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Abstract

Development planning that involves processes which ensure that national policies and strategies are realized and development concerns at all levels are fully integrated into the overall national development thrusts are globally an on-going concern. In Nigeria, there have arguably been development planning initiatives and programmes, yet such efforts do not seem to produce concrete developmental results from all indicators. This study which relied on valuable secondary sources of data, critically examined the problematic of development planning in Nigeria. This study which also contend that development planning in Nigeria has over the years been constrained by the failure of the Nigerian leadership to properly envision true development and place same on the agenda, further argued that sundry factors like misplacement of priorities, poor plan discipline, lack of s ineffective executive capacity and public sector inefficiency, technology transfer syndrome, system corruption and inefficacious public/private partnership have made a genuine development path somewhat illusory. The study concluded with some useful remarks and recommendations such as a true development plan, public sector efficiency and discipline, public/private sector synergy and collaboration and attitudinal change that will create a genial climate clement for the much desired development in Nigeria. Keywords: Development planning, genial climate, public/private sector.

1. Introduction

Development planning as a long-term programme designed to effect some permanent structural changes in the economy is connected with the involvement of government in the economy whereby it sets out objectives about the way it wants the economy to develop in the future and then intervenes to try to achieve those objectives. Development planning is necessary because since development is neither accidental nor does it take place naturally and quickly of its own accord, it is expedient to plan it deliberately. More importantly it is worthwhile to note that although Nigeria has undertaken four national development plans in her post-independence history, namely: the First National Development Plan (1962-68); the Second National Development Plan (1970-74) the Third National Development Plan (1975-80) and the Fourth National Development Plan (1981-85) development planning in Nigeria started with the ten-year plan of development and welfare for Nigeria between 1946 and 1956 Howe it has been argued that these pre independence plans were no plans in the true sense of the word Besides it could be asserted and emphatically too, that many of the drawbacks of the colonial plans, for example, plan distribution and lack of mass participation, are still very glaring with us today, even after a post-independence planning experience that spanned over fifty years. Although several attempts were made, beginning from the close of 1984, to prepare a fifth National Development Plan (1986-90), but it was to no avail.
During the preparation for the production of what became the still-born fifth plan, the idea of a perspective 20-year plan was generated and accepted by the government. As a consequence, the Babangida administration abandoned the erstwhile system of fixed five-year development plans and adopted in its place, two types of national plans, namely: the perspective plan which covered three years at a time and subjected to review every year to evaluate our performance and ascertain whether the economy is on course. The economic crisis that faced the nation in the wake of the 1980’s had revealed that fixed five-year plans were not best suited to cope with attendant problems of economic management and adjustment under conditions characterized by numerous uncertainties as well as pressing issues that called for urgent solutions. The introduction by the government of the 3-year rolling plan can therefore be said to have been necessitated by the need for an indicative rather than a comprehensive and rigidly direct plan. By implication, there existed orderly rolling of one plan into another to be consummated at the end of the perspective plan (time) period. Essentially, the 1992-94 rolling plan is the third in the series of the medium term plans that was put in place by the Nigerian government since the adoption of the rolling plan strategy in 1990. The 1992-94 rolling plan could therefore be regarded as the 7th plan period, starting with the 1962-68 development plans. Apart from the five national development plans, another document that appears to be ambitious is the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (Soludo 2005). The document was expectedly an attempt to put in place the rudiments of a developmental state and design instruments within it to accelerate growth and reduce poverty. Although the NEEDS document Developing Country Studies www.iiste.org ISSN 2224-607X (Paper) ISSN 2225-0565 (Online) Vol.3, No.4, 2013 68 stated explicitly that it is Nigeria’s home-grown poverty reduction strategy and it appears to conform to what a country PRSP should be (World Bank 2010), it suffers from the shortcomings and inadequacies which Ohiorhenuan (2003) identified for African PRSP generally. Among the shortcomings he identified are weakness on poverty diagnostics; cosmetically descriptive rather than analytical approach and weakness in the setting of economic targets. However, the most fundamental problem with NEEDS as a PRSP is its “trickle down” approach to poverty reduction instead of the “Rights Based Approach” now internationally recognized as the most fruitful approach (AAIN 2005). On the whole, development planning in Nigeria has, over the years, been constrained by the failure of the Nigerian leadership to properly envision true development and place same on the agenda, further argued that sundry factors like misplacement of priorities, poor plan discipline, lack of self-reliance, ineffective executive capacity and public sector inefficiency, technology transfer syndrome, system corruption and inefficacious public/private partnership have made a genuine development path somewhat illusory. The actualization of sustainable development plans based on realistic data in Nigeria will therefore require clear development vision, genuine commitment to the development agenda, public sector efficiency and discipline, public/private Sector synergy and collaboration and attitudinal change.

