Problem of Policy Implementation in Nigeria: A Study of Anambra Integrated Development Strategy (ANIDS)

OBIORAH, Chidozie B.
Department of Political Science, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka, Anambra, Nigeria.

OKAFOR, Uzodinma C.
Department of Political Science, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka, Anambra, Nigeria.

Abstract

The study examined the challenges of policy implementation in Nigeria using Anambra Integrated Development Strategy (ANIDS) 2007-2015 as a point of reference. These problems range from poor funding to corruption on the part of the bodies thrust with the responsibilities of ensuring that developmental targets are met in Anambra state. It exposed why policies failed in Nigeria despite the genuineness associated with its formulation. To achieve this, the researcher adopted StructuralFunctional Theory in explanation of the work while questionnaire, in-depth interview and personal observation were the instruments used to generate data. Using descriptive statistics and chi-square as analytical tools, the study revealed that there is serious corruption among the government officials that are responsible for the implementation of public policies in Nigeria. It further revealed that funding has never been the major problem of policy implementation because the available financial resources mapped out for such projects have never been well utilized. Based on the findings, the paper recommended that government should improve her effort in stamping out corruption by strengthening the anti-corruption agencies, as it remains the greatest barrier to policy implementation; increase budgetary allocation public programmes; and that the government should give a legislative backing to ANIDS to ensure its continuity as many projects/programmes suffered abandonment as a result of change in administration.

Keywords

Public Policy, Implementation, ANIDS, Sustainable Development and Poverty

Introduction

Several policies and programmes have been formulated in Nigeria since her inception. All these policies are designed to address the problems of underdevelopment. Poverty, illiteracy and unemployment which are the major indicators of underdevelopment are on the increase. As a matter of fact, while the Federal

Corresponding Author:

Obiorah, Chidozie, Department of Political Science, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka. Email: dozie.obiorah @gmail .com

Ministry of Education (in 2007) estimated over 52 per cent illiteracy rate in the country, the National Bureau of Statistics states that 54 per cent of Nigerian youths were unemployed in (NBS, 2012). This indicates an upward rise in the level of underdevelopment as contained in the "2012 National Baseline Youth Survey Report" issued in Abuja by the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) in collaboration with the Federal Ministry of Youths Development (NBS, 2012).

The problem of public policy implementation has remained a reoccurring issue in Nigeria. Since Nigeria's independence, successive military and civilian governments have not been able to address the daunting challenges of public policy failures in the country.

However, Anambra State since its creation, has experienced an unstable political history which affected the structure and functioning of the body politics and further hindered effective delivery of public goods and services through workable policies. Indeed, the state is battling to be set free from its lingering developmental challenges through adoption of different developmental framework.

Several policy framework has been adopted by successive administrations to address the problem of poverty. The previous military administrative policy framework, the "think home philosophy", the NEEDS/SEEDS, Poverty Alleviation Programme, 7-point Agenda, Anambra Strategic Plan and of course the Anambra Integrated Development Strategy (ANIDS), which is the focus of the paper, has also be designed to eradicate poverty in the state. ANIDS was designed by the former governor of the state, Peter Obi, to develop all sectors simultaneously. It appears to raise some critical questions on the possibility of a single policy framework being able to develop all the sectors of the economy at the same time as broad as it is.

In spite of all these efforts towards reducing absolute poverty and ensuring sustainable development as well as the billions of naira being sunk on each of these programmes, and the euphoria that greeted each, they never yielded desired results, as most Nigerians are still trapped in the quagmire of poverty. Many scholars attributed these problems to insensitivity and greed as well as lack of political-will to allow these programmes survive. It is against this backdrop that the choice of this study was made, to find out why public policies in Nigeria fail using Anambra Integrated Development Strategy (ANIDS) in Anambra State as point of reference.

