

REGIME CHANGE, POLICY INCONSISTENCY AND THE QUESTION OF NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA: A STUDY OF AGRICULTURE POLICIES.

ODUNTAN JOSEPH, AYANDIJI AINA, NWOGWUGWU NGOZI

Abstract

In Nigeria various regimes, regardless of type, always play vital roles in decision making that could enhance national development. There are series of policies and programme, such as Operation Feed the Nation (OFN), Green Revolution (GR), Universal Primary Education(UPE), National Commission for Nomadic Education(NCNE) and many others. These programmes are expected to continue by succeeding regimes but unfortunately, they did not live to the expectation.

Policies made generally in Nigeria are bereft of the global standard of performance of policy making that boost national development. Policy making in most developed countries is based on democracy and good governance, discipline, and sustainability which has made foreign administration successful. For any policy to meet international standard, it requires engagement with all stakeholders, openness, transparency, effectiveness and relevance. However, Nigeria political leaders are involved in multiple roles in agriculture policies and other activities yet it is unsustainable. But in spite of these laudable efforts and contributions, national development has not been positively enhanced. This explains why successive administrations have come up with series of policies especially in agriculture, designed to improve national development yet, there is no congruence between regime change and national development. It appears that these policies have failed in most cases to resolve the issues of national development in Nigeria. Many policies made by Nigeria leaders are good policies, but some seemed to be motivated by primordial interest as well as prebendal considerations. Each successive government has been seemingly treating programmes/policies of predecessors with disdain and would rather prefer the formulation of new policies to assuage the feelings of their cronies and acolytes who often come up with new programmes to deceive the civic public.

The lack of will to straighten up and sustain governmental policies on various gamut of development such as education policy, health, transport, agriculture, power/energy, public enterprises, aviation, and man power/labour has contributed to the low level of Nigeria's National development. There appears to be a lot of political undertones that affect policy consistency by various regimes thereby turning them against Nigeria's national development.

Keywords: Regime Change, Policy Inconsistency, Development

Introduction

Regimes are generally more permanent forms of political organization than governments, states are generally more permanent than regimes. While a regime remains more or less the same, different governments can succeed each other since they can exercise power by accepting the rules constituting an established regime and without changing the basic structure of the state (Fishman, 1990, p. 428). The state is distinct from the regime in that the state is the center of political power; regimes are less related to the political power itself than to the way it is structured. In this way, a regime structure either in civilian (democratic) or military (authoritarian) make decisions of governments as well as executing power of state.

Political leaders and governments worldwide have assigned an increasing central role of policy making to the citizens, and many African countries since independence have undergone transitions from one party rule to multi party rule and from democratic to autocratic rule. Nigeria is not an exception, both autocratic and democratic regimes (i.e military and civilian regimes) have been at the helm of affairs and have played the role of policy making, but both the policies made have had differing effects on national development.

Agricultural policies made in Nigeria, as well as other policies in other sectors, are inconsistent, due to the fact that each succeeding regimes put up policies that satisfy self-interest. For instance, between 1976 to 1979, the military regime of General Olusegun Obasanjo introduced Operation Feed the Nation (OFN) in the Agricultural sector; his civilian successor, Alhaji Sheu Shagari abandoned (OFN) and embarked on another policy tagged "Green Revolution". This switch had a negative effect on human and materials resources.

Attaining any national development in Nigeria will largely depend on sustaining old and current viable policies made by various regimes. Jong (2012) argued that it is not the lack of democratic regime that affects growth and development, but the length of time the particular regime has been in place in relation to policy implemented, whether the regime is democratic

or autocratic. Indeed consistency in policy making by various regimes is the necessary condition for transformation of the economy which is highly essential for national development.

Conceptual Clarifications

Regime change, as a phenomenon has both local and international orientation. Regime change can be viewed as the replacement of one government with another; it is a transition of one political regime to another, especially through concerted political or military action. Studies by Jong (2012) show that countries with stable political regime grow on average faster than countries without stable political change.

In Nigeria since independence, regime change has been in form of replacement of a military regime with another military regime or replacement of a civilian regime with military regime and has had civilian to civilian transition during the fourth republic. Between 1960 to date, Nigeria has had thirteen changes of government with seven military regimes and six civilian governments. All these governments formulated and implemented one policy or the other and there are series of changes or new policies by various regimes.

The concept of regime change can be traced to American democratic tradition of exchange of heads of states every four or eight years. In Africa, regime change has been precipitated by coup d'état, revolution or political instability which, according to Economic Intelligent Unit (2014) is described as events or developments that pose a serious extra parliamentary and extra institutional threat to state institutions, governing political participation and competition. These events and developments will almost invariably be accompanied by some violence as well as public disorder, but need not be necessarily be successful in toppling the government or regime.

Universally, there is a consensus that regime change is necessary in order to have good governance; this is linked to the growing thirst for an improved and qualitative living standard (Umar & Tafida, 2015, p. 59). By implication, for citizens to have a good life, there is a need to have options in governance resulting in necessity for regime change. Through such the changes, potential leaders who will facilitate effective governance will be discovered.

According to Magee and Dorcee (2015) electoral process through democracies have incentive of transparency on political matters and remains the hope for genuine change in any political regime where voters decide who rules them (p. 223). In the same vein, it implies that elections into public offices are decided by voters who are agents of change. Regime change

gives the citizens the opportunity of choosing from an array or plethora of potential leaders who usually show interest in governing/leading the people.

Leadership or governance over the ages is predicated on the type or structure of government in place in every milieu. For example there exist; socialist state (practicing socialism), feudalist state (practicing feudalism), communist state (practicing communism) democratic state (practicing democracy). In essence, good governance and the performance of any leader in every regime is determined by the structure of politics leaned on by that state (Hartman, 2017, p. 88).

Policy inconsistencies according to Boven and Hart (2016) are government operations that evidently went wrong. These may be as a result of consequential mishap which is highly unambiguous, collapse of public infrastructure, IT innovation failures, institutional corruption or other man-made disasters (p. 3). In Nigeria for instance, much of government policies are not about giving benefits and service delivery, and this is possible because of limited political pressures of transparency and accountability and if government had astutely conducted an impression policy design, policy would have been a continuum. Most policies in Nigeria denotes instances where policies operate at the edge of failure as there are major shifts of deviations from original goals and high profile and bitter conflicts among stakeholders in the political arena (McConnell, 2015, p. 64).

Implicitly, policy inconsistency is as a result of deviations from the fundamental plans of the programme by the regime who formulated the policy or the incumbent government. Wogu, Sholarin and Chidozie, (2015) averred that there has been a plethora of conceptual, ideological and psychological policies in Nigeria, most of which were born out of the crave and selfish hunger for identity and recognition that would leave a lasting impression about various administration or regimes in question (p. 138).

A policy is a response to problems of people and the general society or a country. All citizens have four preferences: more public goods, more private benefits, more leisure and lower taxes (Carter & Palmer, 2015, p. 148). In other words, policy should solve the problems of human need and deprivation, which is identified by the citizens themselves or identified by others for a relief. Policies made or enunciated by government are public policies. Public policies are meant to solve people's problems so that they can have access to better living conditions. Policy confer advantages and disadvantages, could cause pleasure, irritation and pain and collectively have important consequences for our well-being and happiness as constituting a significant portion of our environment (Abubakar & Abubakar, 2014, p. 31).

