



PUBLIC POLICY AND DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE IN NIGERIA

Osude Bala Osumanyi¹, Ahmed Usman Ege² and Oyigbenu Zipporah Elijah³

¹Department of Social Sciences, School of General Studies and Pre-ND, Isa Mustapha Agwai I Polytechnic, Lafia, Nasarawa State, Nigeria.

E-mail: osudegiztech@yahoo.com Tel: 08036445282

²Department of public Administration, School of Administration and Business Studies, Isa Mustapha Agwai I Polytechnic, Lafia, Nasarawa State, Nigeria.

E-mail: awajaa1125@gmail.com Tel: 08067090098

³Department of Public Administration, School of administration and Business Studies, Isa Mustapha Agwai I Polytechnic, Lafia, Nasarawa State, Nigeria.

E-mail: oyigbenuzipporahelijah@gmail.com Tel: 08038113546

ABSTRACT: *This research is set out to study the relationship between public policy and democratic governance in Nigeria. The methodology adopted is descriptive and content analysis. The research used elitist model to explain the problem under investigation. It is generally accepted that the process through which public policy is conceived, formulated and implemented is one of the most important processes of governance and societal development. Its relevance lies in the fact that it serves as the political, legal, economic and administrative framework within which government operates. Under democratic governance, public policies are potent tools toward the realization of good governance. These days, it is not uncommon for people discussing or believing in public policies of government probably due to the failure of government in the past to improve considerably the living standards of the people. This is due to several challenges on the side of government and the public. These myriads of problems range from policy somersault, lack of political will and poor financing. The paper posits that government has to be accountable and responsive to the people, work hard on public enlightenment in order to gain support for any policy from the people and solve problem of political apathy of citizens and their loss of confidence on the processes of governance.*

KEYWORDS: Public Policy, Democracy, Democratic Governance, Nigeria

INTRODUCTION

In any democratic dispensation, there is no government that would rise to power without party manifesto and it is these manifestoes that are probably translated to an agenda or policy of that government in power. The interface between public policy and democratic governance is an organic one. Democracy reinforces public policy and vice-versa.

The way and manner through which public or citizens feel the existence of government is through the instrumentalities of public policies. They are working tools or instruments through which nation state realize her dreams. In fact, dividends of democracy are felt by people through the formulation and implementation of public policies by the government. On



this note however, any government that is operating without genuine public policy is like a death or non-existing government. Because it is believed that the intents or actions of that government are utopia.

People nowadays has come to see government as a failure due to colossal problems associated with the ways and manner in which policies are conceived, formulated and implemented because it has not brought desired change in the lives of the people. Government policies are usually greeted with severe public cynicism and disrespect due to big gap between government and the governed. Government has often time left a sour taste in the mouths of Nigerians largely because of policies failure.

Conceptualizing Public Policy and Democracy

Concept of Public Policy

Like any other concept in the field of social sciences, conceptualizing public policy is often problematic. The problem arises from the fact that while some would want to see it as action or inactions of government, others would want to see it as intentions or decisions of government.

We would therefore look at some of the definitions of public policy in order to put the concept into proper perspective.

Ayo (1985), defines public policy as any “action taken by the government in pursuit of certain aims.” From this definition public policy refers only to actions, and not the decisions or statements of intent.

Friedrich (1975) sees public policy as “the proposed course of action of the government or one of its divisions.” It is further defined by Mlekwa (1976) as “official statements determining the plan of action or what the government wants to do. Ikelegbe (1996) see it as “what government integrated courses and programmes of action that government has set and the framework or guide it has designed to direct actions and practices in certain problem areas.” Obikeze and Obi (2004) posits that “public policy is simply, government action and programmes of action toward solving societal problems.”

Furthermore, Dunn (1981:46) defined public policy as a long series of more or less related choices including decisions not to act, made by governmental bodies and officials. Also, public policy has been defined as the formal articulation, statement, or publication of a goal that the government intends to pursue in order to address a need or a problem (Waldt, 2001:93). While some scholars, such as Jones (1997) see public policy making as “a process of ongoing stages, such as policy formulation, policy adoption, budgeting, implementation and evaluation.” Lindblom (1968) sees it as a series of small step or increments, rather than a highly rational and structured process. Yet, Dahl (1970)) view public policy as a matter of competing publics, which represent the diversity and pluralism of society. In the context of plural, democratic countries as Grindle and Thomas have articulated:

“Public policy results from the conflict, bargaining and coalition formation among a potentially large number of societal groups, organized to protect or advance particular interests common to their members (1989:218, cited in Jega, 2007:101).”



