

VOL. 2 NO. 1 2016



ISSN - 2536-7358

IJAD

ILORIN JOURNAL OF ADMINISTRATION AND DEVELOPMENT



**JOURNAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
UNIVERSITY OF ILORIN, NIGERIA.**

VOL. 2 NO. 1 2016



ISSN - 2536-7358

IJAD

ILORIN JOURNAL OF ADMINISTRATION AND DEVELOPMENT



**JOURNAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
UNIVERSITY OF ILORIN, NIGERIA.**

Prof. Abdulganiyu Ambali (OON)
Vice Chancellor, University of Ilorin

Editorial Board

Dr. Osezua Ehiyamen M.
Founding Editor-in-Chief

Prof. Jackson Olujide
Chairman, Editorial Board

Prof. S. T. Babatunde
Language Editor

Editorial Assistants
Bello Muhammed Lawal
Abdulkareem Abdulrazaq
Umar Abubakar

Production Managers
Samuel Oyedele
Akindele Iyiola Ph.D

Editorial Advisory Board

Prof. Haruna Diakwa
Department of Political Science,
University of Maiduguri

Prof. Saliu Hassan
Department of Political Science,
University of Ilorin

Prof. Kunle Ajayi
Department of Political Science,
Ekiti State University

Prof. Gberrebie Daniel
Department of Public Administration
Covenant University, Ota

Prof. Matthew Okotoni
Department of Public Administration
Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife

Prof. Adejo Odoh
Department of Local Government
and Development Studies,
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria

Prof. Shehu Dalhatu
Department of Political Science,
Bayero University, Zaria

Prof. Sat. Obiyan
Department of Political Science
Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife

Prof. Mrs. Juliana Taiwo Makinde
Department of Public Administration
Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife

Dr. Akin Olufowose
Institute of Public Administration of Nigeria,
Abuja

Prof. Sharlene Swartz
Human Social Research Council
South Africa

Prof. Solomon Akinboye
Department of Political Science
University of Lagos, Akoka

Dr. Nandita Kaushal
Associate Professor,
Department of Public Administration
University of Lucknow, Lucknow, India

Prof. Charles Ukeje
Department of International Relations
Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife

Prof. Albert Isaac Olawale
Institute of African Studies
University of Ibadan, Ibadan

Prof. Amusan Lere
Department of Political Science
North-West University, Mafikene Campus,
South Africa

Prof. Fajonyomi Banji
Department of Public Administration
Lagos State University, Ojo

ABOUT THE JOURNAL

Ilorin Journal of Administration and Development is a bi-annual multidisciplinary publication of the Department of Public Administration of University of Ilorin, Nigeria. IJAD welcomes conceptual, theoretical, empirical and policy research papers particularly where such contribute to the dissemination of ideas in the broad areas of Public Administration, Management, Public Policy and Globalisation, Development Studies, Political Science, Organisational Management, Social Milieu, Geo-Informatics, Business Administration, Gender Studies, Conflict, Peace and Security, Climate Change, Industrial Relations & Personnel Management, Community Development, Financial Management, Tourism, Environmental issues and other related fields. It invites scholars and researchers from management and social sciences, humanities and other relevant disciplines to make scholarly contributions to its June and December editions every year. The central focus of IJAD is to provoke fresh insight on the nexus between administration and development by providing a platform for critical and vibrant intellectual confrontation on existing and emerging issues in Africa and the world.

INFORMATION FOR CONTRIBUTORS

Ilorin Journal of Administration and Development is a peer-reviewed publication with manuscripts anonymously assessed by at least two reviewers. Submission of manuscripts to IJAD implies that author(s) are committed to publishing in the journal. It also presupposes that the same article is not being simultaneously submitted to any other publishing outlet nor has it been published elsewhere with a content that is evidently similar.

Manuscripts

Articles must be written in English language and should not exceed 6,000 words and 15 pages together with references, typed in double-spacing on one side of A4-size paper with minimum of standard 1.5 inch margin and referencing done in APA style (6th ed.). The title page of the paper should indicate full names and addresses (i.e. institutional affiliation, if any) of the author(s). It should be accompanied with an *abstract* not exceeding 250 words and maximum of ten (10) keywords for indexing purposes. The acceptable word processing packages are Microsoft and Word Perfect, (please indicate whichever), Times New Roman font with size 12. Authors should be consistent on the writing style (British or America) adopted.

Referencing

References must be arranged in alphabetical order and typed in single line spacing at the end of the paper and should contain full bibliographical details. Where citations include works of multiple authors, the full name of most senior author with addition of *et al* will suffice. If however, authors are not more than two, the full names of the authors should be provided – (surname and initials will suffice in all cases). Works done by the same author should be listed in the chronological order of publication.

Submission and Correspondence

Authors of well researched articles are to submit three hard copies together with corresponding electronic copy of the paper to the:

Editor-in-Chief

Ilorin Journal of Administration and Development, Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria.

E-mail: ijad.unilorin@gmail.com or osezuaomo2002@yahoo.com, osezua.em@unilorin.edu.ng

All articles submitted to the Journal must be original and should in no way violate any existing copyright and publication ethics relating to libel and others.

Additional guidelines

Once accepted, the articles can only be submitted to another journal or published in any other form with the consent of the Editor-in-Chief. Copyright of an article published in the journal belong to the journal, which reserves the right to publish it in a form of language of its choice.

Authors should provide the necessary permission for the publication of any copyright material they wish to include in their articles.

Papers accepted for publication are subjected to peer review mechanism. The Editorial Board reserves the right to determine which articles may be accepted for publication and only the authors whose papers are adjudged publishable may be communicated as necessary. Authors are advised to enclose two self-addressed envelopes for possible reply.