Statement of the Problem
The Nigeria Poverty Profile Report 2010, a report which emerged from the recent concluded Harmonised Nigeria Living Standard Survey (HNLSS) conducted by the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) with support from the World Bank, DFID-UK and UNICEF put the state absolute poverty, food poverty and gini coefficient at 56.8 per cent, 34.2 per cent and 0.3803 respectively in 2010. The 2010 poverty incidence of 56.8 per cent for the state is a concern because the same state had an incidence of 51.0 per cent in 1996 which improved to 20.11 per cent in 2004. The state currently has a literacy rate that hovers around 75 per cent which happens to be the rate it has-been since 2004 (NBS, 2012). Moreover, the impacts of policy failure in Nigeria have led to a widespread infrastructural decay, poverty, hunger and diseases, increase in crime rate, instability and insecurity, unemployment and other numerous problems. It is not to be argued that implementation is the bane of public policies and programmes in Nigeria. This simply explains why poverty is in geometric rise in Nigeria. To buttress this fact, Osibanjo (2016) stated that "about 110 million Nigerians were still living below poverty line despite the policies of past governments to improve their welfare". He went further to argue that some past government plannings,

policy formulation and budgets were not accountable to the people, stressing that in the past there have been "policies that do not seem to have solutions that truly reflect the understanding of the question of poverty in Nigeria.

However, the poverty mapping and profiling in Anambra State, 2008, shows a high incidence of poverty. Across the three senatorial district surveyed, the head count poverty index was 58 per cent. This is corroborated by the National Bureau of Statistics data which indicated that the incidence of poverty in Anambra State increased from 20.11 per cent in 2004 to 68.0 per cent in 2010 (Anambra State Government, 2013).

Consequently, in tackling the reoccurring developmental challenges of the state and in keeping with its determination to achieve the MDGs and overcome the perennial and hydra-headed problems of infrastructural decays, that in 2006, Anambra State Government of Peter Obi designed ANIDS to guide the actions and inactions of the State Government towards development. ANIDS, therefore, strategizes development in all sectors of the economy with the aim of improving the quality of life of Anambra people.

It is on this note that this paper sought to find out why there are frequent policy failures in Nigeria by using ANIDS programme in Anambra State as a point of reference.

Objectives of the Study
The major purpose of this study is to investigate why public policies in Nigeria fail despite the genuineness of these policies/programmes by using ANIDS as a point of departure. Specific objectives include;

1. To find out if funding has negatively affected the realization of ANIDS programme in Anambra state; and
2. To examine whether corruption among the public officials has been responsible for poor implementation of ANIDS in Anambra State.

Conceptual Discourse

Public Policy
Dror (1973) aptly conceptualizes policy in this sense, as a "major guideline for action". The key characteristic of a policy is that, it involves a choice; it is an important choice or a critical or major decision taken by individuals, groups or organizations. This means that there has to be several policy alternatives. Second, policies are proposed courses of actions or projected set of decisions. Policies are prospective or are statements of future actions.

More so, a policy is a course setting action. It provides the direction, the guide and the way to the achievement of certain goals. It provides the frame within which present and future actions are taken (Ikelegbe, 1994). The point to note here is that policy entails choice selection among several policy alternatives, a projected set of decisions, goal-oriented targeted to achieve some objectives, has to tackle some problem areas and as well a course setting action that tailored towards the achievement of certain goals.

Public policy, as a concept has a variety of uses. This is because the perception of the meaning, impact and significance of public policy may vary with the perspective of participants and observers (knoll, 1969

in Dahida, and Maidoki, 2013). Also, the interdisciplinary nature of the concept constitutes another problem. However, the only way by which we can demarcate one from another is to add the epithet that will reflect our area of interest; for instance, economists talk of "economic policies" while educationists often refer to policies relating to education as "educational policies". But when used in either way, it portrays different meanings. In addition to this, there is controversy in existing literatures in Political Science over the boundary of what constitutes public policy (Oyejide, 2009). This has been better exemplified by Sharkansky (1978) who assertes that policy can be referred as a proposal, an on-going programme, or the goals of a programme, major decisions or the refusal to make certain decision. What the above position suggests to us is that the focus of public policy may not necessarily be at the three stages of policy-making process, but it can be mainly on a state. Thus, one can aptly argue that public policy concerns the formulation of a decision, its implementation and evaluation. On this note, Dimock, et al. (1983) argue that public policy is deciding at any time or place what objectives and substantive measures should be chosen in order to deal with a particular problem issue or innovation. It also includes the reasons they should be chosen.