2. Development: A Conceptual Discourse
Development is an ever-changing step towards achieving some goal and the optimum realization of the well being of people in their communities. It is not an absolute but a relative term because it is difficult to measure, especially as a particular activity may be considered development or a step forward in a particular society, but it may not be so considered in another society. Development is very much related with aspirations and expectations of the people. It is interaction of the people with the natural resources available to them. Quite often, development is viewed as some dynamic change of society from one stage to another without assuming that it is the final stage. Marsh (1996) conceived the concept as huge changes in the lives of people and societies and a progression from one condition to another; that is, from underdevelopment to development. The modern concept of development can be traced to 1987 when the report of the Brundtland Commission defined development to include economic, environmental, socio-cultural, and health as well as political needs. In defining development therefore, one cannot avoid concerns with social and political issues, while focusing on goals, ideals and economic matters. Some scholars have, however, emphasized the need for human-centred development; that is, the focus of development needs not be machines or institutions, but people. In the same vein, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) maintained that the people must be at the centre of all development (UNDP 2008). The World Bank (2008) also asserted that investing in people, if done rightly, would provide the finest foundation for lasting development. It further noted that all people have the same basic needs in form of clean water, fresh air, comfortable housing, etc., which must be met if development is to take place. Development is also seen as an aspect of desirable and planned change influenced by governmental action. Thus development is a value-based and a broad concept. Development is equally a multi-dimensional process involving the reorganization and reorientation of the entire economic and social systems (Todaro and Smith 2009). It transcends beyond the improvement in income and output to the radical transformation in institutional, social and administrative structures. Although development is commonly seen in a national context, its holistic realization may necessitate fundamental modifications of the international economic and social system. Development is therefore a many-sided process. At the level of the individual, it also connotes increased skill and capacity, greater freedom, creativity, self-discipline, responsibility, and material well being (Rodney 1972). Although the orthodox view of development assumes that growth in income will translate automatically to improvements in the welfare of the citizens of any given country (Iyoha et al. 2003), due to the experience of many less developed countries in the 1950s and 1960s, which revealed the simultaneous existence of rapid growth and the general deterioration in the condition of human life; attempts have been made to humanize the concept of development. In the thinking of Seers (Todaro 2009), for instance, evaluation of developmental levels must be concerned with what has been happening to
poverty, unemployment and inequality. Besides, development is a continuous process of generating and more efficiently allocating resources for achieving greater socially satisfying ends (Aboyade 1973). Development is, by implication, made up of two basic and fundamental interrelated parts: increasing the availability of resources and improving the utilization of available resources. While the first component encompasses the natural, human and financial, the second component is a complex function of social organization, level of technology, efficiency of management and the content of public policy.

The resource that is primarily critical to the development process is the natural resource. This is because the natural endowment constitutes the basis for man’s primary economic activities. All the same, from the perspective of resource availability for economic development, the significant factor is not simply the size of the surface area; rather, it is the productive capacity represented by the economic quality of the physical environment. Therefore natural environments become resources when they are discovered and exploited (Fajingbesi 2009). In this direction, development implies change and this is one sense in which the term “development” is used to describe the process of economic and social transformation within countries (Thirtwall 2008). Development therefore encompasses a process of improving the quality of human life which involves raising the standard of living of people (income and consumption, level of food, medical services, education and other infrastructure); creating social, political and economic systems and institutions which promote human dignity and respect and increasing freedom of choice of goods and services. Development is equally an innovative process leading to the structural transformation of the social system through the productive exploitation of environmental resources. This process often follows a well-ordered sequence and exhibits common characteristics across countries. The concept of development, in fact, embraces the major economic and social objective and value that societies strive for and the three basic and distinguishing components or core values in the wider meaning of development are life-sustenance, self-esteem and freedom (Goulet 2008). Life sustenance is concerned with the provision of basic needs, while self-esteem and freedom have to do with the feeling of self-respect and independence and liberty from the three evils of want, ignorance and squalor. These three core components are interrelated, for lack of self-esteem and freedom result from low levels of life sustenance and both lack of self-esteem and economic imprisonment become links in a circular, self-perpetuating chain of poverty by producing a sense of fatalism and acceptance of the established order-the accommodation to poverty (Galbraith 2008).

3. **Planning: A Conceptual Understanding**

Planning is as old as mankind and it has been undertaken in all facets of human endeavour, including warfare, politics, administration and the social spheres
(Ejumudo 2008). It is one of the areas of the classical management theorists. Although planning is an old function in human society, strong interest in planning is primarily a recent phenomenon. Planning is deciding what to do, how to do it and who is to do it (Koontz et al. 2006). It is deciding what actions to be taken in the future for the purpose of achieving organizational goals. It involves thinking ahead initiating and taking a pre determined course of action and deciding in advance what should be done, how, when and by whom. Without planning, the activities of organizations institutions, societies and nations may well become a series of random actions with meaningless objectives (Datta 2010). Planning, in fact, provides a rational approach to pre selected objectives and strongly implies managerial innovation. It is not only the most critical aspect of all the managerial functions, it is an intellectually demanding process that requires that we consciously determine courses of action and base our decisions, which bridges the gap between where we are and where we want to go. Despite the obvious importance of planning, it is still the least well done part of managing and poor planning may be the cause of many managerial problems. In essence, planning is the process of determining how the organization can get to where it wants to be and exactly what it will do to accomplish its objectives. Essentially too, planning entails the determination of control, direction and method of accomplishing the overall organizational objective. It is the process by which managers examine their internal and external environments, ask fundamental questions about their organizations purpose and establish a mission goals and objectives (Dalton 1996). It includes all the activities that lead to the definition of objectives and to the determination of appropriate courses of action to achieve those objectives. (Ivancevich et al. 1994) Planning is thus preparation for action and the first step to every sort of human activity as well as a rational process characteristic of all human behaviours (Piffner and Presthus 2008). In sum, planning is planning no matter the nature or type. There is in short a convergence of opinion among authors on administration and management that planning has a primacy over all the other organizational functions (Glueck 1992; Byers 1994; Hackett 1997; Koontz et al. 2006; Stoner and Freeman 2004; Cowling & Mailer 2004; Ezeani 2006; Certo 2009). Over the years, management writers have presented several purposes of planning. For example, Roney (2002) posited that organizational planning has two purposes: protective and affirmative. The protective purpose of planning is to minimize risk by reducing the uncertainties surrounding business conditions and clarifying the consequences of related management action. The affirmative purpose of planning is to increase the degree of organizational success. The fundamental purpose of planning is therefore to establish a coordinated effort within the organization and help it reach its objectives or facilitate its accomplishment. All other purposes of planning are simply spin-offs of this fundamental purpose that engenders a future-oriented approach and looks beyond normal everyday problems to project challenges and solutions in the future.