The cardinal reason or reasons for formulation and execution of public policy is to satisfy the interest of the citizens which is in the same sense the responsibility of government. Public policy is an all-encompassing concept used to cover the whole lots of government mandates. It could be policy on education, economic, social, security, political and agriculture which government desired to achieved for the common good of her citizens.

Jega (2007) summarizes public policy in the context of democracy to mean “the formulation and implementation of public policy is generally seen as the prime responsibility of government. In order to gain popular support and legitimize their stay in power, governments use policy initiatives and outcomes. The extent to which these satisfy popular needs and aspirations is normally associated with the popularity of an elected representative government and its chances of continuing to enjoy legitimacy and electoral support.

On this premise, the distinctive features of public policy as noted by Waladt (2001:90) are as follows:

“Public policy is authoritative. This means it can be enforced through instrument of state. Public policies involve the participation of government institutions and fragmented structures of semi-independent groups and organizations through a complex system of formal and informal delegation of responsibility and control. At the very least, such policies must be processed, authorized, or satisfied within the framework of government. Thus, in order to be authoritative, a policy must be approved and promulgated by an institution that is authorized by statute or the constitution.”

In addition to the above features, it is pertinent to note that other features here are relevant. Thus, public policy must have support and input of citizens in order to be effective, it must be rational and very comprehensive. Public policy cannot be effective if it does not evolve from the people, because, the cardinal objective of every government is to meet the yearnings of her citizens. Where it fails to do this, government would lose her legitimacy and popular supports from the citizens.

Concept of Democracy

Democracy is a concept developed to describe human behaviour. It is seen as a way of life of some people and also appears most obvious to be an acceptable norm by its promoters or advocates. The term democracy means several things to different persons. Abraham Lincoln describes it as government of the people for the people and by the people. The root word for democracy is the Latin word “*democratia*”, meaning rule by the people what way it is conceptualized, it is a government founded on the people’s will (Emiri in Maduabuchi, 2003:179). The people determine who gets what, when and how. It implies recognizing the people as the source of all political power and authority. The people’s will is usually expressed by way of election.

Schumpeter (1967) defines democracy as “institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individual acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for the people’s votes.” Sartori (1965) sees democracy as “the power of people and rule or the people”. In the views of Appadorai (1975) “It is a system of under which the people exercise the governing power either directly or through representatives periodically elected by themselves.”



From the foregoing however, the various prescriptions are meant to explain the concept of democracy. Those expressions were attempt at defining the concept in various ways by the scholars mentioned above. The general consensus according to Ujo (2000:5) is that democracy is a political system in which the people of a country rule through any form of government they choose to establish.

For democracy to strive according to Emiri (in Maduabuchi, 2003), all necessary elements for its sustenance must exist. Elements of democratic practice include a general acceptance of electoral and political party arrangements within which diverse groups interest are represented, as well as the formal constitutional guarantee and existence of certain liberties and freedoms. Democracy being the government by the consent of the govern is categorize into “direct and indirect democracy”.

Direct democracy is a type that individuals collectively choose what policy they will jointly pursue or what law they will accept. Direct democracy was the type of political system in Ancient Greece. In the Ancient Greece, all citizens could speak and vote in assemblies (Ujo, 2000:5). Indirect democracy on the other hand could be called representative democracy and been adopted in most modern states. The system introduces an electoral system in which those to represent the interest of the people are elected. Those elected are given the responsibility of making laws and policies for the people.

Theoretical Framework

This research is anchored on Elitist theory of democracy and also implore pluralistic model to explain the topic under investigation.

Modern democracies are essentially representative and responsible democratic.hence, the choice of elitist theory in order to put the work in a proper perspective.