Consequently, this problem calls for prudent management of the meager resources to meet some of the pressing demands of the citizens especially in Anambra State. The positions of Chandler and Piano (1988) and Dimock et al. (1983) appreciate the fact that "planning" forms the bedrock of public policy. Whereas planning is explained by Chandler and Piano (1988) as: Conceiving meaningful goal and developing alternative choices for future action to achieve these goals. Planning involves a systematic procedure for the reduction of many alternatives to an approved course of action. It determines not only goals but the sequential order in which they are pursued, the need for coordination and the standards for maintaining control. In essence, anything that involves planning has a goal to achieve. Therefore, we can argue that Chandler and Piano/Dimock et al. position on public policy captured the concept from the point of view of goal attainment.

Policy Implementation
Policy implementation is one of the major problems confronting developing nations. According to Adamolekun (1983), policy implementation refers to the activities that are carried out in the light of established policies. It means to the process of converting financial, material, technical and human inputs into outputs - goods and services (Egonmwan, 1991). Edwards (1980) sees policy implementation as a stage of policy-making between the establishment of a policy (such as the passage of a legislative act, the issuing of an executive order, or the promulgation of a regulatory rule) and the consequences of the policy for the people whom it affects. It also involves a wide variety of actions such as issuing and enforcing directives, disbursing funds, making loans, assigning and hiring personnel, etc.

Stripped of all technicalities, implementation problem in most developing nations is the problem of a widening gap between intentions and results. Honadle (1979) tried to identify the problem associated with policy implementation as that of social carpenters and masons who fail to build to specifications and thus distort the beautiful blueprint. Here, he was equating policy with a building plan. Going further, he stated that:

> *Implementation is the nemesis of designers, it conjures up images of plans gone*
> *awry and of social carpenters and masons who fail to build to specifications and*
> *thereby distort the beautiful blue prints for progress which were handed to them.*
> *It provokes memories of "good" ideas that did not work and places the blame on*
> *the second (and second-class) member of the policy and administration team...(*
> *Honadle,1979:39).*

The above quotation according to Honadle, shows the importance that is attached to policy implementation and those that are responsible for implementing these policies. It also shows that no matter how beautiful the blueprint of a programme is, a defective implementation of it will make nonsense of the whole programme.

Maduagwu (2005), on his part, counted the politics of personal rule, the master and servant relationships associated with the programmes to alleviate poverty among the factors accounting for the failure of all past efforts. Others include lack of project continuity on the part of the incumbent government (Oyoze, 2003), political and policy instability (Adamu, 2006), neo-colonial influence and the millennium economic policies of liberalization, policy reversals, and non-Transparent programme administration (Nwafor, 2005), programme inconsistency, poor implementation, corruption of government officials and public servants, poor targeting mechanisms and failure to focus directly on the poor (Ogwumike, 2002). Commenting on high level of deficiency in policy implementation, Egware (1997) highlighted high import content of most of the operations, inappropriate technology, politicization, personalization, and the none involvement of the people for whom the programmes are designed for, and the erroneous assumption that the poor generally constituted a homogenous group among the factors that are responsible for policy implementation failure in Nigeria. In other words, many of the programmes were politically motivated, designed more to buy legitimacy for the government rather than being primary in function and genuine in their intention to help the poor. He noted that those who benefited from these various programmes as being the rich and powerful elites.

However, Egonmwan (1984) identified some other problems that affect policy implementation in developing countries. Among them are: inadequate definition of goals; over-ambitious policy goals; and choice of inappropriate organizational structure in implementation of policies. Inadequate definition of goals makes a policy to lack clarity, internal consistency and compatibility with other policy goals with the result that the successful implementation of such a policy becomes problematic. This is a problem of communication. Goal definition varies in developing countries because people disagree about the objectives of a given programme or because people do not care to define such objectives because the objectives are not to their advantage. Egonmwan equally stated that some policy-makers assume that they know the needs of the target groups and therefore see no reason for clarity of goals.

By and large, Egbulefu (2009:16) identified lack of political will/attitude to public policy implementation as another challenges of policy implementation in Nigeria. Public policy implementation or delivery is negatively or positively affected by the attitude or behaviour of the implementers. That is, if they are negatively disposed to a policy, there will be lack of commitment to the implementation process. The Nigerian state is privatized, dependent, weak and lacks autonomy. Therefore, despite the availability of public policies that stands to better the lot of the average Nigerian, the state unfortunately lacks the political will to positively realize such policy objectives. The argument is that, even though the set objectives of government policies stand to benefit the public, the cabal that holds the top echelon of government hostage, at any point in time, will jeopardize or frustrate the implementation of public policies. In the energy sector, for instance, Nigeria with a population of over 140 million people presently generates only a miserable 1,500 megawatts capacity. And despite the sinking of a copious 13.2 billion American dollars in the sector by former President Olusegun Obasanjo regime between 1999-2007, no tangible result was achieved (Egbulefu, 2009:16).