Development planning as a long-term programme designed to effect some permanent structural changes in the economy is connected with the
involvement of government in the economy whereby it sets out objectives about the way it wants the economy to develop in the future and then intervenes to try to achieve those objectives (UNDP 2008). Development planning is necessary because since development is neither accidental nor does it take place naturally and quickly of its own accord, it is expedient to plan it deliberately. Development planning involves processes which ensure that national policies and strategies are realized and development concerns at all levels are fully integrated into the overall national development thrusts (Datta 2010). They set out the macroeconomic growth targets as well as the size and allocation of the public sector development. In addition, they provide the direction with respect to promoted sectors, thereby giving guidance to the private sector in determining their own investment policies. Development planning typically follows a set of distinct phases including situation analysis, both internal to the area, and the forces which are shaping the area. This may involve a range of tools to assess the strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities (SWOT) facing an area; prioritizing key issues, problems or outcomes; developing objectives; developing plans to address the objectives, including strategies, activities and projects; developing a spatial picture of the situation as well as plans; developing budgets to achieve the plans. Planning at all levels uses some form of these basic tools.

5. Appraisal of Development Planning Efforts in Nigeria

Although setting up criteria for the appraisal of development plans is a thorny issue, Lewis (1959) identified five criterions for the evaluation of development plans. They are:

- The plan’s contribution to policy making;
- Plan size and priorities;
- Plan strategy; and
- Plan implementation.


The first national development plan was launched in June 1962 and was expected to operate for a period of six years up to 1968 (FRN 1962). But in spite of the fact that the regional autonomy was still very attractive, the regional and federal governments realized the need for the formulation of common objectives and economic targets.

6.1. Policy Making

The first plan was not bad in terms of contribution to policy making. The macro-objectsives of the plan included ensuring the growth rate of at least 4.0% per annum; achievement of economic take-off by 1980; developing
opportunities in specific areas like health, education and employment; to enhance access to opportunities in education, health and employment; promotion of balanced development; promotion of equity in income and promotion of macro-economic stability. In addition, there was a spelt-out commitment to encourage private entrepreneurship particularly indigenous entrepreneurship. It was clear from the plan document that efforts were made to tackle key policy issues like physical and institutional infrastructural inadequacy. At any rate, the first plan saw to the creation of Kainji Dam and the establishment of the Nigerian Industrial Development Bank which is a clear indication of the successful institution of infrastructural development by the plan. The plan, however, failed when one considers the fact that marketing boards continued to impose taxes on agricultural export commodities, which clearly became a cog in the wheel of the progress of the peasant farmers who were the main producers of and contributors to agricultural development. The problem was further compounded by the over-valuation of the pound which meant additional taxation of such exports, with the Developing Country Studies www.iiste.org ISSN 2224-607X (Paper) ISSN 2225-0565 (Online) Vol.3, No.4, 2013 71 accompanying effect of a drastic cut down in the prices of domestic food items due to the influx of relatively cheaper foreign food items. This situation was particularly defective, especially due to the high priority position of agriculture during the said period. In fact, the situation was nothing short of milking a productive cow to death.

6.2. Plan Size and Priorities:
The first plan had a capital expenditure package of N1, 307.8 million. By the plan’s estimate, available domestic financial resources amounted to N526 million. Under-spending was estimated to amount to N45.8 million, leaving a balance of expenditure gap of N781.8 million to be financed from other sources. It was assumed that foreign aid will cater for N654.2 million, leaving an uncovered gap of N127.6 million to be financed possibly by inflationary measures. Judging by the Lewisian view that the basis of a development is not needs, but resources, it is obvious that the first plan was over-sized, especially when one considers the fact that the plan’s investment was N1,307.8 million, with domestic resource availability amounting to no more that N526 million. It is no distortion of facts to assert therefore that the expectation of 50 per cent (N654.2 million) of the capital budget from foreign sources was clearly unrealistic. However, despite the abysmal performance of the foreign aid sector during the plan period, the domestic economy was able to generate resources for the financing of the plan. Ultimately, executive capacity constituted a greater constraint on plan implementation than finance, which resulted in a fast depletion of our foreign reserves. At the end of the plan period, total capital expenditure
amounted to about N307.0 million against the planned figure of N1,307.8 million, which amounted to about 80 percent rate of achievement. It should be emphasized, however, that the iron and steel (industrial) project was not implemented at all. Also, agriculture, industry and manpower development were accorded highest priority rating by the first plan. It should be stressed, however, that despite the fact that agricultural development is a key factor in successful industrialization and the fastest route to modern development, the highest priority ranking given to agriculture was nothing but mere paper work, especially as agriculture which then employed more than 70 per cent of the work-force received only 13.6 per cent of the planned capital expenditure. In fact, the sector received only 9.8 per cent of the total in terms of actual expenditure.