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

We are delighted to introduce to you the second issue of our journal for 2016. This edition is a true reflection of the central focus of the journal, in that, it captures articles which address critical existing and emerging issues with policy implications for administration and development. In the first article, *Women and Governance in the Nigerian University System*, Moti, Ukertor Gabriel examines women involvement in leadership positions in selected Nigerian within a period of five years (2009-2013) and reveals that although obstacles to women involvement in the University decision-making positions still persist, there has been improvement in the involvement of women in University leadership and governance in recent years. Aremu Fatai, Isiaq Atanda and Aluko Opeyemi in their article, *Managing Democratic Structures in Africa: The Way Forward*, seek to interrogate democracy in Africa and the existing institutions in the face of administrative letdown with the adoption of the afro barometer database round six 2015 in the analysis of level of democracy in four selected states in Africa with selected institutions: the executive, the legislature, the judiciary and the security sector. In the article, *Women Educational Empowerment as Panacea for Nation-Building*, Abdullahi Muhammad, Lawan Ibrahim and Umar Abubakar x-ray the current educational status of women in Nigeria against the notion that women constitute almost 50% of the country's population but contribute very little in the nation-building, and conclude that despite the current wave of globalisation, women especially in the North are still lagging behind in education due to poverty, religious and socio-cultural beliefs. Samuel Oyedele explores *Communication Management for Effective Local Government Administration in Nigeria*; arguing that local government administration in Nigeria has not been efficient enough to contribute meaningfully to national development and submits that a major factor influencing the efficiency and effectiveness of local governments in Nigeria is organizational communication which, if effectively carried out, will ensure greater efficiency and development in local government administration. In the article, *Evaluation of Planning Strategies for Development Administration in Nigeria*, Alabi Abdullahi, Ameen Abdullateef and Arinze Okpala seek to know why efforts made by both military and civilian governments to achieve national development in Nigeria since 1960 have yielded little or no results. They conclude that lack of political will, corruption, lack of data bank, insufficient machinery and technology were responsible for failure of development programmes in the country. Osezua Ehiyamen, and Nkogbu, Godfrey Oshilim in their article, *Managing Changes in Organizational External Environment: The Role of Human Resource Managers* contends that, given the fast pace of changes in the external environment facing organizations, human resource managers must keep with the pace if they are to succeed and remain relevant. The paper concluded that changes are inevitable in organizations and the human resource management field is not exempted from such changes. Olaniyan, Samson Olajide examines *Governance and Food Security in Nigeria between 1996 and 2014* using Principal Component Analysis and Generalized Method of Moments. The result showed that governance has a positive and significant relationship with food security and agricultural production in Nigeria. The study concluded by emphasizing the importance of management and governance in Nigeria in order to achieve food security and high agricultural production. In the article, *E-Government in Nigeria: Progress and Prospects*, Abdulkareem Abdulrazaq, and Ishola Abdulrasaq investigate the level of progress and the drawbacks that have inhibited the fast development of E-Government in Nigeria after sixteen years of introduction in the country, and conclude that performance has been a mix of failure and success over the period. Lastly, Ebenezer Ejalonibu Lawal and Opeyemi Idowu Aluko in their article, *Election Management and Democratisation Process in Nigeria's Fourth Republic*, adopt the system and decision making theories in analysing the extent of stability in the polity at post election years, and conclude that good governance and the use of constitutional provisions are instrumental in resolving electoral disputes.

Osezua Ehiyamen Mediayanose., Ph.D
 Editor-in-Chief
 Ag. Head of Department

CONTENTS

Editorial Comments	vii
Articles	
Women and Governance in the Nigerian University System	1-10
<i>Moti, Ukertor Gabriel, Ph.D</i>	
Managing Democratic Structures in Africa: The Way Forward	11-20
<i>Aremu Fatai, Ph.D, Isiaq Atanda and Aluko Opeyemi</i>	
Women Educational Empowerment as Panacea for Nation-Building	21-27
<i>Abdullahi Muhammad, Lawan Ibrahim and Umar Abubakar</i>	
Communication Management for Effective Local Government Administration in Nigeria	28-34
<i>Samuel .O. Oyedele</i>	
Evaluation of Planning Strategies for Development Administration in Nigeria	35-44
<i>Alabi Abdullahi, Ameen Abdullateef and Arinze Okpala</i>	
Managing Changes in Organizational External Environment: The Role of Human Resource Managers	45-51
<i>Osezua Ehiyamen, Ph.D, and Nkogbu Godfrey Oshilim</i>	
A Principal Component Analysis of Governance and Food Security in Nigeria	52-58
<i>Olaniyan, Samson Olajide, Ph.D</i>	
E-Government in Nigeria: Progress and Prospects	59-67
<i>Abdulkareem Abdulrazaq and Ishola Abdulrasaq</i>	
Election Management and Democratisation Process in Nigeria's Fourth Republic	68-78
<i>Ebenezer Ejalonibu Lawal, Ph.D and Opeyemi Idowu Aluko</i>	

EVALUATION OF PLANNING STRATEGIES FOR DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION IN NIGERIA

¹ Alabi Abdullahi
alibi.abdullahi@kwasu.edu.ng

² Ameen Abdullateef
abdlateef4ever@yahoo.com

³ Arinze Okpala

Abstract

For any country aspiring development, there must be robust plans that will lead her into the Promised Land. Since Nigeria got her political independence in 1960, efforts have been made by political leaders, both the military and civilian government, to introduce a lot of planning strategies to achieve national development. These include the short-term, medium and long-term planning, such as the five year plans, rolling plans and vision 2010, 2015, 2020, SEEDS, NEEDS and even the Transformation Agenda. The features of these plans were centred on poverty reduction, unemployment, national integration, political and economic self-reliance, rural-urban development and agricultural development; but the problem here is that little or nothing was achieved among these plans. Why? Findings of this study revealed that lack of political will, corruption, and lack of data bank, insufficient machinery and technology to take care of the programmes were responsible for failure. It therefore proffered some solutions to ameliorate the problems encountered in the implementation of the plans. The paper adopted qualitative research method and relied on secondary data from textbooks, journals, and the internet.