Stone and Ladi (2015) conceived public policy as the purview of the states and as executed by the state (p. 3). Therefore, Public policy is the policy developed or formulated by governmental bodies or officials for the interest of all the people. It is the governmental bodies and officials who have the authority in any political system to make policies.

National development is a condition that leads to economic expansion which provides better tools for production and solves the onerous task of survival faced by all humans. National development should be the goal and pride of any government (Emeh, 2013, p.116). However, policy stands as a major instrument to fast track national development and growth (Adebayo, 2015). Policy serves as the guideline to shape the economy of the nation but can also constitute a constraint to development if they are not properly formulated or implemented by various regimes.

Nwanegbo and Odigbo (2013) asserted that development could be seen as a process of empowering people to maximize their potentials and the ability to exploit nature to meet daily human needs. It can therefore, be seen as a process by which the quality of human lives and capacity to surmount daily needs are considerably improved. To Emeh (2013) development is a multi-dimensional process involving the reorganization and the re-orientation of the entire economic social system. Development transcend economic, social needs but involves all aspects of development which includes increase in citizens' access to food, water and shelter, information and means of communication (technology), health care delivery, good and motorable roads, good education, and justice. Whenever these are obtainable, there will be increase in the individual dignity, happiness and patriotic values of life. By implication, development encompasses radical changes in all social, administrative and institutional structures, behavior, attitude and custom of citizens in a country.

National development can therefore be defined as the overall development or a collective socio economic, political as well as religious advancement of a country or nation which can be best achieved through proper development planning through the country's collection of policy strategies mapped out by government. National Development is "a multi-dimensional process involving changes in structures, attitudes and institutions as well as the acceleration of economic growth, the reduction of inequality and eradication of absolute poverty in any society (Todaro, in Ihenacho, (2014, p. 51).National development is highly essential and critical to the sustenance and growth of any country. No country is tagged as developed until she is able to provide qualitative life for her citizenry.

It is a very comprehensive term which includes all aspects of the life of an individual and the nation. It is a process of reconstruction and development in various dimensions of a

nation and development of individuals. It includes full growth, expansion of industries, agriculture and education, social, religious and cultural institutions. National development is a development of a nation as whole. It can be seen as all round and balanced development of different aspects and facets of a nation: political, economic, social, cultural, scientific and material. National development is the total effect of all citizens' forces and addition to the stock of physical, human resources, knowledge and skill.

National development of a nation is a process of societal transformation from a traditional to a modern society and such transformation is also known as modernization (Sapru, 2012). Hahn-Been in Ihenacho (2014) defines development as a process of acquiring a sustained growth of a system's capacity to cope with new continuous changes towards the achievement of progressive political, economic and societal objectives in a nation (p.50). Therefore, development is nothing but improving the welfare of the individuals which is usually measured in terms of providing infrastructural facilities that could afford them a chance for a better life. Improving the standard of living, education, health and opening out new and equal opportunities for richer and varied life are all important ingredient of development. The primary goal of development is to improve man and his environment.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has defined National Development as growth plus change. Change in turn is social and cultural as well as economic and quantitative and qualitative (UNDP, 2014).

National development is confined to those related to overall socio – economic development, policies that reflect initiative based on national objectives and that enjoy a broad social consensus. A genuine national development policy requires not only their coherent interaction, but also to narrow the focus of their multitude measures, by selecting the country's top priorities (Kryeministri & Premijera, 2016, p. 4). In essence, national development of a country should be total and top most in the heart of the leaders compelling them to commit all efforts and resources to make life better for the citizens. This is best achieved through development planning, which can be described as the country's collection of strategies mapped out by the government (Lawal & Oluwatoyin, 2011, p. 238). The point made here is that underlying structure or frame work is essential for national development to have a good measurement hence national development must be strategically planned.

Ekele (2011) defines national development as the interface of social and economic development of people, with emphasis on human capital development, poverty alleviation, employment generation and general economic development. The concept here is that political, economic and social issues must be given adequate attention and direct change.

Wise Geek (2014) conceptualized national development as a process that seeks to highlight, social and economic needs of the people in more practical and utilitarian terms as well as in the long run. Bamigboye (2014) argues further that the general idea of national development is on improved standard of living and a healthy environment capable of sustaining the population (p. 2341). In this context, the three variables of development that is, political, social and economic must be strongly emphasized in order to satisfy the needs of the citizens in practical and functional terms that will be maintained for a long period.

Implicitly, national development is carried out via governmental machinery capable of commanding loyalty, maintaining order, evoking legitimacy, encouraging integration, permitting popular participation that satisfy popular wants and expectations. Also citizens must exercise the skills capable enough to create a highly industrialized society and manipulates its environment for a high quality of life for the general society. National development refers to the ability of a country or countries to improve the social welfare of the people, for example in providing social amenities like good education, infrastructure, medical care and social services.

National development is a socio economic development where goals are realized by drawing the energies of people, growing an inclusive economy, building capabilities, enhancing the capability of the state and promoting leadership and partnership through society (National Population Commission (NPC), 2011, p. 33). The foundation of national development is the development especially in social, economic, political, emotional, linguistic and cultural fields. When all the factors endeavor to provide unity in the integration of national actions and challenges thereby encouraging the people to meet the aspirations and goals related to their personal and social benefits which are willingly or unknowingly geared toward national progress, national development is achieved (ibid). In essence, national development is the transformation of all the sections in the society of a nation state into socially, economically, politically, educationally, orderly and materially desirable entities with the aim of improving the quality of life of the people. It is a socio-economic process which seeks to bring about more equitable distribution of resources and income within the society (Mundi, 2008).

According to Kothari Commission, (1964 – 1967) national development lies in confidence in a nation's continuous rise in standard of living of masses, reduction of unemployment, equal opportunities for social, political and economic development, good and impartial administration, mutual understanding and a sense of cooperation among the masses.

It is the ability of a nation to improve the lives of its citizens through uniform distribution of resources and the integration of people into national economy.

OyeAdeniyi (2014) described national development as an idea that embodies all attempts to improve the condition of human existence in all ramifications (p. 53). The emphasis is improvement of every citizen's material well-being and not just focus on the elites, the powerful or the rich. The improvement must be sustainable such that the future must be taken care of. The notion also demands that every citizen should have access to good quality of life and poverty should be removed or reduce drastically. Furthermore, Nwanegbo and Odigbo, (2013) asserted that national development could be seen as the process of empowering people in a nation to maximize their potentials and ability to exploit nature to meet daily human needs. It can also be seen as a process by which the quality of human lives and capacity to surmount daily needs are considerably improved. Explicit in this assertion is that people must be given the opportunity to utilize their potentials which will enable them to meet their daily needs and therefore have a quality life.