6.3. Plan Strategy

In respect of rural-urban balance, the first plan was obviously urban-oriented. The truism of this assertion is evident when one considers the fact that the percentage of the expenditure did not have any meaningful impact. The situation was lamented by Lipton (1977), when he observed that the greatest contemporary issue in the third world underdevelopment is not between foreign exploiters and the indigenous population or capital and labour, but rather between rural poverty and powerlessness and urban affluence and power. This plan heavily favoured the urban sector to the relative neglect of the rural sector in line with the colonial pattern. In fact, Okowa (1982) estimated that about 90 per cent of planned investment in infrastructural facilities in the first plan was allotted to the urban sector, while less than 6 per cent was allotted to the rural sector. Even in the area of industrial development, the first plan focused largely on large enterprises to the detriment of the small scale entrepreneurs. For instance, the Nigerian Industrial Development Bank, established in 1964 was barred from financing unincorporated business, which clearly defined most of the small scale industries out of the bank’s operations.

6.4. Plan Implementation

Although the first plan made some appreciable impact in terms of plan implementation, particularly in respect of some key projects of the plan like the Kainji Dam, the country’s first petroleum refinery and the Nigerian Industrial Development Bank, the implemented plan did deviate significantly from the planned programme. For instance, agriculture and industry had actual allocations of 9.8 and 8.9 per cent respectively, as compared with planned allocations of 13.6 and 13.4. Given the highest priority rating of these two key sectors, such downward displacement of allocations of investment expenditure ought not to have been entertained. In fact, in the first plan, four capital programmes were patched together so that this was not an integrated plan at all. Conclusively, the masses had no
place in the first plan. Even the technocrats who prepared the plan were foreign. In fact, the two expert planners during the first plan, W.F. Stopler and L.M. Hansan, are Americans. Although it is quite clear from the plan document that government was aware of the need for mass participation for successful plan implementation, yet the government did nothing to encourage the participation of Nigerians in both planning and implementation. Thus, the government’s statement that: ‘Governments may govern, economists may plan, Developing Country Studies www.iiste.org ISSN 2224-607X (Paper) ISSN 2225-0565 (Online) Vol.3, No.4, 2013 72 administrators may organize, but ultimately the execution of all plans, no matter how well designed and intentioned, depends on the response of the people themselves’ was nothing but a mere political posturing.


The second National Development plan (SNDP) started in 1970 instead of 1969 because of the civil war which necessitated the extension of the first National Development plan to 1970 (FRN 1970). The objectives of the plan which give the impression of Nigeria’s first attempt to grapple with real development included efforts to build a united, strong and self-reliant nation; a great and dynamic economy; a just and egalitarian society; land of bright and full opportunities for all citizens; and free and democratic society.

7.1. **Policy Making**

This plan recognized the importance of policy making in development planning. The plan also recognized the role which policy could play in the management of the external sector in the 1960’s, for which cause a monetary policy was geared towards the provision of easy money to satisfy Government’s financial requirements. In this regard, the financial system was to be reconstituted with an eye to increasing the plan’s capacity to mobilize funds for development purposes. The afore-said fiscal policy was expected to provide funds for financing economic development, containing inflationary pressures and reducing existing inequalities in wealth, income and consumption. Recognizing the enormous damage done to physical infrastructural facilities due to the civil war, emphasis was placed on the physical rehabilitation of infrastructure. The plan was essentially geared towards rehabilitation, reconstruction and reconciliation. Consequently, programmes including agricultural research and extension services were planned and executed.

7.2. **Plan Size and Priority**

The second plan had an initial investment expenditure of N1,560,000 million for the public sector which was eventually revised upwards to 3,271.9 million, thereby giving the plan an over-sized structure. Although the overreliance on the foreign aid contribution that was evident in the 1962-68 plan was corrected
during the second plan, the priorities given to transportation and communication as witnessed in the colonial planning of 1949 through 1956 transcended the 1962-68 to that of 1970-74 plan. For example, the biggest single sector in the 1970-74 plan was transportation with 23.7 per cent of the total public sector programme and 30.1 per cent of the Federal Government’s programme. Agriculture, industry and education combined were allocated 21.1 percent of the federal programme, leaving transportation with 1.7 per cent. Worse still, more emphasis was placed on industries that would tie Nigeria’s economy to the monopoly capitalist nations (market) in terms of dependency of our economy on foreign raw materials. This is evident in the import-substitution industries in Nigeria. Particularly, the 1970-74 plan for the industrial sector witnessed the setting up of ventures like the Peugeot Motor Car Assembly Plant in Kaduna and the Volkswagen Plant in Lagos to the relative neglect of food storage and processing industries or the liquefied natural gas or petro-chemical and agro-allied industries.

7.3. Plan Strategy

While the plan was aware of the multiplier effects of improvements in rural incomes, it proceeded to identify itself with the first plan’s strategy of taxing the ‘rural surplus’ through the marketing boards for urban development. Obviously, therefore, the plan can be said to be urban-biased. It should be emphasized that the urban-oriented posture of the plan was nothing short of a contradiction of its egalitarian objectives. In the words of Aka, the objectives were a mere political posturing of a defensive radical mariner. In terms of industrial development, the second plan de-emphasized on small scale industrial development as an important factor for employment generation with its accompanying effect of rapid improvement of the living standards or conditions of the rural inhabitants and elements of the urban informal sector.