Introduction

A government cannot develop a country; it can only help its country develop.

Ackoff, adopted in Arvind (2015)

Everyone is talking about development, but what is it in reality? One thing is certain: it has no simple meaning; development means something different to each one that speaks.

Dickbison adopted in Arvind (2015)

Nigeria as a country has been in existence for about 56 years and up-till today, efforts are still made to strategise on how to depict Nigeria with colour of development. A lot of developmental projects have been embarked upon by the actors in Nigeria since the collapse of the colonial administrations. During Obasanjo's regime in 1975, *Operation Feed the Nation* (OFN) was introduced for the purpose of

promoting national economic self-reliance through agricultural development initiatives. To achieve these aims, there is need for government to come up with plans that will address various obstacles that have been the hindrance to the accomplishment of the programmes.

However, development planning, as a long programme designed to effect some permanent structural changes in the socio-political economy, is needed to be connected to any political economy programmes of the country. This will enable government to set out objectives about the way it wants the economy to develop in the future and then try to achieve those objectives (Ejumudo, 2013). In furtherance to this, every government is expected to draw comprehensive plans periodically through which the welfare of citizens can be enhanced socially, economically and politically among others. Consequently, the goal of these plans could be to facilitate targeted growth of the spheres of life

¹ Department of Politics and Governance, Kwara State University, Malete

^{2&3} Department of Public Administration, University of Ilorin, Ilorin

(Ibietan & Oghator, 2013). More importantly, it is worthwhile to note that although Nigeria has undertaken national development plans in her post-independence history- the first national development plan (1962-68); the second national development plan (1981-85); the third national development plan (1975-80) and the fourth national development plan (1981-85), all these plans did not deliver the dividends of socio-political economy development to Nigeria.

In the final analysis, this work will examine the strategies involved in development administration and the planning process. Arguably, development is the top priority of the national government in virtually all *Third World Countries*. The processes of development are very popular; but the precise nature of particular development problems vary from one country to another, depending on their unique economic, social, political and cultural characteristics such as efforts made by the countries to overcome the limitations of illiteracy, improve health and nutrition, and decrease hunger.

Statement of Problem

In spite of the fact that Nigeria has drawn a lot of plans to cater for the socio-political economy of the country, efforts are still on to redress some common issues, such as poverty, unemployment, insecurity, rural-urban migration, mono-economy and social conflicts. Consequent upon this explanation, this study seeks to identify the following as major problems that affect the national development planning in Nigeria. First, the plan strategy is one of the problems facing the national development plans as it relied on the utilization of the proceeds from oil to establish the productive base of the economy. There was a fall in the oil market shortly after some plans came into effect. Second, adoption of undemocratic planning process as in the case of the transformation Agenda that called for a national conference during Jonathan's administration. Those that represented the people and the government participated in the conference without recourse to the input of the citizens. Third, inaccurate and outdated data for the planning process. Lastly, misplacement of priorities which has resulted setback successful implementation of development plans. Going by the resources at the country's disposal the government must ensure that priority should be given to programmes that will cater for the people as at when necessary rather than mass execution and implementation with no proper arrangements.

Against this backdrop, the study attempts to answer

the critical question of how has planning strategies assisted development administration in Nigeria, and seeks to examine the various strategies adopted by the government since establishment of first national development planning, and how they have assisted the economic development of the country.

Conceptual Clarification

Development Administration

A meaningful discussion of development administration can only start after some definition hurdles have been cleared, since social sciences is not Mathematics in which symbols acquire universal applicability. Since, most concepts in Social Sciences take contextual meaning; such have to be explained. The term "development administration" was first used in 1955 by an Indian scholar called Goswami. The concept however was used to differentiate the administrative system needed for developing countries and the traditional administrative system which is usually concerned with the maintenance of law and order to ensure a reasonable degree of security and stability in the community (Abdulhameed, 2008). Rodney (1969) viewed development as a many-sided process; at the level of the individual, it implies increased skill and capacity, greater freedom, creativity, self-discipline, responsibility and material well-being. The implication of this definition is that the term encompasses different facets of the society, such as economic, political and social.

Todaro (2009) explains that development, as a multi-dimensional process involves the reorganizing and reorientation of the entire economic and social system. This entails, in addition to improvement of income and output, radical changes in institutional, social and administrative structures as well as in popular attitudes, customs and beliefs. The explanation of the definition given by the scholar is that development means "system structure"; that is, if the institution is well structured, it will definitely motivate other sectors to function well as expected by the society. To Seers (1969) as cited in Abdulhameed (2008), development is argued in the form of questions. That is, the questions to ask about a country's development are: what has happened to poverty? What is happening to inequality? What is happening to unemployment? If any of these issues have not declined from high levels, then beyond doubt, there is a problem of development in such country.

According to Ohagwu's study in Joseph (2014), development is not the same thing as change,

growth or modernization, but the nature, content and course of a society. It is the choice about goals for achieving the realization of human potentials. Gboyega (2003) cited in Joseph (2014) described development as an idea that embodies all attempts to improve the conditions of human existence in all ramifications. It implies improvement in material well-being of all citizens, not the most powerful and rich alone, in a sustainable way such that today's consumption does not impede the future. It also demands that poverty and inequality of access to the good things of life be removed or drastically reduced. It seeks to improve personal physical security and livelihoods and expansion of life chances. Meanwhile, Naomi (1995) believes that development is usually taken to involve not only economic growth, but also some notion of equitable distribution, provision of health care, education, housing and other essential services, all with a view of improving the individual and collective quality of life.