Be that as it may, the elitist theory of democracy is a critique of the classical democratic theory in the sense that it attempts to evaluate and refine its main principles. Elitist theory of democracy is derived from the concept of elitism. The main stand-points of elitism are as posited by Ujo (2000:11);

- 1) Society is divided into the few who have power and the many that do not. Only a small number of persons allocate values for society; the masses do not decide public policy.
- 2) The few who govern are not typical of the masses that are governed. Elite are drawn disproportionately from the upper socioeconomic strata of society.
- 3) The movement of non-elite to elite position must be slow and continuous to maintain stability and avoid revolution. Only non-elite who accepted the basic elite consensus can be admitted to governing circles.
- 4) Elite share a common consensus on basic values of the social system and the presentation of the system.
- 5) Public policy does not reflect demands of the masses but rather the perverting values of the elite. Changes in public policy will be incremental rather than revolutionary.



- 6) Active elite are subject to relatively little direct influence from apathetic masses. Elite influence masses more than masses influence elite.

This theory was developed to explain the working of modern organization. Mosca (1939) asserted that elite and not masses would govern all societies, because elite possess organization and unity of purpose. On his own part, Lasswell (1952) argued that: "Government is always government by the few, whether in the name of the few, the one or the many."

Elitism is classified into two models which are; the single elite and plural elite model. The single elite model holds that there is a monolithic concept of power. It posits that political power is concentrated in the hands of relatively few people, usually drawn from the corporate, financial, military and governmental circles, who make key decisions in all significant areas of life and who are subject to very little influence from the masses (Dye and Zeigler, 1972).

The second model is the pluralist one which the research adopts as its unit of analysis. According to this model, power is shared among leadership groups representing different segments of society; these separate elites are competitive and are held responsible by the masses through election, party competition and interest groups.

The major arguments of this model are:

The model posits that power is an attribute of individuals in their relationship with other individuals in the process of decision making. Regardless of the social or economic position, an individual has power to the extent that he can induce another individual to do something he would not otherwise do. Power relationship to this model does not necessarily persist overtime. A set of power relationship that is formed for a particular decision may be replaced by a different set of power relations when the next decision is made.

The differences between the elite and masses cannot be clearly separated. Therefore, the movement in and out of the ranks of decision makers is with relative ease, depending on the nature of the decision. This distinction also is defined on the basis of interest both have in a particular decision. Leadership to this model is fluid and mobile. To the model, access to decision making can be achieved through some factors which are skills of leadership, organization, information about issues, knowledge about democratic processes and skill in public relation.

Wealth or economic power is an asset in politics, but it is only one of many kinds of assets. It is pertinent to note that no single group or individual dominates decision making in all issues. The model holds that there are multiple elites within society who exercise power in some kinds of decisions which could not be the same in some. Competition is inevitable among elite but they share basic commitment to the "rules of the game" in democratic society.

It is relevant to note that public policy remains central in democratic governance because it allows for bargaining and compromises among competing interest or groups. Theory also reveals that masses can exercise considerable influence over elite through elections and membership of political party(ies). Indeed, competition among elite can enable the masses to hold elite accountable and exert considerable influence in the system.



The theory is considered most applicable because it explains the forces and factors responsible for public policy making in a democracy. The theory essentially exposes the opportunities that abound in democratic practice. These opportunities are openness, accountability, representation and responsiveness. Leadership must be accountable in order to gain confidence of the masses.

Furthermore, public policy is not a reserve of a particular interest group in the society rather; it is for all strata of the society. No particular group can monopolize the power to make decision but all groups are equal partners in the process of decision-making.

The theory advances that there are no restrictions in the democratic practice since all groups are fundamentally relevant in policy making. The right of individual group is strictly respected.

Sources of Public Policy Making

Public policy is not a wishful enterprise, but deliberate action designed towards achieving desired objectives by government or her agencies. In this sense, however, public policy making must emanate from reliable sources.

There are so many sources of public policy making according to Obikeze and Obi (2004:87-88), viz:

- i) The management: - Management as the controllers of an organization engages in planning. It is in the process of planning that management establish an organization's mission, goals and objectives. They therefore define the organization policy as a means of realizing the already defined objectives.
- ii) Subordinate executives: It is said that he who wears the shoes, knows where it pinches. The workers themselves who do the actual job are better placed to appreciate the inefficiencies of the job. Therefore, in their own little way, they determine public policy as it relates to the actual job.
- iii) Customs and tradition: The history of the people determines the way and manner to which they behave and even related. It is on this note that the customs and traditions of the people plays a major role in shaping their thoughts about the day to day activities of government and in doing this however, government must always put into consideration the way of life of this people before coming up with any action or authoritative public statement which is in a way public policy.
- iv) External environment: The external environment determines public policy. External environments are factors such as laws, technology, socio-cultural norms, trends and ecology that may affect government or her agencies directly or indirectly when it comes to policy making. The external environment can be seen as everything outside the government that might in any way or the other affect the operations of the government.
- v) The mass media: The mass media are agencies that help in the socialization process. They are agents of mass mobilization and enlightenment. They set agenda for the society and government alike. Mass media help in the process of social integration and



direct the attention of government to some happenings in the society that ordinarily government is not aware of. By so doing, it is helping to determine public policy.