On his own part, Ikelegbe (2005:183) identified poor implementation design, conception and discipline as the problems confronting policy implementation in Nigeria. Planning, according to him, is of

paramount importance no matter what your venture might be. Therefore, the design of the modes and methods of implementation of a policy is critical to implementation success. Wrong choices of means and methods could mar implementation chances and cause policy failure. This is because the instruments, methods, knowledge, technology, equipment, models and modes of delivery utilized in implementing a policy determine whether implementation and performance would be successful or not (Ikelegbe, 2005). According to Oyejide (2009), one of the core reasons why this problem persists has to do with the class character of the post colonial elites as well as the structural deformity of the Nigerian state.

Similarly, Ake (2001) and Nwoye (2005) also show that "other factors that combine to frustrate policy implementation include pervasive corruption, chronic mismanagement, intense parochialism, poor leadership and lousy work ethics". They went further to argue that when corruption penetrates the implementation process, public policies become mutated and the desired goals may not be achieved.

An Overview of Anambra Integrated Development Strategy (ANIDS)
ANIDS is a programme targeted at a simultaneous development of all sectors of Anambra State. ANIDS as a public policy enables Anambra State Government to identify budgetary gaps, some of which the state government may need to fill with development partners.
The last decade saw the state adopt different policy regimes. The period 2003-2007 saw the state aligning to the national policy; National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) by adopting a State Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (SEEDS). In line with the goals and objectives of national development, Anambra .SEEDS expressed the very vision and core contents of the State government's development objectives and as a document, guided the government development aspirations and activities across a broad range of sectors. Just like NEEDS, Anambra SEEDS claimed to be a plan document that is people-oriented as it addressed the yearnings and aspirations of the people of the state (Amakon, 2013).

The key sectors of the State's economy which SEEDS addressed, because of their linkages and direct contributions to poverty reduction, wealth creation and employment generation, include, but are not limited to health, education, agriculture, commerce and industry, basic infrastructures (roads, water, electricity, etc.), human development and general administration. Anambra SEEDS was later enveloped by the adoption of an, "All-point Agenda" as embodied and called Anambra Integrated Development Strategy (ANIDS) for the development of all sectors simultaneously. It was in line with the objectives of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and in keeping with its determination to achieve the MDGs and overcome the perennial and hydra-headed problems of infrastructure! decays that made Anambra State Government under the administration of Peter Obi designed ANIDS to guide the actions and inactions of the State Government towards development. ANIDS, therefore, strategizes development in all sectors of the economy with the aim of improving the quality of life of Anambra people.

ANIDS, which embodies the State Government's strategic vision is conceptualized to solve the state's hydra-headed development problems in an organized, comprehensive and holistic manner by fast tracking development in all sectors of the state economy simultaneously.

ANIDS is the simultaneous development of all sectors of the economy. ANIDS as a public policy enables Government to identify budgetary gaps some of which the state government may need to fill with development partners.

Details of this development strategy, which pursued the development of all sectors simultaneously, include among others, empowering thousands of the less privileged particularly women and vulnerable

group such as widows, orphans, HIV patients and the physically challenged to enable them either expand their trade or start petty trading or small scale farming. Provision of revolving loans to establish small scale agro-based business such as poultry farms, fish ponds, pigs farms, sundry equipment (including palm oil processing machine, palm kernel cracking machines, food processing machines, soap-making machines and electricity-generating sets to power them) have been given to hundreds of cooperative groups to establish cottage industries (ANIDS Report, 2009).

The programmes of ANIDS encompass the gamut of society ranging from construction of phase II of the new secretarial complex, renovation of the state assembly, to health. Here, robust plans are envisaged such as completion and equipping of Cardio-Thoracic Centre, Kidney Dialysis and Breast Cancer Centre also in Onitsha, Amaku General Hospital Awka, Umuleri General Hospital, psychiatric hospital Nawfia andUmunze General Hospital (Anambra State: ANIDS, 2009).