Furthermore, Nwanegbo and Odigbo (2013) quoted in Joseph (Ibid) assert that development could be seen as the process of empowering people to maximize their potentials and the ability to exploit nature to meet daily human needs. It can also be seen as a process by which quality of human lives and capacity to surmount daily needs are considerably improved. The term is also a process of societal advancement where improvement in the well-being of people is generated through strong partnership between all sectors, corporate bodies and other groups in the society. It is reasonable to know that development is not only an economic exercise, but also both socio-economic and political issues and it pervades all aspects of societal life (Chrisman, 1984 in Joseph (Ibid)).

Development is not just a matter of getting more money into the hands of the poor, but ensuring that increased production, and its resulting increased income, leads to an improved standard of living (Obadan, 1988). Every meaningful, concrete and lasting development begins and ends in the focus on human resources. Human resources refers to all economic resources that are wholly and directly supplied by human beings, this includes the suppliers of labour services and entrepreneurial function. The size of the human resources depends largely on the population size while the quality is a product of educational, health services and environmental factors (Conducive environment that promotes an investment friendly platform).

Contemporary Theories in Development Administration

Arivind (2013) identified two approaches/theories on development administration. The focus of development according to him has changed over the years; keeping pace with new development theories. Once confined to the deployment of foreign aid, development administration today focuses on planned change to meet a nation's broad political, economic, social, and cultural objectives. Non-government, non-bureaucratic, religious, cultural, voluntary, and community organizations are now increasingly involved in development projects. Localized, decentralized, and participative approaches to development are being encouraged. The following are the theories/ approaches identified:

From Blue-print Approach to Learning-Process Approach

The blue print approach involves designing a specific plan of action in advance for administering a development programme. With all potential benefits, this approach is inflexible and to some extent closed-ended, with its inability to respond to the needs of a changing environment. In contrast, a learning-process approach involves a cybernetics process by which developments and incorporate mid-course corrections are based on existing local conditions. Problems are diagnosed and solutions implemented by people and administrators jointly through a process of mutual learning. This approach emphasizes planning with the people, and doing so during the process of administering a development programme.

Production-Centered Approach to a People-Centered Approach

Another trend in contemporary development administration theorizing is a shift from a production-centered to a people-centered approach to development. The production-centered development approach emphasizes production of goods and services to maximize returns on investment. This approach stresses:

- i. Industry over agriculture;
- ii. Urban development over rural development;
- iii. Utilization of capital resources over human resources;
- iv. Exploiting the environment for short-term gain over sustained harnessing of natural resources; and
- v. Establishing large-scale industries over small-scale industries.

The approach neglects the basic needs of the rural

growth or modernization, but the nature, content and course of a society. It is the choice about goals for achieving the realization of human potentials. Gboyega (2003) cited in Joseph (2014) described development as an idea that embodies all attempts to improve the conditions of human existence in all ramifications. It implies improvement in material well-being of all citizens, not the most powerful and rich alone, in a sustainable way such that today's consumption does not impede the future. It also demands that poverty and inequality of access to the good things of life be removed or drastically reduced. It seeks to improve personal physical security and livelihoods and expansion of life chances. Meanwhile, Naomi (1995) believes that development is usually taken to involve not only economic growth, but also some notion of equitable distribution, provision of health care, education, housing and other essential services, all with a view of improving the individual and collective quality of life.

Furthermore, Nwanegbo and Odigbo (2013) quoted in Joseph (Ibid) assert that development could be seen as the process of empowering people to maximize their potentials and the ability to exploit nature to meet daily human needs. It can also be seen as a process by which quality of human lives and capacity to surmount daily needs are considerably improved. The term is also a process of societal advancement where improvement in the well-being of people is generated through strong partnership between all sectors, corporate bodies and other groups in the society. It is reasonable to know that development is not only an economic exercise, but also both socio-economic and political issues and it pervades all aspects of societal life (Chrisman, 1984 in Joseph (Ibid)).

Development is not just a matter of getting more money into the hands of the poor, but ensuring that increased production, and its resulting increased income, leads to an improved standard of living (Obadan, 1988). Every meaningful, concrete and lasting development begins and ends in the focus on human resources. Human resources refers to all economic resources that are wholly and directly supplied by human beings, this includes the suppliers of labour services and entrepreneurial function. The size of the human resources depends largely on the population size while the quality is a product of educational, health services and environmental factors (Conducive environment that promotes an investment friendly platform).

Contemporary Theories in Development Administration

Arivind (2015) identified two approaches/theories on development administration. The focus of development according to him has changed over the years; keeping pace with new development theories. Once confined to the deployment of foreign aid, development administration today focuses on planned change to meet a nation's broad political, economic, social, and cultural objectives. Non-government, non-bureaucratic, religious, cultural, voluntary, and community organizations are now increasingly involved in development projects. Localized, decentralized, and participative approaches to development are being encouraged. The following are the theories/ approaches identified:

From Blue-print Approach to Learning-Process Approach

The blue print approach involves designing a specific plan of action in advance for administering a development programme. With all potential benefits, this approach is inflexible and to some extent closed-ended, with its inability to respond to the needs of a changing environment. In contrast, a learning-process approach involves a cybernetics process by which developments and incorporate mid-course corrections are based on existing local conditions. Problems are diagnosed and solutions implemented by people and administrators jointly through a process of mutual learning. This approach emphasizes planning with the people, and doing so during the process of administering a development programme.

Production-Centered Approach to a People-Centered Approach

Another trend in contemporary development administration theorizing is a shift from a production-centered to a people-centered approach to development. The production-centered development approach emphasizes production of goods and services to maximize returns on investment. This approach stresses:

- i. Industry over agriculture;
- ii. Urban development over rural development;
- iii. Utilization of capital resources over human resources;
- iv. Exploiting the environment for short-term gain over sustained harnessing of natural resources; and
- v. Establishing large-scale industries over small-scale industries.