7.4. Plan Implementation

Hard and fast rules to enforce plan discipline and conditions required for the introduction of new projects were all embedded in the plan. In the above plan, a total capital expenditure of N2,236.4 million was realized against the initial plan size of 560.0 million which was revised upwards to N3,271.9 million. This represented a financial achievement rate of 67% in terms of the revised programme and over 140 per cent against the background of the original programme. By the close of 1974, a reasonable number of abandoned agricultural farms and plantations in the war-affected areas had been rehabilitated and a number of government-owned companies were established in several areas of business including banking and insurance. The plan implementation was comparatively better than the first plan when one considers the level of plan distortion. For instance, agriculture during the second plan, received 9.7 per cent allocation of 9.9 per cent, showing 0.2 per cent distortion against the 3.8 per cent distortion for the first plan. In the same vein, industry and commerce had a revised allocation of 7.1 per cent, but in actual sense, it received 6.5 percent that represented 0.6 per cent contrary to
the 4.5 per cent distortion recorded in the first plan. Essentially too, the second plan was defective in the area of mass participation despite the substitution of indigenous expertise for the foreign ones that prepared the first plan.


This plan marked a watershed in the history National Development planning for several reasons. First, its sheer size was very large. It has been put roughly by Ayo (1988) to be almost ten times the size of the Second National Development Plan. Second, it was handled by the National Economic Advisory Council (NEAC) which was established in 1972. The council undertook extensive consultation with various bodies and organs and was well placed to consult widely because of its wide membership base. This comprised government officials of various technicalities and backgrounds and representatives of various bodies such as private organizations, trade unions, chambers of commerce, manufacturers’ Associations, Agricultural Associations and other professionals. The objectives of the plan were increase in per capita income; even distribution of income; reduction in the level of unemployment; increase in the supply of high level manpower; diversification of the economy; balanced development and indigenization of economic activities. The third plan was supposed to be a blue-print for the industrial development of Nigeria (FRN 1975). Although the financial capacity to implement the plan was there, the political will was almost completely absent. In fact, Nigerians were more concerned with sharing the oil booty than in laying the foundation for the much-needed industrial development index.

8.1. **Policy Making**

The third plan which was meant to ensure a radical transformation of the economy during the plan period identified three objectives of the policy which were: economic growth and development; price stability and social equity. The plan also classified the policy into three namely: fiscal policy, monetary policy and incomes policy. While the fiscal policy was meant for the curtailment of imports and generation of government revenue, the monetary policy and the incomes policy were meant for the control of inflation and the reduction of income inequality respectively. Although the plan recognized the need for improvement in the lot of the rural people, the Udoji awards of 1975 worsened the relative position of the rural dwellers through the combination of a very strong Naira and massive importation of food.

8.2. **Plan Size**

The third plan originally projected a capital expenditure of N30.0 billion and was revised upwards to N43.3 billion in 1976 due to the massive increase in oil revenue without any evidence of a new absorptive capacity to support such flamboyance. Although the plan was not oversized in financial terms, it was essentially oversized when considered against the background of the level of executive capacity. It could be asserted therefore that inadequate executive capacity and lack of
strong political will were some of the greatest problems that plagued the plan in terms of implementation or execution

8.3. **Plan Priorities**

Although the third plan accepted the five national objectives identified by the second plan, the lack of operationality of the said objectives occasioned the identification of seven short-term objectives which were: increase in per capital income; more even distribution of income; reduction in the level of unemployment; increase in the supply of high level manpower, diversification of the economy, balance development indigenization of economic activity Consequent upon the above mentioned objectives, the plan placed more emphasis on economic infrastructure, industrial development, agriculture and manpower development The revised plan, however, shifted priority in favour of social services. Although the plan earmarked and expended a huge amount of money to support agricultural development, a policy environment was created which made agricultural development far from possibility.

8.4. **Plan Strategy**

The third plan capitalized on the oil boom for the purpose of creating a productive base for self-sustaining growth and development. To achieve the objective of more even distribution of income, the public sector was made to provide subsidized facilities for the poor, which eventually benefited the rich. Despite the plan’s goal of improving living conditions of the rural people, the resource allocation pattern was even more urban-based than the previous plans. In fact, the plan aided and abetted the resultant massive rural-urban migration. The plan also failed to recognize the key employment-generating role of the small scale industries.

8.5. **Plan Implementation**

A good number of programmes like the further indigenization of the economy and free education and industrial projects like the Warn and Kaduna refineries, and Ajaokuta Steel Plant were implemented during the said plan period. However, one must emphasize the non-implementation of the petrochemical complex and the liquefied Natural Gas projects. The implementation of the plan was fraught with indiscipline when one considers the fact that N979.8 million was spent
contrary to the planned expenditure of N667.4 million on importation of consumer goods for the 1975-75 period. This overspending persisted despite the awareness by government of the adverse effect of such a pattern on the achievement of our development objectives. Structural distortion also characterized the third plan. For instance, Agriculture and Industry were allotted 7.2 per cent and 17.2 per cent of the public sector’s capital expenditure respectively.