- vi) The elite also help to formulate public policy by making their views known on some certain public issues or problems. They could render advice or make critique of government action or inactions over those issues or problems of public concern.
- vii) The masses are not left out in this aspect of public policy-making because they can influence, shape and change the policies and programmes through peaceful protest or demonstrations.
- viii) The legislature is also a viable agent that plays a major role in the process of public policy making through the enactment of laws or resolutions in the national or state assemblies.
- ix) The pressure groups are not left out in this engagement. They play a vital role through lobbying, demonstrations, criticism, public debate and violent or peaceful protest to influence the decisions of government over certain public matters.

Historical Overview of Public Policy Making in Nigeria

Historically, the policy environment in the post-colonial Nigeria has been characterized by what Hirschman referred to as “failure-prone policy process” and a tendency for “muddling through” (Clark and Wood, 1978:439). The implication of the above statement is that the public policy process is so erratic, if not irrational, that it muddles things up; it fails to be responsive to public demands and it therefore hardly ever meets set goals. Public policy process in Nigeria is founded on conservative colonial precedents and by this, it lacks inclusiveness. This is as Jega (2007:110) puts, largely on the account of a combination of legacies, impact and consequences of colonial and prolonged military rule.

Under colonial rule (1900-1960) as witness all over then, the policy making process was in the interest of the colonial power. The public policy as was shrouded in the philosophy or ideology of modernization and westernization (capitalism), was relatively closed and restrictive to and hardly meet the fundamental needs and aspirations of the colonized people but to colonial enterprise. It could be recalled that the process was controlled, guided and directed by colonial administrators and their conspirators. As Adebayo (1989:75) revealed that “very often, it had been the administrator who has been both the master and the instrument of policy.” It should be noted that the public policy making process was “one-man gang”.

Although, at the theoretical basis, the colonialists used or employed rational policy making models intended as practiced in their home countries but in reality, the situation was by far at variance with what was happening back in the metropolis. Their policies were not really rational and logical solutions to the needs and demands of the colonized Nigerians; but rather aimed at advancing the interests of the colonial power. To further buttress this fact, Jega (2007:11) opine that on some occasions, there might have been some consultations with the traditional authorities in some parts of the country in agenda-setting phase of colonial policies, or some acceding to workers’ demands. But this was the exception rather than the rule. Initially, until 1922, the process lacked constitutional backing and was sanctioned by colonial orders and gazettes.



Furthermore, as Jega (2007) concludes that in general, therefore, the public policy making process under colonial rule was closed, authoritarian, arbitrary, elitist and pragmatic, while the execution machinery was characterized by disciplined professionalism provided by foreign administrative experts. Closed to independent, in fact in the period of decolonization (1950) when British official role in government was reduced and there was increase of indigenous participation in governance, the colonial public policy making process was by rating characterized by strong administrators and weak policy-makers because the influence of colonialist in the management of administration were still visible not until at independence.

The situation did not change even at independence. This is because the political/administrative elites that took over political power from colonial masters were exhibiting the same character like the colonialists. In addition, the policy making processes were conservatively in the hands of permanent secretaries and ministers were merely either approving or disapproving proposals or recommendation from permanent secretaries.

The old order still continued even at First Republic (1960-1966) especially with regards to policy formulation due to colonial legacies. Though, it was a period of transition from colonial rule to civil democratic rule but the process of public policy making was relied heavily either on expatriate permanent secretaries or on newly appointed and inexperienced indigenous administrators. The generally low educational qualifications of the elected officials were another hindrance to their ability to initiate policy or exercise substantial control over administrators executing policies.