The approach neglects the basic needs of the rural

poor in Third World countries and promotes socio-economic inequality. In the people-centered approach to development, the needs of the people take precedence over the production system. This approach views an individual not as a subject but as an actor, who defines the goals, controls the resources, and directs the processes affecting his/her life. The central themes of people-centered development are: empowerment of people; and development of an administrative process which responds to the needs of the people. The key elements in people-centered development are: Human growth and well-being; Equality; Self-reliance; Participation; and Sustainability.

Invariably, a development programme can be sustained by (a) creating a felt need among beneficiaries about the efficacy of the programme; (b) developing institutions which continually adapt; (c) providing (or self-generation) of resources; and (c) building support among political elites and community groups.

Historical Analysis of Previous National Development Plans

First National Development Plan (1962-1968)

The First National Development Plan was launched in April 1962 and it was to cover a period of six years (1962-68). Under this plan, a total investment expenditure of about N2.132 billion was proposed. Out of this, public-sector investment was expected to be about N1.352 billion, while the remaining investment expenditure of N780 million was to be undertaken by the private sector. The full implementation of this development plan was however interrupted by two major political events, namely, the military intervention in 1966 and the 1967-70 civil war. Consequently, the period of the plan was extended to March 31, 1970. Even with these major interruptions, notwithstanding, both the Federal Government and regional governments recorded a number of landmark achievements during the development plan period.

During the crisis period, the Federal Government alone successfully executed projects like the Oil Refinery in Port Harcourt, the Paper Mill, the Sugar Mill and the Niger Dam (in Jebba and Bacita respectively), the Niger Bridge, and ports' extension; while it also constructed a number of trunks 'A' roads. It is interesting to note that it was also during this period that the first-generation Universities were established in Ibadan and Lagos by the Federal Government, Ahmadu Bello University

by the Northern Nigerian Government, University of Nigeria Nsukka (UNN) by the Eastern Nigerian Government and the University of Ife (now known as the Obafemi Awolowo University) by the Western Nigerian Government. The federal and regional governments were able to achieve this much in spite of the crisis because during the period, the annual capital budgets operated within the development plan framework. They were employed as the main instrument of control and allocation of development resources (Ukertor, 2015). This was in itself made possible by the existence of a development plan which provided guidelines for meaningful and co-ordinated development during the plan period despite two political crises.

Second National Development Plan (1970-1974)

General Yakubu Gowon launched the Second National Development Plan in 1970 on behalf of the Federal Government and the government of the then twelve states of the federation. It was launched shortly after the end of the war and because it was a post-war development plan, its focus was on the reconstruction of a war-battered economy and the promotion of economic and social development in the new Nigeria. What this means, according to Ukertor (2015), is that the philosophy of the plan was consequently influenced by the exigencies of the war, which include the building of a united, strong and self-reliant nation; a great and dynamic economy; a just egalitarian society; a land of bright and full opportunities for all citizens; and a free and democratic society. Like the First National Development Plan, the Second National Development Plan also recorded a number of major projects, which were successfully executed by both the federal and state governments. Such projects include: the successful construction of many federal roads; the successful take-off of the National Youth Service Corps Scheme; the introduction of federal scholarship and loan schemes for Nigerian students, etc.

Third National Development Plan (1975-1980)

The then Military Head of State also launched the Third National Development Plan on behalf of all governments in the country. The plan covered a five-year period from April, 1975 to March, 1980. Ukertor (2015) describes this plan as a watershed in the evolution of economic planning in Nigeria. It was a unique development plan because, apart from its huge initial investment of about N30 billion (which was later revised to N43.3 billion), extensive consultations with the private sector of the economy were made in the course of its preparation.

The cardinal objectives of this plan were also part of its uniqueness. Such objectives include: increase in per capital income during the plan period; more even distribution of income; reduction in the level of unemployment; diversification of the economy; balanced development; and indigenization of economic activities. As laudable as the objectives of this development plan were, the implementation was adversely affected by the change of government in July, 1975, barely three months after the plan was launched. In particular, the change of government led to a reappraisal of some of the cardinal objectives is contained in the plan. Here, more emphasis was placed on those projects which were thought to have direct effects on the living standard of the common man. Sectors that were thus given priority included agriculture, water supply, housing and health (Ibid).

Fourth National Development Plan (1981-1985)

The Fourth National Development Plan (1981-85) was launched by President Shehu Shagari in 1981 on behalf of the Federal Government and the governments of the then nineteen states of the federation. This was the first plan to be formulated by a democratically elected government under a new constitution based on the presidential system of government. As observed by Ukertor (2015), the plan was intended to further the process of establishing solid base for the long-term economic and social development of Nigeria. Unlike the previous development plans, the fourth plan was the first in which the local governments were made to participate at two levels. One, they participated at the level of preparation, and two, they were allowed to have their own separate programmes under the plan. The capital investment target was N82.2 billion shared between the public and private sectors with the former putting in about N70.5 billion, while the latter put in the balance of N11.7 billion.

The challenges of this plan were traced to the change of government in 1983 and cum the change in 1985. These two changes seriously disrupted the implementation of the programme of the plan and, consequently, the performance of the economy during the fourth plan period was generally poor. Whatever the case (success or failure), it is interesting to note that between 1945 and 1986; the concept of development planning was a common planning tool for social, economic and sustainable development in Nigeria (Abdulrosheed, 2012). The failure of this plan to maintain economic development led to the introduction of national rolling plans.

The Rolling Plan Era (1990-1998)

By 1986, it had become obvious that the National Development Plans had hit the rocks. The huge deficits of the third and fourth plans exacerbated the country's external debt situation which stood at about \$22 billion. Thus began the introduction of Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP), which was basically a 'reform therapy' from the World Bank and International Monetary fund (IMF). SAP was only an economic emergency programme expected to last for two years. SAP underscored a shift from project-based to policy-based planning system and emphasized a private-sector-led economy rather than the prevailing public sector-led philosophy that had inspired previous plans. SAP, therefore, presented an opportunity for reevaluating the country's planning system as the fixed medium term planning system seem to have failed.