However, it should be noted that Nigeria over the years, has had to grapple with the daunting task of development. Unfortunately, various development indexes still rank Nigeria among the poorest countries of the world in terms of socio-economic development (Eshikena, 2012). Nigeria since independence has been facing the challenges of national development in spite of enormous human, material, and natural resources in the land. Corruption has been at the root of the challenges of national development. As opined by Campbell (2016) Nigeria's fundamental problem is a system of institutionalized corruption that channels public money into the pockets of few Nigerian "big men". This has resulted into series of impediments which among others include slow economic growth in terms of Gross National Product (GNP) and standard of living, large scale unemployment and under employment, slow process of modernization, rapid growth population, large pool of illiteracy, incidence of poverty, phenomenon of urbanization, lethargic attitude of people to core value of work and unwillingness to take responsibility, rise of phenomenon of brain drain and low quality products of institutions of higher learning (p.32).

Indicators of absence of national development include unemployment, low productivity, high population growth, poor human resources development, corruption, debt burden, bad governance, and micro economic distortion. As emphasized by Ewetan and Urhie (2014) there are developmental challenges in Nigeria which include endemic rural and urban poverty, high rate of unemployment, debilitating youth unemployment, low industrial

growth, unstable and deteriorating exchange rate, high inflation rate, inadequate physical and social infrastructure, very large domestic debt and rising stock of exchange debt.

National development should encapsulate measurement such as a well-planned national economy, development of human resources, increase in agricultural production through application of modern technical knowhow, application of science and technology, provision of mass education and provision of various facilities to meet the needs and aspirations of disadvantaged, deprived and poorest of the poor segments of population. The measurements of key parameters include percentage growth and numerical impact in investment in areas like, macro economy, agriculture, health, manufacturing, infrastructures; education and polity should be periodically measured. Measures of improvement may be material, such as increase in GDP, or social, such as literacy rate availability of healthcare and other social infrastructures that can aid national development.

Policy Implementation by various regimes in Agriculture Sector

Agriculture in relation to the economy linked with other sectors is important for development and growth, agriculture sector induces the economy and there will be no development without agriculture. Agriculture is important for generating development and growth. Hence, agricultural policy is a statement of action and a fundamental tool employed by any nation in achieving agricultural development (Food and Agricultural Organisation, 2004) while agricultural policy changes refers to incremental shifts in existing structure or new or innovative policies (Bennett & Howlett, 1992). Agriculture therefore is fundamental to the sustenance of life in that nutritional food is provided adequately for human survival and development and materials for industries are also provided, which implies that agriculture is paramount and serves as the basis for economic development in particular and national development in general.

Agricultural Policies (1960 – 1983)

Immediately after gaining independence, new Agricultural policies were formulated to ensure more equitable growth in agriculture. The previous extraction policies of the colonial period were changed to export led agricultural policy. This led to the demarcation of the country into the Western Region (cocoa), Northern Region (groundnut) and Eastern Region (oil palm) (Ayoola, 2001). In this period, agricultural policy witnessed an import substitution in which industrialization was seen as the best method to achieve national development, particularly economic growth. There was establishment of many domestic industries within this period. Manufacturing industries were considered as the most

appropriate tool to initiate the process. With this policy, it was hoped that imports would be replaced and internal growth fostered; and that the costs of the strategy would be mostly borne by the advanced countries supplying the manufactured consumer goods. As laudable as the project was, there was no programme or project set out to achieve the objectives of these policies, hence the policy had no meaningful impact because it has no strategy planned towards the accomplishment of a specific objectives and the desired goal of the policy.

National Accelerated Food Production Programme (NAFPP)

This was an agricultural extension programme initiated in 1972 by the Federal Department of Agriculture during General Yakubu Gowon's regime. The main target of the programme is to have significant increase through subsistent production increase in maize, cassava, rice and wheat in the Northern states within a shortest period of time. The programme was designed to spread to other states in the country after the pilot stage that was established in Anambra, Imo, Ondo, Oyo, Ogun, Benue, Plateau and Kano states. Mini –kit, production-kit and mass adoption phases were the three phases of the programme. Lapses found in the programme include: farmers sponsored (financially) the last two phases of the programme. This discouraged some farmers from participating in the programme. Farmers who could not form co-operatives were left out in the programme since the programme relied on disbursement of credits and farm inputs through co-operative societies.

Abrupt/premature withdrawal of funding by the Federal Government due to the introduction of another programme termed Operation Feed the Nation. Demonstration trials were done on some selected farmers' plots by the research and extension personnel which did not give a true/good representation of the outcome of the technology or programme (Iwuchukwu & Igbokwe, 2012, p. 13). In other words, it means farmer's concepts and input were not put into consideration at the time the policy was being formulated as it lacks farmer's participation.

Agricultural Development Projects (ADP):

ADP formerly known as Integrated Agricultural Development Projects (IADP) was earlier established in 1974 in the North East (Funtua), North West (Gusau) and North Central (Gombe) states as pilot schemes. The programme was result oriented and impressive resulting; hence it led to its replication in 1989 to the entire then nineteen states of the Federation. This approach to agricultural and rural development was based on collaborative efforts and tripartite arrangement of the federal government, state government and World Bank (Amalu, 1998). It needs to be added that today, this programme has grown to become the major agricultural and rural development programme existing in states in Nigeria.

The programme features reliance on the small scale farmers as the main stakeholder who will bring about increase in food production and the feedback information mechanism which serve as a decentralized decision making process. It is innovative, because, it allows farmers and families to give their responses and contribution to how to improve on technology, incentives, subsidies etc. according to their practical experiences. The objectives of the programme are to bring about solution to the decrease found in agricultural productivity by sustaining domestic food supply, through massive infusion of World Bank funds. The ADPs were established to provide extension services, technical input support and rural infrastructure to the farmers/rural dwellers.

It must be however, noted that in the process of executing this project some difficulties were encountered which include shortage of funds as a result of drop in oil prices from 1982 and this resulted in the inability to recruit qualified staff competent enough to carry out the assignment. Also there was no fund to procure the materials and necessary facilities to take off. It therefore, makes the schedule time for implementation to be very slow (Ayoola, 2001). Another hiccup in the programme was that, much emphasizes was laid on modern/high input technology for example sole cropping while most of the farmers practiced mixed/relay cropping and presently, the programme encountered high frequency of labour mobility, input agencies involvement were limited, reduction in funding policies intricacies of technology transfer etc.

Operation Feed the Nation (OFN):

This programme came up on 21st May 1976 under the military regime of General Olusegun Obasanjo. The essence of this programme was to increase food production in the entire nation, ensure full participation of all irrespective of individual career or profession or discipline. This implies that every person irrespective of the area of profession will be capable of feeding himself or herself. Under this programme, every available piece of land in urban, sub-urban and rural areas was meant to be cultivated while government provided inputs and subsidies (like agrochemicals, fertilizers, improved variety of seed/seedlings, day olds chicks, machetes, sickle, hoes etc.) freely to government establishments. Individuals received these inputs at a subsidized rate. Iwuchukwu and Igbokwe (2012) attributed the failure of the programme to the following: Farming was done on any available piece of land irrespective of its suitability for agriculture. Majority of the participants in the programme had little or no farming background and there was no formal or informal preparatory teaching or advice given to them on how to manage their farms. They practiced mono cropping instead of mixed/relay cropping and relied on hired labour to carry out their farming activities, which

resulted in high input and low output/yield per unit of land. Preference was given to government establishments and individuals in authority/administration over the poor farmers (real producer of food) in terms of input supply. There was abundance of food in the market and less demand for the food because many people produced part or almost the whole food they consumed. There was incidence of endemic poultry diseases especially new cattle disease that destroyed birds due to lack of quarantine and necessary routine inoculation vaccination.