The case of Second Republic (1979-1983) was not very different from the old order; because as Joseph (1987) puts; the public policy making arena remained constrained by inherited legacies which was influenced by the prebendal disposition of politicians and their appointed officials. The elected officials lack the requisite knowledge of the workings of government and counted so much on a scarred bureaucracy inherited from thirteen years of military rule (1966-1979). The new rulers as Jega (2007:112) argued were more interested in democratizing processes of private capital accumulation than in empowering the people in the political and public policy making arena. Ake (1994) termed the actions of political elites as pursuing agendas that was anti-people where he said “democratization of disempowerment”. The policy making process was neither rational nor consultative or participatory (Jega, 2007:113).

In the era of military junta (1966-1979; 1983-1999), the policy making process became increasingly militarized. It could be said that the nature and character of public policy was then very closed, restrictive, arbitrary and authoritarian and harder and harsher than under colonial and civilian regimes. The military as we all know, rule by decree and that could be seen in the processes of policy making generally under this era, public policy were personalized and privatized without adequate participation from the people. As put by Jega (2007), indeed, as military rule became prolonged with dictatorship, policy making became imbued with patronizing and patrimonial tendencies, which sought to reward allies and primordial loyalties or penalize opponents and perceived enemies. The undemocratic nature of military regime has added legacies to those of colonialism, in weakening governance structures, institutions and processes, to the extent that the citizens lost confidence in the entire system.



In the present civil rule and democratization (1999-2019) process, the case is not entirely different but complicated because of colonial and prolong military hangover that paused a great threat to public policy making process. As Jega (2007) conclude that “essentially, we are still grappling through and the policy process is as crisis-prone as ever, in spite of spirited attempts at reforming the system. But the situation has to change and for this to happen, the monumental challenges, which pervade the system, have to be effectively confronted.

Public Policy and Democratic Governance in Nigeria: An Interface

The context of modern democratic governance has evolved in relation to, or linked to the notion of representative government. Democracy in this premise is conceptualized as representative form of government, implying that at regular intervals, citizens derived the right to vote in elections, choose public officers to whom they delegate their authority for the management of their common affairs for a fixed period. These elected officials are then in turned assisted by a category of appointed officials, called the administrators, or civil servants, or public officers, as noted by (Waldt, 2001:90). Jega (2005) further re-enforce this point by saying that “the elected public officials exercise their power and delegate authority so long as the people who elected them are satisfied with their conducts and management of common affairs.” In this system, control mechanisms are usually employed through regularized periodic elections which the voters could either renew the mandate if satisfied or dissatisfied with their performances or not.

In the practice of democracy, the public policy process is assumed to be the arena for continuous interaction and dialogue between voters and public officials. Here, the process is ideally a slow, rational, deliberative process of interaction, consultations and engagement between the citizens and their elected and appointed officials. Jega (2005) argue that under democratic system, popular participation, empowerment and consultation are important because they help to provide legitimacy for governmental action associated with a public policy and they also help to anticipate unintended consequences.

Thus, the interface between public policy and democracy, as Reich (1994:113) observed is rooted deeply in the idea of public deliberation. To him this is a process by which:

Citizens are motivated to act by ideas about what is good for society. Such ideas define how public problems are defined and understood. Government depends on such ideas for mobilizing for public action. Consequently, policy makers find themselves espousing such conceptions of public good.

In the public policy process, as Jega (2005) advanced that “because of many reasons: it helps the officials to clarify ambiguities from citizen’s notions of the public good; it help the public to discover contradictions in officials action or inactions it offers the public an opportunity to articulate or rearticulate public values in democratic governance; it helps to check the excesses of administrative discretion; and it facilitates responsive governance when pressure compels officials to accede to popular demands.” The essence of public policy in a democratic dispensation as Reich (1994:118-124) posited is to accommodate as much as possible, the varying and contending demands made on government by the citizens. It is also to maximize benefits of governance for all. Indeed, public policy is said to be a hybrid of interest group intermediation and net benefits maximization.



In every country of the world, it should be noted that there are public, governmental institutions which provide services and products to satisfy the basic needs of the people. These institutions are truly governed by laws and they rely on appropriated funds for the delivery of their goods and services to the citizens. The totality of these goods, services and products (roads, water, electricity, housing, education, and so) are generally by-products of public policy making process. What types of services are provided by public institutions, how they are provided depends on policy and is shaped by actors and interests in the policy arena. It is in this sense that Elowitz argues that “policies represent the final authoritative allocation of values” in Society (1992). This to some certain degree represents what politics is all about which is a perfect aspect of public policy.