The fourth National Development plan made some improvement on the 3 plan (FRN 1981). It tried to further consolidate the process of laying a solid foundation for economic and social development. A look at the sectoral allocations would reveal that all the subsectors were retained as in the third National Development plan, except that in some cases, increased funds allocation was made. Another difference between the Third and Fourth National Development plans was that the objectives were enlarged and some of them were more particularistic or definitive in the fourth plan. The objectives included increase in the real income of the average citizen; more even distribution of income among individuals and socio-economic group; increase in the level of skilled manpower; reduction in the level of unemployment; reduction of the dependence of the economy on a narrow range of activities; balanced development, increased participation by citizens in the ownership and management of productive enterprises and greater self-reliance. Others were development of technology; increased productivity and the promotion of a new national orientation conducive to greater discipline, better attitude to work and clean environment (Ayo 1988).

9.1. Policy Making

The plan also considered three broad objectives of the policy which were: economic growth and development, price stability and social equity and recognized three policy categories namely: fiscal policy, monetary policy and incomes policy framework; the only difference was the emphasis on the need to generate investible surplus by the latter.

9.2. Plan Size

The fourth plan began with a planned capital expenditure of N70.5 billion for the public sector and N1 1.7 billion for the private sector. However, the slide in the market rendered the N70.5 billion investment target unrealistic. The plan was as a result of the assumption that oil production would remain at over 2 million barrels a day at a price of at least $40 per barrel. Unfortunately, however, by February 1983, Nigeria was producing less than 1 million barrels a day at about $ 30 per barrel.
The plan can be said to be over-sized, if the relevant available data upon which the plan size was determined is anything to go by.

9.3. **Plan Priorities:**
The fourth plan like the previous plans accorded the highest priority to economic infrastructure, industry, agriculture and manpower development. To this end, agriculture, industry and education were allotted 12.6 per cent, 13.6 per cent and 11.0 per cent respectively. The fourth plan also emphasized the development of technology and the promotion of a new national orientation.

9.4. **Plan Strategy**
The fourth plan also relied on the possible utilization of the proceeds from oil to establish the productive base of the economy. Unfortunately, there was downward trend in the oil market shortly after the plan came into effect. Consequently, there was the need to curtail the importation of consumer goods in order to be able to generate the funds needed to finance the plan, but the government lacked the discipline to pursue such a line of action. Thus, by the end of 1983, evident signs of the consequences of such a planless strategy were coming to light.

9.5. **Plan Implementation**
In respect of plan implementation, the fourth plan was characterized by uncompleted and often abandoned projects. Key industrial projects started during the fourth plan period included the liquefied Natural Gas Plant at Eleme, a new refinery in Port-Harcourt, petrochemical complexes at Kaduna and Warn and a fertilizer complex at Onne. There was also the problem of distorted under-allocation during the plan period. For example, industry was allotted 15.8 per cent in the revised plan, but in reality, it got 13.6 per cent which amounted to 2.2 per cent distorted under-allocation. Generally, the implementation of the plan was defective.

10. **Fifth National Development Plan and One Year Economic Emergency Programme (Ibrahim Babangida-1986)**
Even in economic sector, the fourth National development plan was assessed to have performed poorly and so it became necessary to carry out extensive consultations as a prelude for the preparation of the fifth National Development plan. A national conference on the matter was held at the University of Ibadan in November, 1984, and the recommendations from it formed the basis of the policies and strategies included in the fifth National Development plan. The objectives remained essentially the same. The main thrust of the plan was to correct the structural defects in the economy and create a more self-reliant economy that
would largely be regulated by market forces. The economy was therefore expected to be restructured in favour of the production sector especially those of agriculture and manufacturing. More than ever, the linkages between the agricultural and manufacturing sectors of the economy were to be emphasized during the plan period (Ayo 1988). The Fifth National Development Plan did not actually take off in 1986 and the year was taken as one-year of economic emergency period and programme. It was later absorbed by a two-year structural adjustment programme (SAP). The two year SAP ended the five-year planning model. The two year model was also replaced by the three year rolling plan.


An innovative view of planning was introduced during the preparation of the fifth Development plan. It was felt that the established 5 year planning model did not actually provide an opportunity for a realistic long-term view of the problem of the economy. It commenced action with a conference organized by the Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research (NISER) and the Federal Ministry of National Planning to discuss strategies for the National Development plan. Following the recommendations of the planning experts who attended the Ibadan conference in November, 1984, the government decided to institute what became known as perspective planning that was to cover a period of 15-20 years, so that there can be a longer term view of the country’s problems. The first phase of the perspective plan was to constitute the fifth National Development Plan, while the establishment of 5-year National Development Plan ceased to operate. In fact, the period between 1986 and 1989 was uneventful.

Essentially, the Babangida administration abandoned the erstwhile system of fixed five-year development plans and adopted in its place, two types of national plans namely the perspective which will span over a period of 15-20 years, and the rolling plan which will cover three years at a time subject to review every year to evaluate our performance and ascertain whether the economy is on course. In view of its comprehensive nature, it requires a lot of information and data to prepare the perspective plan. It is, in this connection, that the national bank undertook a major survey of the statistical base as early as January 1991. This was done to avoid a situation where there will be gaps in our data that will resultantly make it difficult to plan and monitor the performance of our economy.