River Basin Development Authorities (RBDAs).

River Basin Development Decree was promulgated in 1976 to establish eleven River Basin Development Authorities (RBDAs) (Decree 25 of 1976). The original aim of the authorities was to boost economic potentials of the existing water bodies particularly irrigation and fishery with hydroelectric power generation and domestic water supply as secondary objectives. The objective of the programme was later extended to other areas most importantly to production and rural infrastructural development. However, the programme suffered a setback because the authorities grew out of proportion and the operations of some of the authorities suffered because of intensive political interference and also wasting of some substantial public funds in the process to streamline sizes and functions of RBDAs through the disposal of their non-water assets.

Green Revolution (GR)

Green Revolution (GR) programme led by Sheu Shagari evolved in the second republic in April 1980. The objective of the programme was to increase production of food and raw materials in order to provide food security and self-sufficiency in basic staples. Also, the programme aspired to boost production of livestock and fish in order to meet home and export needs and to expand and diversify the nation's foreign exchange earnings through production and processing of export crops. The federal government worked out the success of the programme by making available agrochemicals, improved seeds/seedlings, irrigation system, machine (mechanization), credit facilities, improved marketing and pricing policy favorable for the agricultural products. However, as stated by Akinbamowo (2013) the programme did not achieve its objective of increasing food supply because there was delay in execution of most of the projects involved in the programme. There was also no monitoring and evaluation of the projects for which huge sums of money were spent.

Agricultural Policies (1984 – 1998)

Directorate for Food Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI)

The directorate was initiated in Nigeria in January 1986 under General Ibrahim Babangida's administration. It was a kind of home grown Social Dimensions of Adjustment (SDA) that was embarked upon in most sub Saharan African countries by the World Bank, African Development Bank and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The programme was designed to improve the quality of life (improvement in nutrition, housing, health, employment, road, water, industrialization) and standard/level of living of the rural dwellers through mass participation of the people and the use of many resources that exist in the rural areas. Like other policies, DFRRI did not achieve its desired objectives due to the poor quality of infrastructures provided by the directorate and probably due to embezzlement and mismanagement of funds. Therefore, the impact of the programme became almost insignificant. To buttress this, Idachaba (1989) asserted that the directorate has been criticized in the past for lack of proper focus and programme accountability.

Better Life Programme (BLP) For Rural Women

Better Life Programme (BLP) for rural women was founded in Nigeria by Mrs. Maryam Babangida (wife of the then military president of Nigeria) in 1987. The goals of the programme are to stimulate and motivate rural women towards achieving better living standards and sensitizing the rest of Nigerians to their problems. Others include; raising consciousness about their rights, the availability of opportunities and facilities, and their social, political and economic responsibilities; encouraging recreation and enriching family life; and inculcating the spirit of self-development particularly in the fields of education, business, arts, crafts and agriculture (Obasi & Oguche, 1995). It was however noted that the programme was limited by religion and cultural factors in the sense that the level of participation of the Muslim women in purdah was limited, the benefit therefore was minimal.

National Agricultural Land Development Authority (NALDA):

This programme was established in 1992, with the aims of giving strategic public support for land development, assisting and promoting better uses of Nigeria's rural land and their resources, boosting profitable employment opportunities for rural dwellers, raising the standard of living of rural people as well as targeting and assisting in achieving food security through self-reliance and sufficiency. The only problem associated with this programme was that the highly placed officers were known to snatch land that belonged to poor people.

National Fadama Development Project (NFDP)

The first National Fadama Development Project (NFDP-1) was launched in 1992 in conjunction with the World Bank. The programme covered twelve states of Adamawa, Bauchi, Gombe, Imo, Kaduna, Kebbi, Lagos, Niger, Ogun, Oyo, Taraba including the Federal Capital Territory (FCT). The scheme was designed to improve flooded plains of the Savannah, this led to the irrigation pumps shallow tube well for Small Scale Irrigation Farming System (SSIFS) (Agber, Iortima, & Imbur, 2013, p. 248). The First phase of NFDP was relatively a success and this led to the second and third phases that is, Fadama two and three which is currently on going. The project also adopted Community Driven Approach (CDD), and stakeholders were allowed to participate extensively. According to Iwuchukwu & Igbokwe, (2012) the programme also emphasis poverty reduction, private sector leadership and beneficiary participation. The problem associated with the project was due to the fact that unskilled handling of water application through irrigation degrade and rob the soil of its productive capacity (Omonijo, et al, 2014).

Agricultural Policies (1999 – 2017)

Agricultural policies have witnessed so many changes and shapes, since the Fourth Republic. These changes are reflections of changes in government and administration. Awa and Rufus (2017) asserted that the policies vary only in nomenclature and organizational network, the policy makers and actors adopt various policies to deliver outcome and the government of the day strife to meet the food need of its people. According to Awa and Rufus (2017) since Nigeria's new democracy, (1999 to date) agriculture has grown considerably but the growth has been unsustainable and agriculture policy has continued to change with different policy interventions and reforms (p. 27). Different regimes from 1999 to date have adopted the policy change theory that best suit them in an attempt to meet the various food needs of Nigerians. President Olusegun Obasanjo (1999-2007) adopted the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategies (NEEDS) and its State counterpart, (SEEDS). President Musa Yaradua and Goodluck Jonathan (2007-2015) embarked on Agricultural Transformation Agenda and currently President Muhammed Buhari (May, 2015 to date) continued Agricultural Transformation agenda and Youth Agricultural Programme (Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (FMARD), 2016).

The fourth republic that started in 1999 witnessed ambitious economic reforms and in an attempt to tackle the problems facing the Agricultural Sector in Nigeria, the regime of Obasanjo of 1999 to 2007 put in place the National Agricultural Policy, which was jointly

formulated by the national stakeholders and International Development Partners and approved by the Federal Government in 2002. The major components of the National Agricultural Policy are the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) document. Specifically, the National Agricultural Policy assigns supportive roles to the government, while investments in the sector are left to the private sector initiative. The broad objectives of the National Agricultural policy include: Promotion of self-sufficiency in food and raw materials for industries; recognition that agriculture is business, hence giving private sector priority where the role of government is to facilitate and support private sector initiatives; promoting reliance on local resources; diversification of the sources of foreign exchange earnings through increased agricultural exports arising from adoption of appropriate technologies in food production and distribution, which specifically responds to the needs of women, bearing in mind that they constitute over 50% of the labour force in agriculture (Awa & Rufus, 2017). In other words, the policy emphasizes the private sector and women involvement and it enhanced usage of local resources which will lead to self-sufficiency and increase in foreign earnings through export of agricultural products. The thrust of policy direction for Agriculture under Obasanjo Administration include:

National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS).

