Gap

Very Low ☐ Low ☐ Fair ☐ High ☐ Very High ☐

10. Influence of Low Motivation

Very Low ☐ Low ☐ Fair ☐ High ☐ Very High ☐

11. Influence of Bureaucratic procedures

Very Low ☐ Low ☐ Fair ☐ High ☐ Very High ☐

Section D

12. What values are most important to you when carrying out your job?

_____
_____
_____
_____

13. How do you deal with clients who do not meet the mandated requirements for registration or inspection of product standard as requested by the policy you implement?

_____
_____
_____
_____

14. What kinds of barriers do you encounter when carrying out your duties?

_____
_____
_____
_____

15. Of these barriers you identified, can you rate the barriers, according to that which provides the most influence on your job?

_____
_____
_____
_____

16. What do you do to overcome these barriers you face when carrying out your duties?

_____
_____
_____
_____

Thank you very much for your participation.