The economic crisis that faced the nation since 1983 revealed that fixed five-year plans were not the best suited to cope with the attendant problems of economic management and adjustment under conditions characterized by numerous uncertainties as well as pressing issues that called for urgent solutions. The introduction by the Developing Country Studies government of the 3-year rolling plan could be said to have been necessitated by the need to have an indicative rather than a comprehensive and rigidly directive plan. It was also borne out of the fact that there is the need to have a systematically and orderly rolling of one plan into another to be consummated at the end of the perspective plan time period.

Following independence, a total of five national development plans were launched between 1962 and 1980 with the common characteristic of poor implementation. Arguably, from the mid-1980s, systematic planning suffered a setback as the State grappled with the problems of the separation of roles between public and private sectors. The introduction of three-year rolling plans during this period of policy experimentation did little to rekindle the declining economic fortunes of the country. Economic conditions plummeted fuelled by such factors as corruption, decline in the price of crude oil and wrong policy formulation and implementation. Poverty then became a problem of major proportions and concern for the first time in Nigeria and the trend worsened through to 1999. It was against this background that the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) that appears to be an ambitious developmental blueprint was introduced. The document was expectedly an attempt to put in place the rudiments of a developmental state and design instruments within it to accelerate growth and reduce poverty. The National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) is therefore a response to the development challenges of Nigeria for the level grossly underestimated the extent of social, political, and economic decay of the country was grossly underestimated. Although the NEEDS document stated explicitly that it is Nigeria’s home-grown poverty reduction strategy and it appears to conform to what a country PRSP should be (World Bank 2010), it suffers from the shortcomings and inadequacies which Ohiorhenuan (2003) identified for African PRSP generally. Among the shortcomings he identified are weakness on poverty diagnostics; cosmetically descriptive rather than analytical approach and weakness in the setting of economic targets. However, the most fundamental problem with NEEDS as a PRSP is its “trickle down” approach to poverty reduction instead of the ‘Rights Based Approach’ now internationally recognized as the most fruitful approach (AAIN 2005).

13. The Problem of Development Planning in Nigeria

In the face of the disturbing proliferation of national development plans in Nigeria, there still largely exist development gaps that have reached levels that can be appropriately dubbed problematic. In fact, several years of development planning in the country has failed to produce the supposed much sought-after sustainable development. Arguably, the challenge of development planning in Nigeria is compounded by the fact that sustainable development itself is not so much on the agenda of successive Nigerian governments and the absence of a true development agenda has not placed the country on the right sustainable development path. This explains why Nigeria may be described as being in the thick of the world’s
poorest people that could be running against the tide and lagging behind in terms of almost all the development indicators. It is instructive to note that while there had been plethora of activities couched and cosmetically dubbed development plans, true development has not been on the agenda as far as the Nigerian leadership is concerned. In fact, lack of clear vision is the foundational basis for the disjointed mission with poorly tangible results in all the globally recognized and acceptable developmental indicators that had so far attended development planning efforts in Nigeria. The sundry factors like misplacement of priorities, poor plan discipline, lack of self-reliance, ineffective executive capacity and public sector inefficiency as well as poor public/private sector partnership that have made a genuine development path somewhat illusory are evidently micro, subsidiary and mere appendage to the macro and main crux of the developmental planning problematic in Nigeria. The subsidiary and micro factors that are an outgrowth of the mainstream near absence of true development agenda in Nigeria are:

13.1. **Misplacement of Priorities**

Like the colonial ones, the policies of the post-independent plans also exhibited a basic lack of urgency. A typical example is the iron and steel industry that was in the first and second plans and was initiated for projected completion during the fourth plan. This represented a lag of twenty years; yet this project was repeatedly acclaimed the cornerstone of Nigeria’s industrialization. Similar examples include petrochemicals, fertilizers, the petroleum refinery, liquefied petroleum gas and other heavy industries. While this leisurely pace persisted, the country completed such counter-productive projects like the National Stadium and Trade Fair Complex in Lagos, the Festac Durbar Hotel at Kaduna and staged the multi-million Naira FESTAC itself in 1977. Developing Country Studies

13.2. **Lack of Plan Discipline**

Nigerians seem to lack the political will to keep to our plans. While there are enough rules in the plans to enforce plan discipline, Nigerian leaders simply have a special knack for side tracking development plans. Though plan projects acquired priorities since 1962, these are invariably ignored by the bureaucratic bourgeoisie in a blatant demonstration of the superiority of its selfish class interests over avowed national objectives. Typical examples could be found in the FESTAC which cost hundreds of millions of Naira, yet nowhere in any plan document and the Universal Primary Education (UPE) programme which was not in the second plan, yet its implementation began during that plan and its critical phase commenced during the third plan. In fact, the plans of the various governments could be described as competitive in character, problem distortion and aberration in plan
execution as well as under spending on directly productive projects and overspending on prestige or white elephant projects not included in the plan. Although plans are made to accommodate little variations, the various plans in Nigeria in the past were so much altered during the implementation stages to the extent of distorting—the overall objectives and lack of discipline in plan implementation has led to many abandoned projects which litter the country’s landscape today. Most of these projects like the Ajaokuta steel complex that ought to play catalyst—roles in the country’s industrialization drive are still comatose.