The National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) document was a response to the demands and strategies of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG). The elements of NEEDS are poverty eradication, employment generation, wealth creation and value reorientation. NEEDS provided help to agriculture, industry, small and medium scale enterprises and oil and gas. It sets up a series of performance targets that government wanted to achieve by 2007. These include a 6 percent annual growth in agricultural GDP of US \$3 billion per year on agricultural exports and 95 percent self-sufficiency in food. NEEDS offered farmers improved irrigation, machinery and crop varieties which would help to boost agricultural productivity and tackle poverty head on since half of Nigerian's poor people are engaged in agriculture (Iwuchukwu & Igbokwe, 2012). It is very clear from the statement above that the programme will tackle poverty and bring higher growth in agricultural productivity on the ground of a successful implementation. The Federal Government also encouraged states to engage in the same development strategies known as the State Economic Empowerment and Development Strategies (SEEDS) with the intention of implementing integrated rural development and thereby reduce migration from rural areas to urban centers.

NEEDS is a unique agricultural reforms and it differs from the past reforms in the sense that it ensures ownership through participatory process, a wider and encompassing scope, coordination, problem solving, attractive programme and achievement oriented. Based on the foregoing, the programme brought intimate relationship between the federal government and the state governments and also increased the participatory level of the two levels of government through participatory process that will ensure ownership, sustainability, encompassing scope and coordination.

National Special Programme on Food Security (NSPFS)

This Programme was launched in January 2002 in all the thirty six states of the federation during President Olusegun Obasanjo's regime. The broad objective of the programme was to increase food production and eliminate rural poverty. Other specific objectives of the programme were: assisting farmers in increasing their output, productivity and income; strengthening the effectiveness of research and extension service training and educating farmers on farm management for effective utilization of resources; supporting governments efforts in the promotion of simple technologies for self-sufficiency; consolidating initial efforts of the programme on pilot areas for maximum output and ease of replication; consolidating gain from on-going for continuity of the programme and consequent termination of external assisted programmes and projects. The set broad and specific objectives of the programme were made in good faith and the standard was high and all embracing. Its scope is high because it covers research, management and effective utilization of resources, simple technology for self-sufficiency which result in maximum output and eventually terminate external assistance. Setbacks associated with the programme as stated by (Iwuchuwu & Igbokwe, 2012) were seen in the inability of majority of the beneficiaries to repay their loan on time, complexity and incompatibility of innovation and difficulty in integrating technology into existing production system. Others include: insufficient knowledge of credit use, poor extension agent- farmer contact, unavailability of labour to carry out essential farming activities, lack of modern storage facilities and high cost of farm input.

Root and Tuber Expansion Programme (RTEP)

RTEP was launched on 16th April, 2003 under President Olusegun Obasanjo's administration. It covers 26 states and was designed to address the problem of food production and rural poverty. At the local farmer's level, the programme is designed to achieve economic growth, improve access of the poor to social services and carry out intervention measures to protect poor and vulnerable groups. At the national level the

programme is designed to achieve food security and stimulate demand for cheaper staple food such as cassava, garri, and yam, potato, as against more expensive carbohydrate such as rice (FMARD, 2016).

Small holder farmers with less than two hectares of land per household were the targets of the programme while special attention was paid to women who play a significant role in rural food production, processing and marketing. RTEP also targets at multiplying and introducing improved root and tuber varieties to about 350,000 farmers in order to increase productivity and income (Awa & Rufus, 2017). It inferred that small holder farmers which include women are the target because of their potential for producing increased agricultural food which was already processed and ready for sale.

It was however noted that this National Agricultural Policy, does not seem to address the food crisis because deliberate attempt were not made to reposition the small scale farmers to facilitate their production activities. The government laid more emphasis on individuals, that is, the private sector which is the usual capitalist approach. Inadequate funding and lack of institutional arrangements especially for database policies for implementation hampered some of them. The initiative generated interest and production increased but there were no concurrent provisions for storage and processing resulting in large post-harvest losses and apathy on the side of the farmers (Awa & Rufus, 2017).

Between 2007 – 2009 regime of Musa Yar'Adua, the Agricultural policy was based on Seven Point Agenda to move the nation forward and be among the 20 largest economies by the year 2020. This also led to the ambitious vision 20:2020- a twenty-year plan for Nigeria. Briefly, the seven-point agenda include energy and power, food security and agriculture, wealth creation, education, land reforms, mass transit and the Niger Delta issue.

It involve agricultural production, feeding the industries, distribution, marketing trade and consumption, food processing and manufacturing, distribution and marketing, trade and consumption with the output from the major employer of labour (Awa & Rufus, 2017).

The Jonathan administration (2009-2015) came up with Agricultural Transformation Agenda. This key policy was being driven by the then Minister of agriculture — Mr. Akinwumi Adesina an Agricultural expert now the Chairman of African Development Bank (ADP). The government also continued vision 20:2020. The Agenda focused on supplying fertilizers directly to the rural farmers and not through middle men; providing seeds with high yield directly to the small hold farmers, providing telephones to the rural farmers for easy communication and encouraging value chain in such a way that agricultural produce are being processed locally to finished produce and export (Awa & Rufus, 2017, p. 31). This

programme was the first of its kind in the history of Agricultural policies in Nigeria. The regime further has the programme of providing storage facilities and exporting perishable goods such as tomatoes, by the provision of infrastructure such as perishable sheds at major airports in Nigeria. The Youth Empowerment in Agriculture Programme was initiated by the Jonathan Administration.

The administration of Muhammed Buhari came into existence in May 2015 against the backdrop of mounting economic crisis, as a result of a decline in oil prices and fall in oil production due to renewed militancy in Niger Delta. World Bank Indicators (2014) stated that the resulting economic slowdown, which was confirmed as a recession in the summer 2016, focused minds on the long neglected tasks of reducing reliance on the petroleum sector which accounts for 11 percent of GDP but 95 percent of the nation's export revenue. This implies that the economy of Nigeria was tied mainly to petroleum at the expense of, and neglect of agricultural production which was the mainstay of the economy prior to commercial oil discovery in the 70's. Included in the election manifesto that brought President Buhari and his All Progressive Congress (APC) to power was a pledge to move the economy away from oil, in part by reviving the agriculture sector (APC, 2014). The Buhari's administration inherited the Agricultural Transformation Agenda (ATA) from the immediate administration of President Goodluck Jonathan. ATA therefore became a platform to build upon. In particular, the ATA sought to orient agriculture from development activity centred on the smallholder farmers to a more dynamic profit driven enterprise that connected the farmer to a value chain of processors, distributors and retailers. One of the signature initiatives of former Agriculture minister Akinwunmi Adesina, reformed and streamlined the agricultural input system to ensure that farmers received subsidized fertilizers in a timely fashion via credits delivered to their phones (Downie, 2017, p. 2). This step is novel in Nigeria, in that for the first time in agricultural policy formulation and implementation in Nigeria, a new government continued with a previous government policy. After a retreat of Federal Government Ministers sworn in by President Muhamadu Buhari on the 11th of November, 2015, the new Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development — Audu Ogbe had this to say "We shall continue the Agricultural policy of the past regime, improve on seed yield and fertilizer distribution, emphasize export and make agriculture as a business by mechanization, and the value chain of transformation through production, and marketing and also funding Research Institutes" (Ogbeh, 2016).