In the opinion of Mkandawire (2002:1), democratically elected institutions are viewed as constituting both the enabling environment for social development and the evaluative framework for judging process of policy-making. In this sense therefore, these institutions are expected to open up and liberalize the policy making process, enhancing popular participation and encouraging wide-ranging consultations. Where these are absent, it could be perceived as a “piori”, closing or narrowing the policy making process and making it restrictive.

In a democratic dispensation as captioned by Waldt (2001:91), public policies involve interplay of many individuals and organizations in complex working relationships; the policy process is inherently political and is characterized by negotiation, bargaining, persuasion and compromise. Thus for policies to be effective, the process through which they are made and executed has to be rational, logical, sequential and deliberative. Both public policy and democratic governance are about the people therefore, it should be certain that the stages of public policy making process should reflect the total will of the people. The stages of policy agenda, policy formulation, policy adoption, policy implementation and policy evaluation should be characterized by openness, transparency, popular participation, support and broad consultation, which reflect considerable democratic culture. Democracy allows for inclusiveness, accountability, responsiveness and give and take which primarily re-echo the real essence and value of public policy.

From the foregoing however, the key arguments have been that there is a link between public policy and democracy (particularly the popular democracy).

Challenges of Public Policy Making on Democratic Governance in Nigeria

The subtopic above suggests that there is link between public policy and democratic governance in Nigeria. This is because the success or otherwise of public policy could have associated impact (whether negative or positive) on democracy. Democracy is about majority rule and in the same manner; public policy is but to address the felt needs of majority of people in the society.

To start with however, what are the possibilities of a “success-prone policy process in a country with history of policy failures?” The success of public policy in Nigeria is always short because there are no cogent solutions to policy problems in Nigeria. It may very well be a case of too many easy solutions flying around. Sambo in Anifowose and Ememuo (1999:308) posits that, it is for example logical to blame government for policy failures... and we blame our policy makers for the same reason.



But we may very well be dead wrong. Our focus on government as the root of policy failures may be misplaced. By bringing one government down or supporting a new one, we may not have thereby improved on policy fortunes (Ake, 1996:31). Ake's position is premised on the useful distinction he made between the ruling class and government, suggesting, in effect, that the ruling class is in power (always) while the government is only in office. The significance of Ake's in-depth analysis is that we concentrate too much energy on reforming governments and its institutions believing that therein lies the key to a success-prone policy process and in so doing, we neglect totally inherited dependent economic structure and its corresponding state structure.

Given the nature of the policy environment in Nigeria as stated above, we would not get anywhere in our quest to addressing these challenges of public policy without finding solution to the problems of the political context of policy making.

Sambo in Anifowose and Enemu (1999:309) offers an elaborate connection between public policy and the ruling class in developing countries and problems therein, when he said: "public policies can be made to reflect the interest of the vast majority of the people in developing countries. A crucial aspect of this process is the accommodation rather than the repression of the political expression of dissent. The capacity of the ruling class in developing nations to mobilize the vast majority of their people around national purposes and policies is contingent on this accommodation. That the ruling class has not been sufficiently sensitive to this necessity is primarily responsible for the continuing failure of policy decision in these countries."

Affirming this position, Jega (2007:110) revealed that "the public policy making process lacks the essential attributes of openness, inconclusiveness, transparency, participation and consultation. On the contrary the process is essentially driven by officialdom in the sense that government officials, both the elected and the unelected, arrogated to themselves the wisdom, prerogative and expertise of controlling and managing the policy making process with little if any reference to, or interaction with, the majority of the citizens. Thus, the process is not people-driven, transparent, consultative, but rather closed, exclusive, insensitive, unresponsive and often irresponsible." It should be noted that the public policy maker are totally uncountable and conserved in their approach which demean the vitality of democratic standard. Democracy engenders effective policy formulation and implementation as could be said of popular mandate of the people given to their representatives and where this is not followed, it can be said to lack democratic adherent.

Another challenge of public policy is the weak institution of government that are supposed to assume their formidable constitutional role in the policy making process. These institutions are too fragile and less powerful than the individual elites of the state. Suffice it to say that the state institutions to which both democracy and public policy rest on are inherited legacies of both colonial and military powers, so they can't function effectively.