In the Education sector, ANIDS' ambitious plans are encapsulated in the construction, reconstruction and rehabilitation of various educational institutions from primary to tertiary. In agriculture, ANIDS plans to eradicate poverty and hunger by boosting all sectors of agriculture. Other areas of thrust include public utilities and water resources, environment, works and roads, lands survey and town planning, information and culture. Others are transport, housing and urban development, commerce, industry and development (Chukwuemeka & Chukwujindu, 2013).

The Anambra Integrated Development Strategy ANIDS is also designed to promote industrial development of the state and create enabling environment for the attraction of local and foreign investment, public-private partnership and in particular provide basic infrastructure! facilities, credit access, industrial parks/shade/estates/ entrepreneurial training skill acquisition scheme, for the growth of small and medium scale enterprises, acknowledged world-wide as engine of growth.

Emerging from the trajectory, we discovered from this literature that policy-making or formulation has never been a problem in Nigeria but the problem is implementation. Scholarly, expositions have shown that the subsequent governments of Nigeria have always come up with wonderful and well-intentioned policies and programmes to address the problems of poverty and underdevelopment but the major challenge lie in implementation. Thus, the issues of corruption and funding were not adequately addressed in the literature in relation to implementation of ANIDS. Therefore, this forms the gap the study intents to fill in this paper.

Theoretical Framework

The structural functionalism framework of political analysis has been particularly found useful for comparative politics. The major proponents of the theory include, Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton, Marion Levy, Gabriel Almond and Coleman. They identified four characteristics of a political system: (a) all political systems have political structures; (b) the same functions are performed in all political system with different frequencies and by different kinds of structure; (c) all political structures are multifunctional; and (d) all political systems are 'mixed' system. Almond and Powell identified four input functions and three output function. Input functions are political socialization and recruitment, interest articulation, interest aggregation and political communication. Output functions include rule making, rule application and rule adjudication. Almond paid special attention to the input functions which are performed by non-governmental structures or institutions. Although all structures are multi-functional, yet some structures are especially suited for specific functions. Almond and Powell identified two chief

characteristics of development of political system, which include structural differentiation and secularization of culture.

By role differentiation or structural differentiation, we refer to the processes whereby roles change and become more specialized or more autonomous or whereby new types of roles are established or new structures and sub¬systems emerge or are created. Secularization of culture is the process whereby traditional orientations and attitudes are given to more dynamic decision-making processes involving the gathering of information, the evaluation of information, the laying out of alternative course of action, the selection of a course of action from among the possible courses, and the means whereby one tests whether or not a given course of action is producing the consequences which were intended.

From the above posited theme on structural functionalism, it is germane to note that the theory has its major concern on the structures and the functions they perform within a system. What this connotes is that both formal and informal institutions have their various responsibilities of ensuring the sustenance of the system. In this study, the theory is drawn into view to capture the quest of the study. The study looks at the challenges of policy implementation in Nigeria focusing on ANIDS programme in Anambra State. It questions why numerous policies generated within the state do not receive proper implementation. It is on that basis that this study employs structural functionalism to evaluate why the various institutions of government thrust with the responsibility of ensuring policy implementation fail in their various responsibilities. To that extent, the study views Anambra State Integrated Development Strategy which tries to explore development of the state in all facets of human endeavour. Unfortunately, the programme did not achieve much in line with "Millennium Development Goals" now "Sustainable Development Goals". It only provided the State with a palliative measure on how to address the vexed issues of political imbalance in the state. By and large, the study tries to look at the inability of the state institutions to address developmental challenges in the state. It presented an ugly platform that negatively affected ANIDS programme in Anambra State.

Research Method
This study employs survey research as it utilizes both primary and secondary sources of data. Documentary evidence and questionnaire were used to elicit responses. The study area covered the people of Anambra State with a total population of 4,177,828 (NPC, 2006). The state is stratified into three geopolitical zones as Anambra North, Anambra Central, and Anambra South Senatorial Zones respectively. Two local government councils were selected from each senatorial zone and they included: Ogbaru and Anambra East Local Governments (Anambra North); Idemili North and Dunukofia Local Governments (Anambra Central) and Aguata and Nnewi North Local Governments (Anambra South).