The Youth Empowerment in Agriculture Programme (YEAP) was launched by the Permanent Secretary Federal Ministry of Agriculture — Arch Sonny Echono on 10th of

November, 2015. According to him the Federal Government has commenced the process of empowering 30,000 Youths along area based priority value chains and initially 12 states are participating and the beneficiaries would be trained in different value chain namely; Rice, Aquaculture, Poultry, Maize, Tomatoes, Wheat, Sorghum, Apiculture, Soya bean, Cassava, Groundnut, Oil Palm. Snailry, Grass cutter and multiple value chain like welding and fabrication, repairs and maintenance (www.frnard.gov.ng.)

It is further noted that the policy introduced School Feeding Programme which the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development planned in line with Brazil nutritional smart agricultural school feeding programme. Brazil School Feeding Programme is second only to that of the United States of America in size and depth; 40 million school children are fed daily at an estimated annual cost of 2 billion USD, shared by the Federal, States, Local Governments, communities and Private sectors (FMARD, 2016)

The Nigeria government is interested in how to increase productivity and yield of small holder farmers using cooperative model and technological advancement of Brazil. Brazil has achieved self-sufficiency in rice production and export 20% of her rice to more than 65 other countries. There is a yield gap of rice production of 1.5 metric tons of rice to 2 million tons of rice and the Nigeria government will adopt measures borrowed from Brazil to meet Nigeria's self-sufficiency in rice production and processing (Awa and Rufus, 2017).

Therefore in the preparedness to achieve this laudable objective, the Present Federal Government banned the importation of rice that gulps foreign exchange, decrease foreign reserves and raise inflation. On the 17th of November 2015, the Federal Government through the Central bank of Nigeria started to implement its policy — Anchor Borrowers Programme designed to assist small scale farmers to increase the production and supply of feedback to agro-processors. The CBN has set aside N20 billion from the N220 billion Micro, small and Medium Enterprises Development Fund (MSMEDF) for farmers at single digit interest rate of nine per cent. Implementations are hinged on a three pronged approach. These are out-grower support programme, training of farmers, extension workers and bank as well as risk mitigation (FMARD, 2016). From the foregoing, it can be deduced that the agricultural policy adopted by the Buhari administration is the Brazil model of cooperatives and school feeding and this can lead to food sufficiency and export of excess to other countries.

It is also noted that the Agricultural Policy of the Jonathan Administration, adopted by the Buhari Administration, with a little modification, have a major shift especially in its policy implementation which advocate empowerment of the small holder farmers. Though the Growth Enhancement Scheme (GES) of Goodluck Jonathan succeeded in reaching more

farmers, the quantities of fertilizers delivered to the farmers were inadequate and corruption was entrenched in the program.

The Agricultural Promotion Policy (APP) of the Buhari Administration emphasized the necessity to continue and build on the efforts of the previous administration with a lengthy and convincing analysis of the problems in the agriculture sector yet the solutions provided were deficient of details and statements made on the importance of agriculture was unmatched with financial commitment. According to Williams (2016) the proportions of federal budget allocated to agriculture was only 1.26 percent in 2016 and 1.8 percent in 2017. This lack of sustainable financial commitment to agriculture is mirrored in the sub national level, where only few of Nigeria’s 36 states have prioritized the sector for example in Cross River, Ondo, and Niger states average budgets for agriculture between 2008 and 2012 were 1.2, 3.8, and 4.6 percent respectively (Olomola, 2014). From the foregoing, there is no doubting the fact that the budget allocation for agriculture sector is considerably low far short from the budget commitment of 10 percent agreed by Africa Union and cannot take the nation to sustainable level of development desired.

Proportion of National Budget allocated to Agriculture, 2011-2017

Year	National Budget	Agriculture	Percentage
2011	N4.07 trillion	N81.2 billion	1.81
2012	N4.69 trillion	N78.9 billion	1.66
2013	N4.92 trillion	N81.4 billion	1.77
2014	N4.6 trillion	N66.6 billion	1.47
2015	N4.493 trillion	N7 billion	0.9
2016	N6.07 trillion	N29.8 billion	1.26
2017	N7.24 trillion	N92.0 billion	1.8

Source: Compiled by the author from NBS (2018)

The following are the programmes that anchor Jonathan’s and Buhari’s agricultural policy.

Markets II: Markets II is an acronym for Maximizing Revenue and Key Enterprises and Targeted Sites funded by US Agency for International Development (USAID), primarily with smallholder’s farmers, seeking to improve their productivity (Flahersty & Abdulahi, 2014). It is a policy which provides inputs, improved technologies and training to farmers and linking them to markets for their produce. MARKETS II focuses on five agricultural value chains: cocoa, cassava, rice, sorghum and aquaculture. It also has a secondary interest in developing Soybean and maize as a source of fish feed for aquaculture value chain. The value chain approach means engaging with a road set of players beyond individual farmers including processors, credit organisations, suppliers and transporters. MARKETS II is aligned with

Feed the Future, the global hunger and food security initiative established by President Obama in 2010. Though Nigeria is not one of the feed the future's 19 focus countries, according to Feed the Future (2015) Feed the Future is larger than most fully fledged partners, hence MARKETS II is not subject to vigorous reporting requirement that require Feed the Future programs to work in specific country regimes and achieve demanding targets to reduce poverty and stunting. As a result, MARKETS II has been able to operate in a wide geographical area. The program has operated in 25 of Nigeria's 36 states and, as at midterm review of 2015 it has been calculated that the programme had reached 691000 rural households with agriculture or food security assistance or both (Feed the future, 2015).

It can be deduced from the foregoing that Nigeria benefitted massively from the program and if the policy makers faithfully continue with the program, it will eliminate or reduce problem attached with food security in Nigeria. Kaduna, Kebbi, Plateau and Akwa Ibom states are among the potential candidates suggested by USAID officials for the Feed the Future program. There are suggestions that the program will work even more closely with the private sector, where most of the dynamic activity take place in Nigeria's agriculture policy. Under this approach, future engagement with the government would be through public private partnerships only. In addition, officials are looking to pivot toward northeast and link agricultural development more closely with efforts to increase food security program (USAID, 2016). The programme has worked with some of the poorest farmers, using a mixture of cash transfer and technical assistance to increase agricultural productivity and generate income (USAID and MARKETS II, 2016). Therefore, it can be submitted that the successful implementation of this program will mean that Nigeria will not have to contend with the problem of food security. As Adebayo & Ojo, (2012) rightly opined, every region of the country specializes in one or two major crops, whether food or cash crops, and together the country will be relatively self-sufficient in food production.

NEXTT: - An acronym for Nigerian Expanded Trade and Transport Project, a project put in place to increase business opportunities through Nigeria most important route. The project took practical steps to increase traffic flow along some routes that suffer chronic congestions. One of the solutions according to Downie (2017) has been to work with Ministry of Transport (MOT) on a tender to build truck stops so that vehicles awaiting entry into Lagos port can pull off the road rather than locking it up with obstructions (p. 7). NEXTT has also provided seed funding and consultancy services to business seeking to establish them along the corridor. The majority of the beneficiaries have been agricultural businesses and companies that make starch from cassava for use in beer making and export driven

companies producing cocoa, ginger and cashew. From the foregoing, it is obvious that there is a need for NEXTT to partner with the ministry of transport for traffic free movement of trucks carrying food to various parts of the country.