A three tier planning system was to succeed SAP. The new proposal consisted of: a 15-20 year Perspective or Long term Plan; and a three-year Rolling Plan. The perspective plan was to identify long term policies upon which the rolling plans and the annual budgets will derive their medium and short term programmes respectively. The Babangida Administration consequently introduced a perspective known as rolling plan. Based on this, the government decided on a 20-year perspective plan for the period of 1989-2008. According to the philosophy of this rolling plan, the first phase of the perspective plan would constitute the Fifth National Development Plan. With this structural change of policy, the five-year planning model was replaced with a three-year rolling plan to be operated along with a 12 to 20 year perspective plan and the normal operational annual budgets. This plan became operational with the 1990 budget and it provided the foundation for the three-year rolling plan (1990 - 92). In order to effectively execute this programme, some fundamental reforms were the merging of budgetary and planning functions with the sole objective of minimizing conflict between the two.

However, in the same way that the tradition of five-year development plan was jettisoned by the Babangida Administration, the idea of rolling plan was also shelved in 1996 by General Sani Abacha for Vision 2010, which was launched on September 18, 1996. The programme was to herald socio-economic prosperity for the citizens by systematically improving the quality of life of Nigerians in fourteen years (Ukertor, 2015). General Abacha on November 27, 1996, inaugurated a 250-member committee made up of private-sector representatives,

government ministries, academics, journalists, traditional rulers, trade union leaders and foreign businessmen, among others, shoulder the task of Vision 2010 which was similarly intended to move the country forward. The committee submitted its final report to the Head of State on September 30, 1997 recommending "large-scale deregulation of the Nigerian economy" among others. In other words, the medium term plans in Nigeria was suspended between 1985 and 1999.

Assessment of Transformation Agenda

The Transformation Agenda is a medium term development strategy to speed up the actualization of the Nigeria Vision (NV) 20:2020. It is a framework for the actualization of the Federal Government's economic growth agenda during 2011-2015. The Agenda is anchored on the pillars and targets of the NV 20:2020 and it aims to:

- i) create decent jobs in sufficient quantity to resolve the protracted problem of unemployment and reduce poverty;
- ii) lay foundation for robust and inclusive growth within the Nigerian economy; and
- iii) Improve, on a sustainable basis, the well-being of all classes of Nigerians regardless of their circumstances and location.

The four areas of focus of the Transformation Agenda are governance, human capital development, infrastructure and real sector.

First National Implementation Plan

The First National Implementation Plan (1st NIP), with the theme "Accelerating Development, Competitiveness and Wealth Creation", is a medium term plan for the actualization of the long term broad objectives and targets of the NV 20:2020. The 1st NIP is the period 2010-2013 and it aimed to bridge the infrastructural gap in the country, optimize the sources of economic growth to increase productivity and competitiveness, develop a knowledge-based economy to deepen the technology base of the country, improve governance, security law and order, and foster accelerated, sustainable social and economic development in a competitive business environment.

The 1st NIP contains priority projects and programmes of the Federal Government and investment plans for the State Governments. The total investment profile for 1st NIP is N32 trillion, with the Federal Government investing N10 trillion, and the States and Local Governments investing N9

trillion. The private sector was to invest the remaining N13 trillion. A Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework has been established to track progress in the implementation of the 1st NIP to ensure high performance and accountability. The M&E framework also includes a Performance Contract between the President and the Ministers/Heads of agencies, which is cascaded down the Ministries and Agencies. A National M&E Report is produced annually.

Nigeria Vision 20:2020

The Nigeria Vision 20:2020 is a perspective plan; an economic business plan intended to make Nigeria one of the top 20 economies by 2020, with a growth target of not less than \$900 billion in GDP and a per capita of not less than \$4,000 per annum. The three pillars of the NV 20:2020 are:

- i) Guaranteeing the well-being and productivity of the people;
- ii) Optimizing the key sources of economic growth; and
- iii) Fostering sustainable social and economic development.

Vision 20:2020 is Nigeria's second attempt at driving the attainment of her national aspirations using long term perspective plan. In addition to the first perspective plan (Vision 2010), several strategic planning efforts have been undertaken by the Federal Government in recent years. These efforts include the Poverty Strategy Reduction Papers (PSRPs), the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS I & II), Nigeria's Strategy for attaining the Millennium Development Goals, and the Seven Point Agenda (Onyenekenwa, 2011).

National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS)

NEEDS is Nigeria's home-grown poverty reduction strategy (PRSP). NEEDS builds on the earlier two-year effort to produce the interim PRSP (I-PRSP), and the wide consultative and participatory processes associated with it. NEEDS is not just a plan on paper, it is a plan on the ground and founded on a clear vision, sound values, and enduring principles. It is a medium term strategy (2003–2007) but which derives from the country's long-term goals of poverty reduction, wealth creation, employment generation and value re-orientation (Onyenekenwa, 2011). NEEDS is a nationally coordinated framework of action in close collaboration with the State and Local governments (with their State Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy, SEEDS) and other stakeholders to consolidate on the

achievements of the last four years (1999–2003) and build a solid foundation for the attainment of Nigeria's long-term vision of becoming the largest and strongest African economy and a key player in the world economy.

State Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (SEEDS)

On the State level, State Economic Empowerment and Development Strategies (SEEDS) are being developed to compliment NEEDS. The donor community, made up of IBRD, DFID, EU and UNDP, is taking advantage of this change to align their local programs to improve the quality of assistance to the country. Since states receive over 52% of federal resources, the National Planning Commission (NPC) in collaboration with the donors decided to develop a system whereby state performance can be monitored using SEEDS and to identify priority areas and states that demonstrate effective use of allocated resources. The SEEDS process was launched in early 2004 and a SEEDS Manual designed by the National Planning Commission (NPC) setting out the required contents and process for an effective SEEDS was disseminated to all state via a national dissemination process involving representatives of government, civil society and the private sector at state level. Subsequently, technical assistance was offered to all state to support the development of their SEEDS by teams of consultants with relevant expertise (Onyenekenwa, 2011).

Policy Strategy

- The Federal Government together with a number of donors are committed to provide project matching grants to those states that perform well in the exercise.
- Possible debt relief is to be made available to states that perform well in the exercise.
- Increase donor presence is also one of the benefits for performing well in the exercise.
- The Federal Government together with donor partners is also committed to giving capacity support to states that perform well in the exercise.

REASONS FOR THE FAILURE OF DEVELOPMENT PLANS IN NIGERIA

Development plans in Nigeria depict western notion of development. Ejumudo (2013: 40) averred that "development plans and development initiatives did not encourage the disengagement of Nigerian economy from the exploitative structural links with western capitalist economies." More so, these

reasons have been identified for the failure of development plans in Nigeria:

- The pattern of implementation of the development plans in Nigeria encouraged social problems, hunger, mass unemployment and social inequalities.
- Another factor is the idea of conceiving development planning as a 'big push strategy' which attempts to do everything in one plan. This hampers development efforts as resources are overstretched and little or nothing is achieved in the process (Ibiatan & Oghator, 2013).
- Lack of essential inter-ministerial and inter disciplinary coordinating machinery; lack of proper project monitoring and revision of plans; inadequacy of professional planners due to institutionalized framework for planning; poor or inadequate feasibility studies in planning; lack of comprehensive statistics; erratic and conflicting government policies manifesting in contradictions in areas of planning; lack of proper project monitoring and revision of plans; abuse of office/corruption by public officials; high inflationary rate and geometric growth in population defeating the essence of economic forecasting in plan formulation and implementation; and political instability during military regimes which created uncertainty and retarded various projects articulated in development plans (Ibid).
- Misplacement of priorities- the policies of the post-independent plans also exhibited a basic lack of urgency. A typical example is the iron and steel industry that was in the first and second plans and was initiated for projected completion during the fourth plan. This represented a lag of twenty years; yet this project was repeatedly acclaimed the cornerstone of Nigeria's industrialization. Similar examples include petrochemicals, fertilizers, the petroleum refinery, liquefied petroleum gas and other heavy industries. While this leisurely pace persisted, the country completed such counter-productive projects like the national stadium and trade fair complex in Lagos, the FESTAC durbar hotel at Kaduna and staged the multi-million naira FASTAC itself in 1977 (Ejumudo,

2013).

- Lack of plan discipline- Nigerians seems to lack the political will to keep to our plans. While there are enough rules in the plans to enforce plan discipline, Nigerian leaders simply have a special knack for tracking development plans. Though plan projects acquired priorities since 1962, these are invariably ignored by the bureaucratic bourgeoisie in blatant demonstration of the superiority of its selfish class interests over avowed national objectives. Typical examples could be found in FESTAC which cost hundreds of millions of naira, yet nowhere in any plan document, and the Universal Primary Education (UPE) programme which was not in the second plan, yet its implementation began during that plan and its critical phase commenced during the third plan. In fact, the plans of the various governments could be described as competitive in character, problem distortion and aberration in plan execution as well as under spending on directly productive projects and overspending on prestige or white elephant projects not included in the plan (Ibid).
- Lastly, public service inefficiency; lack of self-reliance; technology transfer syndrome; system corruption, inadequate executive capacity; absence of relevant data; domestic-foreign resource generation ratio; public/private sector partnership.

The Negative Effects of National Plans in the Nigerian Political Economy

Most of the national plans were undemocratic and not people-oriented, because the plans always adopted *TOP-DOWN approach* not *BOTTOM-UP approach*. Hence, the plans failed to achieve positive objectives. Undoubtedly, an attempt to evaluate most national programmes right from the political independence till-today will show that input from citizens were not considered, see the oil policy removal, changing of cars' number plates, PHCN tariff, privatization of PHCN, constitutional amendment and the nature of constitution of the national conference (that is, the representatives of states, religious groups, trade and labour unions, civil society groups, etc.) as part of transformation agenda of former President, Goodluck Jonathan, neither reflected the position of the masses nor exhaustively

tackled the issues brought to the fore. Consequently, Nigeria continues to grapple with several problems which have setback national development. These include:

Poverty

Despite the fact that Nigeria is one of the countries in the world with high economic growth rates, averaging 7.4% according to the Nigeria economic report released in July 2014 by the World Bank; poverty still remains significant at 33.1% in Africa's biggest economy. For a country with massive wealth and a huge population to support commerce, the level of poverty remains unacceptable. Over the last decade, a well-developed economy in the light of natural resources such as oil should have evolved. In addition, poverty in Nigeria can be also caused by the political instability of the country. However, these programs have largely failed to overcome the three reasons for this persistent poverty: income inequality, ethnic conflict, and political instability.

Income Inequality

Income inequality rate grew from 0.43% to 0.49% between 2004 and 2009. This is correlated with differential access to infrastructure and amenities. In particular, there are more rural poor than urban poor. This results from the composition of Nigeria's economy, especially the energy (oil) and agriculture sectors. Oil exports contribute significantly to government revenues and about 15% of GDP, despite employing only a fraction of the population. Agriculture, however, contributes to about 45% of GDP, and employs close to 90% of the rural population.

This incongruence is compounded by the fact that oil revenue is poorly distributed among the population, with higher government spending in urban areas than rural areas. High unemployment rates render personal incomes even more divergent. Moreover, the process of oil extraction has resulted in significant pollution, which further harms the agricultural sector.