The choice of these local governments was based on the purposive sampling of the highest and least population from each senatorial zones of the state to ensure adequate representation of the entire population, while the sample size 400 obtained from the application of the Taro Yamane formulae for sample size determination. Out of the 400 copies of the questionnaire distributed, 285 were returned representing a return rate of 71.1 per cent.

The data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as percentages while the hypotheses were analyzed using chi-square at the appropriate level of confidence (0.05). A Spoint Likert scale technique was used in analyzing the data. The positively worded items of strongly agree, and agree were given the following scores respectively 2 and 1 while the negatively worded items of strongly disagree were given the following scores -I and -2. Undecided was scored zero (0). The various scores are summed up for each of the respondents. Simple percentage was used to determine the direction of their perception

and belief concerning the subject under review. Chi-square (X2) was used to determine the measures of dispersal and to strengthen the decision arrived at.

Data Presentation and Analysis

Tables la-lb below was designed using Spoint likert scale formulae to get information from respondents. These questions designed to tap the opinion of the respondents on different issues raised from the hypotheses including the poor funding and corruption. After the use of percentages to sort out issues from the likert tables, chi-square, in the final analysis, was used in testing the hypothesis at 5 per cent level of significance to make conclusion in each hypothesis stated.

Table la: Inadequate funding hinders effective implementation of ANIDS

Responses	No. of Respondents	% Scores
Strongly Agree	55	(55/285) x 100 = 19.3
Agree	45	(45/285) x 100 = 15.8
Undecided	40	(40/285) x 100 = 14.0
Disagree	65	(65/285) x 100 = 22.8
Strongly Disagree	80	(80/285) x 100 = 28.0
Total	285	100%

Source: Field survey 2016

The percentage agree is 19.3+15.8 = 35.1 per cent while the percentage disagree is 22.8+28.0 = 50.8 per cent.

From the above table, therefore, it is obvious that the number of the respondents who agree that poor funding hinders the effective implementation of ANIDS is 100 representing 35.1 per cent while the distribution that disagree on the above assertion is 145 representing 50.8 per cent. Therefore, the respondents that disagree are more than the ones that agree.

Table Ib: Corruption hindered the effective implementation of ANIDS

Responses	No. of Respondents	% Scores
Strongly Agree	70	(70/285) x 100 = 24.6
Agree	61	(61/285) x 100 = 21.4
Undecided	44	(44/285) x 100 = 15.4
Disagree	52	(52/285) x 100 = 18.2
Strongly Disagree	58	(58/285) x 100 = 20.4
Total	285	100%

Source: Field survey 2016.

From the table above, we discovered that the number of percentage agree 46.0 per cent (totaling 131) is more than the number of percentage disagree which is 110 representing 38.6 per cent. This means that the 46.0 per cent of the respondents agree that public officer's corrupt practices affect ANIDS

implementation while 38.6 per cent of the respondents totaling 110 disagree that corruption hinders the effective implementation of ANIDS in Anambra State.

Test of Hypotheses

Hypothesis one

The formulae for Chy-Square is given as $X^2 = \sum(0 - E)^2/ E$

Where X^2 = Chy-Square

        O = Observed frequency

        E = Expected frequency

        $\sum$ = Summation of all items.

        Df = Degree of Freedom

HO: The implementation of ANIDS has not succeeded in eradication of poverty in Anambra state.

HI: The implementation of ANIDS has succeeded in eradication of poverty in Anambra State.

Hypothesis two

HO: Inadequate funding is not significantly responsible for ineffective implementation of ANIDS in Anambra State.

HI: Inadequate funding is significantly responsible for ineffective implementation of ANIDS in Anambra State.

Table 2a: Chi-square table of hypothesis two, that is, whether inadequate funding is responsible for poor implementation of ANIDS

Response	FO	Fe	Fo-Fe	$(Fo-Fe)^2$	$(Fo-Fe)^2/Fe$
Strongly Agree	55	57	*-2*	4	0.07
Agree	45	57	-12	144	2.53
Undecided	40	57	-17	289	5.07
Disagree	65	57	8	64	1.12
Strongly Disagree	80	57	23	529	9.28
Total	285				18.07

Source: Field survey 2016.

From the above table, the calculated value of X^2 = 18.07, Table value of X^2 or the Critical value is 9.49 while the Degree of Freedom (df) at 0.05 level of significance is (5 -1) = 4. Therefore, df = 4.