ABP (Anchors Borrowers Program):- The Nigeria government initiated this program to stimulate and increase the flow of credits to large and small farmers. The program introduced by the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN), has tried to incentivize domestic production of rice and wheat through agricultural commodities that have been imported in huge quantities. The program ABP seeks to incentivize smallholder's production by providing loans up to 250,000 naira at the competitive rates of 9percent per year to be used to buy agricultural inputs. In addition to advancing credit, the ABP seeks to link farmers to processors, such as rice millers, to ensure that the producers have a guarantee market for their products (Komolafe, 2015).

Thus, the program with the loan facility of 250,000 naira seeks to assist the small scale farmers and also apart from credit advancement, there is a linkage with processors to guarantee markets for the products. Other initiatives to extend credit to farmers, a decision taken in December 2016, to recapitalize the state on agriculture with 1trillion naira with objectives of extending loan to 25 Million farmers at interest rates fixed at a ceiling of 10 percent.

Warehouse Receipt and Post-Harvest Loss: - This is another approach to increase farmer access to credit while addressing the very high level of post-harvest loss has been to an electronic warehouse receipt scheme. Africa Commodity Exchange Ltd. (AFEX), a holding company set up by Nigerian and US based investors, is trying to link farmers and commodity merchants with agricultural and financial markets. One of the ways it is doing this is by strengthening the warehousing system in Nigeria, in part by leasing and rehabilitating government grain storage facilities. For a small fee, farmers can deposit their produce at these facilities, confident that it will be safely and securely preserved. In return they receive a receipt grading the value of their produce that can be used as collateral. Farmers can therefore withhold their products and sell at the right time and right price.

Ready to Use Therapeutic Food (RUTF):- The policy repurposed the agriculture sector to address food security and poor nutrition by developing domestic production of RUTF and high energy biscuits. The food crisis in the North East amplified the need for food security and nutrition as an integral component of the strategy for increased agricultural productivity. As stated by Pelt, Newton and Twiss (2015) none of the specialist food products that international humanitarian organization are procuring for the relief effort can be sourced within Nigeria. Approximately 320,000 children received RUTF each year, which was

imported at the cost of 16 million dollars. Thus, the policy tends to address the problem by developing the production of this imperative nutrition that will reduce expenditure on importation and generate more revenue to the nation. Nigeria is well placed to develop these specialty products because it already produces key ingredients which include wheat, peanuts, and palm oil. The missing link is the integrated value chains that allow these products to be grown and processed in sufficient quantities at a competitive price. Hence the national government unveiled ambitious feeding for school children programme and the project which was launched in June 2016, would make available one nutritious meal to every pupil in primary 1 – 3, each school day. As El Rufai, (2016) puts it, the estimate of the children to be fed was 5.5 million to be funded by the federal government. The federal government also encourages the state governments to fund similar initiatives. In view of the aforementioned, the programme is assumed to have the potential that will stimulate local agriculture production and processing by providing abundant already prepared market, since the program targets children. Because of this potentiality, Kaduna state governor El Rufai embarked on school feeding programme which was not sustained, but sputtered therefore abandoned partly because the project attracted a huge influx of additional pupils into the public schools system. At the federal level, the program fell victim of economic recession (El Rufai, 2016).

Attracting Youth into Agriculture: The policy will make use of public and private partnership established by USAID with Agriculture business firms. Since young people are not willing to use hoes, the program seeks to increase mechanization in agriculture by providing access to smart tractors for 45000 smallholder's farmers. The smart tractors have been developed with smallholders' farmers in mind as it covers with various attachments that can be customized according to the crop being grown, they are equipped with GPS devices to track usage, and they can be hired via SMS messaging and mobile money). In this programme, the youth are targeted specially to operate and maintain the tractors; this prompted the government to organize training for the youths through the youth Agripreneur program, run by International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA), Ibadan. It can be deduced here, that youth will be encouraged to engage in agriculture business and the use of a smart tractor; will speed up productivity which will result in food production and food security in Nigeria.

Conclusion

Regime change and national development in Nigeria are reflections of politics. Policy formulation and policy implementation in Nigeria is highly politicized, policy decisions are highly political orders, directives and assertions bereft of synergy. This happens when the envisaged policies/programmes are manipulated politically to suit the whims and caprices of the policy formulators. In respect of government in power, national development of a country should be total or topmost in the heart of leaders compelling them to commit all efforts and resources to make life better for the citizens.

As important as agricultural development is, national development should be able to transform individuals in virtually all the sectors of the economy. Effects of not growing agriculture sector have adverse effect on national development. New Agricultural policy supposed to give encouragement to youth and small hold farmer's participation as a result of Anchors Borrowers Programme (ABP) initiated by the government to stimulate and increase the flow of credits to large and small farmers. In Nigeria today, the youth's interest in farming is nothing to write home about as many of them found solace in music, information communication technology and other immoral means to generate income.

In Nigeria, since the current democratic dispensation, Agricultural policies have witnessed many changes and shapes. These changes are reflections of changes in governments and administrations. From 1999 to date, different regimes have adopted policy change theory that suits them in an attempt to meet the various needs of Nigerians yet, Agriculture has not witnessed sustainable growth. Effects of which are high cost of staple food and closure of industries.

The political environment in Nigeria is unstable and has constituted a great challenge to policy implementation. It has become a tradition from independence to date; various administrations existed in Nigeria with different ideas. The succeeding political leaders either military or civilian often suspend the old or existing programme of their predecessors and replace such programme with a new one that suit their political agenda. This implies that policy planner will expunge the programme on the drawing board and execute another programme geared towards the current political interest.

Infrastructure such as motor roads, rail roads or irrigation dams should be sufficient without competitive cost for successful implementation of policies. There must be political commitment at all levels of government in order to enforce transformation. If Policies were successfully implemented, it will have impact on national development and that good policies will result into high standard of living. For Nigeria's agricultural sector, a pathway to growth,

there must be actions to ensure production of enough fresh, high quality foods for the Nigerian market to serve the export market successfully and earn foreign exchange. As productivity improves domestically and standard are raised for all Nigerian's food production, exports markets will also benefit, impacting positively on Nigeria's balance of payments.

REFERENCES

- Abubakar, A. N. and Abubakar, T. (2014). Counting the cost of policy inconsistency in Nigeria: The Case of Privatization Policy. *Public Policy and Administration Journal*, 3 (4), 30-34.
- Adebayo, P. F. & Ojo, E. O. (2012). Food Security in Nigeria. An overview. *European Journal of Development*, 1 (2), 199-222.
- Adebayo, A. (2015, April 29). Policy inconsistency, poor implementation bane of Nigeria's industrial growth. *National Mirror*. pg 12.
- Agber, T. Iortima, P. I., & Imbur, E. N. (2013). Lessons from implementation of Nigeria's past national agricultural programs for the transformation agenda. *American Journal of Research Communication*, 1(10), 238-253.
- Awa, D. O., & Rufus, A. (2017). Agricultural policy and food Security in Nigeria. *International Journal of Novel Research in Interdisciplinary Studies*, 4 (1), 27-33.
- Ayoola, G. B. (2001). *Essays on the agricultural economy: A book of readings on agricultural development policy and administration in Nigeria*: Ibadan: TMA Publishers.
- Bamigboye, P. O. (2014). The military and socio-economic development in Nigeria (1983 – 1999). A Critical Appraisal. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, (5) 23, 2340-2344.
- Bennet, C. & Howlett, M. (1992). The lesson of learning: reconciling theories of policy learning and policy change. *Policy Science*, 25 (5), 27-33.
- Bolaji, S. D., Gray, J. R., & Cambell-Evans, G. (2015). Why dopolicies fail in Nigeria? *Journal of Education and Social Policy*, 2 (5), 57-66.
- Boven, M., & Hart, P. (2016). Revisiting the study of policy failures: *Journal of European Public Policy*, 1350 - 1763.
- Campbell, J. (2016). Nigeria's battle for stability. *Center for National Interest*, (118), 31- 39.