13.3. **Lack of Self-Reliance:**
In spite of about two decades of post-independent planning, the basic neo-colonial structure of the economy persists in terms of its dependence on international capitalism. In fact, by the kind of industrialization strategy of these plans, this is anchored to import-substitution and consequently dominated by the multinationals. Post — independent planning has essentially integrated our economy more tightly and multilaterally into the orbits of imperialistic international capitalism. Worse still, is the capital-intensive techniques of this neo-colonial industrialization together with the orientation towards consumer goods manufacturing in the country, especially the domestic production of former imports of manufactured goods which imply increased reliance on imperialists for capital goods. The ports congestion of the early post-war years and the drastic shortages that resulted underscore the point. This, in fact, explains why most of our civil engineering constructions like roads, harbours, monstrous bridges in Lagos and other major cities in Nigeria, even housing, depend so helplessly on imperialist multinationals like Julius Berger, Dumez and the like.

13.4. **Public Service Inefficiency:**
Since the public service is the institution that implements the development plans, any efforts at improving our implementation record must begin with the public service. The fact that Nigerians outside the public service are quite productive is an indication that the problem must lie to a large extent with the service itself. Although the public service reforms, which among other things, attempted to increase the level of professionalization in the service, is a step in the right direction, the public service is still plagued with the problem of management malady, poor conditions of remunerations, overstaffing, and lack of a clear-cut job description as well as non institutionalization of the principle of management b objective (MBO)

13.5. **Technology Transfer Syndrome**
Until the fourth plan development plans in Nigeria did not recognize the key role of indigenous technological capability in national development. Worse still is the fact that the stress on technological transfer through multination which has proved to be a mirage up till date.

13.6. Systemic Corruption
Systemic corruption has to do with a situation where corruption has been institutionalized and (catapulted) raised to the level of a structural parameter. Thus it has become part of the value-system of a society, that is to say, a condition par excellence. It could be asserted that from the strategic corruption of the cement armada to the mega tonic corruption of the second Republic we have consciously or unconsciously, created systemic corruption in the country and the trend has continued through the third and fourth republics to the extent that it will not be a distortion of historical facts to assert that corruption is at home with Nigerians. Developing Country Studies.

13.7. Inadequate Executive Capacity
Inadequate executive capacity is one of the greatest problems of development plans in Nigeria in the area of execution. In fact, it is frustrating to plan the execution of programmes which require the availability of organization, institutions and skills which the economy does not possess and cannot normally be expected to generate during the plan period. Executive capacity also involves the existence of competent contracting firms and basic socio-economic infrastructure including competent hands to run the civil service and allied government machinery.

13.8. Absence of Relevant Data
Planning relies basically on data. Accurate data is a very scarce commodity in Nigeria due to problems arising from the inadequacies of the federal office of statistics, the unwillingness of Nigerians to reveal information and the outright manipulation of data for pecuniary or other gains. The most vivid illustration of the problem of data in Nigeria is the fact that since independence till date, nobody has been able to answer the simple question “How many are we?” A country that does not know its population would definitely not be in position to determine the other vital statistics necessary for planning life, birth-rate, death-rate, number of those of school age and the other demographic changes in the population which are essential for planning. The absence of reliable background data has made the use of social indicators difficult and inadequate for plan preparation, implementation and the monitoring of national development.
13.9. **Domestic-Foreign Resource Generation Ratio**

There is the tendency to have over-sized plans because of the high expectations from foreign resources. This situation became obvious during the fourth plan, when the original capital outlay of N70.5 billion for the public sector became unrealistic as a result of the disturbances in the oil market. The plan’s resource allocation was based on the assumption that oil production would remain at over 2 million barrels a day at a price of at least, $40 per barrel. Regrettably, however, by February, 1983, Nigeria was producing less than 1 million barrels per day at about $30 per barrel. Also, the first plan could be considered oversized because of the total planned investment of N1,307.8 million, domestic resource availability amounted to N526 million with the expectation of 50 per cent (million) of the capital budget from foreign sources. Worse still, Nigeria’s economy is mono-product and not technology driven in a domestic sense.

13.10. **Public/Private Sector Partnership**

There is arguably a very weak collaboration between the public and the private sectors as far as development planning efforts in Nigeria is concerned. In fact, development planning has largely followed bureaucratic process with little private sector participation so much so that such efforts can be appropriately described as lacking in synergy. Ordinarily, development planning is supposed to incorporate broad policy frameworks that will have elements of public and private sector initiatives.

14. **Conclusive Remarks and Recommendations**

Development planning that involves processes which ensure that national policies and strategies are realized and development concerns at all levels are fully integrated into the overall national development thrusts are a sinequa-non for the translation of initiatives and programmes into tangible results that will meet globally recognized and acceptable benchmarks of true development. The efficacy of such plans will therefore require, as a matter of exigency, getting the basics right that includes instituting sound development policies, ensuring good economic management, promoting private investment, developing human resource capacity, fostering synergistic public/private sector partnership and collaboration as well as providing good physical and institutional infrastructure. The success of the
above will not be the result of any single policy, but the product of multi-sectoral policies with the government distinctly playing the leading role in structural adjustment, particularly in influencing savings, investment and financial policies where private initiatives are encouraged. In this direction, the effective role of development planners is central to the process that will accommodate the interest of all stakeholders so as to create a sense of ownership by all involved. In sum, there should be a true development plan; a reasonable measure of discipline among executors as far as the plan implementation is concerned, especially as a plan can be said to be Developing Country Studies meaningless if the political authorities are not genuinely committed to its implementation with a sense of discipline, public sector efficiency, public/private sector synergy and collaboration and attitudinal change that will create a genial climate clement for the much desired development on a sustainable basis in Nigeria.
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