CONCLUSION

The political apathy of citizens and their loss of confidence on the processes of governance can be resolved by public enlightenment and civil education; these would be more effective in achieving better results if followed by a change of style and disposition by public officials. The public officials should be shining examples to other citizens.

Furthermore, the conception of public policy making should be people driven and its effectiveness should be targeted on the people. Public policy making process should not be restrictive or rigid but open and accommodating. The point is that, public policy should be democratized and democratic system should be public interest centered.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The paper recommends the following:

- i) The need to improve and increase the competence of policy makers to be in tune with democratic practice when formulating public policies.
- ii) Government should expand her scope of participation in the policy making and execution, especially by mobilizing all stakeholders to be actively involved in the process.
- iii) The need to create more awareness and enlightenment on the mind of citizens by the government should be encouraged in order to build people's confidence;
- iv) Accordingly, the need for more funding to public institutions to enable them deliver on their mandates should also be taken seriously by the government.

REFERENCES

- Adebayo, A. (1989). Principles and practice of public administration in Nigeria. Spectrum Books Ltd. Ibadan.
- Ake, C. (1994). Democratization of disempowerment in Africa. Lagos Malthousemonograph.
- Apporadorai, A. (1995). Substance of politics, Oxford University Press. New Delhi.
- Ayo, E.J. (1988). Development planning in Nigeria, Ibadan: University Press Limited.
- Clark, G.K. and D.M. Wood (1978). Policy making in the Third World" in John, W. and Sons (eds.) Power and Policy in the third world.
- Dahl, R. (1970). Modern political analysis Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall.
- Dunn, J. (Ed.) (1993). Democracy: The unfinished journey. 508BC to 1993 New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dunn, W.N. (1981). Public policy analysis: An introduction. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Dye, T.R. and Zeigler, H. (1972). The Irony of democracy. Duxbury Press.
- Emiri, O.F. (2003). "Democracy, rule of law and the judiciary in Maduabuchi D. (Eds.), philosophy and politics: Discourse on values, politics and power in Africa, Malthouse Press Limited, Lagos.



- Friedrich, C. (1975). "Political decision-making, public policy and planning". Uveges J. Jr. ed., *The Dimensions of public administration*: Boston: Holbrooks Press Inc.
- Ibikeze, O.S. and Obie, E.A. (2004). *Public administration in Nigeria: A developmental approach*, Bookpoint Ltd. Onitsha.
- Ikelegbe, A.O. (1996). *Public Policy Making and Analysis*; Benin: Uni Publishing Ltd.
- Jega, A.M. (2005). "The Evolution of the concepts and institutions of democracy: A preliminary survey", in Jega A.M. and Wakili, H. (2005) *the question of democracy direct or representative*. Kano, Mambayya.
- Jega, A.M. (2007). *Democracy, good governance and development in Nigeria: Critical essays*, Spectrum Books Limited, Ibadan.
- Jones, C. (1977). *An Introduction to the study of public policy*, Duxbury Press.
- Joseph, R. (1987). *Democracy and prebendal politics in Nigeria: The rise and fall of the second republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lasswell, H. and Daniel, L. (1952). *The comparative study of elite*. Stanford University Press.
- Lindblom, C. (1968). *The Policy making process*. New Jersey.
- Mkandawire, O. (2002). "Adjustment political conditionality and democratization in Africa". In Chole, E. and J. Ibrahim (eds.).
- Mosca, G. (1939). *The ruling class*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Reich, R.B. (1994). "Policy making a democracy", in Lane, F.J. ed. *current issues in public administration*. New York
- Sambo, A. (1999). "What is public policy in Anifowose, R. and Enervo, F. (Eds.) *Elements of Politics*.
- Satoria, G. (1970). "Concept misinformation on comparative politics". ASPR
- Schumpeter, J.A. (1954). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*, OVP, London.
- Ujo, A.A. (2000). *Understanding political science and politics: A guide for students, politicians and election managers*: Anyaotu Enterprises & Publishers Nigeria Ltd., Kaduna.
- Waldt, G.V.D. (2001). "Public policy and analysis", in Van Niekerk, G.V.D. Waldt and A. Tonker, *Governance, politics and policy in South Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.