- Carter, J. & Palmer, G. (2015). Keeping the schools open while the troops are away: Regime types interstate war, and government, *International Studies Quarterly*, 59 (1), 145-147.
- Downie, R. (2017). *Growing the agricultural sector in Nigeria*. CSIS Global for Security Project. Centre for Strategic and International Studies. Washington D.C.
- Ekele, E. (2011). An examination of critical problems associated with the implementation of the universal basic education programme in Nigeria. *International Education Studies*, 4 (1), 221-229.
- El Rufai, N. (2016, *October 12*). Kaduna State Governor dumps School Feeding Program, *NewswireNGR*.
- Emeh, I. E. J. (2013). Dependency theory and Africa's underdevelopment: A paradigm shift from pseudo intellectualism: the Nigeria's Perspective. *Journal of African and Asian Studies- An Open Access*, (1), 116-128.
- Eshikena, J. (2012). *Nigeria government and politics*, Lagos. Fortran Press Ltd.
- Ewetan, O. O., & Urhie, E. (2014) Insecurity and social economic development in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development Studies*, 5(1), 40-63
- Fishman, R. M. (1990). Rethinking state and regime: Southern Europe's transition to democracy. *World Politics*, 42 (3), 422-440.
- Food and Agricultural Organisation (2004). The state of food security in the world. Food and agriculture organization (FAO) of the United Nations.
- Feed the future (2015). Maximizing agricultural revenue and key enterprises in targeted sites, *MARKETS II 2015*.
- Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development. (2003). Agriculture in Nigeria. The New Policy Thrust. Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development Abuja.
- Flaherstry, K., & Abduluah, A. S. (2014). Agricultural research and development Factsheet. *Agricultural Science and Technology*, (ASTI) 2014.
- Fmard (2016). The agricultural promotion policy 2016-2020. Federal ministry of agriculture and rural development: policy and strategy document.
- Hartman, C. (2017). Ecowas and restoration of democracy in The Gambia. *African Spectrum*, 52 (1), 85-89.

- Howlett, M. (2012). The lesson of failure: learning and blame avoidance in public policy. *International Political Science Review*, 33 (5), 539-555.
- Iheanacho, E. N. (2012). Bureaucracy and development in Nigeria in Obi, E.A., Obikeze, S. O., & Onyekwelu, R.N. (ed). *Introduction to public administration*. Onitsha. Bookpoint Educational Ltd.
- Iheanacho, E. N. (2014). National development planning in Nigeria: An endless search for appropriate development strategy. *International Journal of Economic Development Research and Investment*, 5 (2), 49-60.
- Iwuchukwu, J. C. & Igbokwe, E. M (2012). Lessons from agricultural policies and programmes in Nigeria. *Journal of Law, Policy and Globalisation*, (5), 11-22.
- Jones, B. O., Baumgartner, F. R. (2005). From there to here: Punctuated equilibrium to the general punctuation thesis to a theory of government information processing; *Policy Studies Journal*, 40 (1), 1-19.
- Jong –A- Pin (2012). On the Measurement of Political Instability and its Impact on Economic Growth. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 25, 15-29.
- Kryeministri, Z., & Premijera U. (2016). *Plan for sustainable development, national development strategies 2016 – 2021(NDS)*. Republic of Kosova: Prishtina.
- Lawal, T. & Oluwatoyin, A. (2011). National development in Nigeria: issues, challenges and prospects. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research*, 3 (9), 237 – 241.
- Magee, C. S. P., & Dorces, J. A. (2015). Reconsidering regime type and growth: Lies, dictatorship and statistics. *International Studies Quarterly*, 59, 223-237.
- May, P. J. (2014). Implementation failures revisited: Policy regime perspective. *Public Policy and Administration*, 30 (3), 277-299.
- McConnell, A. (2015). What is policy failure? A primer to help navigate the maze. *Public Policy and Administration*, 30 (3-4), 221-242.
- National Planning Commission (2014). *National development plan 2030. Our future make it work*. Republic of South Africa, Sherino Printers.
- Nwanegbo, C. J. & Odigbo, J. (2013). Security and national development in Nigeria: The Threat of Boko Haram. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(4), 285-291.
- Obasi, I. N. & Oguiche, D. (1995). Innovative programme on rural development in Nigeria: an evaluation of the better life programme using the APBS framework. In Eboh, E. C, C. U

- Okoye and D. Ayichi (ed), *Rural development in Nigeria: Concept, Process, and prospects*. P.577-586. Enugu: Auto Century Publishing.
- Ogbeh, A. (2016). *Agricultural promotion policy (2016-2020)*. Policy strategy document. Abuja, FMARD.
- Olomola, A. S., (2014). Analysis and agricultural public expenditure in Nigeria: Examination at the federal, state and local government levels. *International Food Research*.
- Omonijo, D. O., Toluwase, S. O. W., Oludayo, O. A., & Uche, O. O. C. (2014). Impacts of agricultural development program (ADP) on rural dwellers in Nigeria. A study of Isan Ekiti. *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics*, 128, 41-55.
- Oyeadeniya, J. (2014). National Development Strategies: challenges and options. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 3(4) 51-58.
- Pelt, S.V., Newton, S., & Twiss, C., (2015). Ready to Use Therapeutic Food Feasibility Study. *Lagos Accenture*, March, 2015.
- Stone, D., & Ladi, S. (2013). Global public policy and transnational administration. *Public Administration e*, doi: 11113padm. 12207.
- The Economist Intelligent Unit (2014). Political instability index vulnerability to social and political unrest. Available at <http://viewswire.eiu.com/index>
- Umar, H. S., & Tafida, A.D. (2015). Democracy and social welfare security in Nigeria: A perspective of fourth republic. *Policy and Administration Research*, 5 (2), 59-65.
- United Nation Development Programme, (2017). Our future make it work. National development plan 2030: National Planning Commission Republic of South Africa.
- USAID and MARKETS II (2016). Interview with USAID and MARKETS II staff Abuja August 1, 2016.
- WiseGeek, (2014). Social economic development in [www. wisegeek.com](http://www.wisegeek.com)
- Wogu, I.A.P., Sholarin, M.A., & Chidozie, F. C. (2015).A critical evaluation of Nigeria's foreign policy at 53. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5 (2), 137-147.
- World Bank Indicators, (2014). Oil Rents (% of GDP).[http://dataworldbank](http://dataworldbank.org) .org. indicators.