Decision
Since calculated chi-square (X^2) value of 18.07 is greater than the table value of chi-square (X^2 of 9.49 at alpha level of 0.05 and degree of freedom of 4, therefore, we reject the Alternative (Ht) and accept the

Null hypothesis (H0) which states that "Inadequate funding is not responsible for the ineffective implementation of ANIDS in Anambra State".

Hypothesis three
HO: Corruption among the government officials is not significantly responsible for poor implementation of ANIDS.
HI: Corruption among the government officials is significantly responsible for poor implementation of ANIDS.

Table 2b: Chi-square table of hypothesis three, that is, whether corruption has negatively affected the implementation of ANIDS

Response	FO	Fe	Fo-Fe	$(Fo-Fe)^2$	$(Fo-Fe)^2/Fe$
Strongly Agree	70	57	13	169	2.96
Agree	61	57	4	16	0.28
Undecided	44	57	-13	169	2.96
Disagree	52	57	-5	25	0.44
Strongly Disagree	58	57	1	1	0.02
Total	285				6.66

Source: Field survey 2016

From the above table, the calculated value of X^2 = 6.66, Table value of X^2 or the Critical value is 9.49 while the Degree of Freedom (df) at 0.05 level of significance is (5 -1) = 4. Therefore, df = 4.

Decision
Since calculated chi-square (X2) value of 6.66 is less than the table value of chi-square (X2) of 9.49 at alpha level of 0.05 and degree of freedom of 4, therefore, we reject the Null and accept the Alternate hypothesis (HO which states that "Corruption of the government officials is responsible for poor implementation of ANIDS in Anambra State".

Summary of Findings
1. That funding is not the major factor responsible for the inefficiency of ANIDS to address the problem of poverty and development in the state. The respondents were of the opinion that if the available funds were judiciously and sincerely injected in implementation of these policies, a meaningful change and realization of the objectives of these policies would be achieved.
2. That corruption is significantly responsible for the poor implementation of ANIDS and therefore, remains the cog in the wheel of development and eradication of poverty in Anambra State in particular and Nigeria in general.

Though some of the respondents acknowledged some of the efforts ANIDS has made especially in the health sector, education, construction of roads and other infrastructures, they argued that those things were mainly located in few cities like Onitsha, Awka and Nnewi while the rural areas that form the major population of the state are being neglected.

Conclusion
ANIDS is not different from the previous policy frameworks adopted by the past administration like Think Home Philosophy, NEEDS, 7-Point Agenda, Anambra Strategic Plan or Anambra Medium Plan

etc, as they all designed and focused towards alleviating poverty. The problem has always lie in implementation. Therefore, it has been discovered that corruption remains the canker worm that frustrates the efforts of government towards eradication of poverty in the state. As a result, the effort of the government towards eradication of poverty in Anambra State has not been realized.

Recommendations

The paper recommends that the ongoing reform in fight against corruption by the present administration should be handled with seriousness and that the anti-graft agencies should not be used as an instrument to witch-hunt any political opposition or perceived enemies. Rather, the Commission should be empowered and sincerely encouraged to carry out its constitutional duties without any interference from the government by granting it full autonomy. This will compel all and sundry responsible for the implementation of policies to live up to their responsibilities by avoiding sharp and corrupt practices that negate the successful implementation policies.

Secondly, the study also recommends that government should extensively venture into agriculture and explore other avenues that will help her to generate more funds from the Internally Generated Revenue (IGR) rather than relying solely on federal allocation for the sponsorship of her developmental projects and programmes. The researcher is of the opinion that when this is done, Anambra State and indeed, Nigeria in general would actualize its lofty dreams of effective implementation of public policies.

REFERENCES

Adamu, A (2006) "The Challenges of Nigeria's Economic Development in the 21stCentury: Baking the National Cake", Switzerland, Nigeria Awareness Group Paper, August 30.

Adamolekun, L. (1983). *Public Administration: A Nigerian and Comparative Perspective.* New York: Longman Inc.

Ake, C. (2001). *A political Economy of Nigeria*, Nigeria: Longman Press. Aluko, B. (2011). "As Speaker Bankole Exits." Sunday Tribune, 22 May, p.16.