Long-Term Ethnic Conflict and Civil Unrest

Nigeria has historically experienced much ethnic conflict. With the return to civilian rule in 1999, militants from religious and ethnic groups have become markedly more violent. While this unrest has its roots in poverty and economic competition, its economic and human damages further escalate the problems of poverty (such as increasing the mortality rate). For instance, ethnic unrest and the displeasure of local communities with oil companies has contributed to the conflict over oil trade in the Niger Delta which threatens the productivity of oil trade.

Civil unrest might also have contributed to the adoption of populist policy measures which work in the short-run but impede poverty alleviation efforts.

Political Instability and Corruption

Nigeria's large population and historic ethnic instability has led to the adoption of a federal government. The resultant fiscal decentralization provides Nigeria's state and local government's considerable autonomy, including control over 50% of government revenues, as well as responsibility for providing public services. The lack of a stringent regulatory and monitoring system has allowed for rampant corruption. This has hindered past poverty alleviation efforts, and will continue to do so since resources which could pay for public goods or directed towards investment (and so create employment and other opportunities for citizens) are being misappropriated.

Bad Governance

As rightly observed by Ibrahim (2013), a report of the World Bank reveals that bad governance has many features among which are failure to make a clear separation between what is public and what is private, hence, a tendency to divert public resources for private gain; failure to establish a predictable framework for law and government behaviour that is conducive to development or arbitrariness rules, regulations, licensing requirements etc., which impede the functioning of markets and encouragement of rent seeking priorities that are inconsistent with development, thus, resulting in misallocation of resources and excessively narrow base for decision making.

Furthermore, Obadan (1988: 25) maintained that "when these features occur together they create an environment that is hostile to development. In such circumstances, he further argued that the authority of governments over their peoples tends to be progressively eroded and also bad governance by entailing corruption, and lack of accountability and transparency, provides opportunities for the well-connected elites and interest groups in the society to corner for themselves a sizeable proportion of the society's resources at the expense of the masses." Indeed, the above descriptions symbolically represent the nature of Nigerian fourth republic.

Conclusion

Summing this discourse, this paper notes that Development administration in Nigeria embraced various policies and programmes that were designed to promote social welfare by creating employment opportunities, more managerial opportunities, and

provision of necessary infrastructure. All these could be found in the planning agenda of first national development plan. The second national development plan was designed to check the modality for united, strong and self-reliant nation. Instructively, the national development plans have similar features that illuminate development programmes right from colonial administration to the current political system but proper implementation was a major problem due to lack of political will and over-burden of the planning process.

Recommendations

In the light of the foregoing discourse, this paper therefore proffer possible solutions to the problems encountered in the previous national plans in Nigeria. First, concrete and conscious efforts must be made to ensure that for any national plan, government must carefully prioritise and show commitment to the proposed programmes. Second, in planning for development, proper record must be kept for programmes. Here in Nigeria, there should be available accurate and updated data base to show the actual population of people within geographical locations for appropriate plans to be made. Third, the plan should be based on the resources available so that it will not be cumbersome for execution and implementation. Finally, well trained officers should be engaged in the planning process, with zero-tolerance for nepotism.

References

- Abdulhameed, A. U. (2008). *Theory and practice of Development Administration*. Revised Edition, Kaduna: Joyce Graphic Printers and Publishers.
- Abdulrosheed, O. (2012). *Developmental challenges in Nigeria*. Retrieved from www.google.com 2016
- Arivind, S. (2015). *Evolution of Development and Development Administration Theory*. India: Indian Institute of Public Administration.
- Ejumudu, K. B. (2013). *The Problem of Development Planning in Nigeria: A Critical Discourse*. Retrieved from www.iiiste.org ISSN 2224-607x (paper) ISSN 2225-0565 (online) 3 (4), pp. 20-40
- Galbraith, J. K. (2008). *The nature of mass poverty*. MA: Penguin Books
- Gboyega, A. (2003). *Democracy and development: The imperative of local governance*. An Inaugural Lecture, University of Ibadan, pp. 6-7.
- Ibietan, J & Oghator, E. (2013), *Trends in development planning in Nigeria: 1962 to 2012*. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 15 (4), pp. 25-45. Clarion University of Pennsylvania, Clarion, Pennsylvania.
- Ibrahim K. M (2013). *Planning for development in Nigeria*. Kaduna: Joyce Publishers Graphic Printers and Publishers.
- Joseph, O. (2014). *National development strategies: Challenges and options*. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Invention*. ISSN (online) 2319-7722, ISSN (print): 2319-7714 In Onyeka, U.R (2010), *Development and Utilization of Human Resources of Rural Communities for Economic Growth*. *Journal of Sustainable Human Development Review*, Vol 2, No. 1, March
- Naomi O (1995). *Towards an Integrated View of Human Rights*. *Hunger Teach Net*, 6(3): 6-7.
- Nwanegbo, C. J., & Odigbo, J. (2013). *Development in Nigeria: Issues and Challenges*. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3 (5), pp. 10-17
- Obadan, A. (1988). *Corruption and national development in Nigeria's fourth republic*. *JORIND* 10 (3) ISSN 1596-8308 AJOL
- Onyenekenwa, C. E. (2011) *Nigeria's Vision 20:2020: Issues, challenges and implications for Development*. *Management Asian journal of rural development*, 1 (2), pp. 45-55
- Rodney, W. (1976). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. Dar-Es-Salaam: Tanzania Publishing House
- Todaro, M. P. (2009). *Economic development in the third world*. London: Longman Group.
- Ukertor, M. (2015). *Development plans and vision corrected version as a strategy for sustainable development: The Experience of Nigeria*. Retrieved from www.google/developmentnigeria.org