Amakom, U. (2013). "Public Policies, Budgeting and Spending in Anambra State: Analysis of Performances in a Decade (2003-2013)" *African Centre for Leadership, Strategy and Development*, Centre LSD Book Series No. 6. Abuja.

Anambra State Government (2013). "Anambra State Peer Review Report: Abridged Report" (www.anambrastate/bureauofstatistics)

Chandler, R.C. and Piano, J.C. (1988). *The public Administration D ictionary*. England: ABC- CLIO

Chukwuemeka, C. & Chukwujindu, E.C. (2013). "The Effect of Anambra Integrated Development Strategy (ANIDS) on Nigeria Sustainable Development: AnAppraisal (2006-2011)" in The European Journal of Business and Social Sciences, Vol. 2, No.9 December (http://www.ejbss.com/recent.aspx) Dahida, D. P & Maidoki, B.P (2013) "Public Policy Making and Implementation in Nigeria: Connectingthe Nexus" The Journal of Public Policy and Administration Research (www.iiste.org).

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

Dror, Y. (1973). *Public Policy Making Reexamined*, Chandler: Scranton.

Dye, T. R. (1987). *Understanding Public Policy.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall. Edwards

G C. (1980*). Implementing Public Policy*. Washington: Congressional Quarterly

Egbulefu, T. (2009). "Forces of Darkness" *The Source Magazine*, April 6.

Egonmwan, 1 A. (1984). *Public Policy Analysis: Concepts and Applications*. Benin City: S.M.O. Aka and Brothers Press.

Egonmwan, JA (1984). *Public Policy Analysis: Concepts and Applications.* Benin City: S.M.O. Aka and Brothers Press.

Egware, L. (1997). *Poverty and Poverty Alleviation: The Nigeria's Experience, Poverty Alleviation in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Nigerian Economic Society.

Federal Government of Nigeria (2006). *Population and Housing Census Priority Table Vol. IV*, Population Distribution by Age and Sex, State and Local Government Area. Abuja, NPC.

Honadle, G. (1979). "Implementation Analysis: The Case for an Early Dose of Realism inDevelopment Administration" in, George Honadle and Rud Klauss (eds.) *Administration: Implementation Analysis for Development.* New York: Praeger.

Ikelegbe, A. (1994). *Public Policy-Making and Analysis Benin City*: Uri Publishing Ltd.

Ikelegbe, A. (2005). *Public Policy Analysis: Concepts, Issues and Cases*. Lagos: Imprint Services.

Knuttila, M. and Kubik, W. (2000). *State Theories: Classical, Global and Feminist Perspectives (3d Ed.),* Canada: Femwood Publishing Ltd.

Linz, J. J. and Robert M. (7006). *Political Sociology, and the Future of Democracy*. New Brunswick NJ: Transaction Publishers. (Edited by H.E. Chehabi.)

Maduagwu, A. (2005). Alleviating Poverty in Nigeria. African Economic Anaiysis.www.afbis.com/analysis/alleviating_poverty. Retrieved 20/05/15. New Brunswick NJ: Transaction Publishers (edted by H.E. Chehabi)

Nwafor, M, (2006). Trade Liberalization and Poverty in Nigeria: Lessons From The Past, Enugu African Institute of Applied Economics.

Nwoye, K. (2005). *State Governance and the Democratic Process.* Enugu: Jendiks Press.

Ogwumike, P.O. (2002). "An Appraisal of Poverty Reduction Strategies in Nigeria". www.cenbank,org/out/publication/EFR/RD/2002. Retrieved on 17/03/2015.

Osibanjo, Y. (2015). "Over 100m Nigerians Living Below Poverty Line": http://www.vanguardngr.com/2015/08/over-l-miHion-nigerians-iiving-below-poverty-rmeosinbajo

Oyejide, O. (2009). *Problems of Economic Development in Nigeria.* Ibadan: Spectrum.

Oyoeze, B.O, (2003), "On Economic Reforms and Development Plans in Nigeria". *Daily Times*, August 30.

Sharkansky, I. (1978). *Public Administration: Policy Making in Government Agencies,* Chicago: Rand McNaliy College Publishing Company.

The National Bureau of Statistics (2012). "54% of Nigerian Youths Were Unemployed   in 2012"   http://www.anabrakaonIine.org/anidsANIDS   home pagehttp://www.vanguardngr.com/2013/12/54   -Nigerian-youths-unemployed-2012